



REPORT

28 and 30 April 2012

**Standards
Committee Working
Group (SC-7)
April 2012**



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting	3
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	3
1.3	Election of the Chair and Rapporteur.....	3
1.4	Adoption of the Agenda	3
2.	Administrative Matters	3
2.1	Documents List	3
2.2	Participants List.....	3
2.3	Local Information.....	3
3.	Updates from the Standards Committee Meeting.....	3
3.1	SC Meeting Updates	3
4.	Review of Draft ISPMs	3
4.1	Draft Annex: <i>Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests</i> to ISPM 11:2004, and core text consequential changes to ISPM 11:2004 (2005-001).....	3
4.2	ISPM 15:2009 Draft Revision of Annex 1: <i>Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material</i> (2006-011)	7
5.	Other business.....	9
6.	Close of the meeting	9
	Appendix 1 - Agenda	10
	Appendix 2 - Documents List	11
	Appendix 3 – Participants List	12

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

The Secretariat welcomed the members of the Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) to the meeting. The Secretariat reviewed the rules of procedure for the SC-7 and noted that the SC-7 represents the entire Standards Committee (SC). The SC-7 was reminded that, in the future, they should solicit comments from all the SC members in their region regarding the drafts presented to the SC-7. Also, all SC-7 meeting documents and conference room papers should be made available to all SC members and the Secretariat.

Per the decision in 2011 November SC, the SC-7 should try to move the drafts forward, but when a recommendation is proposed to request an external group to make an action, an e-decision from the SC will be needed.

1.3 Election of the Chair and Rapporteur

The SC-7 elected Ms Julie Aliaga as Chair and Mr Bart Rossel as Rapporteur.

1.4 Adoption of the Agenda

The SC-7 adopted the Agenda (see Appendix 1 to this report).

2. Administrative Matters

2.1 Documents List

The SC-7 noted the Documents List (see Appendix 2 to this report).

2.2 Participants List

The SC-7 noted the Participants List (see Appendix 3 to this report) and the members agreed to keep their contact information current on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP, <https://www.ippc.int/>).

2.3 Local Information

The SC-7 noted the Local Information document.

3. Updates from the Standards Committee Meeting

3.1 SC Meeting Updates

There were no updates from the 2012 April SC meeting for the SC-7.

4. Review of Draft ISPMs

4.1 Draft Annex: *Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests* to ISPM 11:2004, and core text consequential changes to ISPM 11:2004 (2005-001)

The Steward presented the draft. The SC-7 reviewed the member comments, steward's responses to comments and the revised draft ISPM. The major discussions by the SC-7 are provided below.

Title

The SC-7 discussed the title for the draft Annex and for ISPM 11:2004. The SC-7 agreed the title for the draft Annex was adequate and kept it as drafted. However, to simplify the title of ISPM 11:2004 and avoid prolonging this title even further as a consequence of the new Annex, the SC-7 agreed to change it from *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms* to *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*.

International and domestic movement

There was a discussion about why there was text in the draft regarding movement within the country, whereas ISPMs are used for international trade. However, it was noted that the SC requested to change the text for movement within countries. Furthermore, the pest risk analysis (PRA) methodology is also compatible with and useful for domestic concerns, so the text was retained.

Habitat vs location

The steward noted that *establishment* is linked to the biologic term *habitat*, and *spread* is linked to the purely geographical word *location*. He noted that:

- *location* is not and need not be a glossary term
- a PRA is conducted for a defined area (PRA area) and not for different geographic locations within the PRA area
- He explained that the relevant text parts (including the core ISPM 11:2004 text) were rewritten, re-inserting *habitat* wherever correct, avoiding *location* where not needed, and using *endangered area* wherever more appropriate than *habitat* or *location*.

PRA issues specific to plants as pests

There were concerns that text in this draft is already contained in the main text of ISPM 11:2004. The SC-7 retained the draft Annex because the text is specifically related to plants as pests. There were also concerns with the inclusion of the section regarding initiation points of the PRA which is not specific for plants as pests, but SC-7 decided to retain the section on initiation points. With the Annex providing guidance specifically on PRA for plants as pests, some paragraphs in the core text covering the same issue had to be amended in order avoid conflict with the new text. This is because earlier proposals to delete parts of the core text to avoid repetition did not gain full support in the SC.

Regulating at taxonomic level

The SC-7 discussed when conducting a PRA for plants as pests whether an NPPO should take into account a higher or lower taxonomic level than the species. The SC-7 noted that the text includes the term *may*. However, it was decided that generally only analysing at a lower taxonomic level would be needed and be appropriate for plants as pests and therefore only that option was retained.

