



REPORT

**Rome, Italy
26-30 April 2010**

**Standards
Committee
April 2010**

CONTENTS

Report of the Standards Committee, April 2010	3
---	---

Appendixes

Appendix 1	Agenda.....	23
Appendix 2	Documents list	26
Appendix 3	Summary of SC decisions by email November 2009 - May 2010	30
Appendix 4	Draft ISPM: <i>Integrated measures approach for plants for planting in international trade</i>	31
Appendix 5	Draft Appendix to ISPM 15: <i>Submission of new treatments for inclusion in ISPM 15</i>	46
Appendix 6	Specification No. 51: <i>Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade</i>	51
Appendix 7	Specification No. 50: <i>Protocol to determine host status of fruits to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation</i>	54
Appendix 8	Draft specification: specification <i>Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircraft</i>	57
Appendix 9	Draft specification <i>Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities</i>	60
Appendix 10	Draft specification <i>Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages</i>	63
Appendix 11	Specification for Technical Panels No. 4 (Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine).....	66
Appendix 12	Specification for Technical Panels No. 3 (Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments)	68
Appendix 13	Standard setting work programme	70
Appendix 14	Participants list	77

REPORT

1. Mr Sakamura (Vice-Chairperson) welcomed the SC. He noted that the Chairperson, Mr Ribeiro e Silva, had changed position in his government and as a result had left the SC, and that the SC would be required to elect a new Chairperson.
2. The new Secretary of the IPPC, Mr Yokoi, welcomed the SC and noted that standard setting was the most intense area of activity in the Secretariat. He said that one of his priorities was to accelerate recruitment in order to address the weak staffing situation for general administration, capacity-building and standard setting. He presented the staffing situation of the standard setting group (full-time positions, temporary, APOs, consultants, and in-kind contributions by USA and Canada). He noted that the contracts for most staff were ending in 2010, and he anticipated problems for the future. If no additional resources for staff were available, the Secretariat may be required to drastically reduce or halt the standard setting work.

1. ELECTION OF SC CHAIRPERSON

3. Mr Sakamura recalled the Rules of Procedures of the Standards Committee regarding election of the Chairperson¹, and opened the floor for nominations.
4. Ms Chard was nominated and the members of the SC elected her as Chairperson of the Standards Committee. She thanked the SC and looked forward to contributing to moving forward the IPPC standard setting programme. She expressed the thanks and appreciation of the SC to the outgoing Chairperson, Mr Ribeiro e Silva, for his work.
5. The Chairperson introduced three new members of the SC: Mr Dikin (Indonesia), Mr Bakak (Cameroun, unable to attend) and Mrs Castro (Chile, unable to attend). The SC welcomed the new members. Two other SC members were unable to attend: Mr Chandurkar (India) and Mr Mohammad (Syria).

2. ELECTION OF THE RAPPORTEUR

6. The SC elected Mr Porritt as rapporteur.

3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA²

7. The SC adopted the agenda (Appendix 1) with minor changes in the order of agenda items.

4. MEETING INFORMATION

8. The Secretariat introduced the documents list (Appendix 2). Some new documents were distributed. The SC members were requested to verify that their contact details on the participants list are up-to-date and it was stressed that each SC member is responsible for ensuring contact information is correct in order to receive appropriate information.
9. The Secretariat mentioned the paper containing results of the SC evaluation of its November 2009 meeting³. The Chairperson noted that the SC should keep these points in mind during the meeting, especially the suggestions that editing could be done by small groups rather than in the plenary, and that the Chair, at his/her discretion, could limit some protracted discussions in the interest of holding more efficient meetings.
10. The SC:
 1. *Noted* the suggestions for improving meeting process which were made by SC members at the November 2009 SC meeting.

¹ 2010_SC_Apr_51

² 2010_SC_Apr_01

³ 2010_SC_Apr_18

5. UPDATES FROM OTHER RELEVANT BODIES

5.1 Items arising from CPM-5

11. The Secretariat introduced the items arising from CPM-5⁴. One member noted that the role of the SC was to develop standards, its work should focus on this, and at CPM-5 there were a number of comments made on the role of the SC as the body with responsibility to develop standards. In addition the SC should be in a position to withhold a text that was in an unacceptable form, rather than send it for member consultation or to CPM. However, one other member noted that sending ISPMs for consultation was sometimes a way of getting wider views and perspectives, and that the SC should sometimes send drafts out for the purpose of getting comments to progress the draft.

12. One member commented on the CPM decision to restrict the specification for biological control of forest pests to the concept of biological control as part of a systems approach for phytosanitary measures. It was clarified that this was intended to focus on the role of biological control of forest pests as a phytosanitary measure, not as a general control measure. This decision would have to be taken into account when discussing the specification in the future.

13. It was noted that the issue regarding accelerating the development of technical standards would first be discussed by the Bureau, and would be presented to the SC for consideration at the November 2010 SC meeting.

14. Regarding wood packaging material treatments that are alternatives to methyl bromide, and are to be submitted for adoption as a matter of urgency as decided by CPM, it was noted that some treatments currently being considered by the TPPT may be forwarded by the TPPT to the SC, following the TPPT July 2010 meeting, for clearance for member consultation under the special process. One member queried if there could be the opportunity of a second consultation period in 2010. The Secretariat noted that, due to lack of resources, it would be difficult to deal with two rounds of consultation.

15. The SC was reminded that the CPM had noted that the 100-day June-September consultation period is the key comment period, and that comments made 14 days prior to CPM should only be substantive comments clearly linked to the revised text or for correction of evident errors. SC members were requested to help ensure, if they are involved in the preparation of comments at both the national and regional level, that relevant parties are reminded of the difference between these two consultation periods. SC members should also be mindful of guidance offered by CPM-5 regarding the difference between comments made 14 days prior to CPM and the 100-day member consultation when taking part in regional workshops, and advise participants at these meetings of the reasoning behind this request.

16. The SC:

1. *Noted* the CPM decision to restrict the scope of the specification for biological control of forest pests to the concept of biological control as part of a systems approach for phytosanitary measures;
2. *Noted* that CPM-5 requested the Secretariat to work on the topics related to containers and conveyances moved in international trade as a matter of urgency;
3. *Noted* that other issues, such as CPM-5 recommendations for the draft ISPM on fruit fly trapping and irradiation treatments would be discussed under other agenda items
4. *Agreed* that the SC should concentrate on developing good standards as a priority.

5.2 Updates from the Secretariat (November 2009–March 2010)

17. The Secretariat presented an update on Secretariat activities⁵.

⁴ 2010_SC_Apr_58

⁵ 2010_SC_Apr_40

6. STANDARDS COMMITTEE

6.1 Report of the SC Nov 2009

18. There was no comment on the report of the November 2009 meeting⁶.

6.2 Summary of SC decisions by email (Nov 2009-March 2010)

19. The Secretariat presented the decisions made by the SC by email since the last meeting⁷. The SC was informed that the SC had made an additional decision since the paper was written: the SC agreed by email on the composition of the EWG on movement of soil and growing medium in association with plants in international trade, which was scheduled to take place in Canada in June 2010.

20. A summary of SC decisions by email is appended as Appendix 3.

7. DRAFT ISPMS FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL FOR 2010 MEMBER CONSULTATION

7.1 Pest risk analysis to determine whether plants proposed for import are quarantine pests - *high priority*⁸

21. The steward presented the draft. In addition to proposing an annex on PRA for plants as pests, the EWG had proposed some modifications to the text of ISPM 11. No information would be lost in this process. The EWG had proposed that some immediate changes to ISPM 11 should be processed for consultation at the same time as the annex. The EWG had also made recommendations for the future revision of ISPM 11.

22. The steward noted that the draft is limited to import of plants as this was the specification. Some members noted that the scope was too restrictive as it focuses on assessing a proposal to import a plant, and that the annex should cover other cases such as: when a plant is identified in a country and PRA is needed to define if it is a pest or not, when a plant is not present in the whole area and the risk need to be assessed.

23. The steward suggested that the scope was consistent with the specification, which limited the standard to plants for import, and that the way it was written would not prevent it to be used at the national level. In addition ISPMs normally do not address what is done domestically.

24. The Secretariat noted that the IPPC and the CBD have a joint work programme. If the draft was extended to plants which are present in the country, it would be a useful tool for the CBD.

25. It was concluded that the standard should not be limited to imported plants. Additional general comments were made during the meeting. An evening working group was convened to discuss the major issues raised in the SC, and members having comments on the draft were invited to join the evening working group. The evening group would recommend how to proceed, i.e. whether the text could be reworded, or whether it should be addressed by another EWG or by the steward. If the latter, the group should provide guidance for the EWG or steward.

26. The evening working group identified issues that need further consideration. The group suggested an e-mail working group be formed of interested SC members to deal with issues raised at the SC April 2010 meeting and to report back to SC at the November 2010 meeting.

27. The SC:

1. *Concluded* that an e-mail working group shall be formed consisting of interested SC members including the steward to work on the following issues of the draft Annex text by:
 - Modifying the text to include not only the import scenario but also domestic concerns, including intentional movements within a country

⁶ 2010_SC_Apr_19

⁷ 2010_SC_Apr_41

⁸ 2010_SC_Apr_05, 20, 21, 47

- Connected to that issue, expanding on the text's guidance on presence/absence
 - Linking the development of this Annex to relevant CPM recommendations on IPPC coverage of plants as pests and highlighting the relevant framework
 - Considering how to deal with various intended uses of plants, in particular whether plants for planting need a higher profile in the text in comparison with other intended uses.
 - Considering the necessity of each of the draft modifications of the ISPM 11 core text as suggested by the EWG, and clarify which are editorial changes to avoid repetition, and which are changes related to consistency and clarity.
 - Considering whether more guidance can be provided regarding 'probability of spread' and 'potential economic impact'
 - Considering including further suggestions aiming at improving clarity and consistency with other ISPMs.
2. *Requested* the e-mail group to report back to SC at the November 2010 meeting.
3. *Noted* that the email group would be composed of Ms Awosusi, Ms Aliaga, Mr Holtzhausen, Mr Tumukon, Mr Unger, Mrs Melcho, Mr Porritt and Mr Nordbo (Steward).

7.2 Integrated measures approach for managing pest risks associated with international trade of plants for planting - *high priority*⁹

28. The steward summarized the history of the standard, including two expert working group meetings, a small working group and email consultations. He mentioned the main changes made to the draft following comments by the SC-7 and the SC, including:

- incorporation of general integrated measures
- standard made more general, rather than guidelines for bilateral agreements
- removal of references to "systems approach"
- transferring risk categorization from an appendix to the main text.
- expanding risk factors and dividing them into categories, and addition of explanations
- removal of the concept of export brokers
- addition of general management packages as an appendix.

29. Finally, the SC-7 had asked for some new terms to be removed, such as *phytosanitary manual* and *crop specialist*. The expert working group decided not to remove these as they are main components of the system.

30. In answer to a question on why information on non-compliance was so detailed in the standard, compared to other standards where it is dealt with in a more general way, the steward answered that the EWG considered that the non-compliance elements should be detailed in this standard because it focused on plants in nursery, and relied on the place of production operators to perform many of the functions; therefore additional information was required.

31. It was noted that the title was overly complicated, so it was reworded.

32. Regarding the scope, it was noted that seeds are not covered by this standard, as mentioned in the specification. The SC considered adding additional text in the background, but finally agreed not include any explanation, and would see whether comments were received during member consultation.

33. One member wondered why the scope mentioned managing pest risks associated with production and international movement, while the title of the standard relates to international trade. The steward clarified that in order to trade plants, requirements were put on the place of production to make sure the plants are clean, and therefore production should be covered in the standard.

34. As a general comment on the new format of referring to previous standards, one member noted that the text was difficult to read when the year was mentioned next to the ISPM number, as per the new style, e.g. ISPM 5:2010. It was sufficient that the year be mentioned in the references. One member recommended that references to standards should be consistent with other international agreements, for example referring to

⁹ 2010_SC_Apr_6, 22, 23

the year only when the standard had been revised. The steward of the TPG noted that it was more accurate to have the year indicated. The Chairperson indicated that the Secretariat had noted these proposals and may make a proposal to the SC at a future meeting.

35. One member suggested that “local official” be also mentioned in addition to NPPOs and producers. It was noted that local officials may be involved in an integrated measures approach and would have been delegated by the NPPO. The NPPO was responsible for the integrated measure approach and could choose to organize it as it wished.

36. The background mentioned that an integrated measures approach has the advantage of managing the risk of organisms that are unknown to science (among some others). One member asked for clarification. The steward answered that the measures may also control organisms unknown to science, contaminating pests etc. in addition to the known risks.

37. Regarding section 1 on pest factors that affect the risk, some members noted that there was duplication of some elements that are also covered by the ISPMs on PRA, and should be deleted. It was clarified that this section arose from a request from the SC-7 and SC that more explanation of pest risks be added in the text. Some members supported that all elements could be maintained, as it was not only intended for importing countries in relation to PRA, but would also be useful for exporting countries. The SC agreed to leave all elements in the text.

38. Under 3.1, there was a discussion on whether notification of pests by the place of production should refer to relevant pests or regulated pests. Some members noted that ISPMs normally deal with regulated pests. Others noted that the absence of the other pests provides the exporting NPPO with confidence that the place of production is operated properly. The NPPO of the exporting country could decide which pests are relevant, e.g. the regulated pests of the importing country.

39. A small working group considered section 3.1 and re-worked it into sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 with no new text added, making it flow better and less confusing.

40. The SC decided to replace “phytosanitary manual” by “manual” throughout the text, as the content as described in the draft covers production and management practices, as well as pest management measures. In addition it was noted that “manual” is used in other ISPMs.

41. Regarding the considerations for packing and transport in 3.2.1.6, there was discussion on the mention of “phytosanitary certificates or equivalent documents (such as bill of lading)”. The SC decided to leave only phytosanitary certificate as other documents are not of concern for the IPPC.

42. One member noted that some sections of the draft are overly complicated, especially the measures described for high risk situations, including the sections on non-compliance. The member noted that there were different consequences for critical non-compliance and non-critical non-compliance, which could be confusing. As in some other ISPMs, the draft could mention simply non-compliance and provide for bilateral agreements. This suggestion was not accepted.

43. Some members believed that the exporting NPPO would define one “overall” integrated measures approach for the exporting country, including both generic requirements applying to all places of production and specific requirements depending on the import requirements of the different importing countries. There would be one approach, which would consist of both generic requirements applicable to all exports and specific requirements/different procedures applying to different places of production depending on markets. In addition, it was noted that the exporting NPPO would generally attempt to establish systems that could allow companies to export to more than one country.

44. Others believed that there might be different integrated systems approaches for different places of production, depending on the countries they export to and specific phytosanitary import requirements. In that case, there would not be an overall integrated measures approach in the country. There would not necessarily be one general programme, but an integrated measures approach might be defined only for one company. It

was made clear that the text outlines 2 levels of integrated measure approaches to which specific phytosanitary import requirements may be added.

45. It was noted that the draft text proposed the wording of an additional declaration for the PC, but this was not appropriate in this standard as such guidance is addressed in ISPM 12. The text was reworded to refer to ISPM 12, and the possible requirements of the importing country.

46. Under section 5, the draft text presented to the SC mentioned that the NPPO of the exporting country should select the least restrictive measures in consultation with the NPPO of the importing country. It was clarified that the NPPO of the exporting country might not know which would be the least trade restrictive measures, and the text provided the option of communication. It was decided that this might be correct, but does not belong in this standard and was therefore removed from the text.

47. One member wondered where traceability (5.1) stopped. The steward answered that the text intended to cover plants going to nurseries, but not plants that are distributed to stores, but did highlight that the section only “encouraged” NPPOs.

48. Regarding pesticide treatments in Appendix 1 of the draft, one member wondered if these were intended to be phytosanitary treatments adopted in ISPM 28, which might not be available in the near future. It was clarified that this referred to treatments carried out by the country.

49. One member proposed deletion of Appendix 3 of the draft, which included references to national and regional schemes. He noted that the SC had taken a similar decision in a previous draft ISPM in order to not bind the countries concerned to their scheme, and not give the impression that these had been endorsed by the CPM. Deletion was agreed to, noting that these references could be put on the IPP/explanatory document if needed.

50. The SC:

1. Approved the draft *Integrated measures approach for plants for planting in international trade* for member consultation as revised during the meeting (Appendix 4).

7.3 Submission of new treatments for inclusion in ISPM 15 - *high priority*¹⁰

51. The steward recalled that the SC gave guidance in 2009 on further development of the draft, and the text had been redrafted based on that guidance. The level of efficacy for treatments, currently probit 9 in the draft as recommended by the TPFQ, was recognized as a controversial point. However the steward advised that this issue had been discussed on numerous occasions, and he urged the SC to send the text for consultation in order to obtain feedback from contracting parties and appropriate professionals on this issue.

52. One member expressed concern that, if this draft was adopted with the inclusion of probit 9 efficacy, there was a risk that only treatments with data supporting a probit 9 efficacy would be considered and adopted by the CPM in the future. This should not be the case as some treatments currently in use by NPPOs would be valid even if they do not have the data to support the determination of probit 9. The member suggested that this issue be raised in CPM, to ensure that adopting these criteria with probit 9 would not result in the requirement that treatments under ISPM 28 would need to have a probit 9 efficacy. However, another member noted that there was already a provision in ISPM 28 that the level of efficacy of the adopted treatments should be stated. Countries may select treatments depending on their appropriate level of protection.

53. This annex was planned for ISPM 15. Noting that there is a draft standard on the movement of wood in international trade, one member asked if the criteria would also apply to it. It was decided to maintain the text as it is, and that another set of criteria might be appropriate for phytosanitary treatments for wood. The steward noted that the criteria to assess treatments for wood moving in international trade would be similar to these criteria.

¹⁰ 2010_SC_Apr_07, 24, 39Rev1

54. One member noted that there was an inconsistency in the mention of pest groups and individual species, especially table 1 and paragraph 17. It was concluded that they did not need to be consistent as they related to different concepts. In addition, *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* was mentioned as a species and not as part of a pest group in the table as it is the only nematode species of concern identified by the TPFQ. However during testing, substitute species might be used and paragraph 33 therefore mentioned “nematodes”.

55. At step 4, it was noted that the sentence stating that species may not need this level of testing rigour might be confusing. It was explained that this sentence was intended to cover species (e.g. *Anoplophora glabripennis*) for which the number of individuals required for large scale testing to achieve probit 9 (100,000) would not be available. The text was reworded to clarify the concept and an example of species incorporated.

56. The SC:

1. *Approved* the draft Appendix to ISPM 15: *submission of new treatments for inclusion in ISPM 15*, for member consultation as revised during the meeting (Appendix 5).

7.4 Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood - high priority¹¹

57. The steward introduced the draft. The draft listed the main commodity classes of wood and provided options for managing the risk. Annex 1 on risks and tolerances related to bark could not be finalized in time for consideration by the SC at this meeting, and is therefore not included in the draft standard.

58. One member expressed concern about used wood packaging material moving as a commodity (and not as packaging for other commodities). This is not covered in ISPM 15 and it was agreed that it should be covered in the present draft.

59. One member noted that sawn wood, which may have undergone additional basic processing, such as window frames, doors, are not covered in the standard. It was noted that the standard used wood and sawn wood in accordance with the glossary, and therefore by definition excluded this type of commodity.

60. The SC reworded some text in the draft, but did not complete its review due to lack of time. The following issues were identified as still requiring further consideration:

- Proposals on how pest groups are presented in section 1, specifically consideration of an option to present them as a table in an annex, cross-referenced to commodity classes listed in the main text of the standard
- Consider whether an appendix containing the world’s major forest pests of quarantine concern would be appropriate
- Clarify the text using agreed definitions where available, specifically in regards to the terms and concepts of bark-free, debarking and removal of wood, and the processes for producing bark-free or debarked wood.
- Consider references to ISPM 28. The current wording seems to imply that some treatments are attached to ISPM 28. It was suggested to leave a general statement that could be valid for the long-term, noting that the treatments may be found in ISPM 28 once adopted, without giving the impression they already are.
- Consider whether the guidance regarding inspection for living pests in 1.5.1 is correct, specifically if irradiation treatments are adopted in ISPM 28
- In 2.6 reference to pest free places of production should be reconsidered because it was thought that pest free places of production may not be a realistic option for forestry
- In 2.5 and 2.8, as inspection and testing could be considered as verification procedures rather than measures, consider what additions would be necessary to make them measures, e.g. corrective actions
- Review the different categories of pests and harmonize the terms used (e.g. wood-inhabiting moth/wood moth) throughout the text

¹¹ 2010_SC_Apr_08, 25, 26

- Systems approach (currently section 3) should become section 2.9, as a systems approach is an option for risk management like other items in section 2
- It was noted that annex 1 was being developed, and should be completed and integrated into the next version of the draft, prior to representing the draft to the SC for further consideration. The steward noted that the annex will describe how the presence of bark affects risks, the characteristics of wood affecting risk, the differences between complete bark removal and debarking, and give guidance on the size of remaining bark to be considered to support populations and on establishing tolerances (this had previously been developed in the context of the revision of ISPM 15).

61. The SC:

1. *Decided* that the draft as modified by the SC would be referred to the TPFQ for consideration taking into account the issues identified by the SC. In addition, SC members were invited to send all their comments and suggestions to the steward by 30 May 2010, for consideration by the TPFQ at its meeting in July.

7.5 Supplement 1 to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*): Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of official control in relation to regulated pests and not widely distributed in relation to quarantine pests that are present in an area – *high priority*¹²

62. The SC did not have time to discuss this draft and agreed to defer the consideration of this draft to a future meeting.

