Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

International Plant Protection Convention

REPORT

34th Standards Committee Meeting

Rome, Italy
11–15 November 2019

IPPC Secretariat

FAO. 2019. *Report of the 34th meeting of the Standards Committee, 11–15 November 2019.* Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). 91 pages. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

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.

© FAO, 2019

Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original English edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

Third-party materials. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the Meeting 5
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat 5
2. Meeting Arrangements 5
2.1 Election of the Rapporteur 5
2.2 Adoption of the agenda 5
3. Administrative Matters 6
4. Draft ISPMs for Recommendation to Commission on Phytosanitary Measures for Adoption (from Second Consultation) 6
4.1 Draft 2018 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001) ... 6
4.2 Revision of ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) (2009-005), Priority 17
4.3 Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002), Priority 2 12
4.4 Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006), Priority 2 18
5. Commodity Standards 20
5.1 Update from the Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards 20
5.2 Revision of the draft ISPM: Requirements for commodity and pathway standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008) 24
6. Updates on Draft ISPMs for Approval for First Consultation 25
7. Topics 25
7.1 List of topics 25
8. Standards Committee 25
8.1 Follow-up on actions from SC May 2019 25
8.2 Standards Committee working group (SC-7) May 2019 27
8.3 Summary of polls and forums discussed on e-decision site 28
9. Technical Panels – Urgent Issues 28
9.1 Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) 28
9.2 Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) 30
10. Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) Interactions 30
10.1 Update on IC activities 30
11. Updates 30
11.1 CPM Bureau meetings (June 2019 and October 2019) 30
11.2 Strategic Planning Group (SPG) meeting (October 2019) 31
11.3 International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) update 31
11.4 Technical consultation among regional plant protection organizations (TC-RPPOs), 2019 update 31
11.5 Briefings from IPPC Secretariat 32
11. SC Recommendations for CPM-15 (2020) Decisions and Discussions 34
12. Agenda Items Deferred to Future SC Meetings 34
13. Review of the Standard Setting Calendar 35
14. Any Other Business 35

15. Date and Venue of the Next SC Meeting 35
16. Evaluation of the Meeting Process 35
17. Review and Adoption of the Report 35
18. Close of the Meeting..... 35
Appendix 1: Agenda..... 37
Appendix 2: Documents List..... 42
Appendix 3: Participants List 45
Appendix 4: Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5: *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* (1994-001).... 51
Appendix 5: DRAFT ISPM: Revision of ISPM 8: *Determination of pest status in an area* (2009-005) 54
Appendix 6: DRAFT ISPM: Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)..... 61
Appendix 7: DRAFT ISPM: Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as phytosanitary measures (2014-006)..... 70
Appendix 8: DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR: Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS) (2019-009) 78
Appendix 9: Draft ISPM: Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008).... 81
Appendix 10: Summary of standards committee e-decisions (May 2019 – November 2019)..... 87
Appendix 11: Action points arising from the SC November 2019 meeting 89

1. Opening of the Meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

[1] The IPPC Secretary, Mr Jingyuan XIA opened the meeting and welcomed all participants to the Standards Committee (SC) meeting. He welcomed the new SC members. He then welcomed Mr Arop DENG, who had joined the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as the "Secretariat") since the last SC meeting. Mr DENG, who has replaced Mr SHOKI as the lead of the Integration and Support team (IST), introduced himself to SC members.

[2] The Secretary raised the following key points for the SC to consider:

- **Implementation of IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030.** The Secretary highlighted that this is the roadmap for the next ten years and marks a big change in the mission of the IPPC. The previous mission was to *protect* from pests; but in this new Strategic Framework, the mission is to *protect* from pests and to *promote* safe trade. He summarized the eight development agenda items in the new Strategic Framework, which have been grouped into three categories – one per unit of the IPPC Secretariat. For Standard Setting, the tasks are commodity- and pathway-specific ISPMs, management of e-commerce, and development of guidance on the use of third-party entities. For Implementation and Facilitation, the tasks are the harmonization of electronic data exchange, emerging pest responses, and diagnostic laboratory networks, and for Integration and Support, the tasks are climate change and research collaboration. A five-year financial plan will be developed. Implementation of the Strategic Framework will commence in 2020. The Secretary invited the SC to consider three key questions: What is the SC's work plan for 2021? What is the SC's strategy for resource implementation? What is the strategy for communication for the next five years?
- **Promotion of the International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) in 2020.** The Secretary emphasized the significance of IYPH as a once-in-lifetime opportunity to promote the need to protect plant health and the role of the IPPC in this. He called upon the SC members to be very active in promoting IYPH. He outlined some of the key events that would take place during the year, and pointed out that the new Strategic Framework would be adopted at CPM-15 in April 2020.
- **Standards Committee communication.** The Secretary confirmed that, from next year, all six FAO languages will be available, upon request, for SC meetings. Also from next year, it is hoped that the IPPC website, or at least the key parts of it, will be available in all these languages. The Secretary invited the SC to also consider developing factsheets on issues relating to standards, to promote these issues among a wider, less technical audience.
- **Prioritization.** The Secretary emphasized the need for the SC to prioritize work items so that there is a clear focus on those items of work that are most important. He encouraged the SC to fully utilize the resources available in an efficient way to achieve high performance.

[3] The SC Chairperson, Mr Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), thanked the Secretary for these comments.

[4] The IPPC Standard Setting Unit (SSU) lead welcomed all participants and thanked all those who had contributed to the papers for this meeting. He welcomed the new SC members, Mr Nader ELBADRY (Egypt), Mr André PERALTA (Brazil) and Ms Joanne WILSON (New Zealand), welcomed the observers, and acknowledged the absence of Ms Ouroba ALZITANIABOALBORGHOL (Syria), Mr Nicholas EID (Lebanon) and Mr Lupeomanu Pelenato FONOTI (Samoa).

2. Meeting Arrangements

2.1 Election of the Rapporteur

[5] The SC elected Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) as Rapporteur.

2.2 Adoption of the agenda

[6] The SC adopted the Agenda, modified to consider 8.1 immediately before 6.2 (Appendix 1).

[7] The SC Chairperson asked the SC whether the updates (items 8.2 to 11.5) should be considered earlier in the agenda. The SC agreed, however, to leave the updates where they were on the agenda, so that priority could be given to the various draft standards being considered.

3. Administrative Matters

[8] The IPPC Secretariat introduced the Documents list (Appendix 2) and the Participants list (Appendix 3), and invited participants to notify the Secretariat of any information that required updating in the latter or was missing from it.

[9] The Secretariat provided a document on **local information**[1]. New SC members were invited to attend a training session at lunchtime.

[10] The SSU lead introduced the **SSU staff**[2].

4. Draft ISPMs for Recommendation to Commission on Phytosanitary Measures for Adoption (from Second Consultation)

4.1 Draft 2018 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001)

[11] The Steward for the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG), Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France), introduced the draft 2018 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*), the compiled comments from the second consultation, and the Steward's notes[3]. A total of 97 comments had been received, most of which agreed with the proposed deletions and revisions. The Steward proposed to the SC that the draft 2018 amendments be submitted to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) without modification.

[12] The SC discussed the following issues.

[13] **Deletion of "cut flowers and branches" and "plants *in vitro*".** A few of the consultation comments had suggested that these terms should be retained in ISPM 5 because of draft or potential draft standards on these commodities, also suggesting that "cut flowers and branches" be changed to "cut flowers and foliage". The TPG's view was that Glossary definitions for these terms are not needed because these terms can be used in their common sense, and that a Glossary definition is not needed to clarify what an ISPM should cover, as this should be defined by its scope.

[14] The SC agreed with the TPG's view that these terms should be deleted from ISPM 5.

[15] **Revision of "wood".** A few of the consultation comments had suggested that "and" be deleted before "bamboo" in the proposed revised definition of "wood". The Steward pointed out, however, that the "and" is necessary to ensure that the word "products" refers back to both "bamboo" and "rattan".

[16] The SC agreed that the "and" should not be deleted.

[17] **Revision of "treatment".** A few consultation comments had suggested changes to the proposed definition: reverting to "pests" instead of "regulated pests", providing clarity on the word "infertile", adding "or non-viable" to "rendering pests infertile", and deleting "for devitalizing". A further comment had suggested keeping the current ISPM 5 definition. The Steward explained that the proposed definition for "treatment (as a phytosanitary measure)" applies only to regulated pests because, according to Article VI.2 of the IPPC, contracting parties shall not require phytosanitary measures for non-regulated pests. She referred to ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) as being an example of where contracting parties had agreed on treatments targeted at quarantine pests. She

[1] Local information for meeting participants: Rome, Italy: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1034/.

[2] Standard Setting Unit staff (2019-11-07): https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/2463/.

[3] 1994-001; 04_SC_2019_Nov; 27_SC_2019_Nov; 2019-05 SC-7 meeting report: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87337/.

reminded the SC that treatment as a phytosanitary measure should be distinguished from treatment in its common meaning. She clarified that the term "infertile" is used because although most treatments aim to kill pests, others such as irradiation can reach the desired control effect by rendering pests infertile. She explained that there was no need to add "or non-viable" as the purposes of treatments mentioned in the definition are the same as those mentioned in ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*), where the phrase "rendering pests infertile" is used but not "non-viable", and because according to ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*), "rendering pests non-viable" can be considered as covered by the expression "rendering pests infertile". Finally, she clarified that devitalization as a phytosanitary measure can be applied to regulated plants as pests and so, in some cases, a devitalization treatment can be applied as a phytosanitary measure, if technically justified.

[18] The SC agreed that the proposed definition of "treatment" should be retained unchanged.

[19] The SC:

(1) *recommended* the draft 2018 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001) for submission to the CPM-15 (2020) for adoption (Appendix 4).

4.2 Revision of ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) (2009-005), Priority 1

[20] ***Review of the draft standard***

[21] The Steward, Ms Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America), introduced the draft ISPM and her notes and responses to the comments received during the second consultation[4]. A total of 311 comments had been received, and the Steward had revised the draft standard accordingly.

[22] **Main issues requiring consideration by the SC.** The Steward highlighted the following issues for the particular attention of the SC:

- **Appendix 1 (reliability of information sources).** During the second consultation, most developing countries and their regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs), as well as the North American region, were in favour of keeping the appendix within the standard, while others proposed that it be removed to form part of a separate implementation resource. One suggestion was to do both. Another contracting party proposed that the concepts be simplified in the appendix and provided replacement text.
- **Status of the category "transient".** One consultation comment suggested that the category "transient" be reinstated as in the current ISPM 8 (but without the subcategory "Transient but not under official control"). The Steward had not incorporated this change in the draft standard, pending consideration by the SC, and noted that such a change would be considered significant and the draft would need to be submitted to another consultation.
- **"Unable to determine pest status".** Several consultation comments suggested changes to this section, with various options proposed: changing the section's title to "Pest status undetermined"; deleting the current section's title and making the text a stand-alone paragraph with the purpose clarified; deleting the entire section; or moving it to the implementation guide that is currently under development.
- **Pest status "Present: except in specified pest free places of production or production sites".** One consultation comment was that this subcategory should be removed from Table 1, as these situations are not related to the distribution of a pest within a country but rather used as potential risk mitigation measures. The Steward agreed with the comment but had brought the matter to the SC for their decision.
- **Other issues.** The Steward highlighted several other issues raised during the second consultation. These included: whether there was a need to continue addressing the impact of every ISPM on biodiversity even where the ISPM might have very little direct impact on the environment; a

[4] 2009-005; 06_SC_2019_Nov; 15_SC_2019_Nov; 2019-05 SC-7 meeting report: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87337/.

recommendation for a subsequent ink amendment in ISPM 5 (Supplement 1) to modify or remove a sentence saying that " 'not widely distributed' is not a term included in the description of pest status listed in ISPM 8" after this draft revision is adopted; and the suggestion that the consistency of "an area" versus "the area" be referred to the IPPC editor.

[23] The SC considered the text of the standard in detail.

[24] **Background.** The SC deleted reference to "officially" in relation to national plant protection organizations (NPPOs), as all actions by NPPOs are official.

[25] **Impacts on biodiversity.** The SC recalled that the CPM had agreed that this section should be included in all ISPMs, but that some consultation comments had queried its relevance for certain standards. Some SC members commented, however, on the value of retaining this section.

[26] **Purpose of pest status determination.** The SC made a minor editorial change.

[27] **Information used to determine pest status.** The SC noted that a sentence had been added, as a result of the consultation comments, saying that NPPOs may need to consult and exchange information with other NPPOs. Some members did not see the need for NPPOs to consult with other NPPOs about pest status in their own country and commented that, for some countries, such a requirement could be seen as being outside the scope of this standard. However, one member pointed out that, for developing countries, such information provided by other countries may be very helpful. Another member commented that some NPPOs do undertake surveillance in collaboration with neighbouring countries. The SC Chairperson pointed out that the exchange of information between NPPOs was already covered in the final section of the draft standard (on exchange of pest status information between NPPOs). The SC therefore deleted reference to such exchange of information from the section on NPPO responsibilities.

[28] **Describing pest status in an area.** The SC made a minor editorial change, to correctly incorporate a consultation comment.

[29] The SC noted that there were two paragraphs – one in this section and one in the section on Absence – referring to detections that do not affect pest status. The SC discussed whether to combine them, but decided to leave them unchanged; however, the sentence referring to detections in the section on Absence was moved to the section on Describing pest status in an area.

[30] The SC noted that revisions from the consultation comments had resulted in a contradiction, with the text now saying in one sentence that pest status is determined on the basis of current evidence but in the following sentence saying that both current and historical evidence may be used. One SC member commented that the first sentence is saying that the pest status is the *current* status of the pest, whereas the second sentence refers to *how* the judgement of pest status is determined. The SC amended the text accordingly.

[31] **Present: not widely distributed and under official control.** The SC made a minor editorial change to the description of this subcategory to align it with the description of the preceding subcategory.

[32] **Present: except in specified pest free places of production or production sites.** One SC member commented that the description of this subcategory related more to management than pest status; the SC member therefore supported the consultation comment suggesting that this subcategory be deleted. Several other SC members concurred, and the SC agreed to delete this subcategory.

[33] **Present: transient.** The SC completed the description so that it was clear that it related to the presence of the pest in an area.

[34] Regarding the description, some SC members questioned the need to refer to the application of phytosanitary measures in the context of a transient pest. One SC member pointed out that the description is only about the pest status and not a requirement about the phytosanitary measures to be taken, so there is no need to refer to measures in the description. Other SC members recalled, however,

that in the Annotated Glossary, transience is described as "the presence of a pest which is not expected to establish, either because conditions are not suitable for it or because measures can readily be applied to destroy it (eradication)"; they suggested this needed to be considered in the discussion. One SC member emphasized that the key concept is "temporary presence".

[35] Another SC member asked what the difference would be between "present: not widely distributed and under official control" and a pest status of transient where appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied. An SC member responded that the complex discussion being had by the SC at this meeting indicated that the answer was not clear. The SC agreed that the difference between this subcategory and the "present: not widely distributed and under official control" subcategory should be clear, but that any substantial changes to this subcategory, other than changes addressing consultation comments, would present a problem for adoption.

[36] The SC also recalled that no consultation comments had called for the deletion of reference to measures, indicating that reference to measures in the description had not been viewed as a problem by contracting parties. One SC member commented that a control (a phytosanitary measure) would only be applied if the pest was expected to establish, so the application of measures should not be part of the reason for the assignment of transient status.

[37] Some SC members encouraged the SC to keep the description of this subcategory brief and focused, and not too detailed. The Steward pointed out that additional guidance to help users interpret the standard could be provided in the associated implementation guide. Other SC members expressed a preference, however, for including sufficient information in the description so that the meaning is clear and users do not have to refer to the guide to understand the standard.

[38] One SC member commented that the description of this subcategory may depend on the reason for determining pest status: for example, if conducting a pest risk analysis (PRA), a pest may be determined as not expected to establish and not requiring phytosanitary measures, but when a pest is first recorded, it might not be possible to determine immediately whether it is likely to establish and so phytosanitary measures may be applied as a precaution. Another SC member supported this view.

[39] There was considerable discussion about the usefulness of including examples in the description, as although these were intended to help they might actually give rise to confusion. These included concerns about including an outbreak in a pest free area as an example of transience, as the pest would be under official control and not transient, and the option to apply phytosanitary measures to transient pests on the basis that they could cause economic damage during their temporary presence. One SC member proposed that these examples be deleted, as they are in fact about how a determination of pest status is made rather than a description of the pest status itself; guidance on the application of the standard should also be placed in the implementation guide rather than in the standard. However, another SC member commented that this may result in this subcategory being mis-applied. To resolve this difficult issue, the SC agreed to remove all controversial examples and to keep the description brief, with the intention that further information be provided in the implementation guide. This then retains the concept of this subcategory as submitted for consultation, without causing confusion.

[40] **Suggested new subcategory for absence because of unsuitable conditions.** One SC member proposed that a new subcategory "Absent: unsuitable conditions" be added to cover those situations where it is very clear that the conditions in a country are not suitable for establishment and so there is therefore no need to conduct surveillance in order to determine absence. The Steward explained that it is covered by the "absent: pest not recorded" subcategory because in those situations there would be no pest records from general surveillance. Therefore, the SC agreed that the addition was not needed.

[41] **Absent: the entire country is a pest free area.** The SC clarified that this subcategory, which a consultation comment had proposed be changed to "absent: the entire area is pest free", is only intended to refer to entire countries and so reverted to the initial wording, also removing the reference to several countries in the description.

[42] **Absent: pest records invalid.** One SC member queried the need for two new points that had been added in response to consultation comments, concerning situations where pest records are deemed to be invalid because old records have not been updated or single reports have never been confirmed. The SC member explained that these concepts are already covered in other points. The SC decided to replace the two points with one point, referring to records that have not been confirmed.

[43] **Text accompanying the table on "Pest status: absent".** Some SC members commented that the phrase "absence of information from general surveillance may indicate not only that the pest is absent but also that is has no economic importance", which had been added following consultation comments, is confusing. One SC member clarified that the intention of this sentence is that, in general surveillance, lack of information on the presence of a pest may either be because the pest is absent or because it is not of economic importance. One SC member queried whether absence can only be confirmed through specific surveillance, but another commented that absence can be determined from general surveillance, provided the surveillance is consistent. One SC member commented that lack of economic importance is only one of many examples of why a pest might not be recorded in general surveillance and suggested that the whole of this new sentence be deleted. The SC agreed to delete it.

[44] The SC discussed potentially using the phrase "lack of adequate surveillance information" and recalled guidance in ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*) that lack of evidence is not evidence of absence. The SC amended the text to make it clear that the lack of evidence may be due to inadequate or insufficient surveillance activities.

[45] In considering the circumstances which do not or may not affect pest status, the SC recalled that several consultation comments were very specific that "may" be used rather than "should" in relation to the "detection of a pest in an area, confirmed by surveillance not to represent a population".

[46] **Unable to determine pest status.** One SC member suggested that this section could be deleted and replaced by the addition of two sentences to the Absence section, to explain that if there is not enough reliable information the NPPO should say that the pest status is undetermined rather than declaring that the pest is absent. However, another SC member pointed out that this would then contradict the text earlier in the same paragraph, where it said that if information on pest presence is unreliable an NPPO may conclude that a pest is absent. One SC member suggested removing the latter text, but another commented that the NPPO should be able to declare absence if the information indicating presence is unreliable. The SC amended the text to separate out the concept of surveillance from that of unreliability.

[47] The Steward suggested that two sentences from the section on "Unable to determine pest status", relating to obligations under the IPPC and provision of information to other NPPOs, be moved to the section on "Information used to determine pest status". Another SC member commented, however, that it still needs to be clear that, in certain circumstances, it may not be possible to determine pest status.

[48] In the end, the SC deleted the "Unable to determine pest status" section, to avoid having a third pest status category. One SC member noted that this section had been added so that, for example, when an NPPO needs to complete a form giving the pest status, it is clear that how it should respond; the SC member expressed the concern that, without this section, NPPOs may give the status as "absent" instead. The SC discussed whether to be explicit about what wording NPPOs should use. One SC member suggested "undetermined at this time", as this would indicate that efforts should continue to determine pest status. Another SC member suggested that it should be left to NPPOs to decide what wording to use, but some other SC members preferred that the standard be explicit that if an NPPO is unable to determine pest status, then it should say so. The SC agreed that the NPPO should indicate when it is not able to determine pest status, but avoided providing explicit wording to use for this purpose.

[49] **Exchange of pest information between NPPOs.** One SC member commented that the phrase "in a reasonable time frame", which had been added as a result of consultation comments, is vague and so proposed that it be deleted. The Steward explained, however, that the time frame should not be infinite. The SC therefore changed the wording to "in a timely manner", as in the original ISPM 8.

[50] **Appendix 1 (Reliability of information sources).** The Steward recalled the consultation comment proposing that the appendix be simplified and raised again the question of what should be in the guide and what should be in the standard. One SC member commented that the appendix provided guidance only and so was not appropriate for inclusion in a standard, but some other SC members supported the retention of the appendix, emphasizing its usefulness for developing countries. The SC Chairperson noted that, if the appendix is substantially changed, countries will not have the opportunity to comment upon the revised version. This view – that the standard could not be recommended for adoption with such substantial changes – was also endorsed by SC members. One SC member explained that the proposal to simplify the appendix had arisen during discussions about the implementation guide, where a decision tree had been discussed, and had been submitted through the consultation process. The SC member suggested that if the appendix is to be substantially altered by simplifying it, then it should perhaps go in the guide instead of the standard. Bearing these comments in mind, the Steward suggested that the appendix be kept as it is, with only minor amendments.

[51] The SC recalled that, although some consultation comments had supported inclusion of the appendix in the standard, other comments had suggested its removal, and there had been many consultation comments suggesting changes to the appendix. With this in mind, some SC members supported retaining the appendix in the standard, while others were in favour of moving it to the implementation guide and, in so doing, taking the opportunity to simplify it as proposed in the consultation comments. The SC noted again that substantial modifications cannot be made to the draft standard at this stage.

[52] Those SC members supporting retention of the appendix in the standard commented on its usefulness to developing countries, as confirmed by many of the consultation comments, and that it might be easier for users of the standard if information is all in one place.

[53] Those SC members supporting transfer of the appendix to the implementation guide commented that the information would still be available for contracting parties who find it helpful, but that removing it would allow the table to be simplified to make it easier to understand. The guide would be published shortly after the standard, so the timeline would allow for the appendix to be transferred and improved without adversely affecting implementation of the standard. One SC member commented that the range of views expressed in the consultation showed that the appendix is not satisfactory and it does not make sense to adopt something that many countries think needs to be changed.

[54] Some SC members raised the option of retaining the appendix in the standard, including a simplified version in the guide, then subsequently removing the appendix from the standard, but other SC members thought that having two versions of the same information in place at the same time would cause confusion.