Botanical gardens

The SC-7 discussed the proposal to include wording on plants present in collections, such as botanical gardens. There were concerns about how to control the spread of plants present in botanical gardens, known to be a particular pathway of plants as pests, and whether these plants should be safeguarded or placed under official control. Because the term official control has an appropriately wide meaning, is mandating that some government action be taken to ensure safeguards are in place and is defined in ISPM 5, the SC-7 used the term *official control* instead of *safeguards*.

Survival of the plant outside a glasshouse

There was concern about how the NPPO would determine whether the plant could survive outside of a glasshouse environment. Furthermore, the issue of an NPPO declaring presence/absence for plants that can only survive indoors is irrelevant for the particular case of plants as pests. The SC-7 therefore did not agree to the proposed additional text. The SC-7, however, recommended that at the revision of ISPM 8:1998, it should be taken into consideration whether an NPPO may categorize, as absent, plants that are grown or kept under protected conditions only and that the NPPO has determined cannot survive outdoors in the PRA area.

Presence or absence of related plants in the PRA area

There was discussion about where in the draft Annex to place text regarding the presence or absence in the PRA area of wild or cultivated relatives to the plant. It was noted that, while this text is about hybrids and could be moved to another section (such as the section on *Probability of establishment*),

this text focuses mostly on whether the related plants are present or absent, and, therefore, was retained under the section *Presence or absence in PRA area*.

Risk related to aquariums

There was a proposal to add aquariums as a high risk for increased likelihood of establishment and spread, and place it as an example to planting in the open landscape without management, but it was noted aquariums are a controlled environment and could not be considered as an open landscape. However, the SC-7 did note risks of plants in aquariums do exist, and noted it was included in the section on *Probability of spread*.

Intended use for plants other than plants for planting

Following a country suggestion, the SC-7 considered including *plants for research* as another important intended use. The SC-7 considered adding *planting for research* as a new bullet in the paragraph broadly ordering plants for planting according to the risk magnitude, but this would make the text more cumbersome, noting that the intended use of these plants is usually for planting. However, *plants for research* was considered an important intended use in more general terms and was included in the text under *plants for other intended uses than plants for planting*.

Probability of entry

There were concerns why text on assessing the likelihood of establishment and spread was added to the section titled *probability of entry*. The steward explained that this was added because the prospective frequency, volume and destinations of imported plants may have a direct impact on the likelihood of establishment and spread. The SC-7 agreed to retain that notion but delete the reference to risk management that would be irrelevant in that part of the text.

Probability of spread

There was concern about *economic value* being deleted from the paragraph regarding the human-mediated factors, based on a member comment. The steward explained what was meant was consumer demand. The SC-7 retained the *economic value* and added *consumer demand* for clarification.

Plants for planting considered as quarantine pests

There was a discussion whether plants for planting are *considered*, *assessed* or *determined* to be quarantine pests. The steward noted that, at the time of conducting a PRA, the decision on whether to regulate the plants as quarantine pests has not yet been taken, only the plant is considered as having the potential to be a quarantine pest, so the term *considered* was kept.

Codes of conduct as a pest risk management option

There were questions of whether codes of conduct should be mentioned as a management option for an NPPO, because they are often voluntary agreements. The steward explained that a code of conduct is often developed by industry or environmental groups to outline a professional way of behaviour, but sometimes developed by official authorities. It was noted that this is an increasingly important option for or supplement to pest risk management in many countries and should be considered. The text was modified to encourage NPPOs to consider the use of codes of conduct as a management option, so as to clarify that codes may be of a nature other than regulation.

Devitalisation of seeds

There were concerns on the comment regarding the devitalisation of seeds during processing and integrating this comment into the text. The SC-7 noted that grains, not seeds, are for consumption, and, therefore, this is an inappropriate use of the term *seed*. In addition, the SC-7 noted that seeds are included in the ISPM 5 definition of *plant*. Therefore, only the phrase *devitalisation* was added to the text.

Alert systems

The SC-7 discussed the appropriate use of the phrase *alert systems* and noted that alert systems do not report new occurrences, but rather are a type of warning system. The group considered alternative wording, such as *early warning systems* or *early detection systems*. For clarification, the group decided not to use the term *alert systems*, and kept the text as *systems to report new occurrences*.

Assessing the probability of entry to plants that may contaminate plants for planting

The SC-7 considered the comment to add a phrase to the core text of ISPM 11:2004 that the probability of entry for unintended vegetative plants that may contaminate rooted plants being imported for planting (such as a plant growing in the same container as a plant for planting) should be assessed. The SC-7 noted that this should not be included because it is outside the scope of the work. However, the SC-7 noted that the comment is technically sound and should be considered when ISPM 11:2004 is revised.