63. The SC:

1. *Agreed* to defer the draft for consideration at a future meeting.

8. SELECT EQUIVALENT OF FIVE DRAFT ISPMS FOR MEMBER CONSULTATION

64. The Secretariat recalled the standards that have been approved, at the present meeting, previous meetings or by email, for member consultation:

- Integrated measures approach for managing pest risks associated with international trade of plants for planting (approved SC April 2010)
- Submission of new treatments for inclusion in ISPM 15 (approved April 2010)
- Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies¹³ (approved SC May 2009)
- Diagnostic protocol for *Trogoderma granarium*¹⁴ (approved by SC via email in 2008)
- Diagnostic protocol for *Plum pox virus*¹⁵ (approved by SC via email in 2008)
- Irradiation treatment for *Ceratitis capitata*¹⁶ (approved by the SC via email in 2009)

65. The guidelines for choosing the equivalent of 5 draft ISPMS were highlighted and made available¹⁷.

66. It was noted that the Bureau, concerned about the slow progress in the development of technical standards, had requested the Secretariat to consider posting the technical standards that the SC had already approved for member consultation in the SC restricted work area of the IPP (available to NPPOs and RPPOs), until they are sent for member consultation. The SC welcomed this development, given the extensive resources utilized in their development and the potential benefits that could be derived by contracting parties.

67. Regarding diagnostic protocols, the steward of the TPDP noted that sending two protocols for consultation would count as 4 standards. If a choice had to be made, he suggested sending the protocol on *Plum pox virus*, in order to process a protocol on a different category of pest.

68. The SC selected the following standards for the 2010 June-September 100-day member consultation:

¹² 2010_SC_Apr_09, 27, 28, 29, 30

¹³ 2010_SC_Apr_10

¹⁴ 2010_SC_Apr_17

¹⁵ 2010_SC_Apr_11

¹⁶ 2010_SC_Apr_49

¹⁷ 2010_SC_Apr_12

- Integrated measures approach for managing pest risks associated with international trade of plants for planting
- Submission of new treatments for inclusion in ISPM 15
- Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies
- Diagnostic protocol for *Plum pox virus* (Annex to ISPM 27)
- Irradiation treatment for *Ceratitidis capitata* (Annex to ISPM 28).

9. DRAFT SPECIFICATIONS FOR REVIEW OF MEMBER COMMENTS AND APPROVAL

9.1 Experimental protocol to determine host status of fruits to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation - high priority¹⁸

69. The steward could not be present, but the steward of the TPF introduced the draft specification. A member of the TPF was present at the meeting and was later selected as the new steward, as the previous steward had resigned. He reported that most comments received during the member consultation phase had been incorporated into the draft specification.

70. One comment suggested the TPG define host status. The SC noted that these terms should be addressed after the TPF developed a draft ISPM as the context would provide guidance to the TPG. It was also noted that the draft may introduce new terms (e.g. primary host, secondary host etc.).

71. The SC:

1. *Approved* the specification for *Protocol to determine host status of fruits to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation* as revised in the meeting (Appendix 7).

9.2 Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade - high priority¹⁹

72. The steward noted that 49 member comments had been received.

73. The SC made modifications to the specification. In particular, the following issues were discussed:
- Several comments had been received on ensuring consultation occurred with relevant stakeholders during the development process. A task had been added for the EWG to recommend to the SC a procedure for discussion with stakeholders on main issues, if needed. The Secretariat noted that there was no need for the EWG to address this as CPM-5 had requested members to involve non-agricultural stakeholders in the consultation process as appropriate, but the task was maintained to ensure that the EWG was aware of the task.
 - A comment asked to take account of the permanent preservative treatment for the flooring of containers made of plant material. This would be considered by the EWG when looking at treatments. One member noted that such flooring also gets damaged and broken, with a need to be replaced, and the group should also look into that.

74. The SC also discussed at length the title and content of the specification with regards to the topic on the work programme that covers both sea containers and conveyances. It was noted that at its November 2009 meeting, the SC decided to proceed in two stages, by first developing a draft ISPM on sea containers, and then considering how to proceed for conveyances. The specification had been drafted with one task to consider how the resulting guidelines for sea containers could support the development of guidelines for minimizing pest movements by conveyances. The EWG could consider whether should work in the direction of one or two standards.

75. The steward stressed that the specification contained only one general task on conveyances, and that containers and conveyances should best be addressed in separate standards, because there are separate procedures, mitigation measures, pests and stakeholders involved. He noted that it might be more appropriate

¹⁸ 2010_SC_Apr_31, 32

¹⁹ 2010_SC_Apr_33,34

to split the topic into two on the work programme, which would ensure that the two components expected by CPM members on containers and on conveyances are delivered with the high priority they have been given.

76. The SC decided to leave the title as containers and conveyances, with a general task on conveyances. The EWG would investigate work on conveyances, and the SC might consider at a later stage splitting the topic on the work programme into two topics, to include an item on (sea) conveyances, depending on the outcome of the work of the EWG.

77. One member envisaged that the EWG might be in a position to define general guidance on conveyances. However, it was agreed that for transparency purposes, the CPM should be informed that the SC is considering these options.

78. The SC:

1. *Approved* the specification for *Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade* as revised in the meeting (Appendix 6).

9.3 Framework for national phytosanitary inspection procedures - *high priority*²⁰

9.4 Regulating stored products in international trade - *normal priority*²¹

79. Items deferred to a future meeting due to lack of time.

10. DRAFT SPECIFICATIONS FOR APPROVAL FOR MEMBER CONSULTATION

10.1 Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircraft - *high priority*²²

80. The steward introduced the specification indicating that it had been developed closely following the draft specification for sea containers and conveyances.

81. The International Air Transport Association (IATA) was added to the organisations which might take place in the work. One member noted that IATA has its own guidelines on air containers.

82. It was discussed whether aircraft would be covered. The steward thought that it might be easier for this standard to include guidance on aircraft rather than for the standard on sea containers to include guidance on sea conveyances (see section 9.1).

83. The SC approved the draft specification *Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts* for member consultation as revised in the meeting (Appendix 8).

10.2 Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities - *normal priority*²³

84. The steward introduced the specification, noting that the CPM had reviewed the priority given to this topic from *High* to *Normal*.

85. One member thought that the work on authorization might have consequences on the way the word *authorize* and related terms are used in adopted ISPMs and a review of the use of these terms should be done. It was noted that this would involve extensive work, but the EWG could be asked to give guidance on this matter. A new task was added to consider the use of *authorize* and similar terms in adopted ISPM, and how it would relate to procedures and requirements outlined in this new standard, and provide recommendations to the SC on this matter.

²⁰ 2010_SC_Apr_35, 36, 37

²¹ 2010_SC_Apr_42, 43

²² 2010_SC_Apr_48

²³ 2010_SC_Apr_13

86. Consideration was given to add a task in all new specifications, asking EWGs to consider consistency of the draft text with adopted standards. The Chairperson proposed that the SC did not have time to work on its wording at the present meeting and that it be considered at a future SC meeting.

87. It was stressed that the authorization of public officers to issue phytosanitary certificates would not be covered by the draft ISPM. The discussion should be confined to a broader context of “authorization” and not touch upon the issue of “public officer”, noting the decision of CPM-3 (2008). A statement was added to the scope in this regard.

88. The following issues were also raised:

- The EWG should consider what phytosanitary activities need to be performed by authorized entities, which entities would be authorized, and the scope of the authorization.
- One member noted there was a problem in mentioning inspection as one of the phytosanitary activities for which entities might be authorized as inspection is an official procedure.
- Concern was expressed about mentioning authorizing individuals, especially in relation to testing activities, and this could be considered by the EWG.

89. The SC:

1. *Approved* the draft specification *Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities* for member consultation as revised in the meeting (Appendix 9).

10.3 Handling and disposal of waste moved internationally in conveyances - normal priority²⁴

90. The steward introduced the specification.

91. It was clarified that the standard would be about waste generated during international voyages, not waste transported internationally as a commodity. It was also agreed that the standard should address phytosanitary risks and the title and draft were modified accordingly.

92. The SC:

1. *Approved* the draft specification *Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages* for member consultation as revised in the meeting (Appendix 10).

10.4 International movement of cut flowers and foliage - normal priority²⁵

10.5 Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) - normal priority²⁶

93. Items deferred to a future meeting due to lack of time.

11. TECHNICAL PANELS

94. The Secretariat noted that Secretariat lead would present updates on their TP’s activities. It was also noted that the CPM has asked the SC to provide increased supervision of the work of TPs, and it was hoped that presentations would help the SC review decisions.

95. The SC was reminded that when TPs were first created, it was envisaged that they would stop their work when all tasks had been completed. It was suggested that the SC request TPs to discuss when they expect their tasks to be completed. The SC might consider whether other TPs be needed in the future to replace former TPs, for example a TP on pest risk analysis. The Secretariat also recalled that the SC is in charge of reviewing the membership of TPs, and that the SC might want to have a close look at the composition and terms of membership to ensure a continuity in the composition of TPs when terms of members expire.

²⁴ 2010_SC_Apr_14

²⁵ 2010_SC_Apr_15

²⁶ 2010_SC_Apr_50

96. The SC:

1. *Thanked* members of all the TPs for the excellent work they have done over the years.
2. *Asked* TPs to review their work programme and the continued need for their work, and develop a medium term plan for their work, identify key areas that may need addressing, set a completion date if possible, and report back to the SC.

11.1 Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols²⁷

97. The Secretariat lead presented the activities of the TPDP.

98. The steward expressed his concerns at the way the Panel is currently operating and thought that it was not possible to continue in this way. In particular, he insisted on the importance of annual meetings where TP members can get regular feedback from the group to keep on the right track. Noting the many changes of Secretariat lead in the last few years, he also mentioned that there should be continuity.

99. The limitation of the Secretariat's ability to administratively process documents for member consultation did not allow for the timely adoption and use of the protocols. He regretted that the *Trogoderma granarium* protocol, cleared in 2008, would not be sent for consultation in 2010. This is not positive for the functioning of the TP, frustrates authors and may make the protocols obsolete before they are adopted. The steward noted that if only one protocol per year is sent for member consultation, then it will block the whole process of protocol development and reminded the SC that there were approximately 30 diagnostic protocols under development. He asked the Secretariat to reconsider that the *Trogoderma granarium* protocol is sent for member consultation.

100. The Secretary expressed his sympathy with the problems expressed, but explained the situation that the Secretariat was facing. He noted that at the beginning of the meeting he had highlighted that the Secretariat lacks resources, including staff. He also noted that more and more staff were employed on short-term. Recalling the agreement to send for consultation the equivalent of 5 ISPMs per year, he noted that even that number might be reduced, until appropriate resources are obtained. He noted that a communication strategy will be developed to assist in attracting funds to the Secretariat. He added that the online comment system might be a solution as this would minimize Secretariat's involvement, but it was not possible to tell until the system becomes operational. The Secretary could not anticipate how much the system would help.

101. The Secretary requested advice from the SC and Bureau on a mid-term target (approximately 5-10 years) for areas that may require standards or specific pest-related information (e.g. diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments).

102. The Bureau member was asked to comment and recalled that the CPM had stressed the need for quality standards. However willing NPPO officials provided to the secretariat as in-kind resources are, the Secretariat needs to have people skilled to deal with standards development, who have the time to do this type of work. The Secretary's role will be to double the money available for the Secretariat.

103. Some members expressed their concerns with the situation:

- Recognizing that the Secretariat cannot do more with the current resources, it would be useful if the Secretariat could identify tasks that can be accomplished by volunteers, with details on skills, time requirements, etc. The Secretary encouraged countries to provide in-kind contributions of experienced staff members.
- Rather than talking about the problems, alternative systems and strategy should be considered, such as that from Codex Alimentarius, where responsibility is assigned to countries for the development of standards.
- The SC and CPM needs to be more selective in choices of topics, so that the work is more efficient, noting in particular that most standards are identified as high priority.
- It was noted that diagnostic protocols were going to be posted on the IPP with access to view granted to NPPO and RPPO contact points after they are approved for member consultation. This would make them available to members who need them, and this could be used by the Secretariat, members

²⁷ 2010_SC_Apr_44

and the TPDP to show that they are available. The steward noted that posting protocols on the IPP is not an alternative to the adoption of internationally-agreed protocols. There is plenty of guidance in the form of diagnostic protocols available in regions; what is lacking are internationally-agreed protocols.

104. The Secretariat noted that the Bureau has undertaken to examine other methods to approve technical standards, noting that the current system may be overly complex. The Bureau is also going to consider whether these technical standards need to go through the full standard-setting procedure.

105. One member noted other bottlenecks, other than Secretariat resources, in the development of diagnostic protocols, i.e. the ability of members to review more than five standards during member consultation, and the number of comments at late stages of consultation. In addition 32 out of 80 subjects or topics on the work programme are diagnostic protocols, which would also have to be revised at some stage as the diagnostic protocols may become obsolete quite rapidly. It would take many years to adopt all these protocols and the goal might have been unrealistic to start with. The status of diagnostic protocols should be considered, and alternatives in status and development process might be identified.

106. The SC discussed the status of Mr Delano James (Canada) who had been nominated as a standby virologist to replace the current virologist, who had finally not left the TP. It was stressed that this was an individual case, and should not create a precedent of having standby members for all TP members.

107. The SC:

1. *Noted* the progress with development of diagnostic protocols.
2. *Recalled* that two draft protocols have been cleared by the SC in August 2008 for member consultation (*Trogoderma granarium* and *Plum pox virus*)
3. *Decided* that Mr Delano James (Canada) be invited as an invited expert to the next meeting, and the TPDP should discuss for the need of additional expertise in virology, and report back to the SC in November 2010 on the need for an additional virologist in the TPDP
4. *Noted* that the TPDP will discuss the composition of editorial teams at its next meeting, and that calls for experts for some protocols might have to be re-issued as a result.
5. *Agreed* that David Schindel (Barcode of Life) attend the next TPDP as an invited expert.
6. *Noted* the proposal that diagnostic protocols, when sent for member consultation, include in the cover note a list of experts/ institutions consulted and main discussion points during development.

11.2 Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine²⁸

108. The Secretariat lead presented the activities of the Panel.

109. The steward noted that the Panel would like to reinforce the cooperation with the TP on phytosanitary treatments.

110. In relation to the proposed evaluation of sulfuryl fluoride as a treatment for wood packaging, the TPFQ had indicated that there was scientific information suggesting that the treatment may be a greenhouse gas. One member noted that the TPFQ should consider the incremental effect of use of sulfuryl fluoride on the atmosphere if it is adopted as an ISPM 15 treatment. It may be that the effect is so small that the impact is not relevant to the environment. One positive effect might be a rapid reduction in the use of methyl bromide for this purpose if the sulfuryl fluoride treatment is adopted.

111. The TPFQ had proposed that a footnote linking to the explanatory document on ISPM 15 be included in ISPM 15, in order to link to correct information on the duration of the methyl bromide treatment. The issue to be clarified in ISPM 15 is whether the duration of the treatment is limited to 24h or could be expanded beyond 24 h. One member was concerned that a footnote be added to the ISPM when the explanatory document is not an adopted document. The SC did not agree to such link and asked the TPFQ to reconsider this issue and come back to the SC November 2010 with a solution to the issue of duration of treatment, and also work with the TPPT on this issue.

²⁸ 2010_SC_Apr_54, 55, 2009_SC_May_25

112. The SC reviewed the proposed revised specification for the TP noting that the specification had been amended to reflect the expanded focus of the TPFQ. This would not be sent for member consultation as the work of TPs is the responsibility of the SC.

113. The SC:

1. *Noted* the work being undertaken by the FAO Department of Forestry in developing a guide for foresters to aid in the implementation of ISPMs.
2. *Requested* the TPPT to consider the necessity of additional prescriptive guidance (e.g. checklists, questions and answers, etc.) which permits treatment developers to more easily meet the requirements of ISPM 28.
3. *Approved* the proposal resulting from the TPFQ's consideration of a paper on methyl bromide presented to CPM-4:
 - that information regarding a formula for calculating CT products during methyl bromide treatment and written procedures for dealing with partial treatment failures should be included in an explanatory document, and;
 - that guidance included in ISPM 15 on loading prior to conducting treatments is essential and should not be removed as proposed in the paper.
4. *Noted* that the TPFQ has requested the IFQRG to consider and provide technical responses to a number of scientific issues.
5. *Approved*, as a critical need in supporting the implementation of ISPM 15 (2009), the development of an explanatory document (author: Shane Sela; referees: TPFQ) which addresses:
 - methyl bromide guidance (including a proposed formula for calculating CT products and guidance on dealing with partial treatment failures);
 - heat treatment guidance, and;
 - clarification of procedures in achieving implementation of the standard
6. In relation to Annex 2 of ISPM 15:
 - *considered* there should be a clear link on the IPP between ISPMs and associated explanatory document
 - *asked* the TPFQ to consider whether and how Annex 2 might be revised to clarify issues relating to the duration of treatment
 - *noted* that the TPFQ will work with the TPPT on this issue.
7. *Approved* the change proposed by the TPFQ to the scope of the proposed standard on the international movement of seed of forest species, with modifications:
 - Those tree seeds that may carry regulated pests of risk to forests and are intended for propagation and use in urban, commercial and natural forests.
 - The scope does not include: seeds that are primarily used for fruit production.
 - A list of tree seeds commonly considered to be forest species would be included in Annex.
8. *Noted* the work programme of the TPFQ
9. *Approved* the revision of the specification for Technical Panels No. 4 (Technical panel on forest quarantine) as presented (Appendix 11).

11.3 Technical Panel on Fruit Flies²⁹

114. The Secretariat lead presented the activities of the TPFQ.

115. The steward of the draft ISPM for phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly management reported on the current stage of activities on the development of the standard, noting that while the draft standard itself was ready, the appendix had only recently been drafted and the complete text would be presented to a future meeting.

116. Regarding the two requests for the SC to make recommendations regarding technical assistance for fruit flies, it was noted that this is not the role of the SC to take such decisions. The TP had recommended several decisions on fruit fly specific capacity building issues, such as training assistance as part of capacity

²⁹ 2010_SC_Apr_38

building and pest risk assessment training, and consideration of discussion papers. It was noted that interventions had been made at CPM on the need for technical assistance in relation to fruit flies.

117. Regarding the guidance requested by the TPF on the format and placement of the environmental statement in draft ISPMs, there was disagreement on whether guidance was needed now or experience with drafting such statements should be gained first. The SC decided that the need for guidance on the environmental statement could be reconsidered at the May 2011 SC meeting.

118. The SC:

1. *Requested* that the Steward and the TPF work expeditiously, considering only the 84 comments submitted 14 days prior to CPM-5, to revise the draft for presentation to the November 2010 SC meeting, and
 - that the draft will maintain its format as an appendix,
 - that the SC considers waiving the 100-day member consultation, and
 - that the draft be submitted for adoption at CPM-6.
2. *Noted* the work programme for the TPF for 2009–2010.
3. *Noted* that, in revising ISPM 4 (currently on the work programme), particular attention should be paid to sections on surveillance, in relation to fruit flies
4. *Noted* the suggestion to consider updating ISPM 9, in particular the sections on surveillance, in relation to fruit flies, and *agreed* to consider this at its November 2010 meeting when reviewing the standard setting work programme
5. *Agreed* that the issue of guidance on the format and placement of the environmental statement in draft ISPMs be reconsidered at the May 2011 SC meeting.

11.4 Technical Panel for the Glossary³⁰

119. The Secretariat lead presented the activities of the TPG. The Secretariat noted that, if the work on consistency continues, the TPG may need to meet more frequently to support the large volume of work. He noted that there was no provision for funding of additional meetings. One member noted his concerns in relation to the information provided by the Secretariat regarding resource limitations in the Secretariat and that they would be unhappy if resources would be found for this work in preference to other work awaiting resources.

120. The TPG had asked whether a definition of cold treatment was needed. It was noted that the comment made at member consultation, raised in relation to Russian terminology, seemed to be a translation issue.

121. Several members expressed the need to make superseded versions of ISPMs accessible, despite their status as having been automatically revoked after the revision is adopted. The Secretariat advised that they had recently finalized an archiving policy, which would be put in the procedural manual, and all versions of ISPMs kept in the FAO library, both electronically and on paper. Members noted that these standards should also be available on the IPP.