[55] Considering all the points made, the SC finally agreed that the appendix be removed from the draft standard and be included in the guide instead. One SC member noted that an ink amendment would be need to ISPM 6 as this has a cross-reference to ISPM 8 regarding reliability of information.

[56] The SC asked the IPPC editor to check that all references to Appendix 1 be removed from the draft standard and to review the consistent use of "an area" versus "the area".

[57] **Potential implementation issues.** The Steward referred to the potential implementation issues raised as consultation comments[5]. She highlighted the need for adequate training, facilities and financial resources. The representative from the IC (Implementation and Capacity Development Committee) commented that there were many opportunities to support implementation of this revised ISPM 8.

Update on development of the pest status guide

[58] The SC Chairperson introduced Ms Barbara PETERSON (Canada), who gave an update on development of the pest status guide (2017-039)[6]. This guide, which is being developed under the IC, is intended to

[5] 06-SC_2019_Nov.

[6] 25_SC_2019_Nov.

support implementation of ISPM 8 and to address challenges identified in the Implementation and Review and Support System (IRSS) surveys. The Pest Status Guide Working Group had met in Rome, Italy, 16–20 September 2019. They had reviewed the outline structure of the guide, identified key information to be included in each chapter and the corresponding authors, and drawn up a work plan. The group had discussed the process that should be used to determine pest status and how to further categorize a pest after it has been determined to be either "*present*" or "*absent*", and had developed corresponding flow charts. Two problematic issues with the draft revision of ISPM 8 were discussed: there was a general consensus that Appendix 1 on reliability of information sources was too prescriptive and that the large number of categories will make it difficult to apply. They had therefore drafted a revised appendix. As the draft standard was under consultation at the time, members of the working group had been encouraged by the Secretariat to submit any comments on the content of the draft standard as consultation comments in the usual way.

[59] One SC member asked whether the guide would be available upon adoption of the standard. Ms PETERSON replied that a draft of the guide needs to be submitted to the European Commission by December 2019, to meet funding obligations. The next step will be to share the draft with the SC and IC for review and comment. The guide would then be finalized after adoption of the revised ISPM 8, with the aim of it being published by the end of 2020.

Consequential changes to other ISPMs

[60] The Steward commented on the changes to other ISPMs that would be needed as a consequence of the revision to ISPM 8, as identified by the expert working group for this draft standard[7].

[61] The SC Chairperson suggested that, as the draft will be presented for adoption by CPM-15 (2020), the matter be deferred to the May 2020 meeting of the SC.

[62] The SC:

(2) *thanked* the present and previous stewards for their efforts in revising this draft standard

(3) *agreed* to remove Appendix 1 from the draft revision of ISPM 8: *Determination of pest status in an area* (2009-005) and *recommended* to the IC that, after revision taking into account consultation comments, it be included in the pest status guide (2017-039)

(4) *recommended* the draft revision of ISPM 8: *Determination of pest status in an area* (2009-005) as modified in this meeting for submission to CPM-15 (2020) for adoption (Appendix 5)

(5) *agreed* to defer consideration of the consequential ink amendments to ISPMs resulting from the draft revision of ISPM 8, to the May 2020 meeting of the SC

(6) *requested* that the Secretariat forward implementation issues identified for this draft standard to the Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU) of the Secretariat for consideration by the IC

(7) *noted* the update on the pest status guide (2017-039).

4.3 Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002), Priority 2

[63] The Steward, Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (Canada), introduced the draft ISPM and his notes and responses to the comments received during the second consultation[8]. A total of 515 comments had been received, and the Steward had revised the draft standard accordingly.

[64] The Steward invited the SC to comment on the following issues:

- **Comments not supporting further work on the draft ISPM.** Six comments had not supported further work on the draft ISPM. These expressed concerns over the following issues: national legal frameworks currently in existence not providing for the possibility of empowerment of

[7] 08_SC_2019_Nov.

[8] 2014-002; 37_SC_2019_Nov; 38_SC_2019_Nov; 2019-05 SC-7 meeting report: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87337/.

entities other than the NPPO to perform the phytosanitary activities listed in the draft standard; the reliability of phytosanitary certificates issued as a result of a process involving such entities; the potential for delegation of authority to be considered as a normal situation; the need for NPPO functions to be regulated at the national level; and authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions not being a phytosanitary measure. Three of these comments suggested that, if necessary, a new CPM recommendation be adopted instead of the draft ISPM.

- **ISPM needing further development.** Two of the comments had said that the draft ISPM is not yet ready for presentation to CPM for adoption and recommended that the development of the draft ISPM be aligned with that for the draft ISPM on *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014).
- **Title.** One comment had proposed that the title be changed back to that used during the first consultation (*Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions*). The rationale given was that the current title is too explanatory for a title and the concerns raised during the first consultation – that NPPOs can decide whether or not they authorize entities and there is no obligation for NPPOs to do so – were properly addressed by revisions to the main text.
- **Audit and supervision.** The six comments related to this issue included concern over whether entities should be authorized to undertake audit and supervision at all, proposals to delete the section on "Roles and responsibilities of entities authorized to audit or supervise" (either because this will be dealt with by the draft standard on *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014) or because, according to the comments, audit and supervision are not phytosanitary actions), and requests to clarify the meaning of audit and of supervision. The Steward recalled that the TPG had not seen the need to define audit and supervision and had suggested using the dictionary meaning, and that the SC-7 had subsequently recommended defining the terms in the draft ISPM on *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014).
- **Can an authorized entity authorize another entity?** One comment had queried whether an NPPO could authorize an entity to further authorize other entities to perform phytosanitary actions. To address this comment, the Steward presented some possible text for consideration by the SC to clarify that the responsibility to authorize remains only with the NPPO.
- **Free of conflict of interest vs manage conflict of interest.** Nine comments had related to whether entities should be free of conflicts of interest (seven comments) or whether conflicts of interest should be managed (two comments). The Steward noted a consultation comment that managing conflict of interest contradicts with section 3.1 of ISPM 7 (*Phytosanitary certification system*), which says that non-NPPO personnel should be subject to restrictions and obligations equivalent to those for government officials and have no conflict of interest.
- **NPPO feedback to entity.** Two comments were of the view that it should not be the NPPO's responsibility to provide recommendations to an entity on how to improve, as this opens the NPPO up to significant liability and also stifles innovation.

[65] The SC Chairperson invited the SC to comment on how they wish to deal with the issues raised on this standard, given the consultation comments, and in particular whether it is ready to be submitted for adoption.

Addressing concerns over adoption

[66] The SC had a wide-ranging discussion over whether the text of the draft standard should be submitted for adoption, recognizing both the concerns expressed by some contracting parties about the implementation of this standard and the care and attention that the SC has already devoted to addressing these concerns.

[67] Several SC members noted that the concerns expressed by some regions were not about technical issues with the standard but related to mistrust in the concept of authorization. Some SC members referred to concerns over perceived mistrust between NPPOs and the private sector in terms of whether such entities would adequately discharge their duties and others referred to concerns that authorization could potentially undermine the functions of NPPOs.

[68] One SC member expressed the view that the changes proposed in the consultation comments indicate that the draft standard is not ready for adoption and that, even if the text is amended to address these, the draft standard is unlikely to be adopted given the significant concerns expressed by some contracting parties. He therefore suggested that perhaps a recommendation would be the better course of action at this stage, although he was happy to continue developing the standard in the meantime.

[69] Some SC members recalled that many countries authorize entities when implementing ISPM 15, so the concept has already been accepted. The Steward commented that the issues raised during both rounds of consultation have been addressed in the text of the draft standard, so there is not much more that can be done to the text to address concerns about the concept. Several SC members agreed with this. One SC member commented that the draft standard makes it clear that authorization is not mandatory and gives guidance for NPPOs who have decided to authorize entities. Others added that legal advice has been sought and heeded, and pointed out that implementation of ISPMs is not mandatory but that ISPMs provide guidance to promote harmonization.

[70] One SC member recalled that when objections are submitted at CPM, they need to be technically justified, so any objection would need to relate to technical issues with the standard. Another SC member responded, however, that if there were many objections, it would be unlikely that the standard would be adopted even if the objections were not technically justified, as there would not be sufficient time to evaluate each objection.

[71] One SC member commented that although his country had initially had reservations about the authorization of entities, they do now authorize entities and they have memoranda of understanding to control the activities of these entities. In his view, developing countries may benefit from the standard. However, another SC member commented that, for some countries, it is not the time to implement this standard because it might undermine their ability to progress with implementing fundamental trade facilitation agreements. Other SC members were of the opinion that the implementation of this ISPM would contribute to the facilitation of safe trade.

[72] One SC member explained that SC members and the Secretariat had worked very hard during their IPPC regional workshop to show how the draft standard addressed the concerns expressed by NPPOs, but there had been an insurmountable concern among some NPPOs that their functions would be undermined by adoption of this standard.

[73] The IFU lead informed the SC that work is being undertaken within the framework of the IRSS to conduct a desk study on the application of the concept of the authorization of entities. This should include examples of where authorization has worked well, and should be available in January 2020 and thus in time for CPM-15 (2020).

[74] Some SC members suggested that the draft standard on authorization be considered together with the draft standard on *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014), as they are complementary to each other, and this would also allow further time for conceptual concerns about authorization to be overcome.

[75] Another SC member proposed that the draft standard be presented to CPM-15 (2020) with a reminder about the objective of this standard, but that it not be submitted for adoption until later, to give time for concerns about the concept to be overcome.

[76] One SC member suggested that perhaps communication material could be developed through the IC to complement the standard, and that progress with the standard could be temporarily suspended to allow time for this. The IC representative commented that there are many opportunities for implementation material, but that the IC would need to move very quickly on this so this would also be dependent on resources being available.

[77] The Steward expressed his concern, however, that if the draft standard on authorization is postponed because the basic concept is not yet accepted, then this would bring into question the Standard setting process itself, as the draft standard has been developed based on a topic approved by CPM and a detailed

specification on that underwent consultation, and furthermore the draft ISPM has been reviewed by the SC and has been through two country consultations. He also recalled that authorization of entities is specifically mentioned in the development agenda of the new Strategic Framework. He suggested that, as the concerns about this draft standard are not of a technical nature, the resolution of the problem is a matter for CPM rather than the SC. Another SC member expressed the view that it would be setting a dangerous precedent if a decision of the SC is determined by issues that are not technical.

[78] The Secretariat indicated that Rule 6 of the IPPC Standard setting procedure[9] specifies that "situations where consensus is required but cannot be reached shall be described in the meeting reports detailing all positions maintained and presented to the CPM for discussion and appropriate action."

[79] With this in mind, one SC member suggested that the SC continue to work on the text to take account of the second consultation comments, present it to CPM-15 (2020) with an explanation of the concerns expressed by NPPOs, and leave it to CPM-15 (2020) to decide whether to have a vote to adopt it or to ask the SC to work on it further.

[80] The SC Chairperson recalled that CPM had already given authority to the SC to progress with the standard, so the task for the SC is to develop the standard from a technical perspective and it is a decision for the CPM whether to proceed to adoption. He summarized the options for the SC as follows:

- option 1: revise the authorization standard at this meeting without expecting adoption by CPM-15 (2020)
- option 2: defer further work on the authorization standard and look at it in parallel with the audit standard
- option 3: do no further work on the authorization standard until a decision is taken by CPM-15 (2020).

[81] Regardless of which option the SC decides to follow, he suggested that an explanation be provided to the CPM, with suggestions on the way forward and seeking CPM decisions on this issue.

[82] The SC could not reach consensus to recommend the draft ISPM to CPM-15 (2020) for adoption at this stage; therefore, the SC discussed the content of the paper to be presented to the CPM.

[83] **CPM paper.** The SC Chairperson invited SC members to consider how best to draft a paper for CPM-15 (2020).

[84] The SC agreed to set up a small working group to draft the paper, which would then be finalized through an SC e-decision. The Steward proposed that the paper should explain the concept of authorization, giving examples and referring to the Convention and legal advice, and should summarize the key concerns that have been raised by contracting parties, including freedom from, versus management of, conflicts of interest and authorization of entities to conduct audit. One SC member suggested that the paper to CPM should highlight the following points coming from the consultation comments: the need for the standard; the suggestion to delay adoption; the suggestion to delay development of the standard, allowing alignment with the draft standard on audit; and support for the draft standard, including from some developing countries who had found that the use of authorized entities allowed access to resources that the NPPOs do not have. One SC member supported the Steward's suggestion that legal advice from FAO be mentioned, to provide confirmation of the understanding of the Convention, but also suggested that it should be made clear that the concerns raised were not of a technical nature and that the paper should emphasize again that the role of this draft standard is not to coerce an NPPO to authorize entities but to harmonize authorization, and that decisions about whether to authorize will rest solely with the NPPO.

[85] The SC agreed that the small working group would draft a first version of the CPM paper and would comprise the following SC members: Mr Moses Adegboyega ADEWUMI (Nigeria), Mr Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom), Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy), Mr Nader ELBADRY (Egypt), Mr

[9] CPM-11 (2016) report, Appendix 7: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82487/.

Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ (Costa Rica), Mr David KAMANGIRA (Malawi), Ms Sophie PETERSON (Australia), Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (Canada), Mr Masahiro SAI (Japan), Mr André Felipe C.P. da SILVA (Brazil), Ms Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) and Ms Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America). The Secretariat confirmed that, to meet the deadlines for CPM papers, the draft CPM paper on authorization would need to be finalized by 4 December at the latest, so that the e-decision could be opened on 5 December at the latest.

[86] The SC agreed that the Steward would act as lead for the draft CPM paper. The Steward agreed to circulate a proposal on the structure and the content of the paper to the small group. The SC Chairperson encouraged the members of the small group to send their comments to the lead as soon as possible, given the tight timeline for submission of CPM papers. The draft standard as modified in this meeting will be attached to the CPM paper.

[87] **CPM side-session.** In addition to the paper itself, the SC also agreed to recommend to the CPM Bureau (hereafter referred to as the "Bureau") that a side-session be held at CPM-15 (2020). The Secretariat confirmed that this recommendation could be made verbally to the Bureau by the Bureau representative at the SC meeting, Ms Marica GATT. The Bureau is due to consider the agenda for CPM-15 (2020) in December 2019.

[88] The SC agreed that the small working group, as well as developing the draft CPM paper, would also draw up a proposal for the content of the side-session, for submission to the Bureau by 12 December.

Review of the draft standard

[89] The SC Chairperson invited SC members to comment on how to proceed with the draft standard. One SC member did not support spending time at this stage aligning the draft standard with the draft standard on *Audit in a phytosanitary context* (2015-014), but proposed that the SC continue work on the draft authorization standard. Other SC members thought that there was very little work left to do to finalize the draft authorization standard, and proposed that the SC continue with the text – which was the task it had been set by CPM – and highlight the sections that are causing concern; the draft standard could then be attached to the CPM paper.

[90] The SC agreed that it would not submit the draft standard for adoption, but would revise the text at this SC meeting based on the consultation comments so that it could be attached to the CPM paper for consideration by CPM-15 (2020).

[91] **Contentious parts of the text.** In reviewing the draft, the SC marked up the draft to highlight those parts of the text that had prompted concerns during the consultation and in the discussion among SC members.

[92] **Background.** The SC agreed to add ISPM 6 as a further example of an ISPM that contains reference to authorization.

[93] **Impacts on biodiversity.** One SC member expressed concern that this section appears to imply that biodiversity would be positively affected if third-party entities are used compared to when the same functions are delivered by NPPOs.

[94] **Requirements.** One SC member recalled that some contracting parties had expressed concern about including destruction as an example of where authorization can be used, and so suggested that destruction be deleted from the list of these examples. The Steward pointed out that there are situations where authorized entities are used for destruction, for instance when a shipment is destroyed. One SC member commented that destruction is resource intensive and often NPPOs lack the capacity to properly deliver it, and therefore proposed that destruction be retained in the text, which was agreed by the SC.

[95] The SC amended the text to make it clear that an authorized entity may be authorized to assess the eligibility of another entity to be authorized, but the decision about whether to authorize the latter entity should rest solely with the NPPO.

[96] One SC member queried whether auditing is a phytosanitary action. The Steward clarified that FAO Legal, both prior to and during CPM-14 (2019), had confirmed that it is. Another SC member referred to the definition of phytosanitary action in ISPM 5.

[97] **Numbering of headings.** The SC renumbered the headings for the sections on Authorization programme and on Development of authorization programme, so that they are in the same order but part of the same section.

[98] **Roles and responsibilities of entities authorized to audit or supervise.** One SC member raised the question of whether definitions for supervision and audit are needed. The Steward clarified that the TPG had considered that the dictionary definition of "supervision" was adequate, and that a definition of "audit" was proposed in the draft standard on *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014) in response to consultation comments.

[99] The SC amended this section to make it clear that it is not an obligation for the NPPO to grant authorization to an entity to conduct audit.

[100] **Audits to maintain authorization.** The SC made it clear in the text that an NPPO can conduct unscheduled audits even without receipt of notification of non-compliance.

[101] **Types of nonconformity.** The SC made a minor editorial amendment to this section. In response to a query from an SC member, the Steward clarified that it is the investigations that are triggered by notification of non-compliance, rather than the audits or supervision.

[102] **Suspension and revocation of authorization.** The SC amended the text, by use of the word "should", to make it clear that the decision to authorize rests solely with the NPPO.

[103] **Conflicts of interest.** The Steward invited comments from the SC about whether entities should be free from conflicts of interest, or whether it is acceptable for entities to declare and identify how to manage conflicts of interest. One SC member proposed that, for consistency, both the NPPO and authorized entities should be free from conflicts of interest. Another SC member noted that this may be problematic for small countries, where it can be difficult to avoid such conflicts of interest, and suggested some wording from the draft standard on *Audit in a phytosanitary context* (2015-014) that may be suitable. The Steward suggested that perhaps the standard could say that the NPPO should set the framework for conflicts of interest, which would then leave it to the discretion of the NPPO as to whether entities need to be free from conflicts of interest or can have managed conflicts of interest. One SC member responded, however, that although this would address conflicts of interest in the NPPO's own country, it would not address the concerns of some importing countries. The SC member also pointed out that some countries are changing their legislation to be specific about authorization. Another SC member highlighted that the purpose of standards is harmonization, so the standard would serve to harmonize authorization practices. In response to a suggestion from an SC member, the IC representative agreed that input from the IC may be helpful in providing guidance on good practices to implement properly the authorization of entities. Finally, the SC inserted some text in the section on Development of authorization programme and in the section on Criteria for eligibility of entities to say that NPPOs should develop a framework to assess and identify potential conflicts of interest and address them appropriately, and that to be eligible the entity needs to conform with the requirements of the NPPO on conflicts of interest.

[104] **Title of the draft standard.** The SC agreed to keep the title of the draft standard as *Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*, as modified by the Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) before the second consultation.

[105] **Potential implementation issues.** The SC agreed to wait until after CPM-15 (2020) before forwarding potential implementation issues to the IC.

[106] The SC:

(8) *agreed* to develop a paper for submission to CPM-15 (2020), outlining the concerns raised during second consultation that require decision by the CPM, and attaching the revised draft ISPM on *Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002) (Appendix 6)

(9) *recommended* that the Bureau consider holding a side-session at CPM-15 (2020) to discuss concerns about the draft standard on *Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002)

(10) *agreed* to defer consideration of potential implementation issues until after CPM-15 (2020).

4.4 Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006), Priority 2

[107] The Steward, Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile), introduced the draft ISPM and his notes and responses to the comments received during the second consultation[10]. A total of 249 comments had been received and the Steward had revised the draft standard accordingly. In general, the comments had aimed to improve the content of the standard and to give it greater consistency. Some comments supported this draft standard and recognized its significance. In contrast, others comments had raised concerns about the implementation of this standard, because this type of treatment is unknown to them, or they do not have the technology or human capacity to do this type of treatment, or because it might be difficult for developing countries to implement. Other comments had suggested adding more details about the efficacy of the treatment or other specific details, and the need for greater clarity to differentiate between modified atmosphere and controlled atmosphere treatments.

Review of the draft standard

[108] **Scope.** The SC amended the text to make it clear that modified atmosphere treatments include controlled atmosphere treatments and thus both are covered by the standard, and then amended the associated text in the Background.

[109] **Impacts on biodiversity and the environment.** The SC deleted the reference to nitrogen, as nitrogen gas is not harmful *per se*. For clarity, the SC also changed the text to remove the mention of "importing countries" that had been added as a result of consultation comments.

[110] **Treatment application.** In the lists of ways in which oxygen and carbon dioxide concentrations may be modified, the SC added a further item in response to consultation comments: adding a substance (such as iron oxide) that captures oxygen.

[111] **Treatment parameters.** The SC deleted reference to nitrogen from the list of the main parameters to consider. The SC also noted that there had been two contradictory consultation comments about whether to include pressure in the list. The SC agreed not to add "pressure" to the list, noting that the chapeau to this list now refers to the *main* parameters, indicating that the list is not exhaustive.

[112] The SC added reference to packaging in the examples of enclosures, as packaging is cited as an example of an enclosure later in the draft standard.

[113] One SC member suggested that the sentence saying "the effect on the product quality must be taken into account", which had been added as a result of consultation comments, be deleted, because effects on the quality on the product should not be addressed in ISPMs. Another SC member recalled that, although ISPM 28 is an exception, in general ISPMs do not refer to "quality". One SC member commented that, for some markets, there are insufficient treatment schedules available and so it may be useful to include guidance to say that quality is a factor to consider when applying treatments. The SC considered modifying the text along the lines of the text used in ISPM 42 (*Requirements for the use of temperature*

[10] 2014-006; 19_SC_2019_Nov; 28_SC_2019_Nov; 2019-05 SC-7 meeting report: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87337/.

treatments as a phytosanitary measure) and ISPM 43 (*Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure*). The SC recalled, however, that in the treatments covered by these two ISPMs, humidity may affect the efficacy of the treatment, whereas for modified atmosphere treatments, humidity affects product quality rather than the efficacy of the treatment. The SC therefore agreed to delete the sentence.

[114] **Enclosures used for modified atmosphere treatments.** In the list of enclosure features, the SC changed "treatment failure" to "technical failure (e.g. leakage)", to address a consultation comment.

[115] **Measuring and mapping temperature.** The SC removed reference to calibration of temperature sensors as calibration is already referred to in the chapeau to the section on Measuring treatment parameters. The SC amended the text relating to temperature mapping so that it is clear that this is only relevant when modified atmosphere treatment is applied in combination with temperature treatment. The SC also made editorial amendments to the text to improve clarity.

[116] **Authorization of treatment providers.** As a consequence of their earlier decision not to recommend the draft standard on *Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* to CPM-15 (2020) for adoption, the SC agreed not to add a cross-reference to this draft standard.

[117] **Prevention of infestation and contamination after treatment.** The SC changed "reinfestation" to "infestation", so that the standard does not imply that there is an expectation that infestation is present before treatment, and for consistency with other standards.