Examples of plants that are competitors

There were concerns about providing examples of plants that are competitors. Providing names of plants and pests as examples in ISPMs is usually avoided. There were also concerns that the examples are scientifically incorrect. The SC-7 found that the member comments attempting to partly correct the issue were insufficient and agreed to delete the examples.

Intended vs unintended

The steward suggested removing the terms *intended* and *unintended* in the draft Annex and core text, noting that those words have led to a lack of clarity and subsequent requests for new definitions. The steward noted that if a plant is destined for a particular planting location it is already assumed that the plant is intended to be in that location. The SC-7 considered the terms *intended* and *unintended* were, in many cases, unnecessary and modified the text accordingly.

The SC is invited to:

- Consider recommending to the CPM the draft Annex to ISPM 11:2004 *Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests* (2005-001) and the core text consequential changes to ISPM 11:2004.
- Consider, at the revision of ISPM 8:1998 (2009-005), whether an NPPO may categorize as absent plants that are grown or kept under protected conditions only and that the NPPO has determined cannot survive outdoors in the PRA area (e.g. in vitro collections, some indoor plants and seed collections).
- Consider, at the revision of ISPM 11:2004, the relevance of assessing the probability of entry for unintended vegetative plants that may contaminate rooted plants being imported for planting.

4.2 ISPM 15:2009 Draft Revision of Annex 1: *Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material (2006-011)*

The Steward was unable to attend, so the Secretariat presented the draft. It was noted that the main changes to the draft are the addition of guidance to heat treatments in general and the addition of the phytosanitary treatment using dielectric heating. The SC-7 noted that it is very important that this revised annex be adopted as soon as possible to encourage the reduced use of methyl bromide (MeBr) to fumigate wood packaging material.

The Secretariat lead for the Technical panel on forest quarantine (TPFQ) (who is also the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) lead for the dielectric heating treatment) was available via email to provide technical explanations.

The SC-7 reviewed the member comments, steward's responses to comments and the revised draft ISPM. The major discussions by the SC-7 are provided below.

Use of should, shall and must in the draft Annex

The SC-7 discussed whether it was most appropriate to use the term *should*, *shall* or *must* throughout the text. The SC-7 adjusted the text to reflect the CPM-1 (2006) decision on the appropriate use of the terms *should*, *shall* or *must*, and for consistency matched the treatment factors for heat treatments and dielectric heating to the adopted methyl bromide text. Thus, the level of obligation is being expressed by *should* in the respective chapeaux, followed by the use of present-tense verbs in the indents.

Dimensions of the wood

The SC-7 modified the text to clarify that, for heat treatments, any remaining bark should be included when measuring the dimension of the wood.

Calibrating treatment equipment and the frequency of calibrations

There was a discussion whether the NPPO can specify how to calibrate treatment equipment and the frequency of calibrations. The SC-7 noted that the NPPO has the overall responsibility that calibrations are carried out appropriately and these specifications can differ from the manufacturer's instructions if justified. The text was clarified to state that temperature sensors and data recording equipment should be calibrated in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions at a frequency specified by the NPPO.

Intervals of temperature readings

There was a proposed addition, based on a member comment, that temperature readings may be recorded at longer intervals until the specified temperature is reached. The SC-7 concluded that this is irrelevant and should not be included in the draft ISPM.

NPPO approving the treatment provider

One SC-7 member suggested adding text that, for consistency with heat treatments and for technical reasons, the NPPO approves the provider of MeBr treatments. It was noted that there is no member comment regarding this, and that approval of MeBr treatment providers in some countries may not be by the NPPO. The SC-7 recommended this issue be considered when ISPM 15:2009 core text is revised.

Dielectric heating and bidirectional radiation source

There was some lack of clarity regarding the use of bidirectional radiation source and its impact on wood greater or less than 5 cm in thickness. The Secretariat lead for the TPFQ explained that dielectric heating penetrates thin wood easily, leading to even heating across the wood profile. When treating wood greater than 5 cm in thickness it can be more difficult to get even heating using a single radiation source, so it may be necessary to have radiation coming from more than one direction (e.g. bi-directional). This can be achieved by using two radiation sources or using wave guides that split

and reflect a single source so it effectively comes from two or more directions. It was also noted that dielectric heating at longer frequencies (e.g. radio waves) penetrates far better than microwaves and these may be applied from a single source.