122. The SC:

1. *Noted that* the annex to the October 2008 meeting report appended as the last page of the TPG October 2009 report be forwarded to the TPF and also be taken into account when preparing the next version of the annotated glossary.
2. *Noted* that recommendations in relation to member comments and to inconsistency in the use of terms for ISPMs under member consultation will be included in templates and transmitted to stewards (and the relevant SC meeting).
3. *Noted* the process for proposals for new terms and definitions, which will already be used for the present meeting. and this will be placed in the procedural manual
4. *Agreed* to the regular and one-off tasks of the TPG.
5. *Agreed* to suggestions for addition to the work programme of the following subjects (including those labelled as pending): *Domestic regulation; Exclusion; Area-wide control; Efficacy, effectiveness;*

³⁰ 2010_SC_Apr_16, 45

- Confinement; Quarantine station; Electronic certification ; Certificate, phytosanitary certificate; hitch hiker, Gray, legislation, plant pest; organism, pest, naturally occurring; re-export (of a consignment) ; Presence, occurrence ; Review of the use of and/or in adopted ISPMs; restriction; Pending: conditional hosts, host susceptibility and related terms ; Pending: country of origin.*
6. *Agreed that the TPG consults the TPPT on the terms effectiveness and efficacy.*
 7. *Noted that hitch hiker, legislation, Gray, plant pest will be proposed for deletion only in the next batch of Glossary amendments (i.e. after TPG 2010 meeting).*
 8. *Agreed to the TPG suggestions to not work on the following terms: Revision of consignment; traceability/trace-back; revision of containment.*
 9. *noted that FAO Legal Service was requested to advise on the status of old versions of standards, and on the appendix to ISPM 5 on CBD terminology*
 10. *Noted that “explanation of glossary terms” should be a standing agenda item for TPG meetings and explanations will be added to the annotated glossary.*
 11. *Noted that consistency work on ISPMs 10, 13, 14, 22 and supplement 1 to ISPM 5 was presented to the SC in November 2009, together with general recommendations, recommendations on revision of standards and details on the work and process for activities with Spanish.*
 12. *Agreed that the TPG develops a process for reviewing consistency across standards in some cases, and making horizontal consistency changes across all standards (and this be added to the work plan).*
 13. *Noted that the TPG will assemble and maintain a list of general consistency changes, which have to be looked at for all standards and could be part of the annotated glossary.*
 14. *Noted the remarks on the consistency process and agree that general rules applied for the analysis could also be written down*
 15. *Requested the TPG to continue work on consistency, and work next on ISPMs 8, 9, 5 (possibly 20, 23) on which work has already started*
 16. *Noted that the TPG gave input to the Secretariat on issues related to ISPMs in languages.*
 17. *Requested that the Secretariat informs the Ozone Secretariat of two errors in the 2007 UNEP document (UNEP/OzL.Pro.WG.1/27/5), not repeated in the Montreal Protocol Secretariat’s brochure of 2007.*
 18. *Requested the Secretariat, to clarify with the Ozone Secretariat, the issue of whether RNQPs can be submitted, or not, to pre-shipment fumigation under the Montreal Protocol.*
 19. *Noted that the next published version of the annotated glossary (i.e. as an explanatory document) will be finalized at the October 2010 TPG meeting, for presentation to the SC.*
 20. *Noted that, regarding the list of terms (in the annotated glossary) considered but not added to the glossary, it should attempt to specify who/which group proposed each term and the reasons for rejection.*
 21. *Noted that the TPG finalised the draft revision of Supplement 1 to ISPM 5 on Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of official control in relation to regulated pests and not widely distributed in relation to quarantine pests which are present in an area.*
 22. *Recognized that the knowledge of “first generation” TPG members (John Hedley, Ian Smith and Reinouw Bast-Tjeerde) is essential to the proper operation of the TPG and meaningful decisions on IPPC terminology and consistency of ISPMs, and agree and formalize that, once they have resigned from the TPG, “first generation” TPG members be considered to participate at future TPG meetings as invited experts with the ability to request travel assistance from the IPPC Secretariat.*
 23. *Agreed to add a Russian-speaking member to the composition of the TPG and note that a call will be made*
 24. *Noted that the structure of ISPMs will be defined in detail in the style guide for ISPMs, and previous TPG recommendations regarding ISPM style and content will be considered when developing the style guide.*
 25. *Requested the Secretariat to consult the Ozone Secretariat on the draft Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in relation to the Glossary after the TPG finalizes it in October 2010 and before presenting it to the SC for consideration for member consultation.*
 26. *Selected Wang Yuxi as Chinese-speaking member of the TPG*
 27. *Noted that a call will be made for a Spanish-speaking member.*

11.5 Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments³¹

123. The steward of the TP presented the activities of the Panel.
124. Regarding the irradiation treatments for *Cylas formicarius* and *Euscepes postfasciatus*, which had been returned to the SC by CPM-5, the SC debated whether these should be sent back to the TPPT or removed from the work programme. The issue raised was that live adults that remained after treatment may be able to produce F1 progeny after irradiation. If adults were trapped in the importing country, it would be very difficult to determine whether they are sterile, if there was a treatment failure, or to determine their origin. Therefore it would be difficult for the importing country to determine whether it should implement a control and eradication programme.
125. It was also noted that there is also a generic irradiation treatment in development and the TPPT will need guidance in the future on how to deal with this issue. One member noted that the ISPM 18 itself might need some additional wording to explain this issue, but this was not supported.
126. One member wondered about having a category of ISPMs not adopted by all IPPC contracting parties, but the SC did not consider this was appropriate.
127. It was decided that the TPPT would be requested to add some text in these two irradiation treatments explaining the difficulties, in particular linked to the difficulty induced in differentiating sterile and non-sterile adults in traps.
128. The SC:
1. *Approved* the revision to Specification for Technical Panels No. 3 (Technical Panel on phytosanitary treatments) (Appendix 12)
 2. *Noted* that the TPPT recommended a vapour heat treatment for *Cucumis melo* var. *reticulatus* for *Bactrocera cucurbitae* and the Secretariat will format the treatment and submit it to the SC through the special process.
 3. *Noted* that treatment submissions where there has been no response from the submitter will be deleted from the TPPT work programme if there is no response to a registered letter which was sent by the Secretariat in 2009
 4. *Noted* the following administrative procedures that have been revised by the TPPT will be added to the IPPC procedural manual: Prioritization criteria for proposed phytosanitary treatments and score definitions, Procedures for the production of phytosanitary treatments, Submission form for phytosanitary treatments and Checklist for evaluating treatment submissions
 5. *Asked the* TPPT to consider the two irradiation treatments for *Cylas formicarius* and *Euscepes postfasciatus*, and propose some additional wording explaining the problems that may arise from possible detections in the importing country from treated commodities.
 6. *Noted* that the TPPT is reviewing 9 fruit fly heat treatments, working to resolve member comments on 8 fruit fly cold treatments, 2 irradiation treatments and reviewing 5 new submissions of fruit fly cold treatments.
 7. *Noted* indexes are being developed for all adopted treatments
 8. *Thanked* Japan for hosting and partially funding the next meeting of the TPPT in July 2010.
 9. *Noted* that at their next meeting the TPPT will discuss new submissions, submissions from previous years and treatments returned by the SC in the following order of priority: ISPM 15 treatments, fruit fly cold treatments, fruit fly heat treatments and irradiation treatments.

12. UPDATE ON THE STANDARD SETTING WORK PROGRAMME³²

129. The Secretariat presented the work programme as adopted by CPM-5, and changes arising, in particular in relation to adoption dates and the need for new stewards. (Appendix 13)

³¹ 2010_SC_Apr_56

³² 2010_SC_Apr_59

130. Regarding the revision of ISPMs 7 and 12, the aim was to have a full discussion at SC November 2010 before presentation at CPM-6. One member noted that intersessional work may be required to resolve outstanding issues between SC-7 and SC November, and wondered if the SC should agree on options for such work. The Secretariat mentioned a few options: designating authority to the SC-7, waiving the requirement to have 3 weeks for email discussion, allowing email consultation with SC, or convening a small working group with volunteers from the SC and possibly invited experts. One member noted that there might be a need for a wider consultation. It was noted that the SC-7 might also propose options for further discussion by the SC in cases where no conclusion could be reached.
131. The Secretariat was concerned that none of the four SC members from the Latin America and Caribbean region were able to attend the SC-7, and encouraged members, in particular from that region, to provide written comments on the revision of ISPMs 7 and 12 to other SC-7 members, so that their concerns could be considered by the SC-7 when redrafting the texts.
132. Two members wondered if the SC-7 should take place before the SC in the future in order to allow discussion on issues raised at SC-7. The Secretariat noted that, if it was the case, it would not be possible to meet deadlines for translations of ISPMs produced by the SC for member consultation.
133. One SC member wondered if the appendix to ISPM 12 on Phyto e-cert could be developed in a faster way than decided by the CPM, which depends on extra funding. The Secretariat noted that the CPM decision should be followed, and alternative proposals would have to be agreed by the CPM.
134. The SC:
1. *Agreed* to the priority to attempt to have a redrafted ISPM 7 and 12 for the SC November 2010 in a form that could be finalized for adoption at CPM-6.
 2. *Agreed* that the SC-7 should have the authority to do what is needed to move the work forward, including, if a working group is needed, that members of the SC and original EWG may be involved.
 3. *Decided* that:
 - documents should be posted at least 1 month prior to the SC November 2010 meeting, and
 - the SC-7 should keep the SC informed throughout the process in case there are other options that might be necessary, and
 - decisions may be made by the SC via email in this regard.

12.1 Adjustments to stewards³³

135. The steward of the draft on Pre-clearance noted that he would retire from the public service and noted that a replacement steward would have to be nominated at the SC November 2010 or in early 2011.
136. The SC reviewed and made modifications to stewards for draft ISPMs. The stewards are indicated in the work programme in Appendix 13.

13. BUSINESS CARRIED OVER FROM MAY 2009 AND NOVEMBER 2009 SC MEETINGS

13.1 Categorization of commodities³⁴

137. Agenda item deferred to a future SC meeting.

13.2 Consultant's report on reorganization of ISPMs with attachments³⁵

138. One member presented the work done at the request of CPM-3 to consider the reorganization of ISPMs based on a proposal from Japan. The consultant had also considered practices in other organizations, such as Codex Alimentarius and OIE.

³³ 2010_SC_Apr_53

³⁴ 2009_SC_May_43, 52, 54

³⁵ 2009_SC_May_31, 31a, 31b

139. Another member explained that the consultant had recommended to use a system in line with the OIE and in line with the IPPC framework for standards, to identify gaps that may exist in the IPPC framework for standards, and to propose a new way of organizing standards, proposing the name *Code of phytosanitary measures*. Movement of text within ISPMs might be considered later. When the consultant did his review, there were no treatments, diagnostic protocols or IPPC recommendations. This may raise additional issues in relation to reorganization. The proposal on technical manuals would also have to be considered when reorganizing ISPMs.
140. The Secretariat noted that web technology has advanced since the study had been conducted and would allow regrouping of standards into the IPPC framework for standards, without renumbering them. He urged the SC to give the Secretariat freedom to group standards in a format that is easily accessible and clear. One member noted that the existing draft IPPC framework for standards would require some revision before being used as a model for a structure on the IPP.
141. The Secretariat noted that the system should remain flexible. Some SC members agreed with this and broadly agreed with the recommendations in the consultant's report. The Secretariat invited the SC to provide comments as the system gets implemented.

13.3 Proposal for technical manual³⁶

142. Agenda item deferred to a future SC meeting.

13.4 Discussion paper: Classification of comments on IPPC documents in country consultation (Jens Unger)³⁷

143. The Secretariat noted that four categories of comments would be used in the 2010 member consultation: technical, substantial, editorial and translation.

14. AGENDA ITEMS DEFERRED TO FUTURE SC MEETING

7.5 DRAFT REVISION: Not widely distributed. REV1 Supplement 1 to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) - *high priority*

9.3 REVISED SPECIFICATION: Framework for national phytosanitary inspection procedures - *high priority*

9.4 REVISED SPECIFICATION: Regulating stored products in international trade - *normal priority*

10.4 DRAFT SPECIFICATION: International movement of cut flowers and foliage - *normal priority*

10.5 DRAFT SPECIFICATION: Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) - *normal priority*

13.1 Categorization of commodities

13.3 Proposal for technical manual

15. REVIEW OF STANDARD SETTING CALENDAR

144. The Secretariat presented the draft standard setting calendar for 2010-2011³⁸.

16. PRESENTATION - ONLINE SYSTEM FOR COMPILING MEMBER COMMENTS

145. The Secretariat presented the development of the online system for compiling member comments, aimed at streamlining the comment system for members, and that may aid in addressing resource issues for Secretariat. The system was developed taking into account users with low speed internet access. It was noted that submission of comments on paper will still be accepted, in a first phase, for users that have limited internet access.

³⁶ 2009_SC_May_15

³⁷ 2010_SC_Apr_46

³⁸ 2010_SC_Apr_52

146. A prototype was expected in July 2010 and the system would be launched for the 2011 member consultation. A few features were stressed:

- Contact points can invite some in-county reviewers to submit comments through the system
- Contact point can verify comments, and can export them as pdf, xls, etc.
- Optional sharing of country comments at the time of submitting them to the Secretariat
- Options to sort comments in different ways
- Comments can be exported to the steward as pdf or xls files, and steward would not be working in the system, but in exported file.

147. SC members had the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback. The usefulness of a system allowing members to work offline, and upload their comments in bulk into the system, was stressed by several members. The Secretariat noted that this had been considered, but would require extra funding and was not planned in the first version. It was also noted that flexibility is requested to use the system also for collecting comments at the regional level and that contact points should also have the possibility to delegate their responsibility for reviewing and accepting comments.

148. SC members were invited to provide feedback on the presentation by 10 May. The Secretariat noted that testing would be carried out during July and August and called upon SC members to take part in the testing when solicited.

17. UPDATE ON REGIONAL WORKSHOPS FOR DRAFT ISPMs

149. The Secretariat presented a paper on the regional workshops for draft ISPMs³⁹. It was noted that presentations by stewards of draft standards for member consultation needed to be sent to the Secretariat by 15 June. The Secretariat noted that SC members were encouraged to take part in the regional workshops for the review of draft ISPMs, and SC members were invited to contact the Secretariat if they were interested.

Noting the provision in the paper that stewards should engage SC members in translating presentations, SC members agreed that this issue should not be a task neither for stewards nor SC members.

150. The SC:

1. *Advised* that stewards and SC members would not be involved in the translation of presentations for regional workshops for the review of draft ISPMs.

18. DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT SC MEETING

151. The next meeting of the SC is scheduled on 1-5 November 2010, Rome, Italy.

19. EVALUATION OF MEETING PROCESS

152. This issue was raised under agenda item 5. No further comment was made under this agenda item.

20. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

153. The report was adopted.

21. CLOSE

154. The Chairperson thanked the SC, IPPC Secretariat, interpreters and FAO staff involved in the meeting for their cooperation. The Chair congratulated the SC on the work achieved and closed the meeting.

³⁹ 2010_SC_Apr_57

AGENDA
Standards Committee

26 – 30 April 2010

FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy, German room, C-269

26 April start time 10:00

Daily schedule: 09:00-12:00 and 13:30-16:30

		AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT
Opening of the meeting			
		Welcome by Secretary	
1.		Election of SC chair (SC Vice-chair)	2010_SC_Apr_51
2.		Election of the rapporteur (SC Chair)	
3.		Adoption of the agenda (SC Chair)	2010_SC_Apr_01
Administrative matters			
4.		Meeting information (Secretariat)	
	4.1	Documents list	2010_SC_Apr_02
	4.2	Participants List	2010_SC_Apr_03
	4.3	Local Information	2010_SC_Apr_04
	4.4	November 2009 meeting evaluation	2010_SC_Apr_18
5.		Updates from other relevant bodies	
	5.1.	Items arising from CPM-5	2010_SC_Apr_58
	5.2.	Updates from the Secretariat (November 2009– March 2010)	2010_SC_Apr_40
6.		Standards Committee	
	6.1.	Report of the SC Nov 2009	2010_SC_Apr_19
	6.2.	Summary of SC decisions by email (Nov 2009-March 2010)	2010_SC_Apr_41
Review of ISPMs and specifications			
7.		Draft ISPMs for review and approval for 2010 member consultation	
	7.1.	DRAFT ISPM: Pest risk analysis to determine whether plants proposed for import are quarantine pests <i>high priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_05
		SPECIFICATION NO. 44 (REV.1) Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests.	2010_SC_Apr_20
		EWG meeting report May 2009 Paris	2010_SC_Apr_21
		Recommendations from EWG for changes to ISPM 11	2010_SC_Apr_47
		In-session documents	2010_SC_Apr_61, 62
	7.2.	DRAFT ISPM: Integrated measures approach for managing pest risks associated with international trade of plants for planting <i>high priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_06
		SPECIFICATION NO. 34 Pest risk management for plants for planting in international trade.	2010_SC_Apr_22
		EWG meeting report December 2008 Bet Dagan	2010_SC_Apr_23
	7.3.	Draft ISPM: Submission of new treatments for inclusion in ISPM 15 <i>high priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_07
		SPECIFICATION NO. 31: Revision of ISPM 15 (<i>Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade</i>)	2010_SC_Apr_24
		Extracts of relevant TPFQ meetings	2010_SC_Apr_39_Rev.1
	7.4.	DRAFT ISPM: Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood - <i>high priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_08
		SPECIFICATION NO. 46 Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood	2010_SC_Apr_25
		Extracts of relevant TPFQ meetings	2010_SC_Apr_26
	7.5.	DRAFT REVISION: Not widely distributed. REV1 Supplement 1 to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) - <i>high priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_09
		SPECIFICATION NO. 33 Supplement to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>): Guidelines for the interpretation and application of the phrase <i>not</i>	2010_SC_Apr_27

		<i>widely distributed</i> in relation to quarantine pests.	
		--EWG meeting report November 2006 Copenhagen --Extracts of TPG report October 2009 Rome --Extracts of relevant SC and SC-7 meetings	2010_SC_Apr_28 2010_SC_Apr_29 2010_SC_Apr_30
8.		Select equivalent of five draft ISPMs for member consultation	
	8.1.	Guidelines for choosing equivalent of 5 draft ISPMs	2010_SC_Apr_12
	8.2.	Draft ISPMs previously approved for member consultation	
		DRAFT ISPM: Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies - <i>normal priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_10
		DIAGNOSTIC PROTOCOL for <i>Trogoderma granarium</i> - <i>normal priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_17
		DIAGNOSTIC PROTOCOL for <i>Plum pox virus</i> - <i>normal priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_11
		TREATMENT: Irradiation treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> – <i>high priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_49
9.		Draft specifications for review of member comments & approval by SC	
	9.1.	REVISED SPECIFICATION: Experimental protocol to determine host status of fruits to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation - <i>high priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_31
		Compiled comments	2010_SC_Apr_32
	9.2.	REVISED SPECIFICATION: Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade - <i>high priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_33
		Compiled comments	2010_SC_Apr_34
	9.3.	REVISED SPECIFICATION: Framework for national phytosanitary inspection procedures - <i>high priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_35
		Compiled comments	2010_SC_Apr_36
		Notes from steward for consideration by the SC	2010_SC_Apr_37
	9.4.	REVISED SPECIFICATION: Regulating stored products in international trade - <i>normal priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_42
		Compiled comments	2010_SC_Apr_43
10.		Draft specifications for approval for member consultation	
	10.1.	DRAFT SPECIFICATION: Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts - <i>high priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_48
	10.2.	DRAFT SPECIFICATION: Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities - <i>normal priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_13
	10.3.	DRAFT SPECIFICATION: Handling and disposal of waste moved internationally in conveyances - <i>normal priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_14
	10.4.	DRAFT SPECIFICATION: International movement of cut flowers and foliage - <i>normal priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_15
	10.5.	DRAFT SPECIFICATION: Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) - <i>normal priority</i>	2010_SC_Apr_50
Review of Technical Panels			
11.		Technical Panels	
	11.1.	Technical panel on diagnostic protocols	
		Update on activities since May 2009	2010_SC_Apr_44
		Review of technical panel	
	11.2.	Technical panel on forest quarantine	
		Meeting report: Nanjing China July 2009	2010_SC_Apr_55
		Update on activities since July 2009	2010_SC_Apr_54
		Draft specification of the TPFQ	2009_SC_May_25
		Review of technical panel	
	11.3.	Technical panel on fruit flies	
		Meeting report: Vienna, Austria, September 2009	2010_SC_Apr_38
		Review of technical panel	
	11.4.	Technical panel for the glossary	
		Meeting report: Rome, Italy June 2009	2010_SC_Apr_16
		Meeting report: Rome, Italy October 2009	2010_SC_Apr_45

		Review of technical panel	
11.5.		Technical panel on phytosanitary treatments	
		Update on activities since May 2009	2010_SC_Apr_56
		Review of technical panel	
12.		Update on the standard setting work programme	2010_SC_Apr_59
	12.1.	Adjustments to stewards	2010_SC_Apr_53
Other Business			
13.		Business carried over from May 2009 and November 2009 SC Meetings	
	13.1.	Categorization of commodities	2009_SC_May_43 2009_SC_May_52 2009_SC_May_54
	13.2.	Consultant's report on reorganization of ISPMs with attachments	2009_SC_May_31 2009_SC_May_31a 2009_SC_May_31b
	13.3.	Proposal for technical manual	2009_SC_May_15
	13.4.	Discussion paper: Classification of comments on IPPC documents in country consultation	2010_SC_Apr_46
14.		Agenda items deferred to future SC Meeting	
15.		Review of standard setting calendar	2010_SC_Apr_52
16.		Presentation -- online system for compiling member comments	
17.		Update on regional workshops for draft ISPMs	2010_SC_Apr_57
Conclusion of the meeting			
18.		Date and venue of the next SC meeting	
19.		Evaluation of meeting process	
20.		Adoption of the report	
21.		Close	

Standards Committee, 26-30 April 2010
FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy, German room, C-269
DOCUMENTS LIST