[118] **Documentation.** The SC deleted the sentence "Likewise, the NPPO as treatment executor is responsible for maintain [*sic*] documents of procedures and keep [*sic*] appropriate records" because "treatment provider" earlier in the paragraph is not restricted to authorized entities but could also refer to NPPOs as treatment providers, and because the responsibilities of NPPOs for record keeping are covered in the section on Record keeping.

[119] **Record keeping.** The SC integrated into the chapeau the requirement that equipment calibration records should be kept for at least a year.

[120] **Responsibilities.** The SC deleted "international" before "regulatory agencies" for consistency with other ISPMs.

[121] **Potential implementation issues.** The Steward presented the potential implementation issues raised as consultation comments[11]. Some NPPOs had suggested that they would have difficulty in formulating the technical requirements for modified atmosphere treatments and proposed an appendix or guide to describe the key technical requirements for the facilities and implementation of these types of treatments. The Steward commented that, at present, there was insufficient information about these treatments to produce such material. Some SC members highlighted that the equipment needed for modified atmosphere treatment is the same as that used for fumigation, so no specialized equipment is needed. The IC representative supported the suggestion from an SC member that a recommendation be put to the IC for the development of an implementation guide, but highlighted that any such development would be dependent on available resources. He invited the SC members to contribute any suitable material from their own countries, should the IC agree to proceed with development of a guide. The SC agreed to forward this as an implementation issue to the IC.

[122] The SC:

(11) *thanked* the present and previous stewards for their efforts in revising this draft standard

(12) *recommended* the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure* (2014-006) as modified in this meeting for submission to CPM-15 (2020) for adoption (Appendix 7)

[11] 19_SC_2019_Nov.

(13) *requested* that the Secretariat forward implementation issues identified for this draft standard to the Implementation Facilitation Unit of the Secretariat for consideration by the IC.

5. Commodity Standards

5.1 Update from the Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards

Governance, process and concept ISPM for commodity and pathway standards

[123] The SC Chairperson updated the SC on the progress made by the Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards. Following the approval by CPM-14 (2019), in June 2019 the Bureau had revised the terms of reference for the focus group and its second meeting that took place in Rome, Italy, 17–21 June 2019[12]. The group had worked on a draft concept standard (see 5.2) and made various recommendations regarding the content and status of individual commodity standards and the associated governance process. In providing their recommendations, they had emphasized that commodity standards were designed to be a starting point for trade negotiations and that they would neither impose new obligations on importing countries nor undermine the need for PRA to regulate pests. The group's recommendations included, among other things, the following points:

- The standards under consideration by the focus group do not apply to pathways in the broad sense, so the standards should be referred to as "commodity standards".
- Commodity standards should be annexes under the concept standard.
- A new technical panel, the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS), should be established, with a permanent Steward from the SC. The membership of the Task Force on Topics should be expanded to include the Steward of the TPCS.
- For the first commodity standards, the TPCS should draft the standards; then, as the process becomes more established, drafting groups could be used as needed. The TPCS should have the option to recommend Calls for expert drafting groups to the SC.
- Commodity standards should include a table of pests associated with the commodity, with corresponding measures used to control those pests, and, when relevant, they may also contain information on pests known not to be associated with the traded commodity.

[124] In drafting the concept standard, the group had also developed criteria for inclusion of measures in commodity standards.

[125] The SC discussed the following issues relating to the outcome of the focus group meeting.

[126] **Process for developing commodity standards.** The SC representative on the focus group, Mr Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom), invited the SC to consider the changes that might be required to the Standard setting process to accommodate the development and revision of commodity standards. Some SC members expressed concern about the concept of developing a special standard setting process for commodity standards and suggested that these standards follow the same process as other standards. Another SC member sought clarity on the role of the Bureau regarding development of the concept standard, and in particular whether it would be the Bureau or the SC that recommends the standard to CPM and that undertakes the detailed consideration of consultation comments. The SC Chairperson commented that, if the CPM approves the draft concept standard for consultation, the process should be the same as for other standards. One SC member suggested that, as there is respect and support for the existing Standard setting process and these new commodity standards will have the same status as other standards, the commodity standards should follow the same process as other standards.

[127] The Secretariat clarified that, at present, the development of the concept standard is under the remit of the Bureau, and invited the SC to make clear recommendations to the Bureau and CPM about the future process for commodity standards. The Secretariat highlighted that there is already a hierarchy of

[12] 12_SC_2019_Nov.

standards, with special arrangements for terms, diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments under which some authority had been delegated by CPM to the SC.

[128] The SC representative on the focus group explained that although the focus group was suggesting a fast-track process for updating commodity standards, whereby technical changes could be made to commodity standards by the SC (with delegated authority from the CPM), this only related to measures and would only be enacted when new evidence became available; the development of commodity standards would otherwise follow the normal Standard setting process.

[129] One SC member commented that the new technical panel being proposed would have the same status as other technical panels, so everything would come back to the SC for consideration anyway. The SC member also highlighted that the current Standard setting process is transparent, and saw no reason why it would change even if it is adjusted to fast-track technical adjustments of commodity standards (with the usual consultation comments and panel's responses). Finally, the SC member commented on the resources needed for a new technical panel to be established, and that all the necessary material to develop commodity standards may not be forthcoming as relevant information may not be publicly available.

[130] One SC member commented that the proposed ink amendment to DP 5 (*Phyllosticta citricarpa* (McAlpine) Aa on fruit) being considered elsewhere in this SC meeting (agenda item 9.1) illustrates that there may already be a procedure for technical changes to standards, and asked whether this procedure would not be sufficiently rapid for the changes needed to commodity standards. The SC member also highlighted that the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) and Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) have a Steward, but that the leads for the individual phytosanitary treatments (PTs) or diagnostic protocols (DPs) are members of the technical panel rather than the SC, so the SC needs to consider if this is the arrangement they want for commodity standards or not.

[131] One SC member proposed that the commodity standards follow the usual Standard setting process. The SC representative on the focus group suggested that elements already in use for the governance of DPs and PTs could perhaps be applied to commodity standards, so that no new procedure was being established.

[132] The SC considered the recommendations of the focus group, point by point.

[133] **Commodity standards, not commodity and pathway standards.** The SC agreed to this recommendation.

[134] **Commodity standards as annexes to the concept standard or (for seeds and wood) as annexes to ISPM 38 and ISPM 39.** Some SC members suggested that *all* the commodity standards should be annexes to the concept standard, rather than annexes to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) or ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*). One SC member asked whether actual requirements are going to be in these standards, or whether there will just be a list of pests and associated measures. Another SC member referred to the draft mango standard under development by the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission, which says that PRA still needs to be performed to regulate a pest. The SC representative on the focus group explained that the lists of pests in the commodity standards are not lists of regulated pests, but the commodity standards provide information that NPPOs may use in identifying which pests they need to consider for potential regulation (subject to PRA) and which phytosanitary measures to apply. One SC member emphasized that, to be standards, the individual commodity standards need to have actual *requirements* – that is, they need to say that something "should" be done. The SC agreed to recommend that the commodity standards be annexes to the concept standard.

[135] **Technical Panel on Commodity Standards.** One SC member asked whether consultation comments on the draft concept standard will be addressed by the focus group or by the SC. Another SC member suggested that there would need to be a Steward for each individual commodity standard, given the anticipated volume of consultation comments. The SC representative on the focus group clarified that the focus group's suggestion that it deals with the comments from the first consultation is only a

pragmatic solution to ensure that there is some "ownership" arrangement in place until the CPM has decided about the governance process. The SC agreed to recommend that there be a Steward for each individual commodity standard and that the concept standard remain with the focus group until the decision of CPM-15 (2020). The SC also agreed to recommend that, in the event of CPM-15 (2020) deciding to submit the draft concept standard for consultation, it should follow the normal Standard setting process.

[136] **Membership of Task Force on Topics.** One SC member queried why there would be a representative from the TPCS but not from the other technical panels. The SC Chairperson clarified that it is anticipated that, in the next ten years, there will be a large number of commodity standards and so much of the work of the Task Force on Topics would relate to commodity standards. The Secretariat highlighted that calls for phytosanitary treatments are separate and these do not go to the TFT for consideration but to the TPPT. One SC member supported the idea of calls for commodity standards following the same process as calls for phytosanitary treatments, being separate from the main Call for topics and being dealt with by the TPCS and then the SC and not necessarily by the TFT. The SC, however, agreed with the focus group's recommendation that the Steward from the TPCS be a member of the TFT, in addition to the two current SC representatives and the SC Chairperson.

[137] **Drafting process for the commodity standards.** One SC member commented that specific experts may need to be invited to contribute. The SC Chairperson clarified that it is being proposed that, in some cases, there may be a separate call for experts for a specific standard. Another SC member queried whether there will be one Steward for each standard or, as with the TPPT and TPDP, one Steward for the panel and then technical leads for each standard, and which Steward would be the representative on the TFT. One SC member proposed that it would be the Steward for the TPCS that would be the representative on the TFT, rather than the Steward of an individual standard. The Secretariat indicated that it is anticipated that the functions of this TPCS Steward would be similar to those of the stewards for the other technical panels. The SC representative from the focus group commented that the steward of an individual commodity standard would not perform the same function as the experts on the technical panel, but would perform a coordinating role in the same way as stewards do for other ISPMs developed by technical panels. One SC member commented that the experts on the TPCS would need generic expertise on certain aspects of plant protection (as identified by the focus group), but asked whether expertise on various classes of commodities would also be needed. The Secretariat highlighted that there is already a precedent for the sort of stewardship arrangement being proposed by the focus group, in that the drafting group for ISPMs relating to treatments is the TPPT but with a Steward from the SC, and the Steward of the standard liaises with the TPPT Steward.

[138] **Assessment of measures.** The SC agreed to recommend that the SC should decide upon the criteria for including measures, with support from the TPCS. The Secretariat highlighted that the criteria for inclusion are already in the draft concept standard, which suggests that the process would be similar to that applied for PTs, where the criteria are set out in ISPM 28 and the TPPT apply these criteria.

[139] **Scope of commodity standards to be sufficiently focused.** Some SC members commented that the scope recommended by the focus group, which includes avoiding the need for commodity subcategories, may unnecessarily limit the content of commodity standards. The SC representative on the focus group explained that the intention was that the commodity is described sufficiently so that the relevant pests and measures can easily be identified. The SC agreed with the focus group's recommendation that the scope of the commodity and its intended use be sufficiently specific so that the standard is practical and feasible.

[140] **Table of pests with corresponding measures.** One SC member asked under what circumstances a commodity standard would contain information on pests known not to be associated with the traded commodity. The Secretariat explained that the intention of the focus group was to leave this open, to be decided on a case-by-case basis; for example, pests associated with mango fruit with leaves, but not with mango fruit without leaves, could be listed in a standard on mango fruit without leaves. One SC member suggested that it may be helpful if the standard listed pests associated with each part of the plant. Another

SC member commented that it is difficult to derive a fixed rule and it would be better to decide on a case-by-case basis.

Draft specification for Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (2019-009)

[141] The SC Chairperson introduced the draft specification for a Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (2019-009)[13] and the SC amended it with their suggested changes.

[142] **Tasks.** The SC added a subtask under the second task, to say that the TPCS, when drafting a commodity standard, should focus on the specific commodity and its intended use so that the standard is practicable and feasible.

[143] The SC noted that the task concerning review of adopted commodity standards aligns with that for other technical panels, with the technical panel reviewing the standards and then submitting recommendations to the SC.

[144] The SC considered whether to include a task to provide guidance to the SC on possible future standards on individual measures, but agreed that this would not be a task for the TPCS.

[145] The SC deleted the task on liaison with stakeholders because although the private sector may be invited to expert drafting groups, it is not necessary to include this liaison in the specification.

[146] **Expertise.** One SC member suggested that there may be a need for specific expertise, for instance a forestry group or horticultural group comprising three or four experts. Another SC member asked whether such commodity experts could be included within the six to ten panel members. The Secretariat commented that a similar approach to the TPDP might be expected, as experts on the panel cannot be expected to be experts on each subject being considered. Recalling one of the recommendations from the focus group, the SC inserted in the specification a task for the TPCS to recommend to the SC calls for expert drafting groups for specific commodity standards.

[147] The SC considered replacing "pest lists" with "pest risk", as it is not the lists that are assessed, but instead deleted this bullet point and changed the first bullet point to "commodity pest risk assessment and management".

[148] **Members.** In response to a query from an SC member on invited experts, the Secretariat clarified that meetings of the SC and its technical panels are closed. Although invited experts are allowed in the meetings, they need to be invited by the SC.

[149] **Discussion papers** and **References.** One SC member commented that the section on Discussion papers is not relevant for the TPCS and suggested that it should be deleted. The Secretariat clarified that this section aligns with the similar text in the specifications of other technical panels, but the SC could use this opportunity to review its inclusion. Another SC member commented that it might encourage contracting parties that have useful information on phytosanitary measures to submit them to the panel, and suggested changing "discussion papers" to "relevant material". Other SC members noted that material could be sought via a call for resources rather than this section being retained here. The SC agreed to delete the section, together with the section on References.

[150] The SC:

(14) *noted* the outcomes of the second meeting of the Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards

(15) *invited* the CPM Bureau to consider the comments and recommendations made during the November 2019 meeting of the SC regarding the governance process for commodity standards, including the draft specification on *Technical Panel for Commodity Standards* (TPCS) (2019-009) (Appendix 8).

[13] 21_SC_2019_Nov.

5.2 Revision of the draft ISPM: Requirements for commodity and pathway standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)

[151] The SC Chairperson introduced the draft ISPM on *Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008)[14] and the SC amended it with their suggested changes.

[152] **Outline of requirements.** In the light of their earlier discussion, the SC deleted the reference to commodity standards being annexes of other standards and also changed "may be presented as annexes to this standard" to "are presented as annexes to this standard" as a consequence.

[153] **Background.** The SC added reference to the safeguarding of forests and the environment as being other elements of the IPPC.

[154] **Requirements.** One SC member noted that the concept standard is drafted in a similar way to ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*) and ISPM 28 in that it describes the generic contents of the individual commodity standards but does not contain specific requirements for NPPOs, and this therefore raises the question of whether it should indeed be a standard, as standards provide requirements for NPPOs, or whether the concept standard is in reality guidance for the TPCS. The SC recognized, however, that this was not a matter that could be resolved in this SC meeting.

[155] **Purpose and use of commodity standards.** The SC used alternative wording for "fast-track" to avoid misinterpretation, and amended the text to make it clear that phytosanitary import requirements are set by the importing country not by bilateral discussions, but with consideration of market access discussions. The SC moved to the end of the section the general considerations on the situations where commodity standards should not be developed.

[156] **Scope (under Requirements).** The SC deleted the sentence referring to avoiding having several categories of the commodity, and amended the previous sentence to make it clear that the commodity standard needed to clearly describe the specific commodity and its intended use.

[157] **Description of the commodity.** The SC added "and its intended use" to the heading, deleted some non-relevant parts of the text and incorporated at the end of the section the first sentence of the section on General considerations.

[158] **Pests.** The SC moved the second sentence of the section on General considerations to the section on Pests and made some further modifications, including mentioning the criteria for inclusion of pests. The SC considered the sentence "If a pest is known not to be associated with the commodity, it should not be regulated unless there is technical justification", and considered amending it to reflect that fact that the pest concerned might already be a regulated pest because of association with other commodities. However, the SC agreed instead to delete the sentence, as it repeats guidance elsewhere in the standard regarding the need for technical justification for regulation of pests.

[159] **Options for phytosanitary measures.** The SC moved the paragraph on post-entry measures from the section on General considerations to this section, but deleted the sentence that post-entry measures should not be interpreted as imposing obligations on importing countries, as the meaning was not clear.

[160] **Verification of compliance.** The SC added reference to ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*).

[161] **Criteria for inclusion of measures in commodity standards.** The SC noted that the first sentence duplicated guidance about "at least two contracting parties" in the section on Options for phytosanitary measures, so deleted the sentence in the latter. The SC added a reference to the measures being included in at least one bilateral agreement.

[14] 2019-008.

[162] **Confidence in measures.** The SC split the first bullet point into two, as ISPMs have a different status to regional standards. Similarly, the SC split the bullet point concerning history of use by contracting parties or by the private sector.

[163] **General considerations.** The SC saw no need to include the last paragraph and so deleted it. As all other paragraphs in this section had already been moved elsewhere in the standard as a result of the SC's earlier amendments, the SC deleted "General considerations".

[164] **Tense used.** In response to a query from an SC member, the Secretariat clarified that the present tense was used in this concept standard as it is an "umbrella" standard for the commodity standards that will form its annexes, and so describes the contents of those annexes, in a similar way to ISPM 27. The wording uses the present tense, in anticipation of annexes being adopted. The intention is that the umbrella standard is read in conjunction with the annexes and provides guidance to help NPPOs interpret and use the annexes. The only requirement (and hence use of the word "should") is that contracting parties should consider the commodity standards when developing phytosanitary import requirements.

[165] The SC:

(16) *invited* the CPM Bureau to consider the comments and recommendations made during the November 2019 meeting of the SC regarding the draft ISPM on *Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008) (Appendix 9).

6. Updates on Draft ISPMs for Approval for First Consultation

[166] The following two draft ISPMs that are at an earlier stage in the process were deferred to the SC meeting in May 2020:

- *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014), Priority 1
- *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001), Priority 2.

[167] The SC:

(17) *invited* SC members to provide comments on the draft ISPMs on *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014) and *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) to the respective stewards, with a copy to the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org), by the end of 2019.

7. Topics

7.1 List of topics

***Review and adjustments to the* List of topics for IPPC standards**

[168] The Secretariat confirmed that the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (LOT) had been updated to take account of decisions taken by the SC meeting in May 2019.

[169] The SC:

(18) *recommended* to the CPM that the topic *Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008) be included in the *List of topics for IPPC standards* with priority 1

(19) *recommended* to the CPM that the topic Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (2019-009) be included in the *List of topics for IPPC standards* with priority 1.

8. Standards Committee

8.1 Follow-up on actions from SC May 2019

Proposal to reorganize the pest risk analysis standards into a suite of standards

[170] At its meeting in May 2019, the SC had agreed that, in parallel to the continued work on the draft standard on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001), an SC working group would prepare

a paper for further discussion at the SC November meeting on the possible reorganization of the PRA standards. The group had been asked to consider the following:

- the content of IPSM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*), ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*), and if appropriate ISPM 24 (*Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures*) and ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*)
- two options for the suite of PRA standards:
  - a suite of three standards (one for each of the three stages of the PRA process); or
  - a suite of four standards, including an overarching standard to provide a framework for the whole PRA process
- how to separate out the supplement sections of ISPM 11.

[171] Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (Canada), the lead for the SC working group, introduced the paper resulting from this work[15]. The group had drawn up a list of six options, analysed the corresponding consequences for ISPM 2, ISPM 11 and the new draft ISPM (2014-001) on pest risk management, and identified points for the SC to consider. The options were as follows:

- Option 1: new stand-alone draft ISPM on pest risk management, with no revision of ISPM 11
- Option 2: revision of ISPM 11, section 3 on pest risk management
- Option 3: revision of ISPM 11 and stand-alone ISPM on pest risk management
- Option 4: three standards – one for each stage of PRA
- Option 5: four standards – overarching standard on the PRA process and one for each stage of PRA
- Option 6: one overarching standard on PRA process with an annex for each stage of PRA.

[172] The lead of the SC working group commented that, in the opinion of the working group, it would be better to have a separate ISPM for each stage of PRA.

[173] The SC considered the various options presented by the working group. Many SC members were in favour of Option 5, on the basis that it provided the best solution in terms of clarity of guidance and avoiding duplication of content, with some SC members also supporting Option 4 as being very similar but requiring less work to develop it. In terms of managing the workload, some SC members suggested that it would be best to start with the ISPM on pest risk management and then follow with the other ISPMs. One SC member disagreed and preferred Option 2, indicating that this represented the least workload and the most straightforward way of integrating additional information on pest risk management. One SC member queried whether it would be worthwhile inviting comments from external PRA experts, but another SC member commented that the contributions of experts could be invited in the usual way through expert working groups. The SC Chairperson raised the issue of how best to manage the workload associated with Option 5. One SC member thought that Option 4 would involve less work than Option 5, but other SC members commented that the work involved for Options 4 and 5 would probably be similar and it would be better to choose the option that provides the best solution. One SC member recalled comments made at the last meeting of the SC that the workload of the SC was less than it had been historically.

[174] In conclusion, the SC agreed to submit a paper to CPM-15 (2020), explaining the background, outlining options 2 and 5, referring to the discussion at this SC meeting, and seeking the decision of the CPM.

[175] The SC:

(20) *thanked* the members of the SC working group for their contributions to this task

(21) *requested* that the SC working group on the reorganization of pest risk analysis standards prepare a paper for CPM-15 (2020), drawing upon their work to date and the discussions at this SC

[15] 17_SC_2019_Nov.

meeting, and seeking a decision from CPM-15 (2020) on the way forward and in particular the choice between options 2 and 5.

8.2 Standards Committee working group (SC-7) May 2019

Update from the 2019 SC-7 meeting

[176] The SC Chairperson referred SC members to the papers related to the SC-7 meeting held in May 2019[16]. The SC-7 had reviewed four draft standards (discussed under agenda item 4 in this SC meeting) and approved them for submission to the second consultation.

Agenda of the 2020 SC-7 meeting

[177] As no ISPMs would be coming from first consultation for discussion by the SC-7 in 2020, the SC-7 had discussed possible agenda items for their May 2020 meeting, recalling that at the SC meeting in May 2019, it had been suggested that the SC-7 could focus on strategic issues. The possible agenda items were as follows:

- Review of the Standard setting process: The SC-7 could review the Standard setting process in relation to commodity standards, the new joint call for topics and strategic discussions of the technical panel's work.
- Pest risk analysis / pest risk management standards revision: The SC-7 could continue the discussion on the reorganization and revision of the PRA standards, following the decision of CPM-15 (2020).
- "Authorization of entities": The SC-7 could continue working on this issue following the decision of CPM-15 (2020).
- Pilot "commodity standard": The SC-7 could discuss regional standards that may become commodity standards and start working on a possible pilot commodity (mango had been suggested as a relevant Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission standard that is already under development).
- Specifications for new standards: The SC-7 could draft specifications for standards identified as gaps in the Framework for standards and implementation.

[178] The SC agreed these agenda items, noting that "review" of the Standard setting process refers to consideration and analysis and does not include revision of the process.

[179] One SC member also suggested that other agenda items could also include SC–IC collaboration, IYPH activities and prioritization of the work programme.

Selection or reconfirmation of SC-7 members

[180] The SC agreed that Mr Sam BISHOP (United Kingdom), Mr Nader ELBADRY (Egypt), Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ (Costa Rica), Ms Esther KIMANI (Kenya), Ms Sophie PETERSON (Australia), Mr Masahiro SAI (Japan) and Ms Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America) would be the SC representatives for the SC-7 for Europe, the Near East, Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, the Southwest Pacific, Asia, and North America, respectively.