Because there were no specific requirements for wood less than 5 cm in thickness, the SC-7 removed text because it was not needed and could cause confusion.

Moisture content and methyl bromide penetration

Regarding implementation of ISPM 15, one SC-7 member noted that countries in tropical climates use different types of woods than countries in temperate climates. In tropical climates, the moisture content of the wood is sometimes very high, which could inhibit the penetration of MeBr into the wood. It was noted that the TPFQ has already looked at this issue in detail and the evaluation of MeBr by the TPFQ was based on data collected from experiments using wood with moisture content between 4 and 60%. The Secretariat lead for the TPFQ explained that sawn wood loses moisture quite quickly, especially after it has been de-barked, so it would be expected that wood packaging material would have a medium to low moisture content by treatment time. Based on this explanation, the SC-7 decided not to revise the text, but recommended the SC to further study this issue by adding it to the TPFQ and/or TPPT work programmes.

Dielectric heating and measuring the temperature of the wood

The SC-7 noted that, for the dielectric heating treatment, there is only a reference to measure the temperature on the surface of the wood and questioned whether there would be a need to measure the temperature internally. It was explained that, with dielectric heating, all of the wood heats at once with the heat dissipating through the wood. At the edges, some heat dissipates into the surrounding air, hence, the cooler surface temperature. Cooler spots will occur internally immediately after heating, but the heat will quickly even out throughout the wood except at the surface, losing some of its heat to the air. Therefore, once the equipment has been tested to determine the length of heating required to achieve an adequate internal temperature throughout the profile of the wood, the surface temperature will be the best indicator of internal temperatures and whether the 60°C for 1 minute target temperature has been achieved.

There were also concerns why the text requires two surface temperature sensors, instead of only one. It was explained that this ensures the temperature readings are correct (both sensors should provide equivalent readings, with one validating the other).

In addition, for dielectric heating, the SC-7 discussed the appropriate use of the terms *probe* and *sensor*. Because the temperature of the wood is the coolest on its surface, a probe (placed inside the wood) would not be needed, and only a temperature sensor placed on the surface or measuring by remote sensing would be required. In any case, *sensor* is a broader term, including *probe* in its meaning.

There were also concerns about whether the NPPO should test and validate that the internal temperature of the wood reached the target temperature. It was noted that, for dielectric heating, the coolest temperature is on the surface of the wood, so there is no need for the NPPO to test the internal temperature. The term *test* was removed.

The SC is invited to:

- Consider recommending to the CPM the ISPM 15:2009 draft revision of Annex 1 *Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material* (2006-011).
- Consider, at the revision ISPM 15:2009, adding text that the NPPO approves all treatment providers, including those providing MeBr treatments.
- Consider adding the issue of a possible interference of high moisture content in various types of woods used as wood packaging from tropical climates to the penetration and efficacy of MeBr treatments to the TPFQ and/or TPPT work programs for further study.

5. Other business

There was no other business to discuss.

6. Close of the meeting

The Chair thanked the participants for a productive meeting and closed the meeting.

Appendix 1 - Agenda

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	-	DUBON
1.2 Election of the Chair and Rapporteur	-	DUBON
1.3 Adoption of the Agenda	SC7_2012_Apr_01	CHAIR
2. Administrative Matters		
2.1 Documents List	SC7_2012_Apr_02	CHAIR
2.2 Participants List	SC7_2012_Apr_03	CHAIR
2.3 Local Information (refer to the 2012 April SC Local Information document)	SC7_2012_Apr_04	CHAIR
3. Updates from the Standards Committee Meeting		
3.1 SC Meeting Updates	-	CHAIR
4. Review of Draft ISPMs		
4.1 Draft Annex 4: Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests, ISPM 11:2004, and core text changes to ISPM 11: 2004: Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms (2005-001)	2005-001 (with steward's proposed changes)	NORDBO
Steward: Ebbe NORDBO		
Steward's Response to Comments from 2011 Member Consultation	SC7_2012_Apr_05	NORDBO
Steward's additional notes	SC7_2012_Apr_08	NORDBO
Specification 44 Rev 1: Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests	https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=24119	NORDBO
4.2 ISPM 15: 2009 Draft Revision of Annex 1: Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material (2006-011)	2006-011 (with TPFQ's proposed changes)	SCHRODER
Steward: Thomas SCHRODER		
TPFQ's Response to Comments from 2011 Member Consultation	SC7_2012_Apr_06	SCHRODER
Steward's additional notes		
Specification 31: Revision of ISPM 15 (Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade)	https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=24119	SCHRODER
For reference, Draft ISPM: <i>Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heating</i> (2007-114) (ORMSBY/TPPT)	2007-114 (with TPPT's proposed changes)	DUBON
For reference, TPPT's Response to Comments from 2011 Member Consultation (ORMSBY/TPPT)	SC7_2012_Apr_07	DUBON
5. Other business		
6. Close of the meeting		