DOCUMENT NUMBER	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (Prepared by)	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
2010_SC_Apr_01	4.5	Provisional agenda REV 1b (<i>Secretariat</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	8 April
2010_SC_Apr_02	4.1	Documents list (<i>Secretariat</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	8 April
2010_SC_Apr_03	4.2	Participants List REV 2 (<i>Secretariat</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	8 April
2010_SC_Apr_04	4.3	Local information (<i>Secretariat</i>)	SC Only	15 March
2010_SC_Apr_05_ DraftISPM	7.1	Draft ISPM: Pest risk analysis to determine whether plants proposed for import are quarantine pests (<i>EWG</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_06_ DraftISPM	7.2	Draft ISPM: Integrated measures approach for managing pest risks associated with international trade of plants for planting (<i>EWG</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_07_ DraftISPM	7.3	Draft ISPM: Submission of new treatments for inclusion in ISPM 15 (<i>TPFQ</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_08_ DraftISPM	7.4	Draft ISPM: Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood (<i>TPFQ</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_09_ DraftISPM	7.5	Draft revision: Not widely distributed supplement 1 to ISPM 5 (REV1) (<i>TPG</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	7 April
2010_SC_Apr_10_ DraftISPM	8.2	Draft ISPM: Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies (<i>TPFF</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_11_ DraftISPM	8.2	Draft Diagnostic protocol: <i>Plum pox virus</i> (<i>TPDP</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_12	8.1	Guidelines for choosing equivalent of 5 draft ISPMs (<i>Secretariat</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_13_ Draftspec	10.2	Draft Specification: Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities (<i>Steward</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_14_ Draftspec	10.3	Draft Specification: Handling and disposal of waste moved internationally in conveyances (<i>Steward</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_15_ Draftspec	10.4	Draft Specification: International movement of cut flowers and foliage (<i>Steward</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_16_ Mtgrpt	11.4	Meeting Report: TPG meeting June 2009 (<i>TPG</i>)	Public (not restricted)	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_17_ DraftISPM	8.2	Draft Diagnostic protocol: <i>Trogoderma granarium</i> (<i>TPDP</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_18_ Mtginfo	4.3	November 2009 meeting evaluation (<i>Secretariat</i>)	SC Only	12 March

DOCUMENT NUMBER	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (Prepared by)	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
2010_SC_Apr_19_Mtgrpt	6.1	Meeting Report: SC Nov 2009	Public (not restricted)	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_20_spec	7.1	Specification No. 44: PRA for plants as quarantine pests	Public (not restricted)	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_21_Mtgrpt	7.1	Meeting report: EWG PRA for plants as quarantine pests, May 2009	Public (not restricted)	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_22_spec	7.2	Specification No 34: Pest risk management plants for planting	Public (not restricted)	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_23_Mtgrpt	7.2	Meeting report: EWG Pest risk management plants for planting, December 2008	Public (not restricted)	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_24_spec	7.3	Specification No 31: Revision of ISPM 15	Public (not restricted)	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_25_spec	7.4	Specification No 46: Management of phytosanitary risks intl movmt wood	Public (not restricted)	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_26_	7.4	Extracts relevant TPFQ reports (Int. movement wood) (<i>Secretariat</i>)	SC Only	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_27_spec	7.5	Specification No. 33 Not widely distributed	Public (not restricted)	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_28_Mtgrpt	7.5	Meeting report: EWG Not widely distributed, December 2006	Public (not restricted)	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_29_Mtgrpt	7.5	Extracts TPG Report (Not widely distributed) December 2009 (<i>Secretariat</i>)	SC Only	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_30_Mtgrpt	7.5	Extracts SC & SC7 Reports (not widely distributed) (<i>Secretariat</i>)	SC Only	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_31_Draftspec	9.1	Draft specification: Host status fruit fly (<i>Steward</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_32_Rev01_Comments	9.1	Compiled comments: Host status fruit fly	Public (not restricted)	1 April
2010_SC_Apr_33_Draftspec	9.2	Draft specification: Minimizing pest movement by sea containers (<i>Steward</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_34_Comments	9.2	Compiled comments: Minimizing pest movement by sea containers	Public (not restricted)	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_35_Draftspec	9.3	Draft specification: National phytosanitary inspection procedures (<i>Steward</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_36_Comments	9.3	Compiled comments: National phytosanitary inspection procedures	Public (not restricted)	12 March

DOCUMENT NUMBER	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (Prepared by)	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
2010_SC_Apr_37_	9.3	Stewards notes: National phytosanitary inspection procedures (<i>Steward</i>)	SC Only	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_38_ Mtgrpt	11.3	Meeting report: TPFQ September 2009	Public (not restricted)	12 March
2010_SC_Apr_39	7.3	Extracts relevant TPFQ reports (Submission of new treatments for inclusion in ISPM 15) (<i>Secretariat</i>) REV 1	SC Only	23 April
2010_SC_Apr_40	5.2	Updates from the Secretariat (<i>Secretariat</i>)	SC Only	16 March
2010_SC_Apr_41	6.2	Summary of SC decisions by email (<i>Secretariat</i>)	SC Only	16 March
2010_SC_Apr_42_ Draftspec	9.4	Draft specification: Regulating stored products in international trade (<i>Steward</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	19 March
2010_SC_Apr_43_ Comments	9.4	Compiled comments: Regulating stored products in international trade	CPs, RPPOs and SC	19 March
2010_SC_Apr_44_ TPupdate	11.1	Update TPDP since May 2009 (<i>Secretariat</i>)	SC Only	19 March
2010_SC_Apr_45_ Mtgrpt	11.4	Meeting report: TPG, October 2009	Public (not restricted)	19 March
2010_SC_Apr_46_ Discpaper	13.4	Discussion paper: Classification of comments on IPPC documents in country consultation (<i>UNGER</i>)	SC Only	19 March
2010_SC_Apr_47	7.1	Recommended changes to ISPM 11 from EWG on plants as quarantine pests (<i>EWG</i>)	SC Only	19 March
2010_SC_Apr_48_ Draftspec	10.1	Draft specification: Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts (<i>Steward</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	19 March
2010_SC_Apr_49_ Draft ISPM	8.2	Irradiation treatment for <i>Ceratitits Capitata</i> (<i>TPPT</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	7 April
2010_SC_Apr_50_ Draft spec	10.5	Draft specification: Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20) (<i>Steward</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	7 April
2010_SC_Apr_51	1.0	Election of the SC chair (<i>Secretariat</i>)	SC Only	1 April
2010_SC_Apr_52	15.0	Review of standard setting calendar (<i>Secretariat</i>)	SC Only	1 April
2010_SC_Apr_53	12.1	Adjustment to stewards (<i>Secretariat</i>)	SC Only	1 April
2010_SC_Apr_54	11.2	TPFQ: update on activities since July 2009 (<i>Secretariat</i>)	SC Only	1 April
2010_SC_Apr_55_ Mtgrpt	11.2	TPFQ meeting report Nanjing China July 2009	Public (not restricted)	1 April
2010_SC_Apr_56	11.5	TPPT: update on activities since May 2009 (<i>Secretariat</i>)	SC Only	1 April
2010_SC_Apr_57	17	Update on regional workshops for draft ISPMs (<i>Secretariat</i>)	SC Only	8 April
2010_SC_Apr_58	5.1	Items arising from CPM-5 (<i>Secretariat</i>)	SC Only	7 April

DOCUMENT NUMBER	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (Prepared by)	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
2010_SC_Apr_59	12.0	Update on the standard setting work programme (<i>Secretariat</i>)	SC Only	23 April
2010_SC_Apr_60	11.5	<i>Specification for Technical Panels No. 3 - Rev. 2</i>	CPs, RPPOs and SC	23 April
2010_SC_Apr_61	7.1	PRA for plants as pests: note from evening working group	SC Only	28 April
2010_SC_Apr_62	7.1	PRA for plants as pests: revised recommendations for further work	SC Only	30 April
2009_SC_May_25	11.2	Draft specification for the TPFQ (<i>TPFQ</i>)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	7 April
2009_SC_May_43	13.1	Korea Categorization Commodities (<i>Korea</i>)	SC Only	15 March
2009_SC_May_52	13.1	Discussion paper from Japan on technical issue related to adopted standard: Categorization of Commodities (<i>Japan</i>)	SC Only	15 March
2009_SC_May_54	13.1	Discussion paper from Chile on technical issues related to adopted standard: Categorization of Commodities (<i>Chile</i>)	SC Only	15 March
2009_SC_May_31	13.2	Consultant's report on re-organizing international standards for phytosanitary measure (<i>Ogden</i>)	SC Only	15 March
2009_SC_May_31a	13.2	Consultant's report on re-organizing international standards for phytosanitary measures (<i>Ogden</i>)	SC Only	15 March
2009_SC_May_31b	13.2	Consultants report on reorganization of ISPMs with attachments (<i>Ogden</i>)	SC Only	15 March
2009_SC_May_15	13.3	Proposal for technical manual (<i>COSAVE</i>)	SC Only	7 April

SUMMARY OF SC DECISIONS BY EMAIL NOVEMBER 2009 – MAY 2010

By email since November 2009 the SC:

- Decided, on the basis of email discussion between 23 November 2009 and 26 February 2010, to recommend the following five amended irradiation treatments for adoption at CPM-5 through the Regular process:
 - Annex 6 (Irradiation treatment for *Conotrachelus nenuphar*)
 - Annex 8 (Irradiation treatment for *Cylas formicarius elegantulus*)
 - Annex 9 (Irradiation treatment for *Euscepes postfasciatus*)
 - Annex 11 (Irradiation treatment for *Grapholita molesta*)
 - Annex 12 (Irradiation treatment for *Grapholita molesta* under hypoxia).
- Decided to withdraw the draft irradiation treatment for Annex 13 (for *Omphisa anastomosalis*) from the IPPC Standard Setting Work Programme on the basis of a recommendation of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT).
- Decided, on the basis of email discussion between 21 November 2009 and 12 January 2010, to send the draft protocol for *Thrips palmi* (as revised by the TPDP to incorporate comments from the June-September 2009 member comment period) to CPM-5 for adoption.
- Decided, on the basis of email discussion between 21 November 2009 and 13 January 2010, to recommend that the CPM-5 add the following seven new topics (and their associated priorities) to the IPPC Standard Setting Work Programme.
 1. *International movement of seed* (high priority)
 2. Revision of ISPM 4: *Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas* (high priority)
 3. *Biological control for forest pests* (normal priority)
 4. *Establishment and maintenance of regulated areas upon outbreak detection in fruit fly free areas* (for inclusion as Annex 1 of ISPM 26) (normal priority)
 5. Treatment: *Phytosanitary treatments for movement of soil and growing media in association with plants in international trade* (normal priority)
 6. Revision of ISPM 6: *Guidelines for surveillance* (normal priority)
 7. Revision of ISPM 8: *Determination of pest status in an area* (normal priority).
- Identified six experts to attend the Expert Working Group (EWG) on *Movement of soil and growing media in association with plants in international trade* (Specification No. 43) in Ottawa, Canada, from 14-18 June 2010. A proposal for a backup EWG member from the USA was not accepted due to concerns that this would result in overrepresentation from North America. Instead, the SC chose not to identify a backup member at this stage.

**INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR
PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES****DRAFT STANDARD****INTEGRATED MEASURES APPROACH FOR PLANTS
FOR PLANTING IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

(201-)
DRAFT
DOCUMENT

Date of this document	29 April 2010
Document category	Draft ISPM
Current document stage	Draft for member consultation 2010
Origin	Work programme topic: Plants for planting (including movement, post-entry quarantine and certification programmes)
Major stages	Specification No. 34, May 2006. Revised after review by SC-7, May 2008. Draft sent for member consultation by April 2010 SC.
Notes	File template: IPPCStyles, April 2010. Numbered ¶.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	33
Scope.....	33
References.....	33
Definitions	33
Outline of requirements	33
BACKGROUND.....	34
REQUIREMENTS	34
1. Factors that Affect the Pest Risk of Plants for Planting.....	34
1.1 Pest factors that affect risk	34
1.2 Plant-related factors that affect risk.....	35
1.3 Production factors that affect risk.....	35
1.4 Intended uses that affect risk	36
2. Application of Risk Mitigation Measures.....	36
3. Integrated Measures Approach	36
3.1 General integrated measures	36
3.1.1 Authorization of places of production.....	36
3.1.2 Requirements for the place of production	36
3.2 Integrated measures in high-risk situations	37
3.2.1 Requirements for the place of production in high-risk situations	37
3.2.1.1 Place of production manual.....	37
3.2.1.2 Pest management plan	38
3.2.1.3 Crop protection specialist.....	39
3.2.1.4 Training of employees.....	39
3.2.1.5 Examination of plant material	39
3.2.1.6 Packing and transportation	39
3.2.1.7 Internal audits.....	39
3.2.1.8 Records.....	39
3.2.2 Non-compliance with requirements for the place of production.....	40
3.2.2.1 Critical non-compliance	40
3.2.2.2 Non-critical non-compliance.....	40
4. Responsibilities of the NPPO of the Exporting Country	40
4.1 Establishing integrated measures approaches	41
4.2 Authorization of places of production.....	41
4.3 Oversight of authorized places of production	41
4.4 Export inspections and issuance of phytosanitary certificates	41
4.5 Providing adequate information	41
5. Responsibilities of the NPPO of the Importing Country	41
5.1 Traceability procedures	42
5.2 Auditing by the importing NPPO.....	42
APPENDIX 1: Examples of pest management measures to reduce the phytosanitary risk of plants for planting	43
APPENDIX 2: Examples of non-compliance	45

[1] INTRODUCTION

[2] Scope

[3] This standard provides guidelines for the development and implementation of integrated measures to manage the pest risks associated with the production and international movement of plants for planting (excluding seeds). It outlines factors relevant for the determination of the risk level associated with particular plants for planting and places of production, as well as risk-based application of measures and the responsibilities of the national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) of the importing and exporting countries.

[4] References

[5] **ISPM 2.** 2007. *Framework for pest risk analysis*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[6] **ISPM 5.** 2009. *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[7] **ISPM 11.** 2004. *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[8] **ISPM 12.** 2001. *Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[9] **ISPM 13.** 2001. *Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[10] **ISPM 14.** 2002. *The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[11] **ISPM 20.** 2004. *Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[12] **ISPM 21.** 2004. *Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[13] **ISPM 32.** 2009. *Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[14] Definitions

[15] Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in the present standard can be found in ISPM 5:2009.

[16] Outline of requirements

[17] This standard provides guidance for the use of integrated measures to manage the pest risks that plants for planting (excluding seeds) pose as a pathway for regulated pests and to meet the phytosanitary requirements of the importing NPPO. The use of integrated measures approaches requires the involvement of the NPPOs of both the importing and exporting countries, as well as producers, and relies on pest risk management measures applied throughout the production and distribution processes.

[18] The standard provides guidance on two types of integrated measures approaches: general integrated measures and integrated measures for high-risk situations. Requirements for establishing the integrated measures and for authorizing places of production are also provided. Specific guidance is included on non-compliances in high-risk situations.

[19] The standard also provides general guidance for identifying and categorizing the risks that may be associated with particular types of plants for planting. These risks should be taken into account when determining the strength of measures applied in a particular situation.

[20] BACKGROUND

[21] Several ISPMs on pest risk analysis (PRA) provide general guidance on pest risk management (for example, ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 11:2004, ISPM 14:2002, ISPM 21:2004, ISPM 32:2009). Although these standards provide general guidance for PRA for plants for planting, such plants are generally considered to pose a higher pest risk than other plant products and therefore additional specific guidance is needed. In any case, the conclusions from pest risk analysis should be used to decide the appropriate measures to reduce the risk to an acceptable level for the importing country.

[22] Export inspections of consignments of plants for planting has limitations:

- Some pests may be difficult to detect visually, particularly at low pest population densities.
- Disease symptoms may be latent or masked at the time of inspection (e.g. as a result of pesticide use, dormancy of plants at time of shipping or removal of symptomatic leaves).
- The type of packaging and physical state of the consignment can influence the rigour of inspection.
- Alternative or supplementary non-visual detection methods for many plant pests, particularly pathogens, are not available.

[23] An integrated measures approach for pest risk management may provide an alternative or supplement to single measures (particularly point of entry inspections) to meet the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country. The use of integrated measures for pest risk management requires not only the participation of the NPPO of the exporting country but also the participation of the producer throughout all the production stages of the plants for planting.

[24] An integrated measures approach also has the advantage of better managing the risk not only of known pests that are difficult to detect based on export or import inspections but also of organisms that are unknown to science, contaminating pests and organisms that are not quarantine pests in the country of origin.

[25] The application of an integrated measures approach may also provide an alternative to post-entry quarantine or prohibition.

[26] REQUIREMENTS**[27] 1. Factors that Affect the Pest Risk of Plants for Planting**

[28] The factors described in sections 1.1 to 1.4 should be considered by the importing NPPO when conducting a PRA to identify the appropriate combination of measures to meet its phytosanitary requirements.

[29] These factors should also be considered by the exporting NPPO when establishing measures to be taken at places of production participating in an integrated measures approach to ensure plants for planting meet the importing country's phytosanitary requirements.

[30] 1.1 Pest factors that affect risk

[31] Pest factors that should be taken into consideration include:

- whether the pest occurs in the country/area of origin
- type of pest (arthropod, fungus, virus, bacteria etc.)
- establishment and spread potential
- reproduction rate and numbers of generation per year
- transmission (e.g. vector, graft transmission, mechanical transmission)
- ability to detect the pest, even at low population levels
- availability of control measures
- host range of the pest
- presence of host plants in the country of import
- latency of infection.

[32] Table 1 in Appendix 1 provides options for measures related to pest characteristics that are applicable for most types of plants for planting. Depending on their efficacy, a single such measure may be sufficient to mitigate the risk or a combination of these measures may be incorporated in an integrated measures approach.

[33] **1.2 Plant-related factors that affect risk**

[34] As part of the risk categorization, the initial plant risk factors to be considered are species and area of origin. Within any given species, there is a range of risk associated with the type of plant material moved, as broadly ranked below from lowest to highest risk:

- meristem tissue culture
- *in vitro* culture
- budwood/graftwood
- unrooted cuttings
- rooted cuttings
- plants rooted in sterilized and/or soil-less growing media
- bulbs
- bare root plants (soil free)
- plants rooted in soil.

[35] In addition, risk increases with age, as older plants have had longer exposure to potential pests. Risk also increases with size because larger plants have a larger surface area exposed to pests and may also be more difficult to inspect and treat. However, age and size are not always related (e.g. artificial dwarfing).

[36] Appendix 1, Table 2 provides examples of possible measures that NPPOs may require for different types of plants for planting and different types or groups of pests associated with them. The examples describe frequently used measures for important pest types of the relevant type of plants for planting.

[37] **1.3 Production factors that affect risk**

[38] How plants for planting are produced can influence the level of risk. Some factors include:

- growing media
- irrigation
- other growing conditions.

[39] In general, use of soil as a growing medium is likely to pose a greater risk than a soil-free medium because soil may carry soil-borne pathogens, insects or nematodes. Sterilization or pasteurization of the growing medium prior to planting may mitigate some risk.

[40] The source and quality of irrigation water can affect pest risk. For certain pests spread by water, surface water may pose a greater risk than treated or deep well water. Likewise the method of irrigation may produce microclimates or conditions favourable for pest growth and spread (e.g. overhead (rather than drip) irrigation).

[41] Other growing conditions that may affect risk are listed below, broadly ranked below from lowest to highest risk:

- growth chamber
- glasshouse
- screen house
- field grown in containers (pots, tubs etc.)
- field grown
- plants collected from the wild.

[42] Enclosures such as growth chambers, glasshouses and screen houses usually provide better control over plant material and better opportunity for pest exclusion than field-grown plants. Field-grown crops are generally subject to cultural and chemical pest control, and containers with sterilized growing medium and grown on a

membrane may afford some protection from soil-borne pests. Wild collected plants do not have any form of pest control and may therefore be unprotected from pests.

[43] **1.4 Intended uses that affect risk**

[44] Plants for planting are classified in ISPM 32:2009, as a high-risk commodity category. Nevertheless, plants for planting are used for various purposes that affect the risk. Examples of intended uses are listed below, broadly ranked from lowest to highest risk:

- plants not intended for continuous growing
- plants for continuous growing
- plants for propagation.

[45] **2. Application of Risk Mitigation Measures**

[46] The strength of risk mitigation measures applied at the place of production should be consistent with the identified pest risk. The range of possible management options constitutes a continuum starting from a single measure (e.g. treatment or inspection) to a comprehensive integrated measures approach with numerous elements.

[47] **3. Integrated Measures Approach**

[48] Where individual measures alone are not sufficient to mitigate the pest risk, an integrated measures approach may be implemented. Based on the risk identified this may involve a range of options, from an integrated measures approach whose elements are widely applicable to all plants for planting (see “General integrated measures”, section 3.1) to one with additional elements designed to mitigate situations where the pest risk is high (see “Integrated measures in high-risk situations”, section 3.2). NPPOs may consider these options in addition to pre-export inspection in order to mitigate plant pest risks.

[49] **3.1 General integrated measures**

[50] Where individual measures alone are not sufficient to mitigate the pest risk, the NPPO of the exporting country may authorize a place of production that complies with general integrated measures that are applicable to all types of plants for planting.

[51] **3.1.1 Authorization of places of production**

[52] The following conditions should form part of the authorization process for places of production seeking to participate in the general integrated measures approach:

- maintaining an updated plan of the place of production describing when, where and how plants for planting were produced, stored or prepared for movement from the place of production (including information on plant species and type of plant material such as cuttings, *in vitro* cultures, bare root plants)
- keeping, for at least three years, records that verify where and how plants for planting were purchased, stored, produced and distributed
- designating a person with a well-established working knowledge of pest identification and control as a contact person for the NPPO of the exporting country
- notifying their NPPO if any relevant pests are observed.

Any failure of products or procedures to adhere to the requirements for authorization (non-compliance) should result in the suspension of authorization of the place of production until corrective actions have been successfully completed.