Clarification on the content of the Outline of requirements section of ISPMs

[181] The SC deferred discussion of this matter to the May 2020 meeting of the SC.

[182] The SC also agreed to discuss, at their May 2020 meeting, the section on Impacts on biodiversity and the environment that appears in every ISPM.

[183] The SC:

(22) *noted* the update from the 2019 SC-7 meeting

[16] 18_SC_2019_Nov; 2019-05 SC-7 meeting report: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87337/.

(23) *agreed* to the potential agenda for the 2020 SC-7 meeting as described in this meeting report, pending the outcome of CPM-15 (2020)

(24) *agreed* to the membership of the SC-7 as presented in the Participants list (Appendix 3)

(25) *deferred* consideration of the Outline of requirements section and the Impacts on biodiversity and the environment section of ISPMs to the SC meeting in May 2020.

8.3 Summary of polls and forums discussed on e-decision site

[184] The Secretariat presented a paper listing the e-decisions made from May 2019 to November 2019[17]. This included a joint SC and IC e-forum on the Framework for standards and implementation.

[185] The SC:

(26) *agreed* that the "Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions" reflects the outcome of the e-decisions (Appendix 10).

9. Technical Panels – Urgent Issues

9.1 Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP)

[186] The Steward, Ms Jayani Nimanthika WATHUKARAGE (Sri Lanka), presented the following issues for consideration by the SC.

IRSS survey: review of diagnostic protocols

[187] Further to the request from CPM-14 (2019) for the SC and IC to review the use and development of diagnostic protocols, the TPDP had revised the earlier project proposal and the draft survey questionnaire that had been presented to the Bureau in 2012[18]. The Steward presented the IRSS project proposal and the draft survey questionnaire to the SC for consideration.

[188] Some SC members questioned whether the structure of the questionnaire would allow any useful conclusions to be drawn. One SC member suggested that input from social scientists with expertise in compiling questionnaires may be beneficial, but another SC member commented that this can lead to unnecessary complexities. Some SC members emphasized the need for questionnaires to be short and focused, with a clear objective to the survey. The Secretariat commented that neither the TPDP nor the SSU are experts at drafting surveys, but there is a need to obtain feedback on the use of DPs and the Secretariat and TPDP are open to any suggestions the SC may have about alternative approaches.

[189] The SC agreed that the questionnaire should not be forwarded to the IC but that feedback could perhaps be obtained through the IPPC regional workshops in 2020.

Proposal for revision of DP 5 (*Phyllosticta citricarpa *(McAlpine)) Aa on fruit)

[190] The TPDP, at their meeting in August 2019[19], had discussed the need to revise DP 5 (*Phyllosticta citricarpa* (McAlpine)) Aa on fruit) because of new information regarding the potential for false positive detections using the methods described in DP 5[20].

[191] The SC were invited to adopt a revised version of DP 5 with the following "editorial revision" in the identification section of DP 5, so that users are aware of the potential for false positive test results:

> The described PCR methods may produce positive test results with *P. paracitricarpa* and *P. citriasiana*. In the event of a positive PCR test result, culturing of the fungus and multi-locus sequencing as

[17] 11_SC_2019_Nov.

[18] 10_SC_2019_Nov.

[19] TPDP meeting reports: https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-diagnostic-protocols/.

[20] 09_SC_2019_Nov.

described in Guarnaccia *et al.* (2017) is needed in order to achieve reliable identification of *P. citricarpa*.

[192] As a consequence of this insertion, a reference would also need adding to the References section of DP 5.

[193] One SC member recalled that, according to the Standard setting process as agreed at CPM-7 (2012), when a technical revision is required for an adopted DP, the SC can adopt the updates via electronic means. The revised DPs must be made publicly available as soon as the SC adopts them, and DPs revised through this process (technical revision)[21] are noted by the CPM and attached to the report of the CPM meeting.

[194] One SC member commented that this is not an editorial revision and that more input from experts is needed. Suggestions from other SC members included a focused revision instead of editorial revision, addition of the proposed text but without the second sentence (and consequential reference), greying out section 4.2 of DP 5 and indicating the rationale for the proposed revision, or that the whole DP could be withdrawn from the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP[22]). The Secretariat clarified that the proposal being made was to add an alert and that this did not alter the substance of the DP itself. The SC Chairperson and the Secretariat clarified that an adopted DP should not be removed from the IPP unless it is revoked and that requires CPM approval. However, some SC members expressed concern about leaving a DP on the IPP if it is known that the DP can give rise to false positive results. One SC member suggested that the alert be posted on the IPP, associated with DP 5.

[195] The SC agreed to add the revision of DP 5 to the TPDP work programme in the LOT with "pending" status, so that a revision can take place as soon as a specific PCR test for *Phyllosticta citricarpa* becomes available.

[196] One SC member requested that the Secretariat seek clarification on whether the SC can temporarily remove a DP from the IPP for revision and the associated process involved, since unlike other ISPMs, DPs are adopted by the SC and noted by the CPM.

Possible ways to streamline the diagnostic protocol development process

[197] The SC deferred this agenda item until its meeting in May 2020.

Invited expert to the 2020 TPDP face-to-face meeting

[198] The SC deferred this agenda item to e-decision.

[199] The SC:

(27) *noted* the discussions of the TPDP regarding the request from CPM-14 (2019) to "review the use and development of diagnostic protocols", related to a possible IRSS questionnaire

(28) *agreed* to the need for an alert on the IPP for DP 5 (*Phyllosticta citricarpa* (McAlpine)) Aa on fruit), regarding the potential for false positive results

(29) *added* the revision of DP 5 (*Phyllosticta citricarpa* (McAlpine)) Aa to the TPDP work programme in the *List of topics for IPPC standards* with "pending" status

(30) *deferred* consideration of an invited expert to the 2020 TPDP face-to-face meeting to e-decision.

[21] See section 7.3 (TPDP) of the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting* for more detail on technical revisions of DPs: https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/ippc-standard-setting-procedure-manual/.

[22] International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP): https://www.ippc.int.

9.2 Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT)

[200] The SC agreed to defer its consideration of the possible ways of streamlining the phytosanitary treatments development process to its meeting in May 2020, and to defer the remaining items under this agenda item to e-decisions.

[201] The SC:

(31) *deferred* the TPPT's review of the objection to the draft PT Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating (2007-114) to e-decision

(32) *deferred* consideration of Modified atmosphere usage in irradiation treatments and the objection to the draft PT *Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating* (2007-114) to e-decision

(33) *deferred* consideration of an invited expert to the 2020 TPDP face-to-face meeting to e-decision.

10. Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) Interactions

10.1 Update on IC activities

[202] The IC representative on the SC provided a brief update on IC activities[23].

[203] **Surveillance.** At the IC meeting in May 2020, a paper had been approved for submission to the Bureau. Subsequent progress had been made, including revision of the current IPPC Surveillance guide and development of e-learning materials.

[204] **Implementation if ISPMs.** The IC had liaised with the Secretariat to formulate proposals on how best to communicate potential implementation issues raised by the SC to the IC, and the IC will be considering a paper on this at their meeting in November 2019.

[205] **IC November 2019 meeting.** Priorities for this meeting will include the potential implementation issues raised by the SC in relation to the three ISPMs recommended by the SC this week for adoption, the pest outbreak and pest response system, funding and resources, and succession planning. He pointed out that the latter is necessary as the terms of all IC members are due to end in 2020.

[206] The SC member of the IRSS subgroup is Mr Sam BISHOP.

[207] The SC:

(34) *noted* the update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee.

11. Updates

11.1 CPM Bureau meetings (June 2019 and October 2019)

[208] The Bureau representative Ms Marica GATT referred to the summary provided to the SC on recent Bureau meetings[24] and invited questions from the SC. She also confirmed the extra funding secured for translation at SC meetings. She commented that the Bureau had agreed that, at their meetings, papers submitted prior to the meeting would not be verbally presented, but questions and comments invited instead. One SC member supported this approach for the SC meetings.

[209] One SC member queried whether e-commerce is under the remit of Standard Setting or Implementation and Facilitation. The Secretariat referred to the introductory remarks of the IPPC Secretary and the two topics on the LOT concerning e-commerce (see agenda item 15). The IC representative also referred to work of the IC on an e-commerce landing page, a network of experts, and a capacity development guide on e-commerce.

[23] 35_SC_2019_Nov; IC meeting reports: https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/capacity-development-committee/.

[24] 40_SC_2019_Nov; Bureau reports: https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/bureau/.

[210] The SC:

(35) *noted* the update from the Bureau meetings.

11.2 Strategic Planning Group (SPG) meeting (October 2019)

[211] This SC did not consider this agenda item.

11.3 International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) update

[212] Mr David KAMANGIRA (Malawi), a member of the IYPH Technical Advisory Board, updated the SC on progress with preparations for IYPH[25]. The IYPH Secretariat are organizing six key events, starting with launch events at the FAO and United Nations headquarters in Rome and New York City, respectively. CPM-15 (2020) will include a ministerial segment, attended by the President of Finland and the Finnish Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, during which the IPPC Strategic Framework and Ministerial Declaration should be approved and signed by Ministers. An International Plant Health Conference will be held in Helsinki, Finland, on 5–8 October 2020 and it is hoped that World Food Day on 16 October 2020 will be focused on plant health. Finally, there will be a closing event in December 2020 or January 2021. In addition to these events, the IYPH Secretariat is also managing various initiatives to facilitate IYPH implementation, including calls for financial contributions to bridge the current funding gap.

[213] The Secretariat invited SC members to suggest ideas for promoting standard setting during IYPH.

[214] One SC member suggested that the IYPH Technical Advisory Board be reinstated, and expressed concern over the moves by FAO to broaden the scope of IYPH beyond that agreed by the CPM.

[215] The SC:

(36) *noted* the update on the International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) 2020

(37) *encouraged* SC members to suggest ways of promoting standard setting during IYPH.

11.4 Technical consultation among regional plant protection organizations (TC-RPPOs), 2019 update

[216] The Secretariat updated the SC on the 2019 technical consultation among RPPOs[26].

[217] Regarding e-commerce, the Secretariat confirmed that the intention was to establish a network of experts, and that contacts had already been made with the World Customs Organization and the Universal Postal Union.

[218] Regarding the pest outbreak alert and response system, the Secretariat commented that the CPM had allocated extra-budgetary funds for this work and that a focus group would be established. The work plan for the project is due to be discussed at the IC meeting in November 2019. The work is following the direction set out in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030.

[219] The SC:

(38) *noted* the update on the 2019 technical consultation among RPPOs.

[25] 16_SC_2019_Nov.

[26] 2019 TC-RPPOs: https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/external-cooperation/partners/technical-consultation-among-rppos/2019-31st-tc-among-rppos/.

11.5 Briefings from IPPC Secretariat

Standard setting unit (SSU)

[220] The SSU lead gave a brief update on SC activities since May 2019 and presented a draft 2020 SSU work plan[27].

[221] Meetings held since May included the second meeting of the Focus Group on Commodity Standards, the expert working group on *Audits in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014) and face-to-face meetings of the TPPT and TPDP. Two other meetings are due to take place during 2019: the TPG from 18 to 20 November 2019, and the expert working group for the Focused revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011) from 9 to 12 December 2019. He also thanked France for their in-kind contribution during 2019 and Australia, Canada and the FAO–International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Joint Division for hosting standard setting meetings during the year.

[222] The SSU lead referred SC members to a concept note for a project proposal on capacity enhancement of the IPPC contracting parties' participation in the Standard setting process. Some SC members queried whether the IC is involved as this activity concerns capacity enhancement, but the Secretariat clarified that the IC is not involved at present.

[223] The SC:

(39) *noted* the update from the Standard Setting Unit and their draft work plan for 2020.

Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU)

[224] The IFU lead gave a brief update on IFU activities since May 2019 and current staffing, and presented a draft 2020 IFU work plan [28].

[225] He drew the SC's attention to the work in progress on surveillance, e-commerce, and the pest outbreak alert and response system. He also commented that the IFU will be undertaking a project review.

[226] **IPPC regional workshops and other meetings.** Seven IPPC regional workshops had been delivered by the Secretariat in 2019 and in October the Secretariat had organized the IPPC *International symposium on pest free areas and surveillance* in Shizuoka, Japan.

[227] **IC subgroups.** The IC Subgroup on IRSS had met virtually. They had developed a written procedure for how topics for new IRSS studies and surveys could be submitted (subsequently approved by the IC), developed a survey on pest free areas and have begun a study on the use of third-party accreditation systems by NPPOs. A comparative analysis of the results of the first and second general survey is also being conducted. The Task Force on Sea Containers had met in Baltimore, United States of America, from 23 to 27 September 2019[29], where they reviewed their work since their inception and their terms of reference, discussed the results of questionnaire surveys, and consider a road map for developing recommendations for the IC and CPM-16 (2021) on minimizing the pest risks associated with the movement of sea containers. The IC Subgroup on Dispute Avoidance and Settlement had not formed, due to the low number of nominations. The SPG had subsequently suggested work in this area is postponed until after IYPH, and the IC will be considering the matter at their meeting in November 2019.

[228] **Phytosanitary capacity evaluation and other projects.** Phytosanitary capacity evaluation (PCE) projects are currently ongoing in Nicaragua and Sri Lanka, but the PCE project in Uzbekistan is closed without having been achieved because key elements had not been completed.

[27] 34_SC_2019_May.

[28] 24_SC_2019_May.

[29] Meeting report on Task Force on Sea Containers will be available at: https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/sea-containers/.

[229] **Guides and other training materials.** The IPPC *Guide for establishing and maintaining pest free areas* had been published in October 2019. A working group had met in September 2019 to develop a guide on pest status to support the implementation of the revised ISPM 8 (see agenda item 4.2). Work on the development of a guide for ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) has been put on hold, pending the availability of resources. Work to revamp webpages on the IPP is also underway.

[230] **Pest outbreak alert and response system.** One SC member sought clarification on why the IFU was carrying out work on the pest outbreak alert and response system project when CPM-14 (2019) had decided that work would be initiated dependent on extra-budgetary funds. It is not clear whether the funds have been allocated including FAO programme funds and whether the required direction has been provided to the Secretariat. Since the paper indicates that the projects are under IC supervision, the SC member recommended that the IC discuss the appropriate path forward.

[231] The IC representative explained that the IC in its November 2019 meeting will discuss this issue and the Secretariat support for backstopping projects, and feedback will be provided to the SC.

[232] The SC Chairperson thanked the IFU lead for his update.

[233] The SC:

(40) *noted* the update from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit and their draft work plan for 2020.

Integration and Support Team (IST)

[234] The IST lead provided a brief update on the work of the team[30]. He explained that the main core activity of the IST is communication and partnership and highlighted a few areas of recent work.

[235] **Governance and strategy.** The IST had coordinated meetings of the Bureau and the Strategic Planning Group, and provided regular assistance to other IPPC committees. In October 2019, the SPG and Bureau had agreed on the need to develop a new IPPC communication strategy, to be developed after the International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) in 2020. Preparations for CPM-15 (2020) have been initiated.

[236] **Professional and technical activities.** The IST had overseen the implementation and reporting of NRO activities, including the provision of regular assistance to IPPC contact points and IPP editors.

[237] **Communications and advocacy.** From January to mid-October 2019, the IST had coordinated or cleared 91 IPP headline news, coordinated the development of 40 new publications, translated eight guides into French, and contributed to drafting an article for the FAO website. An IPPC publications plan for 2020 is being developed.

[238] **Information management.** The IST had launched the IYPH website[31] and is carrying out work towards restructuring of the IPP.

[239] **International Year of Plant Health.** The IST provide support to the IYPH International Steering Committee and two members of the IST help with the coordination of IYPH (see agenda item 11.3 for IYPH update).

[240] **Liaison and partnership activities.** The IST continue to liaise both internally within the FAO and as Secretariat lead for external cooperation.

[241] The SC Chairperson thanked the IST lead for his presentation.

[242] The SC:

(41) *noted* the update from the Integration and Support Team

[30] 14_SC_2019_Nov.

[31] IYPH website: https://www.ippc.int/en/iyph/.

(42) *noted* the IST request to inform the IST about any publications that may be developed during 2020, with a view to including them in the IPPC communications plan.

IPPC regional workshops

[243] The SC noted the paper reporting on the IPPC regional workshops held in 2019, with workshops held in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, Europe & Central Asia, Latin America, Near East and North Africa, and the Pacific[32].

[244] The SC:

(43) *noted* the update on IPPC regional workshops.

Projects for which the IPPC Secretariat is providing backstopping

[245] The SC deferred this agenda item.

11. SC Recommendations for CPM-15 (2020) Decisions and Discussions

[246] The SC noted that the following will be recommended for CPM-15 (2020):

- draft ISPMs for adoption: Draft 2018 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001), Revision of ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) (2009-005), *Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure* (2014-006)).
- topics for inclusion in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*: Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008) with priority 1, Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (2019-009) with priority 1
- *List of topics for IPPC standards* (to note the updates).

[247] The SC noted that papers on the following will be prepared for CPM-15 (2020):

- concerns about the draft ISPM on *Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002) (see section 4.3 of this report)
- the reorganization of pest risk analysis standards (see section 8.1 of this report).

[248] In addition, the SC noted that the following issues will be forwarded to the Bureau:

- a recommendation to hold a side-session at CPM-15 (2020) on the draft standard on *Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002) (see section item 4.3 of this report)
- to consider the comments and recommendations made during the November 2019 meeting of the SC regarding the governance process for commodity standards, including the draft specification on *Technical Panel for Commodity Standards* (TPCS) (2019-009), and the draft ISPM on *Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008) (see sections 5.1 and 5.2 of this report).

12. Agenda Items Deferred to Future SC Meetings

[249] The following items were deferred to the May 2020 meeting of the SC:

- consequential ink amendments to ISPMs resulting from the draft revision of ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) (from agenda item 4.2 of this meeting)
- *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014) (from agenda item 6.1 of this meeting)
- *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) (from agenda item 6.2 of this meeting)
- *List of topics for IPPC standards* (from agenda item 7.1 of this meeting)

[32] 13_SC_2019_Nov.

- the Outline of requirements (from agenda item 8.2 of this meeting) and the Impacts on biodiversity and environment sections of ISPMs
- possible ways to streamline the development process for diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments (from agenda items 9.1 and 9.2 of this meeting)
- invited experts to the TPDP and TPPT meetings in 2010 (from agenda items 9.1 and 9.2 of this meeting)
- projects for which the IPPC Secretariat is providing backstopping (from agenda item 11.5 of this meeting).

[250] The following items were deferred to SC e-decision:

- modified atmosphere usage in irradiation treatments (from agenda item 9.2 of this meeting)
- *Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating* (2007-114) – evaluation of the objection (from agenda item 9.2 of this meeting).

13. Review of the Standard Setting Calendar

[251] The SC did not consider this agenda item.

14. Any Other Business

[252] Update on e-commerce topics. The SC did not consider this agenda item.

15. Date and Venue of the Next SC Meeting

[253] The next SC meeting is scheduled for 4–8 May 2020 in Rome, Italy. The SC-7 is scheduled for the following week.

16. Evaluation of the Meeting Process

[254] The Secretariat invited all SC members and observers to complete the evaluation of the meeting via this link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/XFZWMWR by 2 December 2019.

17. Review and Adoption of the Report

[255] The SC adopted the report.

[256] For ease of reference, a list of action points arising from the meeting is attached as Appendix 11.

18. Close of the Meeting

[257] The Secretariat again invited SC members to suggest ideas for promoting standard setting during IYPH and on how the Secretariat can improve its work.

[258] The SC noted that the SC Chairperson will finish his first term on 3 May 2020, and thanked him for his contribution to the work of the committee.

[259] The IC representative expressed his gratitude for the representation offered to the IC at SC meetings, and the contribution provided by the SC representative on the IC. He reiterated that the IC members have only one meeting left before the end of their term and he encouraged SC members to contribute to the nomination of new IC members.

[260] The SC thanked the Secretariat for their support during the week, the report writer, the Rapporteur, and the SC Chairperson for steering the work of the committee so well.

[261] The SC Chairperson expressed his gratitude for the opportunity to serve as Chairperson and his pride at the work achieved by the SC and the degree of professionalism demonstrated among its members. He thanked all participants for their valuable contributions, including the observers, and acknowledged the

value of having a representative present from the Bureau. He thanked the report writer and paid tribute to the skill and dedication of the Rapporteur. Finally, he thanked the translators and the messengers.

[262] The SC Chairperson closed the meeting.