Appendix 2 - Documents List

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)
2005-001	4.1	Draft Annex 4: Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests, ISPM 11:2004, and core text changes to ISPM 11: 2004: Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms (2005-001) (NORDBO)
2006-011	4.2	Revision to ISPM 15:2009 Annex 1 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade): Guidelines for heat treatment; Correction of two titles on MeBr between text and ISPM 15:2009, Annex 1; Addition of sulfuryl fluoride and microwave irradiation treatments (2006-011) (SCHRODER)
2007-114	4.2	Draft ISPM: Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heating (2007-114) (ORMSBY/TPPT)
Other Documents		
SC7_2012_Apr_01	1.3	Agenda (DUBON)
SC7_2012_Apr_02	2.1	Documents List (DUBON)
SC7_2012_Apr_03	2.2	Participants List (DUBON)
SC7_2012_Apr_04	2.3	Local Information (DUBON) (refer to 2012 April SC Local Information document)
SC7_2012_Apr_05	4.1	Steward's Response to Comments from 2011 Member Consultation (NORDBO)
SC7_2012_Apr_06	4.2	TPFQ's Response to Comments from 2011 Member Consultation (SCHRODER/TPFQ)
SC7_2012_Apr_07	4.2	For reference, TPPT's Response to Comments from 2011 Member Consultation (ORMSBY/TPPT)
SC7_2012_Apr_08	4.1	Steward's Notes: Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests (NORDBO)
Specification 31	4.2	Specification 31: Revision of ISPM 15 (Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade)
Specification 44 Rev 1	4.1	Specification 44 Rev 1: Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests

Appendix 3 – Participants List

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Africa Member	Ms Olufunke Olusola AWOSUSI Deputy Director 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	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) 2nd term / 3 years	2014
Asia Member SC-7	Mr Antarjo DIKIN Director, Institute of Applied Research on Agricultural Quarantine Indonesian Agricultural Quarantine Agency Ministry of Agriculture Jl Raya Kampung Utan – Setu, Desa Mekar Wangi Kec. Cikarang Barat Kab. Bekasi 17520 West Java INDONESIA Tel/Fax: (+62) 2182618923 Mobile: (+ 62) 81399155774	antario_dikin@yahoo.com	CPM-5 (2010) 1st term / 3 years	2013
Europe Member SC7	Mr Ebbe NORDBO Head of Section Danish AgriFish Agency Nyropsgade DK - 1780 Copenhagen V DENMARK Tel: (+45) 45 263 891 Fax: (+45) 45 263 613	eno@pdir.dk eno@naturerhverv.dk	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) 2nd term / 3 years	2014
Latin America & Caribbean Member SC-7	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 ext 165 Fax: (+598) 2 309 8410 ext 267	bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy ; bemelcho@hotmail.com	CPM-2 (2007) CPM-5 (2010) 2nd term / 3 years	2013

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Near East Member SC-7	Mr Imad NAHHAL Head of Plant Protection Service Ministry of Agriculture Bir Hassan Embassies Street Beirut LEBANON Office Tel: (+961) 1 849639 Mobile:(+961) 3 894679	imadn@terra.net.lb; inahhal@agriculture.gov.lb	CPM-6 (2011) 1st term / 3 years	2014
North America Member SC7	Ms Julie ALIAGA 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) 301 851 2032 Fax: (+1) 301 734 7639	julie.e.aliaga@aphis.usda.gov	CPM-4 (2009) CPM-7 (2012) 2nd term / 3 years	2015
Pacific Member SC7	Mr Jan Bart ROSSEL Director International Plant Health Program Office of the Chief Plant Protection Officer Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry AUSTRALIA Tel: (+61) 2 6272 5056 / 0408625413 Fax: (+61) 2 6272 5835	bart.rossel@daff.gov.au	CPM-6 (2011) 1st term / 3 years	2014

IPPC Secretariat

Secretariat	Mr Brent LARSON Standards Officer	Brent.Larson@fao.org	N/A	N/A
Secretariat	Ms Stephanie DUBON APO	Stephanie.Dubon@fao.org	N/A	N/A
Secretariat	Ms Fabienne GROUSSET Support	Fabienne.Grousset@fao.org	N/A	N/A