[53] **3.1.2 Requirements for the place of production**

The following measures may be sufficient to meet the phytosanitary requirements of the importing country when the PRA indicates that they are consistent with the risk (e.g. plants of a well-documented plant species with known risks originating from a country or area with a documented history of safe exports):

- conducting visual examinations of plants and places of production by designated staff as necessary, at appropriate times and according to protocols provided by the NPPO of the exporting country (Records

of all examinations, including a description of pests found and corrective actions taken, should be made.)

- establishing a system of sanitation and hygiene
- taking measures, where necessary, to keep the plants free from relevant pests
- complying with any phytosanitary measures required by the exporting NPPO.

Additional requirements may be necessary in order to mitigate specific pest risks at the place of production. Appendix 1 provides examples of different pest management measures that NPPOs may require for different types of plants for planting and different types or categories of pests associated with them. Requirements will depend on the plants concerned, the circumstances in the exporting country and the conclusions of relevant PRAs. In all situations, the strength of the measures at the place of production should be consistent with the risk.

[54] **3.2 Integrated measures in high-risk situations**

[55] Where the general integrated measures of section 3.1 are not sufficient to meet the phytosanitary requirements of the importing NPPO, the situation may require further risk management measures, as described in this section.

[56] **3.2.1 Requirements for the place of production in high-risk situations**

[57] A place of production applying for authorization to participate in an integrated measures approach for high-risk situations should develop a manual that includes a pest management plan and relevant information on production practices. Once this document has been developed, implemented and audited to verify compliance and the NPPO of the exporting country has determined that the measures meet the import requirements of the importing country, the place of production may be authorized by the NPPO of the exporting country to export plants to a particular destination.

[58] The following sections provide the elements to be documented, implemented and audited by the exporting NPPO. A documented quality management system, where available, may also be presented to the NPPO for consideration.

[59] **3.2.1.1 Place of production manual**

[60] The manual should describe all of the requirements, elements and processes that make up the integrated measures for risk management of the plants for planting. The manual should be developed, implemented and maintained by the place of production and approved by the exporting NPPO. For exports of additional plants or exports to additional countries, the manual should be amended, and the affected sections reviewed and approved by the exporting NPPO as appropriate; an audit of the entire programme may not be required.

[61] The manual may include the following elements:

- a description of the organizational structure and of the roles and responsibilities of the relevant personnel, including names of the person designated as responsible for the technical performance of the place of production and/or the crop protection specialist (see section 3.2.1.3) (Either of these personnel may serve as the contact point between the NPPO and place of production.)
- a plan of the place of production, which is kept up to date (This should describe when, where and how plants for planting are produced, stored or prepared for movement from the place of production (including information on plant species and type of plant material such as cuttings, *in vitro* cultures, bare root plants).)
- a pest management plan (see section 3.2.1.2) that includes a description of the phytosanitary requirements of the target importing countries for each plant species and type of plant material
- a brief description of production, shipping and receiving locations
- handling procedures for incoming plant material, including procedures to ensure segregation of plant material
- a description of subcontracted activities
- a description of documentation procedures to maintain evidence of the source and origin of propagation material
- copies of the forms used for internal audit reports and checklists

- a description of how internal audits will be conducted, including the frequency and who is responsible
- copies of employee training records and plans
- record-keeping necessary to maintain forward and backward traceability of plants for planting from the place of production.

[62] 3.2.1.2 Pest management plan

[63] The pest management plan, included in the manual, should describe procedures or processes approved by the NPPO of the exporting country and designed to prevent infestations, eradicate or control pests, or suppress pest populations to the accepted level.

[64] The pest management plan should include the following elements:

- sanitation and hygiene – preventing the introduction of pests to the place of production and minimizing spread within a place of production, for example:
 - . regular removal of plant debris
 - . disinfection of tools and equipment
 - . removal of weeds and non-crop plant material
 - . water treatment
 - . personal hygiene (e.g. hand washing, foot baths, coveralls or aprons)
- pest control – products, procedures and measures (see Appendix 1) to prevent and/or treat pests, such as:
 - . physical barriers (e.g. screens, double doors)
 - . disinfection of growing media
 - . crop protection product applications (e.g. chemical, biological)
 - . disposal of infested plants
 - . mass trapping
 - . climate control
 - . hot water or heat treatment
- handling of incoming plant material – methods and documentation for managing pest risks associated with incoming plant material, with descriptions of:
 - . measures to ensure that all plants for planting entering the place of production are free of regulated plant pests and practically free of non-regulated plant pests, and that the risk of introducing and transmitting plant pests is mitigated
 - . procedures to be followed if pests are detected
 - . records to be kept, including the date, the name of the person carrying out the examination, any pests, damage and/or symptoms found, and any corrective actions taken
- examination of plant material and production sites – methods, frequency and intensity used to examine all plant material in the place of production (e.g. visual examination, sampling, testing (indexing, serology etc.) and trapping), including any laboratories used to identify any pests found
- examination of plants for planting prior to export – methods, frequency and intensity used to examine plants where and when exports are being prepared
- identification and management of infested product, with descriptions of:
 - . how infested product is identified and treated
 - . measures to ensure that non-compliant plant material is not shipped
 - . disposal of culled plant material in a manner that prevents buildup and spread of pests
 - . keeping accurate records of the application of crop protection products and other pest management measures.

[65] 3.2.1.3 Crop protection specialist

[66] Places of production implementing comprehensive integrated measures for pest risk management should employ a specialist with a well-established working knowledge of pest identification and control. The specialist should ensure that sanitation, pest monitoring and pest control measures are implemented as described in the phytosanitary manual and pest management plan and that the NPPO of the exporting country is notified upon detection of relevant pests. This person should also serve as the contact person with diagnosticians who may be needed for pest identification.

[67] 3.2.1.4 Training of employees

[68] Employees should be trained to detect pests regulated by the importing country and communicate information on pest findings to the crop protection specialist.

[69] 3.2.1.5 Examination of plant material

[70] All plant material in a place of production (including plants destined for domestic markets and all production sites) should be examined on a regular schedule by designated staff according to established methods and intensity.

[71] 3.2.1.6 Packing and transportation

[72] The following considerations apply to packing and transport operations:

- Plant material should be packed in a manner to prevent infestation or reinfestation by regulated pests.
- Packing material should meet the requirements of the importing country.
- Each unit of a consignment should be identified in a way that links it to the consignment and to the phytosanitary certificate.
- Packing material and boxes should be clean, unused, disinfested or decontaminated.
- Conveyances at the place of production should be examined and cleaned as necessary prior to loading.

[73] 3.2.1.7 Internal audits

[74] Internal audits should be conducted to ensure that the place of production is in compliance with its phytosanitary manual. Internal audits should focus on whether the documentation and its implementation meet the requirements of the exporting NPPO. For example, the internal audit may evaluate the competency of place of production staff in identifying and controlling pests, carrying out duties and responsibilities and whether the record-keeping of the place of production is sufficient to keep track of the country of origin of plant material, labels etc.

[75] Internal audits should be carried out by employees who are independent of the people directly responsible for the audited activity. The results of the audits and any non-compliances (see section 3.2.2 and Appendix 2) should be recorded and presented to the place of production management for review. The employees responsible for the audited activity should promptly take corrective action regarding any non-compliances discovered during an audit and ensure that corrective actions are implemented effectively and are documented.

[76] If a place of production identifies any critical non-compliances, it should immediately notify its NPPO in writing and ensure that non-compliant plants for planting are not exported. Immediate corrective actions should be taken in cooperation with the NPPO.

[77] 3.2.1.8 Records

[78] Accurate and up-to-date records should be kept and should be able to be retrieved when required by the NPPO. Records that verify compliance with the phytosanitary manual and the requirements of the NPPO should be maintained for at least three years. Records should include date, name and signature of the person who carried out the task and/or prepared the document. Examples of records that may be required include:

- invoices, phytosanitary certificates and other information that substantiate the origin and the phytosanitary status of all incoming plant material
- results of the inspection of incoming plant material
- results of internal audits and external audits

- records of examination during production including any pests, damage or symptoms detected and corrective actions taken
- records of examination of outgoing plant material, including type and quantity of material exported
- copies of phytosanitary certificates for plant material exported by the place of production
- records of pest management measures taken to prevent or control pests (including method of application, product applied, dosage and date of application and results of their application)
- records of non-compliances identified and the corrective or preventative actions taken
- records of training of staff and their qualifications.

[79] **3.2.2 Non-compliance with requirements for the place of production**

[80] A non-compliance is any failure of products or procedures to adhere to the phytosanitary requirements of the importing country or the integrated risk management measures established by the exporting NPPO. Non-compliances can be detected during internal audits, audits conducted or administered by the NPPO, or as a result of examinations of plant material.

[81] If the NPPO finds a critical non-compliance, or repeatedly identifies non-critical non-compliances, identifies multiple non-critical non-compliances, or if the place of production fails to carry out the required corrective actions within the specified time period, the place of production should be suspended promptly from participation in the integrated measures approach.

[82] Reinstatement should occur only once corrective action has been put into place and an audit by the NPPO has confirmed that the non-compliances have been corrected.

[83] A list of examples of critical and non-critical non-compliances can be found in Appendix 2.

[84] **3.2.2.1 Critical non-compliance**

[85] Critical non-compliances are incidents that compromise the integrated measures approach at the place of production or increase the risk of infestation of the plants for planting. On discovering these critical non-compliances, the NPPO should immediately suspend the authorization for the place of production to export. Reinstatement should occur only once corrective action has been put into place and an audit by the NPPO of the exporting country has confirmed that the critical non-compliances have been corrected.

[86] **3.2.2.2 Non-critical non-compliance**

[87] Non-critical non-compliances are incidents of non-compliance that do not immediately compromise the integrated measures approach at the place of production. Corrective actions should be carried out to the satisfaction of the NPPO, within a specified period of time. The corrective actions may require a change to the integrated measures and should include measures to prevent a recurrence.

[88] The exporting NPPO should suspend the place of production or relevant parts thereof from participating in the integrated measures approach if several non-critical non-compliances are identified during an audit, if the same non-compliance is identified repeatedly, or if the place of production fails to carry out the required corrective actions within the specified time period. Exports should be suspended until such time as corrective action is successfully implemented and an audit by the NPPO of the exporting country has confirmed the non-critical non-compliances have been corrected.

[89] **4. Responsibilities of the NPPO of the Exporting Country**

[90] The NPPO of the exporting country is responsible for:

- establishing the implementation of the integrated measures approaches authorizing places of production seeking participation in an integrated measures approach
- overseeing authorized places of production
- ensuring that all plants for planting exported by authorized places of production meet the phytosanitary requirements of the importing country
- carrying out or authorizing export inspections and issuing phytosanitary certificates for consignments from authorized places of production
- providing adequate information to the NPPOs of importing countries upon request.

[91] 4.1 Establishing integrated measures approaches

[92] In establishing its integrated measures approaches, the NPPO should specify its requirements to be met by places of production based on the risk factors described in section 1 and the import requirements for the plants for planting. Furthermore, the documentation and communication requirements for the place of production should be specified.

[93] 4.2 Authorization of places of production

[94] The general requirements for the authorization of places of production that require only the general integrated measures approach are described in section 3.1.

[95] The authorization of places of production seeking to participate in the integrated measures approach for high-risk situations described in section 3.2 should be based upon:

- a review of the phytosanitary manual and an initial documentation audit at the place of production to verify that it is complying with the requirements established according to the risk factors of its production
- an implementation audit whose objectives are to verify that:
 - . the place of production complies with the protocols, procedures and standards specified in its phytosanitary manual
 - . required supporting documentation is sufficient, current and readily available to staff
 - . adequate records and documents are maintained
 - . internal audits are performed and corrective actions completed
 - . procedures in place are adequate to ensure that any pest problems are quickly identified and appropriate actions are taken to ensure that plants for planting that do not meet the requirements of the importing country are not exported
 - . either plant material within the place of production has remained free of all regulated pests and practically free of all other pests or, if the material has been infested by regulated pests, the NPPO was informed and appropriate measures were taken to ensure that the risk of further spread has been mitigated.

[96] Upon successful completion of the documentation audit and the implementation audit, the place of production may be authorized by the NPPO of the exporting country to export specific plants for planting.

[97] 4.3 Oversight of authorized places of production

[98] After authorization, the NPPO should oversee the place of production, in particular through monitoring or auditing of the production system. The frequency and timing of monitoring or auditing should be determined according to the pest risks and on the place of production's record of compliance. Monitoring or auditing should include inspection and where applicable, testing of plants for planting, and verification of the documentation and management practices as they relate to the integrated measures approach.

[99] 4.4 Export inspections and issuance of phytosanitary certificates

[100] The integrated risk management measures may reduce the need for growing season inspections and intensive export inspections of every individual consignment (if agreed to by the importing NPPO of the importing country). Phytosanitary certificates are issued in accordance with ISPM 12:2001. If required by the importing country an additional declaration may be added to phytosanitary certificates that refers to the application of this ISPM and specific parts thereof being in compliance with ISPM 12:2001.

[101] 4.5 Providing adequate information

[102] Upon request the NPPO of the exporting country should provide adequate information to the NPPO of the importing country to support the evaluation and acceptance of the integrated measures approach.

[103] 5 Responsibilities of the NPPO of the Importing Country

[104] The NPPO of the importing country is responsible for setting and communicating technically justified phytosanitary import requirements.

[105] Plants produced under an integrated measures approach may not require intensive import inspection of every consignment. The NPPO of the importing country may decide to only monitor imported plants produced under an integrated measures approach, including testing samples for the presence of pests and verifying that agreed procedures are followed.

[106] The NPPO of the importing country may:

- review the authorization programme presented by the NPPO of the exporting country
- provide feedback on the results of monitoring to the NPPO of the exporting country.

The NPPO should notify the NPPO of the exporting country of any non-compliances (see ISPM 13:2001).

[107] **5.1 Traceability procedures**

[108] The NPPO of the importing country is encouraged to establish procedures that ensure that plants imported under an integrated measures approach can be traced back and forward from the importer and that the importer notifies the NPPO of the occurrence of regulated pests and other pests not normally present in the area. This may be accomplished through a registration/authorization process for importers.

[109] **5.2 Auditing by the importing NPPO**

[110] The NPPO of the importing country may request the NPPO of the exporting country to provide the reports on audits undertaken by the place of production and by the NPPO of the exporting country. The NPPO of the importing country may request the NPPO of the exporting country to audit the integrated measures approaches as established by the exporting country. This audit may consist of documentation review, inspection and testing of plants produced under the integrated measures approach, and, where appropriate, site visits provided that there is justification, e.g. in high-risk situations or in cases of non-compliance (see ISPM 20:2004, section 5.1.5 and ISPM 13:2001).

[111] This appendix is for reference purposes only and is not a prescriptive part of the standard.

[112] **APPENDIX 1: Examples of pest management measures to reduce the phytosanitary risk of plants for planting**

[113] **Table 1.** Measures to reduce the phytosanitary risk of plants for planting categorized by pest group

[114] The following table provides examples for different measures.

	Pest group	Available measures
1	Pests causing latent infections and those that are likely to be transmitted by plants for planting without signs or symptoms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production in a pest free area or at a pest free place of production/production site • Derivation from mother plants that have been tested and found free from the relevant pest • Isolation from sources of infection (e.g. buffer zone or geographical distance from other host plants, physical isolation using a glasshouse or polytunnel, temporal isolation) • Testing of samples of the plants for freedom from pests • Production within a specified certification scheme or clean stock programme that takes into consideration the pests of concern to the importing country
2	Visible stages of pests and pests causing visible symptoms during the growing season	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growing season inspection for freedom from pests or symptoms (e.g. at timed intervals, for example monthly for the three months before export or at different growth stages, if appropriate) • Growing season inspection of the mother plants • Inspection after harvest to meet a specified tolerance for a pest (e.g. tolerance for bulb rots by fungi/bacteria) • Routine pesticide applications
3	Pests spread by contact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production in a pest free area or at a pest free place of production/production site • Prevention of contact with sources of infection (e.g. other plants) • Hygiene measures for handling pruning tools and equipment between different batches/lots • Planning of activities to work with high-health plants first • Use of dedicated clothing and equipment in isolated places (e.g. screen houses) • Routine pesticide applications
4	Pests transmitted by vectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production area/place of production free from vectors • Production in a pest free area or at a pest free place of production/production site [confirmed by monitoring or measures specified below] • Isolation from sources of infection (e.g. buffer zone or geographical distance from other host plants, physical isolation using a glasshouse or polytunnel, temporal isolation) • Pre-planting soil testing for freedom from or to meet a tolerance for soil-borne viruses or their nematode vectors • Pesticide treatments for control of insect vectors of viruses (e.g. aphids)
5	Pests spread by wind	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production in a pest free area or at a pest free place of production/production site [confirmed by monitoring or measures specified below] • Isolation from sources of infection (e.g. buffer zone or geographical distance from other host plants, physical isolation using a glasshouse or polytunnel) • Routine pesticide applications
6	Pests spread by water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production in a pest free area or at a pest free place of production/production site [confirmed by monitoring or measures specified below] • Use of uncontaminated water sources • Irrigation water to be disinfected or sterilized before use • Isolation from sources of infection (e.g. buffer zone or geographical distance from other host plants, physical isolation using a glasshouse or polytunnel, temporal isolation)
7	Soil-borne pests able to colonize the plant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production in a pest free area or at a pest free place of production/production site [confirmed by monitoring or measures specified below] • Isolation from sources of infection (e.g. buffer zone or geographical distance

	Pest group	Available measures
		<p>from other host plants, physical isolation using a glasshouse or polytunnel, growth of plants on raised benches, temporal isolation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Derivation from mother plants that have been tested and found free from the relevant pest • Production within a specified certification scheme or clean stock programme • Testing of samples of the plants for freedom from pests • Pre-planting soil testing for freedom from pests such as fungi, nematodes, viruses transmittable by nematodes
8	Soil-borne pests in growing medium attached to plants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growing medium to be sterilized before use • Use of inert growing media • Use of soil-less growing media • Isolation from sources of infection, maintenance of plants in such a way that contact with soil is prevented (e.g. on raised benches) • Pesticide treatment (e.g. drench or fumigation) prior to export • Roots washed free from growing medium (and repotted in sterile growing medium)
9	Soil-borne pests in natural soil attached to plants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production in a pest free area or at a pest free place of production/production site [confirmed by monitoring or measures specified below] • Isolation from sources of infection (e.g. buffer zone or geographical distance from other host plants, temporal isolation) • Pre-planting soil testing for freedom from pests (especially nematodes, fungi) • Pesticide treatment (fumigation) prior to export • Roots washed free from soil (and repotted in sterile growing medium)

[115] **Table 2.** Examples for measures to reduce the phytosanitary risk of plants for planting based on the type of plant material

Type of plant	Examples of pest types ranked according to importance	Available measures
Meristem culture and <i>in vitro</i> culture	Viruses and virus-like diseases, bacteria, fungi, stem nematodes, mites and insects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Derivation from mother plants, that have been tested and found free from the relevant pest • Cultivation in sterile medium under sealed aseptic conditions • Testing of samples of the plants for freedom from pests
Unrooted cuttings	Insects, viruses, bacteria, fungi and other pests	<p>See groups 1 to 8 in table 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hot water treatment
Budwood/graftwood	Bacteria and viruses, insects and other pests	See groups 1 to 8 in table 1
Bulbs	Nematodes, viruses, bacteria, fungi, insects and other pests	<p>See groups 1 to 8 and 10 in table 1</p> <p>Hot water dipping to control bulb-borne nematodes</p>
Bare root plants	Nematodes and all other pests of the aerial plant part possible	See groups 1 to 8 and 10 in table 1
Rooted cuttings	Nematodes, insects, viruses and bacteria and other pests	<p>Measures depend <i>inter alia</i> on the risk of the growing medium used</p> <p>See groups 1 to 8 in table 1</p>
Plants in growing medium	Nematodes and all other pests of the aerial plant part possible	See groups 1 to 9 in table 1
Plants in soil	Nematodes and all other pests of the aerial plant part possible	See groups 1 to 10 in table 1

[116] This appendix is for reference purposes only and is not a prescriptive part of the standard.

[117] **APPENDIX 2: Examples of non-compliance**

[118] **Critical non-compliance**

[119] Examples of critical non-compliance with the place of production include the following:

- detection of quarantine pests or regulated non-quarantine pests (in excess of tolerance limits) of concern to the exporting or importing country on plant material from the place of production
- failure to undertake required laboratory tests or analyses or correctly follow procedures to identify pests
- failure to carry out control measures at the place of production for regulated pests
- failure to notify the NPPO of the presence of regulated pests at the place of production
- export of ineligible plant taxa, plants from non-authorized origins, or plants not meeting other phytosanitary import requirements
- failure to correctly list the botanical names of all the plants on documents accompanying shipments
- failure to keep consistent, accurate pest management records
- failure to keep consistent accurate records of country of origin of plant material
- failure to undertake ordered corrective action(s)
- failure to perform internal audits as required
- operating without a duly qualified programme manager or crop protection specialist
- modification of the phytosanitary manual or pest management practices without prior authorization from the NPPO
- failure to examine incoming or outgoing plant material
- lack of sufficient or adequately trained staff
- failure to keep plants for planting that have been examined for export separate from other plant material that has not been examined.