Appendix 1: Agenda

	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER/ SECRETARIAT SUPPORT
1.	**Opening of the Meeting**		
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	---	XIA NERSISYAN
2.	**Meeting Arrangements**		
2.1	Election of the Rapporteur	---	Chairperson (FERRO)
2.2	Adoption of the Agenda	01_SC_2019_Nov	Chairperson
3.	**Administrative Matters**		
3.1	Documents List	02_SC_2019_Nov	KISS
3.2	Participants List	03_SC_2019_Nov SC membership list	KISS
3.3	Local Information	Link to local information	KISS
3.4	Standard Setting Unit staff	Link to standard setting staff	NERSISYAN
4.	**Draft ISPMs for recommendation to Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) for adoption (from second consultation)**		
4.1	**Draft 2018 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001)** - Steward: Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC ❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response) ❖ Steward's notes ❖ SC-7 2019 meeting report	1994-001 04 _SC_2019_Nov 27 _SC_2019_Nov Link SC-7 2019 meeting report	BOUHOT-DELDUC
4.2	**Revision of ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005), Priority 1** - Steward: Ms Marina ZLOTINA ❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response) ❖ Steward's summary and potential implementation issues ❖ Update on the development of the Pest Status Guide – Outline of the draft guide on Pest status ❖ Consequential changes to other ISPMs – proposed ink amendments ❖ SC-7 2019 meeting report	2009-005 06 _SC_2019_Nov 15 _SC_2019_Nov 25 _SC_2019_Nov 08 _SC_2019_Nov Link SC-7 2019 meeting report	ZLOTINA/ MOREIRA

	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER/ SECRETARIAT SUPPORT
4.3	**Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002), Priority 2** - Steward: Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM ❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response) ❖ Steward's summary and potential implementation issues ❖ SC-7 2019 meeting report	2014-002 37 _SC_2019_Nov 38 _SC_2019_Nov Link SC-7 2019 meeting report	RAMARATHNAM/ KISS
4.4	**Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006), Priority 2** - Steward: Mr Alvaro SEPULVEDA LUQUE ❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response) ❖ Steward's summary and potential implementation issues ❖ SC-7 2019 meeting report	2014-006 28 _SC_2019_Nov 19 _SC_2019_Nov Link SC-7 2019 meeting report	SEPULVEDA LUQUE/ KISS
5.	**Commodity standards**		
5.1	**Update from the Focus Group on Commodity and pathway standards** ❖ Governance, process and concept ISPM for commodity and pathway standards ❖ Draft specification for Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (2019-009)	12_SC_2019_Nov 21_SC_2019_Nov	FERRO, BISHOP/ MOREIRA
5.2	**Revision of the draft ISPM: Requirements for commodity and pathways standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)**	2019-008	FERRO, BISHOP/ MOREIRA
6.	**Updates on draft ISPMs for approval for the first consultation – *draft ISPMs to be discussed in detail in May 2020***		
6.1	**Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014), Priority 1** - Steward: Mr Alvaro SEPULVEDA LUQUE ❖ Steward's notes and potential implementation issues ❖ Specification 66 (for information)	2015-014 05 _SC_2019_Nov Link to Specification 66	SEPULVEDA LUQUE/ KISS, SHAMILOV
6.2	**Pest risk management for quarantine pests (2014-001), Priority 2** - Steward: Ms Joanne WILSON ❖ Steward's notes Specification 63 (for information)	2014-001_v1 2014-001_v2 20 _SC_2019_Nov Link to Specification 63	WILSON / KISS, SHAMILOV
7.	**Topics**		

	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER/ SECRETARIAT SUPPORT
7.1	**List of Topics** ❖ Review and adjustments to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* ❖ Adjustment / assignment of stewards	33_SC_2019_Nov Link to List of Topics for IPPC standards	KISS
8.	**Standards Committee**		
8.1	**Follow-up actions from the SC May 2019**	Link to May 2019 SC report	Chairperson
	Proposal to reorganize the pest risk analysis (PRA) standards into a suite of standards (SC working group) - Next steps to move forward with the reorganization proposal and the impact of its inclusion in the standard setting programme	17_SC_2019_Nov	RAMARATHNAM and BISHOP, PETERSON, SAI, ZLOTINA BUTCHER/ SHAMILOV, KISS
8.2	Standards Committee working group (SC-7) May 2019 ❖ Update from the 2019 SC-7 meeting ❖ Agenda of the 2020 SC-7 meeting ❖ Selection or reconfirmation of SC-7 members ❖ Clarification on the content of the Outline of requirement section of ISPMs	Link SC-7 2019 meeting report Link to SC membership list 18_SC_2019_Nov	FERRO/ MOREIRA
8.3	Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (from May 2019 to November 2019)	11_SC_2019_Nov	KISS
9.	**Technical Panels – Urgent issues**		
9.1	Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) ❖ IRSS survey: review of diagnostic protocols ❖ Proposal for revision of DP 05: *Phyllosticta citricarpa* (McAlpine) Aa on fruit ❖ Possible ways to streamline the diagnostic protocols development processes ❖ Invited expert to the 2020 TPDP face to face meeting	10_SC_2019_Nov 09_SC_2019_Nov 22_SC_2019_Nov	WATHUKARAGE/ MOREIRA
9.2	Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) ❖ Possible ways to streamline the phytosanitary treatments development processes ❖ Invited expert to the 2020 TPPT face to face meeting ❖ Modified atmosphere usage in irradiation treatments	39_SC_2019_Nov 23_SC_2019_Nov	OPATOWSKI/ KISS, MOREIRA

	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER/ SECRETARIAT SUPPORT
	❖ Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating (2007-114) - Evaluation of the objection	07_SC_2019_Nov	
10.	**Implementation and Capacity Development (IC) Committee Interactions**		
10.1	Update on IC activities - Potential implementation issues on ISPMs	Link to IC meeting reports 35_SC_2019_Nov	DALE/ SEPULVEDA LUQUE
11.	**Updates**		
11.1	CPM Bureau: June and October 2019 meetings ❖ Update on draft CPM recommendations ❖ Update on Implementation topics o Surveillance o e-Commerce o Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems	Link to Bureau meeting reports 40_SC_2019_Nov -- 32_SC_2019_Nov 29_SC_2019_Nov 30_SC_2019_Nov	GATT MOREIRA / GATT GATT
11.2	Strategic Planning Group (SPG): October 2019 meeting	Link to SPG meeting reports Link to SPG 2019 page	FERRO
11.3	International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) update	16_SC_2019_Nov	KAMANGIRA/ SEPÚLVEDA / SHAMILOV
11.4	Technical-consultation among Regional Plant Protection organizations (TC-RPPOs) 2019 update	Link to the 2019 webpage – 31st TC RPPOs	BRUNEL
11.5	Briefings from IPPC Secretariat ❖ Update from the Standard Setting Unit (SSU) - Presentation of the 2020 SSU draft work plan - Concept note: project proposal for capacity enhancement of the IPPC contracting parties for standard setting process ❖ Update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Unit (IFU) ❖ Update from the Integration and Support Team (IST) ❖ Update on the IPPC Regional Workshops ❖ Projects for which the IPPC Secretariat is providing backstopping	34_SC_2019_Nov 36_SC_2019_Nov 24_SC_2019_Nov 14_SC_2019_Nov 13 _SC_2019_Nov 31_SC_2019_Nov	NERSISYAN / MOREIRA LARSON DENG BRUNEL BRUNEL/ SHAMILOV

	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER/ SECRETARIAT SUPPORT
12.	**SC recommendations for CPM-15 (2020) decisions and discussions** (including proposals for discussions on concepts and implementation issues related to draft or adopted standards, special topics session and side-event)		Chairperson
13.	**Agenda items deferred to future SC Meetings**		Chairperson
14.	**Review of the standard setting calendar**	Link to the IPP calendar	NERSISYAN
15.	**Any other business**		Chairperson
	❖ Update on E-commerce topics	26 _SC_2019_Nov	SHAMILOV
16.	**Date and venue of the next SC Meeting**	04 to 08- May 2020 (FAO HQ, Rome)	Chairperson
17.	**Evaluation of the meeting process**	Link to survey	Chairperson
18.	**Review and Adoption of the report**		Chairperson
19.	**Close of the meeting**		Chairperson

Appendix 2: Documents List

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
Draft ISPMs			
1994-001	4.1	Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001)	2019-10-23
2009-005	4.2	Draft Revision of ISPM8: determination of pest status in an area (2009-005)	2019-10-23
2019-008	5.2	Draft ISPM: Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)	2019-10-23
2014-001	6.2	Draft ISPM: Pest risk management for quarantine pests (2014-001) V1	2019-10-23
2014-001	6.2	Draft ISPM: Pest risk management for quarantine pests (2014-001) V2	2019-10-23
2014-002	4.3	Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)	2019-11-01
2014-006	4.2	Draft ISPM: requirements for the Use of modified atmosphere Treatments as phytosanitary measures (2014-006)	2019-10-23
Other Documents			
01_SC_2018_Nov	2.3	Provisional Agenda	2019-10-23 2019-11-01
02_SC_2019_ Nov	3.1	Documents List	2019-11-01
03_SC_2019_ Nov	3.2	Participants List	2019-10-23
04_SC_2019_ Nov	4.1	Compiled comments for draft 2018 amendments to ISPM 5 (1994 -001)	2019-10-23
05_SC_2019_ Nov	6.1	Steward's notes and potential implementation issues	2019-10-23
06_SC_2019_ Nov	4.2	Compiled comments with Steward's responses – Revision of ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005), Priority 1	2019-10-24
07_SC_2019_ Nov	9.2	Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating (2007-114) - Evaluation of the objection	2019-10-24
08_SC_2019_ Nov	4.2	Consequential Changes to other ISPMs	2019-10-24
09_SC_2019_ Nov	9.1	Proposal for revision of DP 05: phyllosticta citricarpa on fruit	2019-10-24
10_SC_2019_ Nov	9.1	IRSS survey: review of diagnostic protocols	2019-10-24
11_SC_2019_ Nov	8.3	Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions	2019-10-24
12_SC_2019_ Nov	5.1	IPPC Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards	2019-10-24
13_SC_2019_ Nov	11.5	Update on 2019 IPPC Regional Workshops	2019-10-24
14_SC_2019_ Nov	11.5	Update from IST	2019-10-24

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
15_SC_2019_ Nov	4.2	Steward's notes on draft ISPM 8 pest status in an area	2019-10-25
16_SC_2019_ Nov	11.3	International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) update	2019-10-25
17_SC_2019_ Nov	8.1	Options for the proposed revision and reorganization of PRA Standard	2019-10-25
18_SC_2019_ Nov	8.2	Update from the SC-7 Meeting Update from the SC-7 MeetingRev1	2019-10-25 2019-11-01
19_SC_2019_ Nov	4.4	Steward's summary – Draft ISPM on modified atmosphere	2019-10-25
20_SC_2019_ Nov	6.2	Steward's summary – Draft ISPM on PRM	2019-10-25
21_SC_2019_ Nov	5.1	Draft Specification for the TP for commodity Standards (2019—009)	2019-10-25
22_SC_2019_ Nov	9.1	Possible ways to shorten the length of time to develop diagnostic protocols	2019-10-25
23_SC_2019_ Nov	9.2	Modified atmosphere usage in irradiation treatments	2019-11-05
24_SC_2019_ Nov	11.5	Update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Unit (IFU)	2019-10-25
25_SC_2019_ Nov	4.2	Update on the development of the Pest Status Guide – Outline of the draft guide on Pest status	2019-10-25
26_SC_2019_ Nov	15	Update on e-commerce topics	2019-10-25
27_SC_2019_ Nov	4.1	Draft amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001) - Steward's additional notes	2019-10-25
28_SC_2019_ Nov	4.4	Compiled comments with steward's responses – Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments (2014-006)	2019-10-25
29_SC_2019_Nov	11.1	e-commerce	2019-10-25
30_SC_2019_Nov	11.1	Draft Action Plan for a pest outbreak alert and response systems	2019-10-25
31_SC_2019_Nov	11.5	IPPC Implementation Projects	2019-10-25
32_SC_2019_Nov	11.1	Update on activities on surveillance	2019-10-25
33_SC_2019_Nov	7.1	Adjustments to the List of topics and the stewards	2019-10-25
34_SC_2019_Nov	11.5	Standards Setting Unit Update	2019-11-01
35_SC_2019_Nov	10.1	Update on Implementation and Capacity Development Committee's activities	2019-11-01
36_SC_2019_Nov	11.5	Concept note: project proposal for capacity enhancement of the IPPC contracting parties for standard setting process	2019-11-01
37_SC_2019_Nov	4.3	Compiled comments with steward's responses - for Draft ISPM: Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)	2019-11-01

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
38_SC_2019_Nov	4.3	Steward's notes : Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)	2019-11-01
39_SC_2019_Nov	9.2	Streamline phytosanitary treatment development	2019-11-01
40_SC_2019_Nov	11.1	Bureau update to SC Nov 2019	2019-11-05

IPP LINKS:	Agenda item
Link to local information	3.3
SC membership list	3.2
Link to standard setting staff	3.4
Link SC-7 2019 meeting report	4.1
Link SC-7 2019 meeting report	4.3
Link SC-7 2019 meeting report	4.4
Link to Specification 66	6.1
Link to Specification 63	6.2
Link to List of Topics for IPPC standards	7.1
Link to May 2019 SC report	8.1
Link SC-7 2019 meeting report	8.2
Link to SC membership list	8.2
Link to IC meeting reports	10.1
Link to Bureau meeting reports	11.1
Link to SPG meeting reports	11.2
Link to SPG 2019 page	11.2
Link to the 2019 webpage – 31st TC RPPOs	11.4
Link to the IPP calendar	14
Link to survey	17

Appendix 3: Participants List

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Africa Member	**Ms Alphonsine LOUHOUARI TOKOZABA** Ministère de l'Agriculture et del'Elevage, 24, rue KiéléTenard, Mfilou, Brazzaville, **REPUBLIC OF CONGO** Tel: +242 01 046 53 61 Tel: +242 04 005 57 05	louhouari@yahoo.fr; A.louhouaritoko@gmail.com;	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years	2021
Africa Member SC-7	**Ms Esther KIMANI** Managing Director Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) P.O. BOX 49592-00100, Nairobi **KENYA** Tel:+254 020 6618 000 Mob: +254 0709 891 000	ekimani@kephis.org; director@kephis.org;	CPM-9 (2014) CPM-12 (2017) 2nd term/ 3 years	2020
Africa Member	**Mr David KAMANGIRA** Senior Deputy Director and IPPC Focal Point Department of Agricultural Research Services Headquarters, P.O. Box 30779, Lilongwe 3 **MALAWI** Tel: +265 888 342 712 Tel: +265 999 122 199	davidkamangira1@gmail.com;	CPM-11 (2016) CPM-14 (2019) 2nd term/3 years	2022
Africa Member	**Mr Moses Adegboyega ADEWUMI** Head of Inspection Southwest Zone Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service FAAN HQT Complex, Ikeja, Lagos, Lagos State **NIGERIA** Tel: +234 -8033913847 / 8059607047	adegboyegamoses37@yahoo.com;	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years	2021
Asia Member	**Ms Chonticha RAKKRAI** Director, Plant Quarantine Research Group, Plant Protection Research and Development Office, Department of Agriculture, 50 Phaholyothin Rd., Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok, 10900 **THAILAND** Tel : (+66) 2561 2537 Fax : (+66) 2561 2146 Mobile: (+66) 8 9128 6488	rakkrai@yahoo.com;	CPM-14 (2019) 1st term/3 years	2022

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Asia Member	**Ms Jayani Nimanthika WATHUKARAGE** Assistant Director (Research) National Plant Quarantine Service, Canada Friendship Road, Katunayake, **SRI LANKA** Tel : +94718015660 / +94 112252028 - 9 Fax : +94112253709	jayaninimanthika@gmail.com;	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years	2021
Asia Member SC-7	**Mr Masahiro SAI** Senior Researcher (Head of Section) Risk Analysis Division Yokohama Plant Protection Station Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF**)** **JAPAN** Tel**:** +81-45-211-0375	saim@pps.maff.go.jp;	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years	2021
Asia Member	**Mr Xiaodong FENG** Deputy Director of the Division of Plant Quarantine, NATESC Ministry of AgricultureNo. 20, Maizidian Street, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100125 **CHINA** Tel:(8610)59194524	fengxdong@agri.gov.cn;	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years	2021
Europe Member	**Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC** Plant health section Sub-directorate for plant quality, health and protection Department of Sanitary Action inprimary production General directorate for food Ministry of agriculture and food251 rue de Vaugirard 75732 PARIS CEDEX 15 **FRANCE** Tel: +33 149558437	laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr ;	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) 2ndterm / 3 years	2021
Europe Member	**Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI** Plant Health Expert Plant Protection Service ERSAF - REGIONE LOMBARDIA Via Pola, 12. 20124 Milano **ITALY** Tel : (+39) 3666603272	Mariangela.Ciampitti@ersaf.lombardia.it	CPM-14 (2019) 1st term / 3 years	2022

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Europe Member SC-7	**Mr Samuel BISHOP** Plant Health Policy team Room 11G35 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs National Agri-Food Innovation Campus Sand Hutton York North Yorkshire **UNITED KINGDOM** YO41 4LZ Tel: +44 (0) 2080262506 Mob.: +44 (0) 7827976902	sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk;	CPM-13 (2018)	2021
Europe Member	**Mr David OPATOWSKI** Head, Plant Biosecurity Plant Protection and Inspection Services P.O.Box 78, Bet Dagan 50250 **ISRAEL** Phone: 972-(0)3-9681518 Mobile: 972-(0)506-241885 Fax: 972-(0)3-9681571	dopatowski@yahoo.com; davido@moag.gov.il;	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) CPM-12 (2017) 3rd term / 3 years	2020
Latin America and Caribbean Member	**Mr André Felipe C. P. da SILVA** Federal Inspector Quarantine Division Ministry of Agriculture, Live Stock and Food Supply **BRAZIL** Tel: (61) 3218-2925	andre.peralta@agricultura.gov.br;	CPM-14 (2019) 1st term / 3 years	2022
Latin America and Caribbean Member	**Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ** Pest RiskAnalyst Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado 300 Sur de Teletica, Sabana Sur, San José, **COSTA RICA** Tel: +(506) 8660-8383	hmorera@sfe.go.cr;	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years	2021
Latin America and Caribbean Member SC Chairperson	**Mr Ezequiel FERRO** Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA Av.Paeso Colón 315 C.A. de Buenos Aires **ARGENTINA** Tel/Fax: (+5411) 4121-5091	eferro@senasa.gov.ar;	CPM-11 (2016) 2nd term / 3 years	2019
Latin America and Caribbean Member	**Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE** Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal Av. PresidenteBulnes 140, 4th floor, Santiago, **CHILE** Tel: + 56-2 234 5120	alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl ;	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) 2nd term / 3 years	2021

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Near East Member	**Mr Nicholas EID** Ministry of Agriculture building, Embassies Street, Bir Hassan, Beirut, **LEBANON** Tel: (+961) 3 443 451 Fax: (+961) 1 849 628	neid@agriculture.gov.lb	CPM-14 (2019) 1st term/3 years	2022
Near East Member SC-7	**Mr Nader ELBADRY** Phytosanitary Specialist, Central Administration of Plant Quarantine, 6 Michel Bakhoum St., Dokki, Giza, **EGYPT** Tel : +201096799493	nader.badry@gmail.com naderelbadry@hotmail.com	**Replacement member for Mr Abdulqader Khudhair ABBAS** CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years	2021
Near East Member	**Mr Abdelmoneem Ismaeel ADRA ABDETAM** Manger of plant Quarantine and plant protection Directorate, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Khartum **SUDAN** Tel: +24991238939 / +249 912138939	ppdsudan@hotmail.com;	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years	2021
North America Member SC-7	**Ms Marina ZLOTINA** IPPC Technical DirectorUSDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) 4700 River Rd, 5c-03.37 Riverdale, MD 20737 **USA** Tel: 1-301-851-2200 Cell: 1 -301-832-0611	Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov ;	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) 2nd term / 3 years	2021
North America Member	**Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM** Senior Specialist (International Phytosanitary Standards): International Phytosanitary Standards Section Plant Protection Division, CFIA-ACIA 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa ON K1A OY9 **CANADA** Tel: (+1) 613-773-7122 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7252	rajesh.ramarathnam@inspection.gc.ca;	CPM-11 (2016) CPM-14 (2019) 1st term / 3 years	2022

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Pacific Member	**Ms Joanne WILSON** Principal Adviser, Risk Management Plant Imports Group Ministry for Primary Industries. **NEW ZEALAND** Tel: +64 489 40528 Mob: +64 2989 40528	joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz	CPM-14 (2019) 1st term / 3 years	2022
Pacific Member SC-7	**Ms Sophie Alexia PETERSON** Assistant Director | Plant Health Policy | Biosecurity Plant Division Department of Agriculture and Water Resources GPO Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601 **AUSTRALIA** Tel: (+61) 2 6272 3769 Mobile: +61 402 313 170	sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au;	**Replacement member for Mr Bruce HANCOCKS** CPM-12 (2017) 1st term / 3 years	2020

Others

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
IC / Observer	**Mr Chris DALE** Assistant Director, International Plant Health Surveillance Program, Plant Division Department of Agriculture and Water Resources 7 London Circuit, Canberra ACT 2601 GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 **AUSTRALIA** Phone +61 2 6272 5192 Mobile +61 466 459 129	chris.dale@agriculture.gov.au	N/A	N/A
Observer	**Ms Patricia V. ABAD** Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Plant Protection and Quarantine 4700 River Road 5C-03-36 Riverdale, MD 20737 **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA** Tel:301-851-2264 Mobile:240-204-2314	patricia.v.abad@usda.gov; pati_abad@hotmail.com;	N/A	N/A
Bureau member Observer	**Ms Marica GATT** Director General (Veterinary and Phytosanitary Division) (VPRD), Abettori Street, Albertown, Marsa HRS 1123, **MALTA** Ph.: (+356) 2292522 Mob.: (+356) 99421791	marica.gatt@gov.mt;	N/A	N/A

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Observer	**Mr. Sarute SUDHI-AROMNA** Entomologist, Senior professional level.Plant Protection Research and Development Office, Department of Agriculture (DOA) 50 Phaholyothin Rd. Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900, **THAILAND.** Tel:+662 579 5583	sarutes@yahoo.com; sarutes@gmail.com	N/A	N/A
Observer	**Mr Steve CÔTÉ** National manager International Phytosanitary Standards, Plant Import Export Division Floor 2, Room 129 E 59 CAMELOT DRIVE Ottawa ON K1A 0Y9 **CANADA** Telephone: (613) 773-7368	steve.cote@canada.ca	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	**Mr Avetik Nersisyan** **Standard Setting Unit Lead**	Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Adriana MOREIRA** **Standard Setting Officer**	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Janka KISS** **Standard Setting Associate**	Janka.Kiss@fao.org	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Artur SHAMILOV** **Standard Setting Officer**	Artur.Shamilov@fao.org	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Karen ROUEN** **Report writer**	Karen.Rouen@fao.org	N/A	N/A

Members who did not attend

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Pacific Member	**Mr Lupeomanu Pelenato FONOTI** Assistant Chief Executive Officer Quarantine Division Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, P.O. Box 1874, Apia, **SAMOA** Tel.: H: (685)27054 W: (685)20924 M: 7767305	aceo@samoaquarantine.gov.ws;	CPM-12 (2017) 1st term / 3 years	2020
Near East Member	**Ms Ouroba ALZITANIABOALBORGHOL** Head of Phytosanitary division, Ministry of Agriculture and Agrarian reform Damascus PO. BOX. 6716 **SYRIA** Tel:+963 3966881255 / +963112237198	orouba.z@gmail.com;	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term/3 years	2021

Appendix 4: Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5: *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* (1994-001)

Publication history

Date of this document	2019-12-09
Document category	Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5 *(Glossary of phytosanitary terms)* (1994-001)
Current document stage	*From* Standards Committee (SC) November 2019 *to* the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) for adoption
Major stages	CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms 2006-05 Standards Committee (SC) approved specification TP5 2012-10 Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) revised specification 2012-11 SC revised and approved revised specification, revoking Specification 1 2017-12 TPG drafted text 2018-05 SC approved for first consultation 2018-07 Submitted to first consultation]2018-12 TPG reviewed consultation comments and adjusted the Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5 2019-05 SC-7 revised 2019-07 Submitted to second consultation 2019-10 TPG assistant steward and steward reviewed consultation comments and adjusted the draft 2018 amendments to ISPM 5 2019-11 SC reviewed and recommended the draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5 to the CPM for adoption.
Notes	Note to Secretariat formatting this paper: formatting in definitions and explanations (strikethrough, bold, italics) needs to remain. **NOTE: The explanations for each proposal are presented only in the version of the draft Amendments presented to consultation and to the SC. For CPM, only the proposals will be presented. For full details on the discussions related to the specific terms, please refer to the meeting reports on the IPP.**

1. DELETIONS

1.1 "commodity class" (2015-013)

Proposed deletion

commodity class	A category of similar **commodities** that can be considered together in **phytosanitary regulations** [FAO, 1990]

1.2 "bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)" (2017-001)

Proposed deletion

bulbs and tubers (as a **commodity class**)	Dormant underground parts of **plants** intended for **planting** (includes corms and rhizomes) [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]