[120] **Non-critical non-compliance**

[121] Examples of non-critical non-compliance include the following:

- failure to notify the NPPO when the programme manager or crop protection specialist changes
- failure to record the identity of a substitute programme manager or crop protection specialist
- failure to undertake corrective actions ordered by the programme manager in a timely manner
- failure to prevent the buildup of pest populations
- failure to maintain sanitation management practices at the place of production
- failure to maintain records as specified in the phytosanitary manual
- failure to periodically provide staff with relevant training
- failure to maintain training records for staff involved in implementing the phytosanitary manual
- failure to maintain an up-to-date list of all employees involved in implementing the phytosanitary manual
- failure to consistently sign and date reports or records
- failure to record relevant changes to the lists of plant taxa produced, their location in the place of production and the plant material to be exported
- failure to detect and record low-level populations of pests
- failure to inform the NPPO of any changes to business practices as outlined in the phytosanitary manual.

**INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR
PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

**DRAFT APPENDIX to
ISPM 15:2009**

**SUBMISSION OF NEW TREATMENTS FOR INCLUSION
IN ISPM 15**

(201-)

**DRAFT
DOCUMENT**

Date of this document	29 April 2010
Document category	Draft new Appendix 1 to ISPM 15:2009
Current document stage	Draft for member consultation 2010
Origin	Work programme topic: Revision of ISPM 15:2002, added by CPM-1 (2006)
Major stages	Specification No. 31, approved SC May 2006. Draft appendix revised and sent for member consultation by SC April 2010.
Notes	File template: IPPCstyles, April 2010. Auto marginal numbering.

[1] APPENDIX 1: Submission of new treatments for inclusion in ISPM 15**[2] Introduction**

[3] New treatments for inclusion in ISPM 15:2009 need to be evaluated in accordance with procedures outlined in ISPM 28:2007 and thus may be submitted by NPPOs and RPPOs if deemed to meet the requirements outlined in that standard. The following incremental, step-based guidance is provided for treatment developers and for NPPOs or RPPOs submitting technical efficacy data in support of phytosanitary treatments to be evaluated.

[4] Treatment developers are encouraged to consult with experts (e.g. statisticians and pest biologists) at an early stage in the process in order to select candidate pests and design any required experiments appropriately. If additional clarification on the submission and evaluation of phytosanitary treatments is required, the IPPC Secretariat may be contacted. If necessary, secretariat staff will endeavour to provide contact details for appropriate experts.

[5] The ISPM 15 treatment evaluation process relies on the principle that all sources of existing relevant information should be considered to support each step in the process. Additional research may be required, but only where the existing information is insufficient to fulfil the criteria presented.

[6] The treatment developers and the submitting NPPO or RPPO should ensure that a range of factors are or have been tested in the development of a proposed phytosanitary treatment for IPPC evaluation. Factors may include:

- effect on quarantine pests likely to be associated with wood packaging material used in international trade
- effect on the pest life stages most likely to be associated with wood packaging material used in international trade
- effect on treatment efficacy of wood types (e.g. hardwood vs softwood, timber vs logs) and dimensions likely to be encountered at the time of treating wood packaging material for subsequent use in international trade
- effect on environmental conditions (e.g. temperatures, moisture content) likely to be encountered at the time of treating wood packaging material for subsequent use in international trade.

[7] Table 1 provides a listing of the most important quarantine pest groups associated with wood packaging material. Candidates selected from the pest groups indicated in Table 1 should be used for evaluation purposes. Steps 1–3 below provide guidance for determining selection of an appropriate pest(s), or an appropriate substitute organism(s), for testing.

[8] **Table 1.** Most important pest groups for evaluation of wood packaging material treatments

Type of organism	Pest group or individual species
Insects	bark beetles termites and carpenter ants wood-boring beetles wood-boring moths wood flies wood wasps
Fungi and fungi-like organisms	canker fungi decay fungi deep penetrating blue-stain fungi oomycetes rust fungi vascular wilt fungi
Nematode	<i>Bursaphelenchus xylophilus</i>

- [9] The following criteria provide a step-wise process that the submitter should follow in the testing or development of justification for a new phytosanitary treatment for potential inclusion in ISPM 15. Included with each step is information that is intended to clarify how to interpret and respond to each criterion.
- [10] This step-wise process is broadly organized into two parts. Initially, submitters of treatments for evaluation should confirm that the groups of organisms associated with wood packaging material presented in Table 1 are susceptible to the proposed treatment and that the organism most resistant to the treatment is identified. More detailed efficacy testing of this most resistant species is then used to provide confidence that the treatment is effective against all organisms associated with wood packaging material from all origins.
- [11] **Step 1: Determination of response of quarantine pest species to proposed treatment**
- [12] Information should be gathered regarding the differences in treatment responses between quarantine pest species associated with wood for the pest groups listed in Table 1. Pest species from these groups may have fundamentally different responses to the proposed treatment. If this is the case, then Steps 2–5 will require information to be presented on independent responses for each of the pest groups.

- [13] Examples of differential pest responses to treatments:
- [14] The mode of action of a pesticide may be specific to a certain pest and may have little or no effect on another (e.g. neurotoxins have a limited effect on fungi).
- [15] The first effects of heat treatment on organism viability occur when intercellular proteins begin to denature and disrupt vital cellular processes. Such protein denaturation occurs in all organisms. However, some organisms or life stages have mechanisms that provide a limited tolerance to these temperature effects. In regard to pests of wood, only a very few quarantine pests of wood of concern in international trade are known to have a slightly elevated tolerance to heat treatments.

[16] **Step 2: Determination of the most treatment-resistant species and life stage within each pest group, and selection of appropriate testing conditions**

- [17] Once the pest groups that react differentially to the treatment process have been identified, treatment submitters should determine resistance to the proposed treatment for each of the identified pest groups. If the species and life stage most resistant to the proposed treatment are conclusively known for each group then it can be assumed that all other species and life stages within that group will be at least equally susceptible to the treatment, and most likely more susceptible. Consideration of the resistance of the following species to the treatment is essential in all cases because they hold particular relevance in relation to wood packaging material used in international trade: *Anoplophora glabripennis*, *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus*, a species from the genus *Monochamus*, a species from the genus *Dendroctonus*, *Fusarium circinatum* and *Heterobasidion annosum*.
- [18] Treatment submitters should carefully consider the various species that form the pest groups presented in Table 1 to ensure that the pest species selected for testing is representative of the group. Appropriate scientific justification or information should be provided for such decisions. Available data on resistance or tolerance to specific treatments should be used to guide or support this decision. In cases where there is considerable variability expected in the treatment responses within the group, more species may need to be tested to determine the most treatment-resistant species. Of the species selected, if the most resistant life stage is not known then all life stages that are likely to be associated with wood in international trade must be considered. In addition, where different life stages exhibit a different response to the proposed treatment, this must be taken into account.

- [19] Examples of life stage-dependent responses to treatments:
- [20] Irradiation treatments primarily affect pest viability through the creation of hydroxyl radicals that begin to break down the DNA in these organisms. Life stages that have higher levels of cell division or activity in general are likely to be more susceptible to irradiation treatments. Hence the later life stages such as adults or pupae are often found to be more resistant to the effects of irradiation than earlier life stages such as eggs or first instar larvae.
- [21] Some pests are known during certain life stages to be differentially susceptible to a specific pesticide (e.g. greater tolerances are shown by adult insect life stages treated with juvenile growth hormones).

- [22] If testing is required in order to identify the most resistant species and life stage within a pest group, the following approaches should be considered. The number of test units required for each species should be statistically valid in order to reflect the variability within the test population in an appropriate experimental design. In all cases, at least five test units per species and life stage should be used. The sample size of controls should be the same as the number of test organisms (e.g. five controls and five treated individuals), with demonstration of adequate survival of controls during treatment. Test units may be either individual pests or colonized pieces of wood containing the target pest. When colonized pieces of wood that may contain multiple individuals are used as test units, only complete mortality, deactivation or sterilization of all individuals is considered a successful result in identifying the resistant species or life stage.
- [23] Test species used should be in a condition that represents their naturally occurring virulence, pathogenicity and fitness. In using isolates, consideration should also be given to the quality, vigour and stability appropriate to the type of organism used. Some organisms, for example fungi and nematodes, should be tested only *in vivo* in wood unless evidence is provided that *in vitro* testing provides equivalent and acceptable results. In testing fungi, fungal isolates from a broad variety of locations should be used, where possible, for each species tested.
- [24] **Step 3: Determination of whether a substitute test species may be used**
- [25] Having identified the most resistant quarantine pest species and life stage, there may be available a substitute test species with similar biological characteristics to the quarantine pest species and an equivalent response to the proposed treatment. Use of a substitute test species may allow for less complex, less costly and safer efficacy testing to be undertaken or enable testing to be carried out in regions where the quarantine species is not present and cannot be assessed. Appropriate justification and scientific information must be presented to support the use of substitute test species.
- [26] **Step 4: Determination of efficacy against the target test species**
- [27] Efficacy testing can be completed either directly, using the numbers of test individuals required to demonstrate statistically the efficacy level, or by extrapolation by fitting dose-response data to a known theoretical dose-response curves (e.g. normal (i.e. probit), logistic, Gompertz⁴⁰, Weibull⁴¹).
- [28] When undertaking extrapolations, testing may be completed either on individuals *in situ* or on units comprising wood pieces that have been either naturally colonized or colonized in the laboratory to simulate natural colonization. When using the “wood unit” approach, the nature and level of colonization should be equivalent to that experienced during natural outbreak conditions to ensure that a worst-case scenario approach is tested. The number of replicates required for extrapolation testing will depend on the fit of the actual response data to the theoretical dose-response curve (and required sensitivity of the outcome at the 95% confidence level. It is recommended that at least 10 replicates are initially included, although the greater the number of replicates, the higher the confidence of the conclusions drawn. The type of test and its expected statistical limits will determine the potential responses of those individuals that are most resistant to the treatment being evaluated; the degree of variation at a determined dose and level of replication should reflect this. The efficacy data provided should also specify the statistical level of confidence supporting efficacy claims made for treatment of the specified pest and life stage.
- [29] The level of efficacy required for treatment success is 99.99683% at a 95% confidence level for all organisms selected for testing. However, since some species (e.g. *Anoplophora glabripennis*) may not provide population numbers sufficient for this testing, testing may be based upon statistically valid extrapolation or the use of substitute species as described in Step 3. By using appropriate pest or substitute species tested at this level of efficacy, the test is considered to provide for the conclusion that the treatment is sufficiently effective against any pest that may be associated with wood packaging material from any origin.

⁴⁰ Gompertz, B. 1832. On the nature of the function expressive of the law of human mortality, and on a new mode of determining the value of life contingencies. *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London*, 123: 513–585.

⁴¹ Weibull, W. 1951. A statistical distribution function of wide applicability. *J. Appl. Mech., Trans. ASME*, 18(3): 293–297.

[30] Step 5: Determination of equivalency of efficacy during experimental testing with efficacy under operational conditions

[31] A schedule must be developed to ensure that the required efficacy is consistently reached or exceeded during production and treatment of wood packaging material under normal operating conditions. In developing this schedule, treatment efficacy should be demonstrated in the type(s) and dimensions of wood packaging material and environmental conditions (e.g. temperature, moisture content) most challenging for the treatment in question. The schedule should clearly document the limitations on efficacy of treatment applications (e.g. penetrability, water solubility) and clearly indicate any restrictive conditions in use of the treatment (e.g. penetration limitations of some fumigants may restrict the dimensions of the wood for which successful treatment is feasible).

[32] Assessment of treatment success

[33] The criteria used to determine treatment success for each pest group and life stage tested must be thoroughly described. In particular, in each case the specific treatment effect(s) should be clearly indicated. For example, treatments on fungi may kill the organism or may simply inhibit growth. With insects, methods for assessing treatment success can vary widely across studies. For example, counts of living specimens immediately after a treatment may underestimate effectiveness as some apparent survivors may die subsequently and, conversely, those that may appear moribund may recover. Mortality of nematodes should be confirmed by the failure of recovery of nematodes from wood samples incubated at 25 °C using a Baermann funnel at both 6 and 21 days after treatment.

[34] Submission of treatment for approval

[35] All treatments proposed for inclusion in ISPM 15 must be submitted to the IPPC Secretariat for evaluation under the provisions of ISPM 28:2007. Submission forms are available from the IPPC Secretariat for this purpose. These forms must be completed and include all of the supporting information required to meet the criteria presented in the above steps.



SPECIFICATION No. 51 FOR ISPM

Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade

Title for the standard

Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade.

Reason for the standard

Sea containers (i.e. 20- and 40-foot intermodal freight or shipping containers) are a significant pathway for the potential entry of pests, as they are now the most common means of transfer of internationally traded goods and moving personal effects. Insects, snails, other invertebrates and vertebrates may contaminate containers during storage or packing, attracted by odour, light, temperature or humidity conditions. Micro-organisms, seeds and other plant parts and plant debris may be present in contaminating soil, birds' excrement etc. on or inside containers. Some of these organisms may be pests. A country may already regulate some of the pests as quarantine pests, while others may not yet have been evaluated in a PRA but may be potential quarantine pests.

Shipping containers move between many countries, and therefore a standard is needed to provide guidelines to countries for managing such phytosanitary risks. Several countries have already developed and implemented phytosanitary standards related to this issue, so there is a need to harmonize phytosanitary measures related to shipping containers.

Scope and purpose

The standard will provide guidance to NPPOs as to:

- identifying particular pest risks associated with shipping containers as pathways in sea and overland transport between countries
- identifying appropriate phytosanitary measures to mitigate such risks, in particular prior to export, including procedures for packing and cleaning of the interior and exterior of shipping containers, as well as inspection and measures related to the area surrounding packing, storage and loading locations
- identifying verification procedures.

The purpose of this standard is to minimize the risk of quarantine pests moved as contaminants with shipping containers, irrespective of the cargo carried. The standard should provide guidance as to how appropriate

pest risk management can be achieved with minimum impediment to efficient movement and management of shipping containers.

Note that the IPPC standard setting work programme includes a separate topic on “Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts” (specifications pending).

Tasks

The expert working group should:

- (1) identify the extent and importance of international pest dispersal caused by shipping containers and provide examples
- (2) identify the ways that contamination leading to pest risk can occur and note the critical points, including issues regarding types of shipping containers, origin and seasonality
- (3) review existing international conventions, international and national standards and industry practices that may be relevant in helping to reduce pest risks from shipping container movement in international trade and delimit the scope of this standard accordingly
- (4) identify and describe possible phytosanitary measures and best management practices to reduce pest risks, including:
 - procedures for packing and subsequent storage, loading and transport of shipping containers to minimize contamination
 - procedures and practical methods for decontaminating and treating shipping containers (outside and inside) prior to export or at import, including treatment options (including treatments for permanent container flooring made of plant material) and the safe disposal of contaminants
 - measures carried out in the area surrounding locations where packing, storage and loading of shipping containers takes place to minimize pest occurrence and the probability of contamination
 - inspection prior to export or at import
 - appropriate reporting, safeguarding actions and phytosanitary measures to be taken in case of non-compliance
- (5) review existing verification systems (or if necessary, describe possible new feasible systems) to record and certify the origin, cleanliness, cleaning or treatments of containers in respect of compliance with this standard or parts thereof, including consideration of:
 - a checking system leading to the use of compliance documents or verifying labels
 - a system for the authorization/accreditation of container companies, export, shipping or treatment companies
- (6) describe the distribution of responsibilities among NPPOs and stakeholders
- (7) consider whether the standard could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment, and if so, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft standard
- (8) consider options for a broader interim consultation on elements of the draft with stakeholders and provide a recommendation on this to the SC
- (9) consider whether and how the resulting guidelines for shipping containers could support the development of guidelines for minimizing pest movements by conveyances.

Provision of resources

Funding for the meeting is provided by the IPPC Secretariat (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.

Expertise

Five to seven phytosanitary experts with one or more of the following areas of expertise:

- export or import systems dealing with shipping containers
- developing certification/auditing/accrediting/authorizing systems

- treatment of shipping containers
- finding, identifying and controlling relevant pests in shipping containers (e.g. as container inspectors/surveyors).

In addition to those experts, the Container Owners Association and the secretariats of the CBD and the IMO, respectively, are invited to nominate an expert to attend the relevant parts of the expert drafting group meeting(s).

Participants

To be determined.

References

A site acting as a source of relevant papers to be set up on the IPP is being discussed with the Secretariat.

Discussion papers

Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) for consideration by the expert drafting group.



SPECIFICATION No. 50 FOR ISPM

Protocol to determine host status of fruits to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation

Title for the standard

Protocol to determine host status of fruits to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation.

Reason for the standard

Determination of host status of fruits to fruit fly (Tephritidae) is a fundamental element in PRA, including pest risk management. There is evidence to indicate that some fruits listed in scientific literature as hosts to specific fruit flies are actually not hosts or are very poor hosts. However, these host records have in some cases resulted in the imposition of unnecessary or overly restrictive phytosanitary measures by NPPOs on such fruit commodities. Given this, there is need for an internationally harmonized protocol to determine host status in order to facilitate trade. This ISPM will have a highly beneficial impact for both importing and exporting countries.

The host status category for hosts of fruit flies is a fundamental concept for other ISPMs concerning fruit flies (e.g. PFAs, ALPPs, systems approaches). Hence, categories of and procedures for determining the host status should be harmonized in this ISPM so that the harmonized terminology can be applied in other ISPMs.

Scope and purpose

The standard will provide guidelines for the determination of the host status of fruits to fruit fly infestation. It will also introduce a standardized terminology to described different types of host status, taking into account terminology used in previous adopted fruit fly standards.

The guidelines should focus on the methodology, statistical design and procedures underpinning laboratory and field trials that may be adopted to ascertain the host status of fruits to fruit fly infestation.

Tasks

The Technical Panel on Fruit Flies (TPFF) is to:

- (1) define categories of fruit fly host status
- (2) draft a comprehensive procedures guideline for the determination of host status of fruits to fruit fly infestation that includes the following aspects:
 - (a) an experimental outline for laboratory procedures and information used to determine host status including:
 - clear identification of fruit fly species

- clear identification of fruit species and cultivars used
 - physiological stage of the fruit
 - fruit fly source (wild or laboratory colony) used for forced infestations including details of laboratory culture such as number of generations the flies have been reared in the laboratory, host from which the first generation of insects were collected
 - control hosts
 - fruit fly female age used for forced infestations
 - fruit fly density used for forced infestations
 - conditions for fruit storage after infestation
 - experimental design
 - spray history of fruit
 - geographic conditions of the area
- (b) describe methodology for the determination of fruit fly hosts under field conditions
- clear identification of fruit fly species
 - clear identification of fruit species and cultivars used
 - fruit fly trapping layout (fruit species and varieties, phenological stages)
 - fruit sampling (number of samples, size etc.) under natural conditions
 - detection record at import and export inspections
 - control hosts
 - relevant aspects of production of fruit
 - experimental design
- (c) definition of the parameters that should be taken into account in order to determine fruit fly host status
- (d) criteria to determine host status in relation to fruit physiology and environmental conditions, including temperature, photoperiod, and relative humidity
- (e) criteria to quantify and interpret the data to ascertain the host status under the experimental design outlined above
- (f) criteria for extrapolation of data to other areas and fruits
- (3) define criteria under which historical information on host status could be used as an alternative or as a complement to a comprehensive procedures guideline under task (2)
- (4) consider whether the new ISPM could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment, and if so, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the ISPM.

Provision of resources

Funding for the meeting is provided by the IPPC Secretariat (FAO). As recommended by ICPM-2 (1999), whenever possible, those participating in standard setting activities voluntarily fund their travel and subsistence to attend meetings. Members may request financial assistance, with the understanding that the priority for financial assistance is given to developing country representatives. Members should consider that resources are limited.

Expertise

Experience and skills include:

- experience with or understanding of the methodology used in the determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies
- expertise with more than one genus of fruit fly and experience with fruit flies in several regions
- knowledge of ISPMs and good writing skills (desirable).

Participants

TPFF and other experts if deemed necessary.

References

APPPC RSPM No. 4. 2005. Guidelines for the confirmation of non-host status of fruit and vegetables to Tephritid fruit flies. Bangkok, APPPC, RAP Publication 2005/27.

NAPPO RSPM No. 30. 2008. Guidelines for the determination and designation of host status of a fruit or vegetable for fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae). Ottawa, NAPPO.

Relevant ISPMs including ISPM 6:1997, ISPM 26:2006 and ISPM 28:2009, and all technical and scientific literature on determination of host status.

Discussion papers

Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) for consideration by the expert drafting group.

**INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR
PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES****DRAFT SPECIFICATION****FOR ISPM****Minimizing pest movement by air containers and
aircraft****DRAFT
DOCUMENT**

Date of this document	4 May 2010
Document category	Draft specification for an ISPM
Current document stage	<i>From:</i> SC April 2010. <i>To:</i> Member consultation.
Origin	Work programme topic: Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircraft
Major stages	Introduced to work programme by CPM-3 (2008). Draft considered by SC April 2010.

DRAFT SPECIFICATION

Title for the standard

Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircraft.

Reason for the standard

Movement of goods and people by aircraft is a significant pathway for the entry of pests. There are numerous examples for the introduction of pests to countries and areas, where these pests have not been established before (e.g. recently the introduction of *Diabrotica virgifera virgifera* into Europe and its spread within). Because of the relatively short journey time for the distance travelled, some types of pests may be transmitted easily via air traffic. Some of these pests may already have been regulated by some countries as quarantine pests, while others may not yet have been evaluated in a pest risk analysis but may be potential quarantine pests.

Air traffic is highly internationalized and many air companies are active on the global scale. Therefore for many countries it is not feasible to set up specific requirements based on Article I.4 of the IPPC for air containers and aircraft, and a standard is needed to provide guidelines for managing such phytosanitary risks. As several countries have already developed and implemented phytosanitary standards related to this issue, there is also a need to harmonize phytosanitary measures related to this.

Scope and purpose

The standard will provide guidance to NPPOs and organizations (including airline and airport authorities and companies dealing with air containers or aircraft) for appropriate measures for minimizing the risk of quarantine pests moved as contaminating pests by this means.

In particular the standard will provide guidance for:

- identifying particular pest risks associated with air containers and aircraft as pathways between countries
- appropriate phytosanitary measures to mitigate such risks, in particular at airports and other places where air containers are loaded
- verification procedures.

Tasks

The expert working group should:

- (1) consider the extent and importance of international pest dispersal caused by air containers and aircraft and identify relevant examples
- (2) identify the ways that contamination leading to pest risk can occur and note the critical points, including issues regarding origin and seasonality
- (3) identify types of pests that may in particular be transmitted as contaminants by air containers and aircraft
- (4) identify the most likely places within the aircraft where quarantine pests may be found
- (5) consider the report of the survey on introduced species by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)⁴² and the guidance developed by that organization and the International Air Transport Association (IATA) standards.⁴³

⁴² Report by the Council on progress in implementation of resolution A33-18: preventing the introduction of invasive alien species, A35-WP/12 EC/4 19/5/04
http://www.icao.int/icao/en/assembl/a35/wp/wp012_en.pdf

⁴³ International Air Transport Association air cargo standards,
<http://www.iata.org/whatwedo/cargo/standards/Pages/index.aspx>

- (6) review existing international conventions, standards and industry practices that may be relevant in helping to reduce pest risks from air containers and aircraft internationally and delimit the scope of this standard accordingly
- (7) identify and describe potential phytosanitary measures and best management practices to reduce pest risks, including:
 - procedures for packing, loading and cleaning of air containers and aircraft to minimize contamination with pests, including treatment options and safe disposal of contaminants
 - procedures and practical methods to be taken at airports and other places where air containers are packed or loaded taking into account particular risk within the relevant area (e.g. mass development of pests, attractants (light, colour), overwintering aggregation)
 - measures carried out in the area surrounding airports and where loading and storage takes place
- (8) describe the distribution of responsibilities among NPPOs, other organizations and stakeholders
- (9) consider whether the standard could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment, and if so, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft standard
- (10) consider whether and how the resulting standard could include guidelines for minimizing pest movements by aircraft or support their further development
- (11) consider ways for further consultation with and involvement of stakeholders on the subject of this standard during the development of this ISPM.

Provision of resources

Funding for the meeting is provided by the IPPC Secretariat (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.

Expertise

Five to seven phytosanitary experts with one or more of the following areas of expertise:

- export or import systems dealing with air cargo
- aircraft and air cargo inspection and pest interception
- airport ground management
- treatment of air containers or aircraft
- pest risk analysis
- development of phytosanitary measures.

In addition to those experts, the ICAO, IATA and CBD are each invited to nominate an expert to attend the relevant parts of the expert drafting group meetings.

Participants

To be determined.

References

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

A site acting as a source of relevant papers to be set up on the IPP is being discussed with the Secretariat.

Discussion papers

Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) for consideration by the expert drafting group.

INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

DRAFT SPECIFICATION

FOR ISPM

Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities

DRAFT
DOCUMENT

Date of this document	25 May 2010
Document category	Draft specification for an ISPM
Current document stage	<i>From:</i> SC April 2010. <i>To:</i> member consultation.
Origin	Work programme topic: Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities
Major stages	Introduced to work programme by CPM-3 (2008). Draft specification considered by SC April 2010.
Notes	File template: IPPCStyles, May 2010.

DRAFT SPECIFICATION

Title for the standard

Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities.

Reason for the standard

Authorization is referred to in the IPPC in Article V.2(a), as well as in several standards such as ISPM 7:1997 (*Export certification system*), ISPM 20:2004 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) and ISPM 23:2005 (*Guidelines for inspection*). However, there is no standard addressing this concept specifically that would provide guidance to countries when authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary activities on their behalf. Authorization of entities is becoming increasingly more common in various regions of the world and an ISPM on this subject would provide the necessary guidance to national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) when they authorize entities to perform certain phytosanitary activities on their behalf.

Scope and purpose

This standard will describe the essential elements required for the authorization of entities, including individuals, facilities, businesses and other organizations, to perform specific phytosanitary activities on behalf of the NPPO. It will provide guidance on the responsibilities of the NPPO in terms of developing criteria for authorization, assessing compliance, and the granting, removal and reinstatement of authorization. In addition, the ISPM should define the responsibilities of the entity to be authorized. Because phytosanitary certificates are issued by authorized public officers only (CPM-4, 2009), this form of phytosanitary activity is not to be included in the consideration.

Tasks

The expert working group (EWG) should:

- (1) consider guidelines for authorization developed and currently used by NPPOs and regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs)
- (2) consider the use of “authorize” and similar terms in adopted ISPMs and how this relates to procedures and requirements outlined in this new standard and provide recommendations to the Standards Committee on that matter
- (3) discuss and determine the phytosanitary activities that may be performed by authorized entities (testing, inspection, treatment, etc.)
- (4) discuss and determine the different categories of entities (e.g. individuals, facilities, businesses, organizations) that may be authorized
- (5) discuss and determine the essential elements/criteria required for the authorization of such entities
- (6) prepare guidance on how to determine and list the responsibilities of the NPPO when authorizing entities
- (7) prepare guidance on how to determine and list the responsibilities of the entities being authorized
- (8) prepare guidance on how to determine the minimum requirements to be met when authorizing an entity to conduct specific activities on behalf of an NPPO
- (9) describe the requirements, criteria and processes to be put in place for the authorization of entities including granting the authorization, assessment/audit of compliance, removal and reinstatement of authorization
- (10) determine and describe the minimum requirements for auditors involved in the delivery of audits at authorized entities
- (11) consider whether the new standard could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment, and if so, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft standard.

Provision of resources

Funding for the meeting is provided by the IPPC Secretariat (FAO) except where expert participation is voluntarily funded by the expert’s government. 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.

Steward

Please refer to the IPPC standard setting work programme.

Expertise

Six to seven experts who have a wide knowledge in phytosanitary activities including at least one person knowledgeable in authorization programmes and their elements and at least one person knowledgeable in auditing compliance with authorization programmes.

Approval

CPM-3 in 2008 added this topic to the IPPC standard setting work programme.

References

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.

Relevant NAPPO standards:

NAPPO RSPM No. 8. 2008. *The authorization of individuals to issue phytosanitary certificates.* Ottawa, NAPPO.

NAPPO RSPM No. 9. 2009. *The authorization of laboratories for phytosanitary testing.* Ottawa, NAPPO.

NAPPO RSPM No. 28. 2009. *Guidelines for authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary services.* Ottawa, NAPPO.

Discussion papers

Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) for consideration by the expert drafting group.

**INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR
PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

DRAFT SPECIFICATION

FOR ISPM

**Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential
pest risk generated during international voyages**

DRAFT
DOCUMENT

Date of this document	27 May 2010
Document category	Draft specification for an ISPM
Current document stage	<i>From:</i> SC April 2010. <i>To:</i> member consultation.
Origin	Work programme topic: Handling and disposal of garbage moved internationally
Major stages	Introduced to work programme by CPM-3 (2008). Draft specification considered by SC April 2010.
Notes	File template: IPPCStyles, May 2010.

DRAFT SPECIFICATION

Title for the standard

Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages.

Reason for the standard

With an increase in the number and frequency of movements of international conveyances (aircraft and vessels) there has been an increase in the volume of waste generated during their voyages that requires disposal.⁴⁴ The movement and disposal of waste material is potentially a pathway for the introduction and spread of quarantine pests. In particular developing countries may have limited facilities and procedures available to handle the waste in a manner that minimizes the risk of introducing a quarantine pest.

Scope and purpose

The standard will provide guidance to NPPOs in determining what is considered waste that has a potential pest risk. It will also provide guidance on developing methods and procedures for handling and disposing of the waste generated during international voyages in a manner that does not lead to the establishment or spread of a plant pest. The standard does not consider risks outside the scope of the IPPC.

Tasks

The expert working group should:

- (1) identify phytosanitary risks related to waste generated during international voyages and determine what is considered to be waste that presents phytosanitary risk, noting that some contracting parties have already developed legislative definitions for waste
- (2) consider the relevance of any existing international agreements or industry guidelines to manage the risk of introduction of quarantine pests associated with waste generated during international voyages, noting that many countries have existing legislative requirements for the management, handling and disposal of all waste (for example, environmental legislation)
- (3) identify information requirements for determining the potential for waste associated with international conveyances to be a pathway for the introduction of quarantine pests and for implementing appropriate phytosanitary measures
- (4) identify any currently utilized waste handling and disposal methods that may be employed by countries (for example, incineration, deep burial and autoclaving) and provide brief guidance to NPPOs on the criteria for locating and regulating the operations in relation to the disposal of waste
- (5) consider whether the new standard could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment, and if so, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft standard.

Provision of resources

Funding for the meeting is provided by the IPPC Secretariat (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.

Collaborator

To be determined.

Expertise

A working group of 5–8 phytosanitary experts and/or expertise from relevant international organizations (for example, the UN International Maritime Organization and the International Air Transport Association).

Participants

To be determined.

⁴⁴ It is estimated that a cruise ship with 3000 passengers will create 11.5 tons of waste in a day (*Cruising for a Bruising*, Washington Public Interest Research Group, 2005).

Approval

Introduced into the work programme by CPM-3 (2008).

References

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.

Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service (AQIS) requirements for quarantine facilities to dispose of waste by:

- incineration (Class 8.1: Disposal facilities – incineration, available at http://www.daff.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0017/1162511/class8-1.pdf, accessed May 2010)
- deep burial (Class 8.2: Disposal facilities – deep burial (available at http://www.daff.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/1162513/class8-2.pdf, accessed May 2010)
- autoclaving (Class 8.3: Disposal facilities – autoclave centres (available at http://www.daff.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/1162515/class8-3.pdf, accessed May 2010).

AQIS. 2009. *Waste on board vessels*. AQIS fact sheet (available at http://www.daff.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/1076152/waste.pdf, accessed May 2010).

IMO (International Maritime Organization). 1972. *Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter*. London, IMO.

IMO. 1988. *Prevention of pollution by garbage from ships* (Annex V of International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973). London, IMO.

International Air Transport Association. ISO14001: *Certification for environmental management systems, maintenance sites, cargo handling operations and catering centres*.

Discussion papers

Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) for consideration by the expert drafting group.



SPECIFICATION No. TP1

For Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine

Revision 2, approved by SC April 2010

Title

Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine.

Reason for the technical panel

ICPM-6 (2004) identified the need for the formation of a technical panel on forest quarantine issues.

Scope and purpose

The Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ) will deal with technical matters regarding forest quarantine issues. It will review relevant technical and scientific information to provide guidance to the Standards Committee (SC) as requested on the development, amendment and revision of standards.

Tasks

The Technical Panel should:

- (1) identify needed standards or revisions to existing standards, submit new topics in response to the Secretariat's biannual call for topics, and recommend priorities for standards to the SC as appropriate
- (2) develop draft ISPMs on work programme topics as directed by the SC
- (3) identify forestry issues relevant to IPPC standard setting that need further research and report this to the SC
- (4) in collaboration with the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) develop criteria for evaluating phytosanitary treatments for specific standards to meet forest quarantine needs in accordance with ISPM 28:2009
- (5) provide advice to the TPPT on the feasibility and applicability of treatments proposed for inclusion in ISPM 15:2009 and other forestry standards as appropriate
- (6) provide advice to the steward of the TPFQ (or other steward of a given standard if appropriate) and the SC on appropriate responses to member comments on ISPMs related to forest quarantine
- (7) identify the extent to which the work of this panel overlaps with the work of other groups, such as the TPPT and relevant research groups, and work with the relevant stewards and chair of the SC to ensure coordination with these groups to prevent duplication of work
- (8) analyse existing research data and identify knowledge gaps relating to forestry pest risk analysis and make proposals to the SC

- (9) provide advice to the SC on potential forest quarantine issues related to standard setting and proposals to address them.

Provision of resources

Funding for meetings is provided from the regular programme of the IPPC Secretariat (FAO) or from extra budgetary resources.

Collaborator

FAO.

Expertise of Technical Panel

Expertise in forest quarantine issues from both the research and phytosanitary fields including practical experience. Membership should cover a range of expertise including: forest pathology, entomology and nematology, inspection, pest risk assessment, regulatory systems.

Participants

6–10 members (from several regions) as selected by the SC. The chair of the International Forest Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG) should be a member. Details of technical panels and their members are available via <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=179728> (accessed May 2010).

Approval

Introduced into the work programme by the ICPM at its sixth session in April 2004.

Specification reviewed by the extraordinary working group of the Standards Committee meeting in July 2004 and approved by the SC in November 2004.

Revised by the TPFQ in March 2005. Revised specification (rev. 1) approved by the SC, April 2005.

Revised by the TPFQ in December 2008. Revised specification (rev. 2) approved by the SC in April 2010.

References

Appropriate ISPMs, specifications and ICPM reports, IFQRG reports of meetings.



SPECIFICATION No. TP3

For Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments

Revision 2, approved by SC April 2010

Title

Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments.

Reason for the technical panel

ICPM-6 (2004) identified the need for the formation of a technical panel on treatments.

Scope and purpose

The Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) will be involved in issues relating to phytosanitary treatments, including collecting and reviewing them and recommending their use internationally.

Tasks

- (1) Identify, collect and evaluate information on existing phytosanitary treatments that are needed for regulated pests and regulated articles and may be implemented at global level.
- (2) If appropriate, recommend to the Standards Committee (SC) when a new call for treatments within an existing topic on the IPPC work programme is required.
- (3) When evaluating treatment submissions, prioritize the work as directed by the SC and using the criteria developed by the TPPT.
- (4) Evaluate treatment submissions against requirements in ISPM 28:2009.
- (5) Review adopted phytosanitary treatments and recommend updates as needed.
- (6) Recommend draft treatments to the SC for adoption through the special process.
- (7) Respond, if needed, to biennial calls for submission for topics to be included in the standard setting work programme.
- (8) Develop draft ISPMs and/or annexes to existing ISPMs on topics relating to phytosanitary treatments as directed by the SC.
- (9) Provide advice to the steward, the SC and the IPPC Secretariat on appropriate responses to member comments relating to phytosanitary treatments.
- (10) Provide advice to the SC on subjects, topics and priorities for technical standard development relating to phytosanitary treatments and identify areas where further research on treatments is needed.

Provision of resources

Funding for meetings is provided from the regular programme of the IPPC Secretariat (FAO) or from extra-budgetary resources.

Expertise

Mixture of treatment researchers and personnel with practical treatment expertise.

Participants

6–10.

Approval

Introduced into the work programme by the ICPM at its sixth session, April 2004.

Specification approved by the SC, April 2004.

Revised by the TPPT in December 2004. Revised specification (rev. 1) approved by the SC, April 2005.

Revised by the TPPT in January 2009. Revised specification (rev. 2) approved by the SC, April 2010.

References

Appropriate ISPMs, specifications, ICPM reports and technical manuals.

IPPC STANDARDS SETTING WORK PROGRAMME

(As adopted by CPM-5 and updated following the April 2010 Standards Committee meeting)

Rows are sorted by projected years of adoption and Priority. Rows are numbered for reference purposes only. Titles given are working titles only and may further evolve during the development of the specification and ISPM. Bracketed text indicates whether the draft was developed by an expert working group (EWG), technical panel (TP) or consultant, and the number of meetings held.

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
1	Regular process	2011	High	Revision of ISPMs 7 and 12 (1 EWG); - Appendix to ISPM 12: Phyto e-Cert	EWG	CPM-1 (2006)	Draft: SC-7 modified for forwarding to Nov 2010 SC and then CPM 6.	Sakamura, Motoi (Japan, SC Nov 2006)	38	Revision of ISPMs 7 and 12
2	Regular process	2011	High	Trapping procedures for fruit flies (1 TPDF)	TPFF	SC November 2005; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft: SC April 2010 requested expeditious work by TPDF in order to attempt to submit it to SC Nov 2010	Enkerlin, Walther (NAPPO, SC May 2007); Cardoso, Rui Pereira (IAEA, SC April 2010)	35	Trapping procedures for fruit flies (Tephritidae)
3	Regular process	2011	High	Glossary of phytosanitary terms (amendments to ISPM 5)	TPG	ICPM-3 (2001)	Amended annually but only appears once on the work programme	Hedley, John (New Zealand, SC November 2009)	TP5	-
4	CPM-4 process	2011	High	Review of adopted ISPMs (and minor modifications to ISPMs resulting from the review) (1 consultant, 2 TPG)	TPG	CPM-1 (2006)	No draft: TPG to review adopted ISPMs (completed 3, 5: Sup 1, 10, 13, and 14)	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	32	Review of ISPMs

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
5	Regular process	2013	High	Pest risk analysis to determine whether plants proposed for import are quarantine pests (1 EWG)	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Draft: SC April 2010 sent back to selected SC e-mail working group	Nordbo, Ebbe (Denmark, SC November 2008)	44	Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests
6	Regular process	2012	High	Integrated measures approach for plants for planting in international trade (3 EWGs)	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Draft: SC April 2010 selected for 2010, June-September 100 days MC	Opatowski, David (Israel, SC Apr 2005)	34	Pest risk management for plants for planting in international trade
7	Regular process	2012	High	Revision of ISPM 15 (<i>Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade</i>) specifically: - Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (3 TPFQ)	TPFQ	CPM-1 (2006)	Draft: SC April 2010 selected for 2010, June-September 100 days MC.	Schröder, Thomas (Germany, SC April 2010)	31	As part of Revision of ISPM 15 (<i>Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade</i>)
8	Regular process	2013	High	International movement of wood (2+1 TPFQ)	TPFQ	SC November 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Draft: SC April 2010 modified and returned to TPFQ	Forest Marie Claude (Canada, SC via mail 2008), Wolff, Greg (Canada, SC May 2006)	46	Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
9	Regular process	2013	High	Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1 EWG, 1 TPG)	TPG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Draft: ready for SC review	Aliaga, Julie (USA, SC Nov 2007)	33	Supplement to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>): Guidelines for the interpretation and application of the phrase not widely distributed in relation to quarantine pests
10	Special process	2012	High	Irradiation treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i>	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC November 2008	Draft: SC April 2010 selected for 2010, June-September 100 days MC	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
11	Special process	2013	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Trogoderma granarium</i> Topic: Insects and mites	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft: SC (via e-mail Sept 2008) approved for MC	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
12	Special process	2012	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for Plum pox virus Topic: Viruses and phytoplasmas	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft: SC April 2010 selected for 2010, June-September 100 days MC	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
13	Regular process	2012	Normal	Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies (1 consultant, 2 TPFQ)	TPFF	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft: SC April 2010 selected for 2010, June-September 100 days MC	Gonzalez, Magda (Costa Rica, SC Nov 2008); (Backup: Holtzhausen, Mike (South Africa, SC Nov 2008))	29	The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies
14	Regular process	2013	High	Determination of host susceptibility for fruit flies (Tephritidae)	TPFF	SC November 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Specification approved by SC April 2010	Cardoso, Rui Pereira (IAEA, SC April 2010)	-	Experimental protocol to determine host status of fruits to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation
15	Regular process	2013	High	Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly management (Tephritidae) (1 TPFQ)	TPFF	SC November 2005; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft under development by TPFQ Appendix being completed	Opatowski, David (Israel, SC Nov 2008); (Backup: Musa, Khidir (Sudan, SC Nov 2008))	39	Suppression and eradication procedures for fruit flies (Tephritidae)
16	Regular process	2013	High	Revision of ISPM 15 (<i>Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade</i>) specifically: -Guidelines for heat treatment (2 TPFQ)	TPFQ	CPM-1 (2006)	Draft under development by TPFQ	Schroder, Thomas (Germany, SC April 2010)	31	(As part of Revision of ISPM 15 (<i>Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade</i>))

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
17	Regular process	2013	High	International movement of forest tree seeds (1 TPFQ)	TPFQ	SC November 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Draft under development by TPFQ	Wang, Fuxiang (China, SC Nov 2008)	47	Reducing pest risks in the international movement of seeds of forest tree species
18	Special process	2013	High	Irradiation treatments for various insects: - Irradiation treatment for <i>Cylas formicarius elegantulus</i> - Irradiation treatment for <i>Euscepes postfasciatus</i>	TPPT	CPM-2 (2007); SC May 2007	Draft returned to TPPT for review	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, CPM-3 2008)	-	-
19	Regular process	2013	Normal	Pre-clearance for regulated articles (1 EWG)	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Draft under review by Steward and EWG via e-mail	Vacant (Backup, Holtzhausen, Mike)	42	Pre-clearance for regulated articles
20	Regular process	2013	Normal	Import of plant breeding material	EWG	ICPM-6 (2004)	Draft ready to review by SC	Holtzhausen, Mike (South Africa, SC Nov 2007)	45:Rev2	Import of plant breeding material for scientific research, education or other specific use
21	Regular process	2013	Normal	Soil and growing media	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Specification approved. EWG planned to meet in June 2010	Forest, Marie-Claude (Canada, SC Nov 2008)	43	Movement of soil and growing media in association with plants in international trade

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
22	Regular process	2013	Normal	Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (appendix to ISPM 5) (1 TPG)	TPG	CPM-4 (2009)	Draft under development	Vacant (replacement for Peralta, Ana to be decided)	-	Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (appendix to ISPM 5)
23	Regular process	2014	High	Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	Specification approved by SC April 2010	Nordbo, Ebbe (Denmark, SC Nov 2008); (Backup: Hedley, John (New Zealand, SC Nov 2008))	-	Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances
24	Regular process	2014	High	Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	Draft specification approved for MC by SC April 2010.	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
25	Special process	2014	High	<p>Fruit fly treatments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cold treatments for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i>: - Cold treatment of <i>Citrus paradisi</i> for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> - Cold treatment of <i>Citrus reticulata</i> x <i>C. sinensis</i> for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> - Cold treatment of <i>Citrus limon</i> for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> - Cold treatment of <i>Citrus reticulata</i> cultivars and hybrids for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> - Cold treatment of <i>Citrus sinensis</i> for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> <p>Cold treatments for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cold treatment of <i>Citrus limon</i> for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> - Cold treatment of <i>Citrus reticulata</i> x <i>C. sinensis</i> for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> - Cold treatment of <i>Citrus sinensis</i> for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> 	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC November 2008	Draft: To be reviewed by TPPT considering additional treatments submitted in April 2010.	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, CPM-3 2008)	-	-
26	Special process	2013	Normal	<p>Diagnostic protocol for <i>Guignardia citricarpa</i></p> <p>Topic: Fungi and fungus-like organisms</p>	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006);	Draft in review by TPDP.	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
27	Regular process	2016	Normal	Guidelines for the movement of used machinery and equipment	EWG	CPM-1 (2006)	Specification approved by SC May 2009.	Rossi, Guillermo (Argentina, SC May 2009)	48	International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment
28	Regular process	2016	Normal	Forestry surveillance	TPFQ	SC November 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Specification approved by SC May 2009.	Aliaga, Julie (United States, SC Nov 2008)	49	Forest pest surveys for determination of pest status
29	Regular process	Unknown	High	Inspection manual	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Draft Specification submitted to SC for approval	Aliaga, Julie (United States, SC Nov 2007)	-	General Guidelines for Inspection Manuals
30	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	Specification approved for MC by SC April 2010	Forest, Marie-Claude (Canada, SC Nov 2008)	-	- Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities - Draft Specification to SC for approval for member consultation
31	Regular Process	Unknown	High	Revision of ISPM 4 Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas.	EWG	SC November 2009; CPM (2010)	No specification	Awosusi, Olufunke Olusola (Nigeria, SC November 2009)	-	- SC April 2010 requested a particular attention on sections: Surveillance, in relation to Fruit flies.