1.3 "cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)" (2012-007)

Proposed deletion

cut flowers and branches (as a **commodity class**)*	**Fresh** parts of **plants** intended for decorative use and not for **planting** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]

1.4 "fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)" (2017-003)

Proposed deletion

fruits and vegetables (as a **commodity class**)	**Fresh** parts of **plants** intended for consumption or processing and not for **planting** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]

1.5 "plants *in vitro* (as a commodity class)" (2017-006)

Proposed deletion

plants *in vitro* (as a **commodity class**)*	**Plants** growing in an aseptic medium in a closed container [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1999; ICPM, 2002; formerly "plants in tissue culture"]

2. REVISIONS

2.1 "seeds (as a commodity class)" (2017-007), "grain (as a commodity class)" (2017-004)

Current definitions

seeds (as a **commodity class**)	Seeds (in the botanical sense) for **planting** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]
grain (as a **commodity class**)	Seeds (in the botanical sense) for processing or consumption, but not for **planting** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]

Proposed revisions

seeds (as a **commodity ~~class~~**)	Seeds (in the botanical sense) for **planting** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]
grain (as a **commodity ~~class~~**)	Seeds (in the botanical sense) for processing or consumption, but not for **planting** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]

2.2 "wood (as a commodity class)" (2017-009)

Current definition

wood (as a **commodity class**)	**Commodities** such as **round wood**, **sawn wood**, wood chips and wood residue, with or without **bark**, excluding **wood packaging material**, **processed wood material** and bamboo products [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]

Proposed revision

wood (as a **commodity ~~class~~**)	**Commodities** such as **round wood**, **sawn wood**, wood chips and wood residue, with or without **bark**, excluding **wood packaging material**, **processed wood material**, and bamboo and rattan products [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]

2.3 "treatment" (2017-008)

Current definition

treatment	**Official** procedure for the killing, **inactivation** or removal of **pests**, or for rendering **pests** infertile or for **devitalization** [FAO, 1990, revised FAO, 1995; ISPM 15, 2002; ISPM 18, 2003; ICPM, 2005]

Proposed revision

treatment (as a **phytosanitary measure**)	**Official** procedure for ~~the~~ killing, **inactivating~~on~~**, ~~or~~ removing~~al of **pests**~~, ~~or for~~ rendering ~~**pests**~~ infertile or ~~for~~ **devitalizing~~ation~~ regulated pests** [FAO, 1990, revised FAO, 1995; ISPM 15, 2002; ISPM 18, 2003; ICPM, 2005]

Appendix 5: DRAFT ISPM: Revision of ISPM 8: *Determination of pest status in an area* (2009-005)

Status box

This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
Date of this document	2019-12-09
Document category	Draft revision of ISPM
Current document stage	*To* CPM-15 (2020) for adoption
Major stages	2009-11 Standards Committee (SC) recommended adding to the work programme. 2010-03 CPM-5 added topic *Revision of ISPM 8 (Determination of pest status in an area)* (2009-005) to the work programme with normal priority (subsequently changed to priority 1 by CPM-09). 2013-11 SC approved Specification 59. 2017-09 Expert working group drafted revised ISPM. 2018-05 SC revised and approved draft for first consultation. 2018-07 First consultation. 2019-02 Steward revised draft. 2019-05 SC-7 (Standards Committee Working Group of seven members) revised and approved draft for second consultation. 2019-07 Second consultation. 2019-11 SC revised and recommended the draft for adoption by CPM.
Steward history	2015-11 SC Ms Marina ZLOTINA (US, Lead Steward) 2015-11 SC Ms Shaza OMAR (EG, Assistant Steward) 2012-11 SC Mr Ebbe NORDBO (DK, Assistant Steward) 2009-11 SC Ms Beatriz MELCHO (UY, Lead Steward)
Notes	2018-01 Edited 2018-05 Edited 2019-06 Edited 2019-12 Edited

CONTENTS

Adoption 56
INTRODUCTION 56
Scope 56
References 56
Definitions 56
Outline of Requirements 56
BACKGROUND 56
IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT 56
REQUIREMENTS 57
1. Purpose of Pest Status Determination 57
2. NPPO Responsibilities 57
3. Information Used to Determine Pest Status 57
4. Describing Pest Status in an Area 58
4.1 Presence 58
4.2 Absence 59
5. Exchange of Pest Status Information between NPPOs 60

Adoption

[To be inserted following adoption]

INTRODUCTION

Scope

[263] This standard describes the use of pest records and other information to determine pest status in an area. Pest status categories are defined and a description of the use of pest status for pest reporting is provided.

[264] This standard also provides guidance on the possible sources of uncertainty associated with information used to determine pest status.

References

[265] The present standard refers to ISPMs. ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms.

IPPC. 1997. *International Plant Protection Convention*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

Definitions

[266] Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

Outline of Requirements

[267] National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use pest status for various activities, such as pest risk analysis, the establishment of and compliance with phytosanitary regulations, the establishment of lists of regulated pests, and the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites.

[268] Pest status is determined exclusively by the NPPO responsible for the area concerned and is categorized under “presence” or “absence”.

[269] The quality of the reported information and the reliability and uncertainty of the data are important considerations to be taken into account by the NPPO when determining pest status in an area.

BACKGROUND

[270] Pest records and other information are used by NPPOs to determine the presence or absence of a pest in an area. The NPPOs of importing and exporting countries need information concerning the status of pests for pest risk analysis, the establishment of and compliance with phytosanitary regulations, the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites, and other activities.

[271] The purpose of this standard is to provide guidance on the determination of the pest status in an area using, in particular, information from surveillance and pest records as described in ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*). Pest status is a part of the content of pest reports as described in ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*).

IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

[272] This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests whose introduction and spread may have an environmental impact.

Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and apply phytosanitary measures to protect biodiversity and the environment.

REQUIREMENTS

1. Purpose of Pest Status Determination

[273] Determination of pest status in an area is a vital component of various activities undertaken to implement the IPPC and covered by the principles described in ISPM 1 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*) and elaborated in other ISPMs.

[274] NPPOs may use pest status information when undertaking activities such as:

- pest risk analysis
- considering market access requests
- planning national, regional or international pest surveillance and management programmes
- establishing and complying with phytosanitary regulations
- establishing and maintaining lists of pests present in an area
- establishing and updating lists of regulated pests
- establishing and maintaining pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites
- exchanging information as outlined in the IPPC.

2. NPPO Responsibilities

[275] Contracting parties have obligations under the IPPC (Article VIII.1 (a)) to report "the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests". Pest status should be determined exclusively by the NPPO responsible for the area concerned.

[276] The NPPO should:

- base its determination of pest status on the most reliable and timely information available
- maintain pest records and supporting evidence, taking into account that they may be needed to support the determination of pest status
- re-evaluate pest status if appropriate.

3. Information Used to Determine Pest Status

[277] Information from pest records or other sources should be used as a basis for determining the appropriate pest status among the categories described in section 4.

[278] The information that should be included in pest records is described in ISPM 6.

[279] Information is available from many sources and has varying levels of reliability. Old information is less likely to be reliable about the current status of a pest than recent information because of changes in pest distribution, taxonomy and detection methods.

[280] Highly reliable and current sources should be used to determine pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources may be used. This may increase uncertainty but can also help to identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (see ISPM 6) and pest diagnostics (see ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*)).

[281] Sometimes it may be difficult or not possible to determine pest status because of uncertainty associated with the available information. Sources of uncertainty may include:

- limited information on pest biology

- taxonomic revisions or ambiguity
- contradictory or outdated information
- difficulties with or unreliability of survey methodologies
- difficulties with or unreliability of diagnostic methodologies
- insufficient information on pest–host associations
- unknown aetiology
- detection of signs or observation of symptoms without finding the pest
- insufficient information on the pest distribution in an area
- unreliability of the information sources.

[282] When an NPPO is not able to determine pest status, the NPPO should indicate that this is the case.

4. Describing Pest Status in an Area

[283] The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources including results from surveillance (see ISPM 6).

[284] Pests under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes (e.g. in a laboratory), or pest interceptions on imported consignments under detention, do not affect the pest status in an area.

[285] Similarly, detection of a pest in an area, confirmed by surveillance not to represent a population, may not affect the pest status in the area. Determination of pest status in an area requires evidence and expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in the area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available information from various sources, also taking into account historical pest records, where available.

[286] Pest status should be determined for an area identified and specified by the NPPO. When pest status is determined, the area concerned and the date should be indicated. Information on pest free areas, pest free places of production or pest free production sites may be added to the report (see ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) and ISPM 10 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*)). Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.

4.1 Presence

[287] If a pest is present and reliable information is available, the pest status should be further characterized using the categories provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Pest status – Present

Pest status	Pest status description
Present: widely distributed	The pest is present throughout the area, where conditions are suitable.
Present: not widely distributed and not under official control	The pest is present in a part or parts of the area and is not under “official control” in accordance with Supplement 1 (Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”) to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).
Present: not widely distributed and under official control	The pest is present in a part or parts of the area and is subject to “official control” in accordance with Supplement 1 (Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”) to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*). The purpose of the official control should be stated alongside the pest status determination.

Pest status	Pest status description
Present: at low prevalence	The pest is present in the area but its prevalence is low in accordance with ISPM 22 (*Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*).
Present: except in specified pest free areas	The pest is present in the area except in parts of the area which are free from the pest in accordance with ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*). These parts should be described alongside the pest status determination.
Present: transient	The pest is present but the evidence supports the conclusion that the pest is not expected to establish because conditions (e.g. hosts, climate) are not suitable for establishment or appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied.

[288] In some cases, it may be necessary to provide additional information about pest presence, for instance:

- the extent of a localized outbreak
- official control measures applied
- the pest has only been reported under specific conditions, such as:
  - on specific hosts
  - in enclosed structures (e.g. in a greenhouse)
  - in botanical gardens
  - in the environment but not on a plant host (e.g. in soil or water)
  - in urban areas
  - at certain times of the year.

4.2 Absence

[289] If a pest is absent and reliable information is available, the pest status should be further categorized using the categories provided in Table 2.

Table 2. Pest status – Absent

Pest status	Pest status description
Absent: pest not recorded	Surveillance supports the conclusion that the pest is absent and has not been recorded (see ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*)).
Absent: the entire country is pest free	The entire country is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*).
Absent: pest records invalid	Pest records indicate the presence of a pest, but the conclusion is reached that the records are invalid or no longer valid, such as in the following cases: - changes in taxonomy have occurred - misidentification has occurred - the record or records have not been confirmed - there are errors in the record or records - changes in national borders have occurred.
Absent: pest no longer present	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past, but surveillance indicates that the pest is no longer present (see ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*)). The reason or reasons may include: - climate or other natural limitation to pest perpetuation - changes in cultivated host species or cultivars - changes in production practices.

Pest status	Pest status description
Absent: pest eradicated	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past. Documented pest eradication measures were implemented and were successful (see ISPM 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*)). Surveillance confirms continued absence (see ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*)).

[290] Lack of information due to inadequate or insufficient surveillance activities does not constitute a basis for determining pest absence.

5. Exchange of Pest Status Information between NPPOs

[291] Information pertaining to pest status in an area contributes to pest reports (see ISPM 17). It is the responsibility of an NPPO to provide pest records and other supporting evidence on pest status upon request from another NPPO.

[292] There may be some cases where a pest status declared by an NPPO is questioned by another NPPO (e.g. when there are repeated interceptions by importing countries or contradictory pest records). In such cases, bilateral contacts between NPPOs should be made to clarify the situation, and if needed the pest status should be revised by the NPPO responsible for the area concerned.

[293] NPPOs should:

- use the categories of pest status set out in this standard when exchanging pest status information, to promote harmonization and transparency
- in a timely manner, inform other NPPOs and their regional plant protection organization, where appropriate, of relevant changes in pest status according to ISPM 17.

Appendix 6: DRAFT ISPM: Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)

Status box

This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
Date of this document	2019-12-02
Document category	Draft ISPM
Current document stage	*To* CPM-15 (2020)
Major stages	2013-11 Standards Committee (SC) recommended topic *Authorization of non-NPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions* to be added to the work programme. 2014-04 CPM-9 added the topic *Authorization of non-NPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002) to the work programme with priority 3 (subsequently changed to priority 2 by CPM-10). 2016-05 SC approved Specification 65 (*Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions*). 2017-06 Expert working group drafted ISPM. 2018-05 SC revised and approved draft for first consultation. 2018-07 First consultation. 2019-05 SC-7 revised and approved draft for second consultation. 2019-07 Second consultation. 2019-11 SC revised the draft.
Steward history	2016-05 SC Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (CA, Lead Steward) 2016-05 SC Ms Marina ZLOTINA (US, Assistant Steward) 2014-05 SC Ms Marie-Claude FOREST (CA, Lead Steward)
Notes	2017-09 Edited 2018-05 Edited 2019-05 SC-7 changed title to *Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* 2019-05 Edited 2019-12 Edited

CONTENTS

Adoption 63
INTRODUCTION 63
Scope 63
References 63
Definitions 63
Outline of Requirements 63
BACKGROUND 63
IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT 63
REQUIREMENTS 64
1. Basic Understanding of Authorization 64
2. Authorization programme 64
2.1 Development of Authorization Programme 64
3. Criteria for Eligibility of Entities 65
4. Roles and Responsibilities for Implementing the Authorization Programme 66
4.1 Roles and responsibilities of the NPPO 66
4.2 Roles and responsibilities of the entity 66
4.2.1 Roles and responsibilities of entities authorized to audit or supervise 67
5. Process for Audits 68
5.1 Audits to authorize an entity 68
5.2 Audits to maintain authorization 68
6. Types of Nonconformity 68
6.1 Critical nonconformity 68
6.2 Other nonconformity 69
7. Suspension and Revocation of Authorization 69

Adoption

[To be inserted following adoption]

INTRODUCTION

Scope

[294] This standard provides requirements for national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) if they decide to authorize entities to perform specific phytosanitary actions on their behalf.

[295] In accordance with Article V.2(a) of the IPPC, this standard does not cover the issuance of phytosanitary certificates. Also, this standard does not cover the development and establishment of phytosanitary measures.

References

[296] The present standard refers to ISPMs. ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms.

IPPC. 1997. *International Plant Protection Convention*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

Definitions

[297] Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

Outline of Requirements

[298] This standard outlines the key requirements for the development of an authorization programme and the eligibility criteria for entities to become authorized. The standard identifies the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved in the implementation of an authorization programme. It also describes processes for audits, types of nonconformities, and suspension and revocation of authorization.

BACKGROUND

[299] Article IV of the IPPC sets out the responsibilities for NPPOs. Article V.2(a) of the IPPC provides for the possibility of NPPOs authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions. The concept of authorization is referred to in several ISPMs, such as ISPM 3 (*Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms*), ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*), ISPM 7 (*Phytosanitary certification system*), ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*), ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*), ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*), ISPM 42 (*Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures*) and ISPM 43 (*Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure*). In order to foster confidence between NPPOs, there is a need to harmonize the requirements for authorizations of specific phytosanitary actions and to ensure that the practice aligns with the principles of the IPPC. If an NPPO decides to authorize entities, it remains responsible for the phytosanitary actions performed by the entities on its behalf.

IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

[300] Authorization programmes may have a positive impact on biodiversity and the environment because they may contribute to the delivery of phytosanitary actions.

REQUIREMENTS

[301] There is no obligation for NPPOs to authorize entities to perform phytosanitary actions. However, if an NPPO decides to authorize entities, the following requirements apply.

1. Basic Understanding of Authorization

[302] An NPPO decides whether to use authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions. Authorization may be used by NPPOs to authorize entities to perform specific phytosanitary actions, to audit other authorized entities, or to supervise phytosanitary actions. Examples of phytosanitary actions that an NPPO may decide to authorize an entity to perform include monitoring, sampling, inspection, testing, surveillance, treatment, post-entry quarantine and destruction. If an NPPO decides to authorize entities, it should have sole responsibility for deciding which entity is authorized and for which specific phytosanitary actions. Audits may be conducted by an authorized entity in order to assess the eligibility of another entity to perform a specific phytosanitary action; however, the decision to authorize should be the responsibility of the NPPO alone.

[303] The NPPO is responsible for ensuring that the authorized entity performs the phytosanitary actions according to the NPPO's requirements. With the authorization, the phytosanitary action is performed by the entity but the responsibility remains with the NPPO. Authorization may be given only to perform phytosanitary actions to implement phytosanitary measures that are decided by the NPPO. Authorization to perform phytosanitary actions does not include NPPO core activities such as issuance of phytosanitary certificates or development and establishment of phytosanitary measures because these are not phytosanitary actions. The NPPO should have sufficient staff with the necessary expertise to carry out oversight, including auditing, of authorized entities.

[304] In this standard, "entities" include the providers of phytosanitary action (e.g. individuals, organizations, enterprises) and, where appropriate, their facilities (such as equipment, laboratories, treatment enclosures). In some cases, authorization of entities may require an NPPO to approve individuals within the entity (such as those responsible for specific phytosanitary actions), relevant documentation, facilities, or any combination of these. The NPPO and the entity should determine the nature of the authorization agreement.

2. Authorization programme

[305] Under its phytosanitary system, an NPPO deciding to authorize entities to perform specific phytosanitary actions should establish an authorization programme.

[306] Before deciding to authorize entities to perform phytosanitary actions and developing an authorization programme, NPPOs should ensure that their country's legal framework enables them to authorize, suspend, revoke and reinstate authorizations.

[~~307~~] NPPOs should only set up authorization programmes that result in effective phytosanitary actions that are delivered with integrity and transparency. The authorization programme should ensure that the authorized entities are accountable to the NPPO for these actions and that phytosanitary security is maintained, consistent with the provisions of the IPPC and ISPMs.

2.1 Development of Authorization Programme

[308] The NPPO should develop an authorization programme that is appropriate for its purposes, first defining the programme's scope and objectives. When developing an authorization programme, the NPPO should:

- set the requirements that must be met by an entity to be authorized
- develop procedures for receiving, maintaining and delivering information, including procedures to ensure confidentiality

- develop procedures to process the information received, from the time of receipt of the information required by the NPPO and its subsequent evaluation to the decision on whether to grant authorization to the entity
- develop a training plan to ensure that NPPO personnel have the expertise to manage the authorization programme
- develop training or identify minimum training, equipment, competency and skills requirements for entities to perform phytosanitary actions; these requirements should be equivalent to those required for the NPPO if it were to undertake the same phytosanitary actions
- develop a template agreement that can be used to formalize the authorization of entities and make the authorization legally binding
- determine a validity period for the authorization agreement, including the timing of any review and the length of any extension if appropriate
- develop specific performance criteria, guidelines and performance-based verification processes for the actions performed by the entities
- develop an audit or monitoring process and supporting tools, which may include audit or monitoring checklists and templates for audit or monitoring reports, and templates for corrective action reports
- develop criteria to determine nonconformities
- develop a process to address nonconformity, this including, where appropriate, suspending, reinstating or revoking authorization
- develop a process for the authorized entity to voluntarily withdraw from the authorization agreement with the NPPO
- identify risks which may arise from authorization and which need to be managed through the authorization programme
- develop contingency plans for ensuring continuity of action in the event that an authorized entity has its authorization suspended or revoked or voluntarily withdraws from the authorization programme
- develop a process to ensure efficient and effective communication between the NPPO and the authorized entity
- develop a process to maintain an up-to-date list of authorized entities.
- develop a framework to assess the impartiality and independence of entities, and to assess and identify any potential conflicts of interest and address them appropriately (e.g. by requiring entities to be free of any conflict of interest or by allowing entities to manage conflicts of interest).

3. Criteria for Eligibility of Entities

[309] The NPPO should ensure that the entity meets the following criteria:

- it can legally operate in the country of authorization
- it has the ability to enter into an agreement with the NPPO
- it has sufficient resources (financial and human), including the expertise, equipment and infrastructure required, to undertake the specific phytosanitary actions to be performed and to ensure continuity of service
- it appoints or identifies the individual or individuals who will be responsible for delivery of the phytosanitary actions to be performed
- it has documentation demonstrating the process by which it will consistently meet the requirements set by the NPPO for the phytosanitary actions to be performed
- it agrees to conform with the NPPO's requirements, including requirements on impartiality, independence and conflicts of interest (e.g. to declare whether it is free of any conflict of interest or to identify potential conflicts of interest)

- it has a clear statement of liability for damages if these result from actions it performs in its role as an authorized entity
- it has a process to ensure efficient and effective resolution of conflicts with the client receiving delivery of the phytosanitary action (if the client is not the NPPO), including a process to elevate issues to the NPPO for a final decision.

4. Roles and Responsibilities for Implementing the Authorization Programme

4.1 Roles and responsibilities of the NPPO

[310] The roles and responsibilities of the NPPO should include the following:

- to assess the entity against the criteria for eligibility for authorization set in this standard and those established by the NPPO
- to evaluate the entity against the requirements set by the NPPO regarding its documented procedures and their implementation on-site, and propose suggestions for improvement as necessary
- to clearly define the phytosanitary actions the entity is authorized to perform and the performance criteria
- to enter into an agreement which authorizes the entity to perform specific phytosanitary actions, and to review and update the agreement as necessary
- to notify entities that do not meet the criteria for eligibility and provide the rationale for the decision
- to train NPPO personnel and, if needed, authorized entities' personnel and ensure that their skills and competencies are maintained at an adequate level to consistently implement the authorization programme
- to carry out regular audits or monitoring of the authorized entity to verify that it conforms with the requirements of the NPPO's authorization programme
- to carry out internal audits of its own procedures and processes to verify that the objectives of its authorization programme continue to be met
- to implement processes for addressing identified nonconformities, including determining the corrective actions and requiring the authorized entity to take the corrective actions, and, where appropriate, suspending or revoking authorization, which may include regulatory enforcement
- to implement processes for reinstatement of authorization
- to implement processes for the entity to voluntarily withdraw from the authorization agreement with the NPPO, when needed
- to maintain documentation, including records and published lists of authorized entities, corresponding authorized phytosanitary action, and authorization period, if applicable
- to identify for how long an entity needs to save its records, in relation to the specific phytosanitary actions performed
- to implement and maintain transparent, efficient and effective communication on the authorization programme, in particular between the NPPO and the authorized entities
- to ensure that NPPO personnel involved in authorization of entities maintain impartiality and are free of any conflict of interest.