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
32	Regular process	Unknown	High	International movement of seed	EWG	SC November 2009; CPM (2010)	No specification	Porritt, David (Australia, SC April 2010)	-	-
33	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	Regulating stored products in international trade	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Draft Specification submitted to SC for approval	Haddad, Safwat A. El (Egypt, SC May 2009)	-	Regulating stored products in international trade
34	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages.	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	Draft Specification approved by SC April 2010 for MC.	Porritt, David (Australia, SC Nov 2008)	-	Handling and disposal of garbage moved internationally
35	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	International movement of cut flowers and foliage	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	Draft Specification to SC for approval for member consultation	Gonzalez, Magda (Costa Rica, SC Nov 2008)	-	International movement of cut flowers and foliage
36	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20: <i>Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system</i>)	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	Draft Specification to SC for approval for member consultation	Tekon, Timothy Tumukon (Vanuatu, SC April 2010)	-	Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20: <i>Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system</i>)
37	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	Revision of ISPM 6 Guidelines for surveillance	EWG	SC November 2009; CPM (2010)	No specification	Hedley, John (New Zealand, SC November 2009)	-	-

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
38	Regular Process	Unknown	Normal	Revision of ISPM 8 Determination of pest status in an area	EWG	SC November 2009; CPM (2010)	No specification	Melcho, Beatriz (Uruguay, SC November 2009)	-	-
39	-	xx	High	Technical panel to develop diagnostic protocols for specific pests	TPDP	ICPM-6 (2004)	-	Tentative: Melcho, Beatriz (Uruguay, SC April 2010)	TP1 Rev2	Technical panel to develop diagnostic protocols for specific pests
40	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Xylella fastidiosa</i> Topic: Bacteria	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Authors identified	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
41	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Puccinia psidi</i> Topic: Fungi and fungus-like organisms	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Authors identified	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
42	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Dendroctonus ponderosae</i> syn. <i>Scolytus scolytus</i> Topic: Insects and mites	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Authors identified	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
43	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Ips</i> spp. Topic: Insects and mites	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Authors identified	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
44	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Aphelenchoides besseyi</i> , <i>A. ritzemabosi</i> and <i>A. fragariae</i> Topic: Nematodes	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Authors identified	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
45	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Striga</i> spp. Topic: Plants	TPDP	CPM-3(2008)	Authors identified	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
46	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Fusarium moniliformis</i> / <i>moniforme</i> syn. <i>F. circinatum</i> Topic: Fungi and fungus-like organisms	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Authors identified	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
47	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Gymnosporangium</i> spp. Topic: Fungi and fungus-like organisms	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft under development	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
48	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i> complex Topic: Insects and mites	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Draft under development	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
49	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Liriomyza</i> spp. Topic: Insects and mites	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Draft under development	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
50	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Sorghum halepense</i> Topic: Plants	TPDP	SC November 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Draft under development	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
51	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for Potato spindle tuber viroid Topic: Viruses and phytoplasmas	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Draft under development	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
52	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for viruses transmitted by <i>Bemisia tabaci</i> Topic: Viruses and phytoplasmas	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Draft in preparation	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
53	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for Tephritidae: Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques Topic: Insects and mites	TPDP	SC November 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Draft under development	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
54	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Erwinia amylovora</i> Topic: Bacteria	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft in review by TPDP	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
55	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Liberibacter</i> spp. / <i>Liberobacter</i> spp. Topic: Bacteria	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft in review by TPDP	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
56	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i> Topic: Bacteria	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft in review by TPDP	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
57	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Xanthomonas fragariae</i> Topic: Bacteria	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft in review by TPDP	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
58	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Phytophthora ramorum</i> Topic: Fungi and fungus-like organisms	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft in review by TPDP	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
59	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Tilletia indica / T. controversa</i> Topic: Fungi and fungus-like organisms	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft in review by TPDP	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
60	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Anastrepha</i> spp. Topic: Insects and mites	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft in review by TPDP	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
61	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Bursaphelenchus xylophilus</i> Topic: Nematodes	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft in review by TPDP	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
62	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Ditylenchus destructor / D. dipsaci</i> Topic: Nematodes	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft in review by TPDP	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
63	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Xiphinema americanum</i> Topic: Nematodes	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft in review by TPDP	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
64	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for Phytoplasmas (general) Topic: Virus and phytoplasmas	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft under development	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
65	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for Tospoviruses (TSWV, INSV, WSMV) Topic: Virus and phytoplasmas	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft in review by TPDP	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
66	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Anoplophora</i> spp. Topic: Insects and mites	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft under development	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
67	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Citrus tristeza</i> virus Topic: Viruses and phytoplasmas	TPDP	SC November 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	Draft under development	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
68	Special process	xx	Normal	Bacteria	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
69	Special process	xx	Normal	Fungi and fungus-like organisms	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
70	Special process	xx	Normal	Insects and mites	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
71	Special process	xx	Normal	Nematodes	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
72	Special process	xx	Normal	Plants	TPDP	CPM-2 (2007)	Work ongoing	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
73	Special process	xx	Normal	Viruses and phytoplasmas	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
74	-	x	High	Technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies	TPFF	ICPM-6 (2004)	-	Aliaga, Julie (USA, SC, Apr 2009)	TP2 Rev2	Technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies
75	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	Establishment and maintenance of regulated areas upon outbreak detection in Fruit Fly Free areas	TPFF	SC November 2009; CPM-5 (2010)	No specification	Gonzalez, Jaime (IAEA, SC November 2009)	-	-
76	-	x	High	Technical panel on forest quarantine	TPFQ	ICPM-6 (2004)	-	Wang, Fuxiang (China, SC Nov 2008)	TP4 Rev1	Technical panel on forest quarantine
77	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	Biological control for forest pests	TPFQ	SC November 2009; CPM-5 (2010)	No specification	TPFQ member (SC November 2009)	-	-

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
78	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood	TPFQ	CPM-3 (2008)	No specification	Musa, Khidir Gibril (Sudan, SC April 2010)	-	-
79	-	x	High	Technical panel on the <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>	TPG	CPM-1 (2006)	-	Hedley, John (New Zealand, SC Nov 2005)	TP5	Technical panel on the <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>
80	-	x	High	Technical panel on phytosanitary treatments	TPPT	ICPM-6 (2004)	-	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2008)	TP3 Rev1	Technical panel on phytosanitary treatments
81	Special process	xx	High	Irradiation treatments	TPPT	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
82	Special process	xx	High	Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Work ongoing	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
83	Special process	xx	Normal	Soil and growing media in association with plants: treatments	TPPT	SC November 2009; CPM (2010)	No specification	Forest, Marie-Claude (Canada, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
84	Special process	xx	High	Wood packaging material treatments	TPPT (TPFQ)	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2008)	-	-
85	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Domestic regulation	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
86	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Exclusion	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
87	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Area-wide control	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
88	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Efficacy	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
89	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Effectiveness	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
90	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Confinement	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
91	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Quarantine station	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
92	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Electronic certification	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
93	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Certificate	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
94	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Phytosanitary certificate	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
95	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Hitch hiker	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
96	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Gray	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
97	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Legislation	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
98	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: plant pest	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
99	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Organism	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
100	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Pest	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-

No:	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Technical Area / Topic / Subject (number of meeting held)	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Current steward (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	Title of specification
101	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Naturally occurring	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
102	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Re-export (of a consignment)	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
103	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Presence	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
104	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Occurrence	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-
105	Regular process	Unknown	-	Definition: Restriction	TPG	SC 26-30 April 2010	No draft: TPG to review	-	-	-

**Meeting of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
Standards Committee, 26-30 April 2010
FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy, German room, C-269 (Start time: 10:00)**

PARTICIPANTS LIST

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

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership confirmed	Term expires
✓	Chairperson (Elected for 3 year term SC April 2010). Term as chair expires April 2013.)	Ms. Jane CHARD SASA, Scottish Government Roddinglaw Road Edinburgh EH12 9FJ UNITED KINGDOM Tel: (+44) 131 2448863 Fax: +44 131 2448940	jane.chard@sasa.gsi.gov.uk	2008 (CPM-3)	2011
✓	Vice-Chairperson (Elected for 3 year term SC Nov 2008. Term as vice-chair expires Nov 2011.)	Mr. Motoi SAKAMURA Director, Plant Quarantine Office, Plant Protection Division Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 1-2-1,Kasumigaseki,Chiyodaku, Tokyo 1008950 JAPAN Tel: (+81)335025978 Fax: (+81)335023386	motoi_sakamura@nm.maff.go.jp	2009 (CPM-4)	2012
✓	Member	Mr. Lahcen ABAHA Ministry of Agriculture Director of Control and Quality at Border Centres of Agadir BP 53 Bensergaou, 80100, par Agadir MOROCCO Tel: (00212) 671-837079 Fax: (00212) 528-828660	abahalahcen@yahoo.fr	2009 (CPM-4)	2012
✓	Member	Ms. Julie ALIAGA (SC-7) Program Director, International Standards Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service U.S. Department of Agriculture 4700 River Road, Unit 140 Riverdale, MD 20737 USA Tel: (+1) 301 734 0763 Fax: (+1) 301 734 7639	julie.e.aliaga@aphis.usda.gov	2009 (CPM-4)	2012

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership confirmed	Term expires
✓	Member	Mr. Abdullah AL-SAYANI (SC-7) Director General of Plant Protection General Directorate of Plant Protection Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation P.O. Box 26, Zaied Street Sanáa YEMEN Tel: +96 71250956 Fax: + 96 71228064	p-quarantine@yemen.net.ye	2009 (CPM-4)	2012
✓	Member	Ms. Olufunke Olusola AWOSUSI Head, Post Entry Quarantine Inspection and Surveillance Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service Moor Plantation, P.M.B. 5672 Ibadan NIGERIA Tel: +234 805 9608494	awosusifunke@yahoo.com ; npqs_ngr@yahoo.com	2008 (CPM-3)	2011
	Member	Marcel BAKAK Head, Plant Quarantine Ministry of Agriculture Minader, Yaounde Cameroon Tel: +23799961337 FAX: +23725050934	Mandjek4@yahoo.fr	2010 (CPM-5)	2013
	Member	Ms. María Soledad CASTRO DOROCHESSI Av. Bulnes 140, Piso 3 Santiago, Chile Tel.:(+5623) 451454; (+ 569) 84497464	soledad.castro@sag.gob.cl	2010 (CPM-5)	2013
	Member	Dr. P.S. CHANDURKAR Plant Protection Adviser to the Govt. of India Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine & Storage (Dept. of Agriculture & Cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture) Block-III, Level-4, Old CGO Complex NH-IV, Faridabad - 121001 Haryana, INDIA Phone No.:+91-129-2413985 & 2410056 Fax No.: +91-129-2412125 or +91-11-23384182	ppa@nic.in	2009 (CPM-4)	2012
✓	Member	Mr. Antarjo DIKIN Indonesian Agricultural Quarantine Agency Ministry of Agriculture JI. Harsono RM No.3 Building E 1st Floor Pasar Minggu, Jacarta Selatan, Indonesia Tel.: +62 081399155774	antario_dikin@yahoo.com	2010 (CPM-5)	2013

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership confirmed	Term expires
✓	Member	Safwat A. El HADDAD First Secretary, Head of the Agricultural Services, Follow up Sector & Director of Potato Brown Rot Project. Ministry of Agriculture & Land Reclamation 5, Nadi El Seid Street, Dokki Cairo EGYPT Tel: (+202) 337 600 893 Fax: (+202) 337 488 671	safwat.el_haddad@email.com	2008 (CPM-3)	2011
✓	Member	Ms. Marie-Claude FOREST International Standards Advisor Office of Chief Plant Health Officer Export and Technical Standards Section Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 CANADA Tel: (+1) 613 221 4359 Fax: (+1) 613 228 6602	marie-claude.forest@inspection.gc.ca	2008 (CPM-3)	2011
✓	Member	Mr. Khidir GIBRIL MUSA General Manager Plant Protection Directorate P.O. Box 14 Khartoum North SUDAN Tel: (+249) 1 8533 8242/9121 38939 Fax: (+249) 1 8533 9423	khidrigibrilmusa@yahoo.com	2009 (CPM-4)	2012
✓	Member	Ms. Magda GONZÁLEZ ARROYO Departamento de Exportaciones Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería P.O. Box 70-3006 Barreal de Heredia COSTA RICA Tel: (+506) 2260 6721 Fax: (+506) 2260 6721	mgonzalez@sfe.go.cr	2009 (CPM-4)	2012
✓	Member	Mr. John HEDLEY (SC-7) Principal Adviser International Coordination Biosecurity New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry P.O. Box 2526 Wellington NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0733	john.hedley@maf.govt.nz	2009 (CPM-4)	2012

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership confirmed	Term expires
✓	Member	Mr. Mike HOLTZHAUSEN (SC-7) Deputy Director Agricultural Products Inspection Services Private Bag X258 Pretoria 0001 SOUTH AFRICA Tel: (+27) 12 319 6100 Fax: (+27) 12 319 6350 Mob: (+27) 7877788	mikeh@nda.agric.za ; netmike@absamail.co.za <i>will change to</i> mikeh@daff.gov.za	2009 (CPM-4)	2012
	Member	Mr. Abdul Hakim MOHAMMAD Plant Protection Directorate Al Abed Street Damascus SYRIA Tel: +963(11) 222 0187 Fax: +963(11) 446 76231 Mob: +963 944 369 075	DPPSYRIA@SCS.SY	2009 (CPM-4)	2012
✓	Member	Ms. Beatriz MELCHO Sub-Director, Plant Protection Division Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries General Direction of Agricultural Services Plant Protection Division Avda. Millan 4703 CP 12900 Montevideo URUGUAY Tel: (+598) 2 309 8410 x 165 Fax: (+598) 2 309 8410 x 267	bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy ; bemelcho@hotmail.com	2010 (CPM-5)	2013
✓	Member	Mr. Ebbe NORDBO Head of Section Danish Plant Directorate Skovbrynet 20 DK - 2800 Lyngby DENMARK Tel: (+45) 45 263 891 Fax: (+45) 45 263 613	eno@pdir.dk	2008 (CPM-3)	2011
✓	Member	Mr. David OPATOWSKI Head Plant Biosecurity Plant Protection and Inspection Services (PPIS) P.O. Box 78 Bet Dagan 50250 ISRAEL Tel: (+972) 3 968 1585; 506 241 745 Fax: (+972) 3 968 1571	davido@moag.gov.il	2009 (CPM-4)	2012

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership confirmed	Term expires
✓	Member	Mr. David PORRITT Counsellor (Agriculture) Australian Embassy 2-1-14 Mita, Minato-Ku, Tokyo 108-8361, Japan Tel: (w) 813 5232 4027 (m) 81 90 8114 0057 Fax: 813 5232 4029	david.porritt@dfat.gov.au	2009 (CPM-4)	2012
✓	Member	Mr. Guillermo L. ROSSI Cooralinador de Puertos y Aeropuertos Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria (SENASA) Paseo Colon 315, Piso 4 B.A ARGENTINA Tel: + 54 1141215176 Fax: +54 1141215179	grossi@senasa.gov.ar ; ffgrossi@gmail.com	2009 (CPM-4)	2012
✓	Member	Mr. Tekon Timothy TUMUKON Principal Plant Protection Officer Department of Livestock and Quarantine Services Private Mail Bag 9095 Port Vila VANUATU Tel: +678 23519 or +678 23130 Fax: +678 23185	tumukon@vanuatu.gov.vu tumukontt@gmail.com	2009 (CPM-4)	2012
✓	Member	Mr. Jens-Georg UNGER (SC-7) Head Institute on National and International Plant Health Julius Kuehn Institute Messeweg 11/12 38104 Braunschweig GERMANY Tel: (+49) 531 299 3370 Fax: (+49) 531 299 3007	jens-georg.unger@jki.bund.de	2009 (CPM-4)	2012
✓	Member	Mr. Fuxiang WANG (SC-7) Director Plant Quarantine Division National Agro-Technical Extension and Service Center Ministry of Agriculture No 20 Mai Zi Dian Street, Chaoyang District Beijing CHINA Tel: (+86) 10 5919 4524 Fax: (+86) 10 5919 4726	wangfuxiang@agri.gov.cn	2009 (CPM-4)	2012

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership confirmed	Term expires
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<p> Mr. Yukio YOKOI Mr. Brent LARSON Ms. Lottie ERIKSON Ms. Stephanie DUBON Ms. Fabienne GROUSSET Mr. Milan IVIC Ms. Jo HAMILTON Mr. Shane SELA Ms. Andrea SISSONS Mr. Adam PHAN Mr. Khaled ALROUECHDI </p> <p> AGPP – IPPC Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: +39 06 5705 4915; Fax: + 39 06 5705 4819 </p>	<p> yukio.yokoi@fao.org brent.larson@fao.org lottie.erikson@fao.org stephanie.dubon@fao.org fabienne.grousset@fao.org milan.ivic@fao.org joanna.hamilton@fao.org shane.sela@fao.org andrea.sissons@fao.org adam.phan@fao.org khaled.alrouechdi@fao.org </p>		
✓	Observer	<p> Mr. Gregory WOLFF Acting Director / Directeur intérimaire Horticulture Division / Division de l'horticulture Canadian Food Inspection Agency / Agence canadienne d'inspection des aliments 59 Camelot Drive / 59, promenade Camelot Ottawa, ON CANADA K1A 0Y9 </p> <p> Tél. (001) 613-221-4354 Fax/Télé. (001) 613-228-6628 </p>	<p> greg.wolff@inspection.gc.ca </p>		
✓	Observer	<p> Mr. Rui Cardoso PEREIRA Joint FAO/IAEA Division IPCS/NAFA Wagramerstrasse 5 P.O. Box 100 A-1400 Vienna, AUSTRIA Tel: (+43) 1 2600 26077 </p>	<p> r.cardoso-pereira@iaea.org </p>		
✓	Observer	<p> Biol. Ana Lilia MONTEALEGRE LARA Department of International Plant Protection Organizations Dirección de Regulación Fitosanitaria Dirección General de Sanidad Vegetal SENASICA-SAGARPA Guillermo Pérez Valenzuela No. 127 Col. Del Carmen, Coyoacán, C. P. 01480 México, D. F. Tel: 5905-1000 Ext. 51341 </p>	<p> ana.montealegre@senasica.gob.mx </p>		

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership confirmed	Term expires
✓	Observer	Beaulla NKUNA Senior Plant Health Officer Directorate: Plant Health Division: International Standards Tel: 012 319 6103 Fax: 012 319 6101	BeaullaN@daff.gov.za		
✓	Observer	Evgeny F. UTKIN Alternative Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to FAO & WFP Embassy of the Russian Federation in the Italian Republic Via Gaeta, 5 00185 Roma ITALIA Tel: (39-06 4941680/81/49	outkin-ef@mail.ru		