4.2 Roles and responsibilities of the entity

[311] The roles and responsibilities of the entity should include the following:

- to provide required information to the NPPO when being considered for authorization to perform specific phytosanitary actions
- to enter into a written agreement to perform the specific phytosanitary actions

- to implement documented procedures to conform with the requirements set by the NPPO, which may cover:
  - operating procedures describing how specific phytosanitary actions are performed (i.e. who does what, when, where and how)
  - skills and competency of personnel
  - training of personnel
  - document control, which includes:
    - revision of documents
    - records, in particular of the activities undertaken in relation to the specific phytosanitary actions
  - a list of equipment and their maintenance or calibration schedule, where appropriate
  - internal audit
  - management of nonconformity
- to provide notification (within an agreed time frame) to the NPPO upon a major change in management or location, a change in process, a nonconformity or any other information that has an impact on the specific phytosanitary action that has been authorized
- to maintain infrastructure and security, where applicable, and resources to consistently carry out the specific phytosanitary actions to conform with the requirements set by the NPPO
- to ensure that personnel have the relevant knowledge and experience required by the NPPO to perform the specific phytosanitary actions
- to train personnel and ensure that their skills and competencies are maintained at an adequate level to consistently carry out the specific phytosanitary actions to conform with the requirements set by the NPPO
- to maintain and provide documented procedures (including records of its activities) to the NPPO as required
- to undergo monitoring, audits and controls as described in the requirements set by the NPPO
- to comply with the requirements set in the authorization agreement, the phytosanitary procedures, standards, legislation and guidelines of the NPPO that relate to the authorization
- to maintain the confidentiality of the information obtained through the authorized phytosanitary actions.

4.2.1 Roles and responsibilities of entities authorized to audit or supervise

[312] The NPPO may choose to authorize entities to audit other authorized entities or to supervise phytosanitary actions. An entity that audits other authorized entities or supervises phytosanitary actions should meet the requirements in section 4.2. The roles and responsibilities of the entity should also include the following:

- to develop and carry out an action plan, including procedures or corrective actions, for dealing with nonconformities of the entities it audits that compromise the integrity of and trust in the programme, including notification (within an agreed time frame) of these to the authorizing NPPO
- to maintain confidentiality of information gained through its auditing or supervisory activities
- to maintain impartiality and independence from the entities it audits or supervises, and be free of any conflict of interest
- to ensure personnel have the relevant knowledge, experience and training to carry out the specific audits or supervision being performed
- to undertake internal audits to provide continuous feedback and identify system gaps (if applicable).

5. Process for Audits

5.1 Audits to authorize an entity

[313] If an NPPO decides to consider the authorization of an entity, the NPPO (or the entity authorized to conduct audits) should first carry out an initial evaluation of the entity's documented procedures.

[314] When the documented procedures are acceptable, the NPPO (or the entity authorized to conduct audits) should carry out an audit to evaluate the entire system and the capability of the entity to implement the documented operating procedures for each phytosanitary action.

[315] At each step of the audit, the NPPO (or the entity authorized to conduct audits) should provide feedback to the entity on observations and opportunities for improvement as necessary.

[316] The decision about whether to grant authorization should rest solely with the NPPO. The NPPO should only authorize the entity if the audit demonstrates that the NPPO's requirements for authorization of entities have been met.

5.2 Audits to maintain authorization

[317] The NPPO should determine the minimum frequency of the audits to maintain authorization, based on the scope and complexity of the phytosanitary actions and the associated level of pest risk, the performance of the authorized entity and the nonconformities identified, and the results of previous audits. An unscheduled audit may be conducted, for instance upon receipt of a notification of non-compliance from an importing country.

[318] Audits may be conducted by the NPPO (or the entity authorized to conduct audits) on a specific part or parts of the entity's system, as necessary.

6. Types of Nonconformity

[319] When the authorized entity does not meet the requirements specified by the NPPO as set out in the authorization agreement, this should be considered as a nonconformity.

[320] A nonconformity may be identified during audits, supervision, or investigations triggered by notification of non-compliance (ISPM 13 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*)).

[321] The type and number of nonconformities identified should be used by the NPPO to determine the status of the entity (authorized, suspended or revoked) and the follow-up audit frequency.

[322] If a nonconformity is identified, the NPPO (or the entity authorized to audit or supervise) should require the authorized entity to take corrective action.

[323] Nonconformities may be considered as critical nonconformities (section 6.1) or other nonconformities (section 6.2).

6.1 Critical nonconformity

[324] "Critical nonconformity" is a nonconformity that immediately impacts the integrity of and trust in the NPPO's phytosanitary system and that requires a rapid corrective action to be identified and implemented. The NPPO may consider nonconformities to be critical in situations such as:

- when there is evidence of failing to properly perform authorized phytosanitary actions
- when a corrective action is not implemented to the satisfaction of the NPPO (or the entity authorized to audit or supervise)
- when there is a failure to implement timely corrective actions to remedy the shortcomings identified
- when the integrity or impartiality of the entity is shown to have been compromised

- when there is evidence of fraud.

[325] An entity's authorization to perform a specific phytosanitary action should be suspended or revoked immediately if a critical nonconformity is identified. The NPPO should have a system in place to manage the critical nonconformity.

6.2 Other nonconformity

[326] "Other nonconformity" is a nonconformity that does not directly or immediately impact the integrity of and trust in the NPPO's phytosanitary system and is not considered a critical nonconformity by the NPPO.

[327] Other nonconformity requires corrective actions to be taken within a time frame specified by the NPPO (or the entity authorized to audit or supervise).

[328] Suspension or revocation of the authorization is not needed but may be considered when this type of nonconformity is repeatedly identified or when corrective actions are not taken within the required time frame. The decision about whether to suspend or revoke authorization of the entity should rest solely with the NPPO.

7. Suspension and Revocation of Authorization

[329] The decision to suspend, revoke or reinstate authorization of the entity should rest solely with the NPPO.

[330] **Suspension.** The NPPO temporarily suspends the authorization of an entity for a specified time in order for the entity to implement corrective action.

[331] **Revocation.** The NPPO withdraws the authorization of an entity.

[332] An entity that has had its authorization suspended and that wishes to have its authorization reinstated should apply to the NPPO for reinstatement. When an entity's authorization has been revoked, the NPPO should evaluate if the entity is eligible for a new authorization. Affected entities should make an application for a new authorization, according to the rules set by the NPPO. The decision about whether to reinstate an entity's authorization should rest solely with the NPPO.

[333] An entity that has voluntarily withdrawn from an authorization agreement and that wishes to have its authorization reinstated should apply to the NPPO for reinstatement.

Appendix 7: DRAFT ISPM: Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as phytosanitary measures (2014-006)

Status box

This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
Date of this document	2019-12-02
Document category	Draft ISPM
Current document stage	*To* CPM-15 (2020) for adoption
Major stages	2014-04 CPM-9 added the topic *Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure* (2014-006) to the work programme with priority 2. 2014-05 Standards Committee (SC) revised the draft specification. 2014-11 SC approved draft Specification 62 (*Requirements for the use of phytosanitary treatments as phytosanitary measures*) for consultation via e-decision (2014_eSC_Nov_06). 2015-05 SC approved Specification 62. 2015-08 Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) meeting (deferred). 2017-07 TPPT meeting revised the draft. 2018-02 TPPT virtual meeting approved the draft. 2018-05 SC revised and approved the draft for first consultation. 2018-07 First consultation. 2019-02 Steward revised the draft. 2019-05 SC-7 revised and approved the draft for second consultation. 2019-07 Second consultation. 2019-11 SC revised and recommended the draft for adoption by CPM.
Steward history	2019-05 SC Mr Alvaro SEPULVEDA LUQUE (CL, Steward) 2017-11 SC Mr Nico HORN (NL, Steward) 2016-11 SC Mr Scott MYERS (US, Assistant Steward) 2016-11 SC Ms Marina ZLOTINA (US, Steward) 2014-05 SC Mr Scott MYERS (US, Steward)
Notes	This is a draft document 2018-02 Edited 2018-05 Edited 2019-05 Edited 2019-12 Edited

CONTENTS

Adoption 72
INTRODUCTION 72
Scope 72
References 72
Definitions 72
Outline of Requirements 72
BACKGROUND 72
IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT 72
REQUIREMENTS 73
1. Treatment Objective 73
2. Treatment Application 73
2.1 Treatment parameters 73
3. Enclosures Used for Modified Atmosphere Treatments 73
4. Measuring Treatment Parameters 74
4.1 Measuring gas concentrations 74
4.2 Measuring and mapping temperature 74
5. Adequate Systems for Treatment Facilities 74
5.1 Authorization of treatment providers 75
5.2 Monitoring and auditing 75
5.3 Prevention of infestation and contamination after treatment 75
5.4 Labelling 75
6. Documentation 75
6.1 Documentation of procedures 76
6.2 Record keeping 76
6.3 Documentation by the NPPO 76
7. Inspection 77
8. Responsibilities 77

Adoption

[Text to this paragraph will be added following adoption]

INTRODUCTION

Scope

[334] This standard provides technical guidance for national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) on the application of modified atmosphere treatments (including controlled atmosphere treatments) as phytosanitary measures, including authorization, monitoring and auditing of treatment providers.

[335] This standard does not provide details on specific modified atmosphere treatments, such as specific schedules for specific regulated pests on specific commodities, and does not include the use of modified atmosphere for non-phytosanitary purposes, such as minimizing the perishability of foodstuffs or other quality-related uses of the modified atmosphere.

References

[336] The present standard refers to ISPMs. ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms.

Definitions

[337] Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

Outline of Requirements

[338] This standard provides guidance on modified atmosphere treatments and their application as phytosanitary measures. It identifies parameters to be considered when applying modified atmosphere treatments. Operational requirements for treatment application, including enclosures, treatment procedures and treatment systems, are described.

[339] Guidance is provided to NPPOs on authorizing, monitoring and auditing treatment providers. The roles and responsibilities of NPPOs and treatment providers are described.

BACKGROUND

[340] This standard provides generic requirements for the application of modified atmosphere treatments as phytosanitary measures, specifically those adopted under ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*).

[341] Modified atmosphere treatments involve altering gas concentrations in ambient air, which is achieved by increasing the carbon dioxide (CO_2) content (hypercarbia) or reducing the oxygen (O_2) content (hypoxia or anoxia) of the treatment environment, or both, to create an atmosphere lethal to target pests. Controlled atmosphere treatment is a type of modified atmosphere treatment.

[342] Modified atmosphere treatments are frequently used in conjunction with modification of other parameters, such as temperature and humidity.

IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

[343] Modified atmosphere treatments may be used to prevent the introduction and spread of regulated pests and hence may be beneficial to biodiversity. The use of modified atmosphere treatments as an alternative to methyl bromide fumigation provides an additional benefit to the environment by reducing methyl bromide emissions, which deplete the ozone layer. While an atmosphere with a high CO_2 or a low O_2

concentration inside the treatment enclosure may be harmful, in this application there are negligible environmental impacts.

REQUIREMENTS

1. Treatment Objective

[344] The objective of using modified atmosphere treatments as phytosanitary measures is to achieve pest mortality at a specified efficacy.

2. Treatment Application

[345] Modified atmosphere treatments are undertaken by either NPPO personnel or treatment providers authorized by the NPPO of the country in which the treatment is conducted or initiated. Modified atmosphere treatments as phytosanitary measures may be applied before export, during transport, or at the point of entry under suitable conditions of confinement.

[346] The O_2 and CO_2 concentrations may be modified in the following ways:

- changing the proportion of O_2 and CO_2 in the atmosphere by adding a gas (such as CO_2 or nitrogen (N_2)) and maintaining this atmosphere
- adding a substance (such as iron oxide) that captures O_2
- converting O_2 to CO_2 by combustion of a hydrocarbon
- holding the commodity in hermetic or semi-hermetic storage, in which the respiration of the commodity and pests infesting it depletes the level of O_2 and increases the level of CO_2
- creating a partial vacuum, which lowers concentrations of all atmospheric gases proportionally.

2.1 Treatment parameters

[347] The main parameters to consider when implementing modified atmosphere treatments include:

- atmospheric gas concentrations (O_2 and CO_2)
- duration of the treatment
- temperature (of the air and the commodity)
- humidity.

[348] Modified atmosphere treatments are conducted in an enclosure (e.g. vacuum chamber, freight container, warehouse, cargo ship hold, packaging). The lethal condition of the atmosphere should be achieved and maintained throughout the enclosure for a specified length of time as required by the treatment schedule.

[349] Respiration, sorption of atmospheric gases and the packaging of the commodity may result in differential gas concentrations within the enclosure and influence the efficacy of a modified atmosphere treatment. This should be taken into account when applying treatments.

[350] When the gas concentrations are not maintained at the required level for the specified duration, the treatment should be restarted.

[351] Temperature and humidity are factors to consider in order to achieve the required efficacy of modified atmosphere treatments, in particular because they affect the respiration rate of the target pest, and should be maintained according to the treatment schedule.

3. Enclosures Used for Modified Atmosphere Treatments

[352] The enclosure used for modified atmosphere treatments may consist either of packaging or of a portable or fixed structure that is designed either as a continuous gas flow system or a static system.

[353] The ability to maintain the specified gas concentrations for the duration of the treatment is influenced by the permeability of the material and the surface area-to-volume ratio of the enclosure, and the effectiveness of seals at structural conjunctions or joins and openings of the enclosure.

[354] Enclosures should be designed and constructed to maintain the parameters of the treatment. Features of specifically designed and constructed enclosures, both fixed and portable, include:

- gas-tight doors or gas-tight valves
- gas concentration control
- temperature control
- humidity control
- pressure control
- recirculation of atmospheric gases within the enclosure
- exhaust systems
- systems to alert operators when there is a technical failure (e.g. leakage).

[355] Modified atmosphere treatments that rely on the introduction of inert gases to reduce O_2 levels and hence achieve anoxic conditions may use non-gas-tight enclosures or enclosures that are not specifically designed for modified atmosphere treatments. When using enclosures that are not specifically designed for modified atmosphere treatments, particular attention should be paid to the pressure required to maintain the treatment parameters as specified in the treatment schedule.

4. Measuring Treatment Parameters

[356] Parameters specified in the treatment schedule should be measured and recorded at appropriate intervals to ensure that the required treatment parameters have been reached and maintained throughout the treatment period to achieve pest mortality. The critical parameters for modified atmosphere treatments are typically O_2 and CO_2 concentrations, temperature and duration of exposure of the commodity.

[357] In some cases, humidity is considered as an important treatment parameter and should then also be measured and recorded during the treatment period.

[358] Pressure does not affect the efficacy of the treatment but may be important to ensure that the required treatment conditions are achieved, either when negative pressure is used to remove O_2 or when positive pressure is used to flush the enclosure of O_2. If pressure is important to achieve the required treatment conditions, it should also be measured and recorded.

[359] All equipment used for measuring and recording treatment parameters should be calibrated according to the manufacturer's instructions and, where applicable, NPPO specifications.

4.1 Measuring gas concentrations

[360] The equipment used to measure gas concentrations within the enclosure should have an adequate accuracy (e.g. ±5% of the gas concentrations to be achieved throughout the treatment).

4.2 Measuring and mapping temperature

[361] The temperature of the commodity and the atmosphere within the enclosure should be measured and recorded to ensure that the required temperature is reached.

[362] If the modified atmosphere treatment is used together with temperature treatment, temperature mapping of the enclosure may be necessary to identify temperature variation under normal operating conditions (e.g. as regards loads and packaging).

5. Adequate Systems for Treatment Facilities

[363] Confidence in the adequacy of modified atmosphere treatments as phytosanitary measures is primarily based on assurance that the treatments are effective against the target pests under specific conditions and

that the treatments have been properly applied. Systems for such treatments should be designed, used and monitored to ensure that treatments are properly conducted and commodities are protected from infestation and contamination after treatment.

[364] The NPPO of the country in which the treatment is conducted or initiated (the latter when treatment takes place during transport) is responsible for ensuring that the system requirements are met.

5.1 Authorization of treatment providers

[365] The NPPO of the country in which the treatment is conducted or initiated is responsible for the authorization of treatment providers. This authorization normally includes approval of both treatment facilities and treatment providers. The NPPO should set requirements for treatment provider authorization, including training of personnel, treatment procedures, adequate equipment and storage conditions. Specific procedures appropriate for each facility, provider and commodity treatment should also be approved by the NPPO.

[366] NPPOs should maintain a list of authorized treatment providers for modified atmosphere treatment, including, where appropriate, approved facilities.

5.2 Monitoring and auditing

[367] The NPPO of the country in which the treatment is conducted or initiated is responsible for monitoring and auditing the treatment facilities and providers. Continuous supervision of treatments should not be necessary, provided treatment procedures are properly designed and can be verified to ensure a high degree of system integrity for the facility, process and commodity in question. The monitoring and auditing should be sufficient to detect and correct deficiencies promptly.

[368] Treatment providers should meet the monitoring and auditing requirements set by the NPPO. These requirements may include:

- access for the NPPO to audit, including either prearranged or unannounced visits or both
- a system to maintain and archive treatment records and provide NPPOs, or where appropriate other government agencies, with access to these
- corrective action to be taken in the event of nonconformity.

5.3 Prevention of infestation and contamination after treatment

[369] The consignment owner is responsible for prevention of infestation and contamination after treatment and may cooperate with the treatment provider on how to achieve this. After the treatment is successfully completed, measures should be implemented to prevent possible infestation or contamination of the treated commodity. The following measures may be required:

- keeping the commodity in a pest free enclosure
- packing the commodity immediately in pest-proof packaging
- segregating and identifying treated commodities
- dispatching the commodity as soon as possible.

5.4 Labelling

[370] Commodities may be labelled with treatment lot numbers or other features of identification (e.g. locations of packing and the treatment facility, dates of packing and treatment) allowing trace-back for non-compliant consignments. When used, labels should be easily identifiable and placed on visible locations.

6. Documentation

[371] The NPPO of the country in which the treatment is conducted or initiated is responsible for ensuring that treatment providers maintain documents of procedures and keep appropriate records, such as raw

data on gas concentrations and temperature recorded during treatments. Accurate record keeping is essential to allow for trace-back capability.

6.1 Documentation of procedures

[372] Procedures should be documented to ensure that commodities are treated consistently in accordance with the treatment schedule. Process controls and operational parameters should be established to provide the operational details necessary for the authorization of a treatment provider. Calibration and quality control procedures should be documented by the treatment provider. The documented procedures should include the following:

- commodity handling before, during and after treatment
- orientation and configuration of the commodity during treatment
- treatment parameters and the means for measuring and recording them
- gas and temperature sensor calibration
- contingency plans and corrective actions to be taken in the event of treatment failure or problems with treatment parameters
- handling of rejected lots
- labelling (if required), record keeping and documentation requirements
- training of personnel.

6.2 Record keeping

[373] Treatment providers should keep appropriate records for each treatment application. These records should be made available to the NPPO of the country in which the treatment is conducted or initiated for auditing and verification purposes or when a trace-back is necessary.

[374] Appropriate records for modified atmosphere treatments as phytosanitary measures, including equipment calibration records, should be kept by the treatment provider for at least one year to enable the trace-back of treated lots. Records on individual treatments may include data on:

- identification of facility and treatment provider
- treatment schedule applied
- commodity treated
- target regulated pest
- packer, grower, exporter and place of production of the commodity
- lot size and volume, including number of articles or packages
- treatment number or other identifying markings or characteristics of the lot
- date and duration of treatment and name of individual performing the treatment
- gas concentration or concentrations, temperature of commodity and (if required) other atmospheric parameters such as humidity and pressure
- any observed deviation from the treatment schedule and, where appropriate, subsequent actions taken.

6.3 Documentation by the NPPO

[375] All NPPO procedures should be appropriately documented and records, including those of monitoring inspections made and phytosanitary certificates issued, should be maintained for at least one year. In cases of non-compliance or new or unexpected phytosanitary situations, documentation should be made available upon request as described in ISPM 13 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*).

7. Inspection

[376] Inspection should be carried out by the NPPO of the exporting country, and an inspection at import may be carried out by the NPPO of the importing country, to determine compliance with phytosanitary import requirements. Where live non-target pests are found after treatment, by either the NPPO of the exporting country or the NPPO of the importing country, the NPPO should consider if their survival indicates a treatment failure and whether additional phytosanitary measures may be necessary.

[377] The NPPO of the importing country may examine documentation and records for treatments conducted during transport to determine compliance with phytosanitary import requirements.

8. Responsibilities

[378] The NPPO of the country in which the treatment is conducted or initiated is responsible for the evaluation, approval and auditing of the application of modified atmosphere treatments as phytosanitary measures, including those performed by the NPPO itself or by other authorized treatment providers. When treatments are conducted or completed during transport, the NPPO of the exporting country is usually responsible for authorizing the treatment provider applying the treatment during transport and the NPPO of the importing country is responsible for verifying if the treatment requirements have been met.

[379] To the extent necessary, the NPPO should cooperate with other national regulatory agencies concerned with the development, approval and safety of the modified atmosphere treatment, including the training and certification of personnel conducting the treatment, the authorization of treatment providers, and the approval of treatment facilities. The respective responsibilities of the NPPO and the other regulatory agencies, if any, should be identified to avoid requirements that are overlapping, conflicting, inconsistent or unjustified.

Appendix 8: DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR: Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS) (2019-009)

Note: the tracked changes are revisions by the Standards Committee proposed at their 2019 November meeting.

Status box

This is not an official part of the specification and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after approval	
Date of this document	2019-~~07~~11-~~23~~14
Document category	Draft specification for a technical panel
Current document stage	*To* CPM-15 for approval for consultation
Major stages	2019-06 Focus group on commodity standards recommended adding to the work programme.
Steward history	-
Notes	This is a draft document 2019-07 Edited

Title

[380] Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS) (2019-009).

Reason for the technical panel

[381] There is broad consensus that commodity standards based on scientific methods and evidence will support safe and streamlined trade to the benefit of contracting parties. The IPPC strategic framework 2020–2030 includes the development of commodity standards. In order to develop such standards and ensure that sufficient rigour, resources and focus can be provided, the Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS) was established in 202X.

Scope and purpose

[382] The Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS) develops and updates commodity standards within the framework of International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) XX [the concept standard] and develops guidance on related aspects.

Tasks

[383] The TPCS should undertake the following:

(44) Draft commodity standards prioritized by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, either directly or with the support of invited experts or through expert drafting groups established by the Standards Committee (SC).

(45) When drafting a commodity standard:

- focus on the specific commodity and its intended use so the standard is practical and feasible
- ~~review~~ consider existing pest risk analyses, existing phytosanitary measures and related information that may inform the development of the standard
- evaluate technical information on relevant pests and phytosanitary measures and ~~determine~~ identify which pests and measures are to be included in the standard, using criteria established for this purpose in ISPM XX [the concept standard].

(46) Ensure that draft commodity standards are consistent with the requirements and criteria in ISPM XX [the concept standard].

(47) Ensure that there is consistency among commodity standards being developed and adopted under ISPM XX [the concept standard].

(48) Review adopted commodity standards (either ISPMs or annexes to ISPMs), identify revisions needed and submit recommendations on these revisions to the SC.

(49) Provide advice to the SC on subjects, topics and priorities for development of commodity standards.

(50) Liaise as needed with the other technical panels under the Standards Committee (SC) (e.g. Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments, Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols, and Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine) and with the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee.

(51) ~~Liaise as needed with relevant stakeholders, including the private sector and academia, under the direction of the SC.~~ recommend to the SC calls for expert drafting groups for a specific commodity standards as needed.

~~(51)~~

(52) Support consultation and adoption of draft commodity standards by, for example, providing advice to the Steward, the SC and the IPPC Secretariat on appropriate responses to member comments relating to draft commodity standards.

(53) Consider how to categorize and catalogue phytosanitary measures included in commodity standards, and those in other standards, for use in an online search tool for target pest, commodity and measure, cross-referenced to relevant sources of information.

(54) When evaluating a phytosanitary measure for inclusion in a commodity standard, consider whether there is sufficient information to support it being proposed as a topic for the development of a specific ISPM.

(55) Consider whether commodity standards could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft commodity standard.

(56) Consider the use of commodity standards by contracting parties and identify potential impediments to operational and technical implementation. Provide information on these impediments, and possible recommendations on how to overcome them, to the SC.

Expertise

[384] Members of this panel should primarily have expertise in:

- commodity pest risk assessment and management
- ~~and~~ development and management of phytosanitary import requirements
- selection and implementation of phytosanitary measures for use in trade
- development of regional and international phytosanitary standards
- ~~assessment of pest lists~~.

Members

[385] Six to ten. Details of the technical panel membership may be found on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/. Panel members are selected by the SC for a five-year term. The SC reviews the composition of the panel on a regular basis. The SC may renew individual memberships for additional terms.

[386] The TPCS may invite experts, as observers, with previous agreement by the SC.

Steward

[387] The SC shall assign ~~Steward of the TPCS, who shall be~~ a member of the SC~~, will be assigned~~ to be the Steward of the TPCS ~~by the SC~~.

[388] Please refer to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* posted on the IPP (see https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards/list).

Provision of resources

[389] Funding for the meeting may be provided from sources other than the regular programme of the IPPC (FAO). As recommended by ICPM-2 (1999), whenever possible, those participating in standard setting activities voluntarily fund their travel and subsistence to attend meetings. Participants may request financial assistance, with the understanding that resources are limited and the priority for financial assistance is given to developing country participants. Please refer to the *Criteria used for prioritizing participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat* posted on the IPP (see https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/).

~~**References**~~

[390] ~~The IPPC, relevant ISPMs and other national, regional and international standards and agreements as may be applicable to the tasks, and discussion papers submitted in relation to this work~~.

~~**Discussion papers**~~

[391] ~~Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) for consideration by the technical panel~~.

[392]

Appendix 9: Draft ISPM: Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)

Note: the tracked changes are the revisions by the Standards Committee proposed at their 2019 November meeting.

Status box

This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
Date of this document	2019-11-14
Document category	Draft ISPM
Current document stage	*To* CPM-15 for approval for consultation
Major stages	2018-10 Focus group on commodity and pathway standards recommended adding to the work programme. 2018-12 CPM Bureau recommended adding to the work programme. 2019-04 CPM-14 added the topic to the work programme (2019-008). 2019-06 Focus group on commodity and pathway standards drafted ISPM 2019-11 Standards Committee reviewed and proposed changes to the Bureau
Steward history	2019-07 Focus group on commodity and pathway standards
Notes	This is a draft document 2019-07 Focus group recommended that "pathways" be excluded 2019-09 Edited

Adoption

[393] [To be inserted following adoption].

INTRODUCTION

Scope

[394] This standard provides guidance on the purpose, use, content and publication of commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures. Such standards, presented as annexes to this overarching concept standard, apply to commodities being moved in international trade and identify pests associated with these commodities and options for relevant phytosanitary measures to be considered by contracting parties.

[395] The scope of this standard and its annexes does not include consideration of contaminating pests or diversion from intended use.

References

[396] The present standard refers to ISPMs. ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms.

[397] **IPPC.** 1997. *International Plant Protection Convention*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

Definitions

[398] Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

Outline of Requirements

[399] Commodity standards should be considered by contracting parties when developing phytosanitary import requirements. Such standards contain lists of pests and corresponding options for phytosanitary measures for commodities being moved in international trade. The lists of pests include those known to be associated with the specified commodity and intended use. ~~and~~ Commodity standards may also include information on pests known to be associated with the plant species but ~~known~~ not ~~to be associated~~ with the commodity being traded. The measures listed are those that satisfy minimum criteria for inclusion in the standard[33], and are categorized according to confidence in the measures. The lists of pests and options for phytosanitary measures are not intended to be exhaustive and are subject to review and amendment.

[400] Commodity standards ~~may be~~are presented as annexes to this standard.~~, or where appropriate, as annexes to other relevant international standards.~~

BACKGROUND

[401] A key element of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) is the safeguarding of agriculture, forests and environment, and the facilitation of safe trade. Trade supports economic growth and development, helping to reduce poverty around the world. Significant advances in the facilitation of safe trade can be made through the development and adoption of international commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures.

[402] The IPPC strategic framework 2020–2030 proposes the development of ISPMs for specific commodities, with accompanying diagnostic protocols, phytosanitary treatments and guidance, to simplify trade and expedite market access negotiations.

[403] The purpose of this standard is to provide guidance on the use of commodity standards. Such standards, presented as annexes to this standard, are designed to support the development of phytosanitary import requirements that facilitate safe trade.

IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

[404] The commodity standards developed according to this standard provide guidance on options for phytosanitary measures. Such measures may help preserve biodiversity by managing the pest risk posed by commodities that are moved internationally, including the pest risk posed by invasive alien species.

PRINCIPLES

[405] [12 bis] The IPPC contains a range of international rights and obligations. In the context of these rights and obligations, the basic principles of particular importance and relevance to commodity standards are as follows:

- Sovereign rights are not affected by commodity standards.
- Existing international obligations of contracting parties under the IPPC and the World Trade Organization Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures remain unaffected.
- Commodity standards do not impose additional obligations on importing countries over and above those already identified in the IPPC.
- The scope of commodity standards does not include diversion from intended use.
- Lists of pests are presented in commodity standards. However, the regulation of any pest remains subject to technical justification, using an appropriate pest risk analysis (PRA) or, where

[33] The inclusion of a measure in this ISPM does not create any obligation for a contracting party to approve it or register or adopt it for use in its territory.

applicable, another comparable examination and evaluation of available scientific information (Articles II and VI of the IPPC).

- Commodity standards provide contracting parties with options for phytosanitary measures to prevent the entry and establishment of regulated pests. These options are not intended to be exhaustive; other measures may be implemented by contracting parties, if technically justified, and may be proposed for inclusion in commodity standards.

REQUIREMENTS

1. Purpose and Use of Commodity Standards

[406] The purpose of commodity standards is to support the development of phytosanitary import requirements that facilitate safe trade.

[407] Measures contained within commodity standards should be considered when developing phytosanitary import requirements. ~~, t~~These standards may serve~~ing~~ to ~~fast track~~facilitate the evaluation of such measures in pest risk analysis (or other comparable examination and evaluation). These standards may also be ~~particularly~~ useful during market access discussions.

[408] Phytosanitary import requirements are established by ~~the~~ importing countries~~y and bilateral discussions~~, respecting sovereign rights, ~~and~~ international obligations and considering market access discussions.

[409] [new para] It is intended that commodity standards provide benefits for both importing and exporting countries. Examples of such benefits include the following:

- supporting and ~~assistance~~ assisting~~to~~ developing countries
- ~~facilitation~~ facilitating~~of~~ market access discussions
- facilitating~~on of~~ safe trade
- optimizing~~ation of efficiency~~the use of resources ~~usage~~
- identifying~~ication~~ and increasing awareness of measures available to minimize pests associated with the movement of commodities in international trade.

[paragraph, previously 33bis] Commodity standards are not developed in the following situations:

- when no effective phytosanitary measures are available
- when an existing ISPM already provides sufficient guidance
- when a commodity should not be regulated within the scope of the IPPC.

2. Content of Commodity Standards

[410] [new para] Specific commodity standards are arranged according to the following sections:

- Scope
- Description of the commodity
- Pests
- Options for phytosanitary measures
- References.

2.1 Scope

[411] A commodity standard ~~refers to a clearly~~clearly describes the specific~~d~~ ~~individual~~ commodity and its intended use, and covers a discrete set of pests and related options for phytosanitary measures. ~~The commodity and intended use described in a commodity standard are limited to avoid having several categories of the commodity in the standard~~.

2.2 Description of the commodity and its intended use

[412] This section clearly describes the commodity and its intended use. ~~to which the standard refers,~~The description should allow [Global change: from present tense to "should"] ~~including the intended use of the commodity and any other factor that may have an impact on the pest risk and that allows~~ the identification of a focused list of pests and associated options for phytosanitary measures. ~~In each case, the range of measures described apply to any commodity that is within the scope of the standard.~~ [previously in 31] It is important to describe the intended use of the commodity because of the influence this has on the pest risk posed by the commodity, as described in ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*)

2.3 Pests

[413] This section should include~~s~~ a list or lists of pests that are known to be both associated with the commodity described. Criteria for inclusion of pests include the availability ~~, as demonstrated by~~ of a PRA or other technical justification, and regulated by at least one contracting party. The list or lists of pests are presented in tabular format with the corresponding options for phytosanitary measures (see below).

[414] Inclusion of a pest in ~~the list or lists of a pest associated with the commodity~~a commodity standard does not provide technical justification for its regulation. [previously 32 (edited)] The determination of whether to regulate these pests is at the discretion of the importing country, based on ~~The regulation of any pest remains subject to~~ technical justification, using an appropriate PRA or, where applicable, another comparable examination and evaluation of available scientific information.

[415] This section may also include information of pests known to be associated with the plant species but, based on available scientific information, known not to be associated with the traded commodity described (e.g. pests associated with *Mangifera indica* for propagation but not with the traded commodity, mango fruit). ~~If a pest is known not to be associated with the commodity, it should not be regulated unless there is technical justification.~~

[416] The list or lists of pests are not intended to be exhaustive.

2.4 Options for phytosanitary measures

[417] This section presents options for phytosanitary measures, including measures adopted in ISPMs or currently used in trade. Individual or combinations of measures may be provided for each pest and may relate to any stage or stages of international trade prior to import.

[new para, previously 33, modified] Although commodity standards only present measures that may be applied up to the point of import, post-entry measures may be considered by contracting parties, as described in ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*).

The list or lists of measures are not intended to be exhaustive but rather to give countries options for consideration.

[418] ~~Measures presented in the commodity standards are options that may facilitate market access discussions and the final objective is that safe trade occurs~~.

[419] ~~Measures included in commodity standards are known to be, or have been, in operation between at least two contracting parties~~.

[420] The measures are presented in the table or tables of pests known to be associated with the commodity, with each measure being listed against the corresponding pest or pests that it controls. A description of each measure, sufficient to indicate its use and practical application, is provided. When necessary, additional information on the measures may be included in an appendix.

2.5 References

[421] All information presented on pests and measures in the standard is referenced in this section.

3. Verification of Compliance

[422] Several ISPMs provide information on verification of compliance. Examples include ISPM 7 (*Phytosanitary certification system*), ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*), ISPM 13 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*), ~~and~~ ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*), and ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*).

4. Criteria for Inclusion of Measures in Commodity Standards

[423] [paragraph] A measure is considered for inclusion in a commodity standard when it is, or has been, set as a phytosanitary import requirement by at least one contracting party (and hence in operation between at least two contracting parties) or when included at least in one bilateral agreement. Inclusion in the standard is further supported if one or more of the following criteria are met:

- Experience from use in trade indicates that the measure is effective. For example:
  - interception data indicate that the measure is effective
  - the measure is, or has been, used extensively
  - the measure has been successfully used to manage non-compliant consignments
  - information from plant health certification schemes indicate that the measure is effective.
- Experience from domestic use indicates that the measure is effective. For example:
  - the measure has been used extensively in relation to movement of commodities within the countr~~ieys~~
  - the measure has been used successfully in outbreak management and suppression
  - results from eradication programmes indicate that the measure is effective
  - information from plant health certification schemes indicate that the measure is effective
  - best management practices for the measure are available.
- Experimental evidence indicates that the measure is effective. For example:
  - private and public sector research indicates that the measure is effective.
- Information from PRAs (pest risk management options) or, where applicable, from another comparable examination and evaluation of available scientific information, indicate that the measure is effective.
- Adopted ISPMs exist that are relevant to the pests or commodities.
- Regional standards exist that are relevant to the pests or commodities.

[424] The practicability and feasibility of the measure is also taken into account when a measure is being considered for inclusion in a commodity standard.

5. Confidence in Measures

[425] [Paragraph] Measures are evaluated by the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards and categorized according to confidence in the measure. There are three categories – high, medium and low – and each category is accompanied by an explanatory description. These categories may be based on factors such as:

- the presence of the measure in an adopted ISPM
- the presence of the measure in a~~or~~ regional standard

- the history of the use of the measure by contracting parties ~~or~~
- the history of the use of the measure by the private sector
- the inclusion of the measure in a PRA
- the number of PRAs that include the measure
- the number of years that the measure has been in use
- reports of success or failure of the measure, including interception data
- the volume or frequency of traded commodities subjected to the measure
- the availability of quantitative or qualitative analyses pertinent to the measure
- the number and diversity of countries applying the measures.

[426] Confidence depends on the rigour of any supporting analyses and may be increased if there are cumulative sources of evidence, such as information on usage or acceptance.

~~6. General Considerations~~

[427] ~~It is important to describe the intended use of the commodity because of the influence this has on the pest risk posed by the commodity, as described in ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*).~~

[428] ~~Commodity standards provide information on pests but the determination of whether to regulate these pests is at the discretion of the importing country, based on technical justification.~~

[429] ~~Although commodity standards only present measures that may be applied up to the point of import, post-entry measures may be considered by contracting parties, as described in ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*). However, this should not be interpreted as imposing obligations on importing countries.~~

[430] ~~Commodity standards are not developed in the following situations:~~

- ~~when the commodity poses a negligible pest risk~~
- ~~when no effective phytosanitary measures are available~~
- ~~when an existing ISPM already provides sufficient guidance~~
- ~~when a commodity should not be regulated within the scope of the IPPC.~~

[431] ~~An individual commodity standard does not apply where a country, having conducted a PRA (or comparable examination and evaluation), has concluded that it does not need to regulate the pest or pests listed for the specific commodity that is the subject of the standard.~~

~~7~~6. Publication of Annexes

[~~432~~427] After adoption by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), commodity-specific standards, containing lists of pests and options for phytosanitary measures for commodities being moved in international trade, are posted separately on the IPP as annexes to this standard. These annexes have the status of an ISPM and should be considered accordingly. Where appropriate, commodity standards may instead be presented as annexes of other ISPMs.

~~8~~7. Review and Re-evaluations

[~~433~~428] Contracting parties should submit to the IPPC Secretariat any new information that could have an impact on the lists of pests or lists of options for phytosanitary measures currently adopted by the CPM. Appropriate information should be provided to support any claims. The Technical Panel on Commodity Standards will review the data and revise the lists if necessary, following the Standard setting process.

Appendix 10: Summary of standards committee e-decisions (May 2019 – November 2019)

Table 1: SC e-decisions presented between May and November 2019

E-decision number	SC decision	SC members commenting in the forum	Polls (yes/no) – participation in the poll
2019_eSC_Nov_01	Approval of Draft DP *Striga* spp. (2008-009) for consultation	13	no
2019_eSC_Nov _02	Selection of Experts for Expert Working Group on Focused Revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011)	16	Yes (11)

Table 2: SC IC e-decisions presented between May and November 2019

E-decision number	SC IC decision	SC members commenting in the forum	Polls (yes/no) – participation in the poll
2019_eSCIC_Nov_01	Approval of the Framework for Standards and Implementation	18	no

2019_eSC_Nov_01: Approval of Draft DP *Striga* spp. (2008-009) for consultation

During an SC e-decision (2019_eSC_Nov_01), the SC was invited to approve the following draft DP for consultation: *Striga* spp. (2008-009).

The SC e-forum was open from 15 to 30 May 2019. 13 SC members commented in the forum and all approved the draft DP: *Striga* spp (2008-009) for consultation.

Two SC members also provided editorial comments, suggesting to order the relevant Striga species consistently throughout the text, rewording the introductory sentence of the section on *Sampling*, moving a paragraph within the Section on *Detection* for clarity and adding scale bars to the floral images in Figures 4 and 5. These suggestions were forwarded to the discipline lead and DP lead author for consideration and will be included in the draft DP for consultation as appropriate.

SC e-decision

Based on the outcome of the forum discussion, the SC approved the following draft DP for consultation: *Striga* spp. (2008-009).

2019_eSC_Nov_02: Selection of Experts for Expert Working Group on Focused Revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011)

During an SC e-decision (2019_eSC_Nov_02), the SC was invited to consider the nominations and select experts for the Expert Working Group on Focused Revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011), with particular attention to the required expertise outlined above.

The SC e-forum was open from 30 May to 14 June 2019. 16 SC members commented in the forum and arrived to the general conclusion to approve the following composition of the EWG:

- Mr Ebbe NORDBO (as assistant steward to the TPG)
- Ms Margaret R. SMITHER
- Mr Haddon BELL
- Ms Maoyu CHEN.

To confirm the agreement of all SC members, a poll was opened to approve the above composition. The poll was open from the 17 June to the 24 June 2019. 11 SC members commented in the poll.

SC e-decision

Based on the outcome of the poll, the SC approved the above composition of the EWG on the Focused Revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011).

2019_eSCIC_Nov_01: Approval of the Framework for Standards and Implementation

The forum was open from 04 to 18 June 2019. 18 SC members and 7 IC members provided comments.

One SC member made the following suggestions:

Key result area A3: even if CPM Bureau is working on the issue of emerging pests/PH situations, we could add something like "Guide to contingency planning and emergency response" in the Implementation column (as was done for A1);

Key result area A4: "Clarification on the concepts of integrated measures and systems approach (Priority 4)" is already in the Standards column, Gap identified, second line) and it should not be duplicated (but I agree to simply delete it from C3).

This was supported by other SC members and incorporated by the Secretariat to be presented to SPG 2019.

SC e-decision

Based on the outcome of the forum discussion, the SC and IC approved the Framework for Standards and Implementation to be presented to SPG 2019.

Appendix 11: Action points arising from the SC November 2019 meeting

Action	Section / Paragraph / Decision point	Responsible	Deadline
1. To inform Ms Ouroba ALZITANIABOALBORGHOL (Syria)and Mr Lupeomanu Pelenato FONOTI (Samoa) and call on replacement members		Secretariat	November 2019
2. Update participants list and the SC membership list with the SC-7 members: The SC agreed that Mr Sam BISHOP (United Kingdom), Mr Nader ELBADRY (Egypt), Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ (Costa Rica), Ms Esther KIMANI (Kenya), Ms Sophie PETERSON (Australia), Mr Masahiro SAI (Japan) and Ms Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America) would be the SC representatives for the SC-7 for Europe, the Near East, Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, the Southwest Pacific, Asia, and North America, respectively.		Secretariat	November 2019
3. Submit the draft 2018 amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001) for submission to the CPM-15 (2020) for adoption.		Secretariat	Send to translation by 9 Dec
4. Submit the draft revision of ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005) to CPM-15 (2020) for adoption - remove Appendix 1 from the draft and recommended to the IC that, after revision taking into account consultation comments, it be included in the pest status guide - forward implementation issues identified for this draft standard to the Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU) of the Secretariat for consideration by the IC		Secretariat	Send to translation by 9 Dec
5. Develop a paper for submission to CPM-15 (2020), outlining the concerns raised during second consultation that require decision by the CPM, and attaching the revised draft ISPM on Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002) and draw up a proposal for the content of the side-session, for submission to the Bureau by 12 December.	4.3 [82] (8)	Mr Moses Adegboyega ADEWUMI (Nigeria), Mr Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom), Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy), Mr Nader ELBADRY (Egypt), Mr Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ (Costa Rica), Mr David KAMANGIRA (Malawi), Ms Sophie PETERSON (Australia), Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (Canada), Mr Masahiro SAI (Japan), Mr André Felipe C. P. da SILVA	05 December

Action	Section / Paragraph / Decision point	Responsible	Deadline
		(Brazil), Ms Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) and Ms Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America)	
6. Review the paper for submission to CPM-15 (2020), outlining the concerns raised during second consultation that require decision by the CPM regarding the draft ISPM on Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002) via e-decision.	4.3 [82] (8)	SC members	19 December 2019
7. recommend the Bureau to consider holding a side-session at CPM-15 (2020) to discuss concerns about the draft standard on Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)	4.3 [86] (9)	SecretariatMs Marica GATT	12 December 2019
8. Submit the draft ISPM on Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006) as modified in this meeting to CPM-15 (2020) for adoption - forward implementation issues identified for this draft standard to the Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU) of the Secretariat for consideration by the IC	(12), (13)	Secretariat (Janka)	Send to translation by 9 Dec
9. Invite the CPM Bureau to consider the comments and recommendations made during the November 2019 meeting of the SC regarding - the governance process for commodity standards, including the draft specification on Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS) (2019-009). - the draft ISPM on Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008).	(15) (16)	Secretariat (XX) Ms Marica GATT	12 December 2019
10. Provide comments on the draft ISPMs on Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014) and Pest risk management for quarantine pests (2014-001) to the respective stewards, with a copy to the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org), by the end of 2019.		SC members	31 December 2019
11. Recommended to the CPM that the following topics be included in the List of topics for IPPC standards with priority 1 - Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (2019-009) - Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)		Secretariat	April 2020
12. Prepare a paper for CPM-15 (2020), drawing upon their work to date and the discussions at this		Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (lead), Mr Sam	5 December 2019

Action	Section / Paragraph / Decision point	Responsible	Deadline
SC meeting, and seeking a decision from CPM-15 (2020) on the way forward and in particular the choice between options 2 and 5 to be p[resented to the SC via e-decision		BISHOP, Ms Sophie PETERSON, Mr Masahiro SAI, and Ms Marina ZLOTINA	
13. Include an alert on the IPP for DP 5 (*Phyllosticta citricarpa* (McAlpine)) Aa on fruit), regarding the potential for false positive results		Secretariat	November 2019
14. Include the revision of DP 5 (*Phyllosticta citricarpa* (McAlpine)) Aa to the TPDP work programme in the LOT with "pending" status.		Secretariat	November 2019
15. To seek clarification on whether the SC can temporarily remove a DP from the IPP for revision and the associated process involved, since unlike other ISPMs, DPs are adopted by the SC and noted by the CPM		Secretariat	Next SC meeting
16. Consider via e-decisions: - Modified atmosphere usage in irradiation treatments - Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating (2007-114) – evaluation of the objection.		SC members	December 2019
17. Suggest ways of promoting standard setting during IYPH		SC members	NA
18. Develop a Report of the Standards Committee (SC) activities to the CPM-15 (2020) mentioning in particular the proposed SC-7 agenda		Secretariat, SC Chair	January 2020