



REPORT

Rome, Italy
23-27 April 2012

Standards Committee April, 2012



Produced by the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention

CONTENTS

1.	OPENING OF THE MEETING	4
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat.....	4
1.2	Election of the Rapporteur and Vice-Chair	4
1.3	Adoption of the agenda.....	4
2.	ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.....	4
2.1	Documents list	4
2.2	Participants list.....	4
2.3	Local information	5
3.	UPDATES FROM OTHER RELEVANT BODIES.....	5
3.1	Items arising from CPM-7 (2012).....	5
3.2	Update from the IPPC Secretariat (November 2011-March 2012).....	8
3.3	Items arising from the SC-7 (May 2011).....	11
4.	STANDARDS COMMITTEE.....	11
4.1	Report of the SC November 2011.....	11
4.2	Update of polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (November 2011-April 2012) ..	11
4.3	Update from the Sea containers steering committee (SCSC) (2008-001)	12
5.	DRAFT ISPMs FROM EXPERT DRAFTING GROUPS	13
5.1	Draft Annex 1 to ISPM 15: Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material (2006-011), Priority 1	13
5.2	Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031), Priority 1.....	14
5.3	Draft appendix 1 to ISPM 12: Electronic certification (2006-003), Priority 1	15
5.4	Draft annex to ISPM 20:2004 – Phytosanitary pre-export clearance (2005-003), Priority 3	18
5.5	Draft annex to ISPM 26:2006 – Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management (2005-010), Priority 2	19
5.6	Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak (2009-007).....	20
6.	SELECTION OF THE EQUIVALENT OF FIVE DRAFT ISPMs FOR 2012 MEMBER CONSULTATION.....	21
7.	DRAFT SPECIFICATIONS FOR REVIEW OF MEMBER COMMENTS AND APPROVAL BY THE SC	21
7.1	Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004), Priority 3	21
8.	DRAFT SPECIFICATIONS FOR APPROVAL FOR MEMBER CONSULTATION	21
8.1	Revision of ISPM 4 – Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (2009-002), Priority 2	21
8.2	Revision of ISPM 6 – Guidelines for surveillance (2009-004), Priority 2	22
8.3	Revision of ISPM 8 – Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005), Priority 3	22
8.4	International movement of cut flowers and foliage (2008-005), Priority 4	22
8.5	International movement of grain (2008-007).....	23
9.	REVIEW OF TECHNICAL PANELS	24
9.1	Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols	24
9.2	Technical Panel on Pest Free Areas and Systems Approaches for Fruit Flies.....	25

9.3	Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments	25
9.4	Technical panel on forest quarantine	27
9.5	Technical Panel for the Glossary	27
10.	LIST OF TOPICS FOR IPPC STANDARDS	28
10.1	Update on the List of topics for IPPC standards.....	28
10.2	Adjustments to stewards	28
11.	AGENDA ITEMS DEFERRED TO FUTURE SC MEETINGS	29
12.	REVIEW OF THE STANDARD SETTING CALENDAR	29
13.	OTHER BUSINESS	29
13.1	SC decisions for CPM.....	29
13.2	Future e-decisions	29
14.	CLOSE OF THE MEETING	29
14.1	Date and venue of the next SC Meeting	29
14.2	Evaluation of the meeting process	29
14.3	Adoption of the report.....	29
14.4	Close	30

LIST OF APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1: Agenda.....	31
APPENDIX 2: Documents list	35
APPENDIX 3: Participants list	38
APPENDIX 4: CPM decisions on improving the standard setting process, adopted at CPM-7 (2012)	46
APPENDIX 5: IPPC standard setting procedure adopted by the CPM-7 (2012).....	49
APPENDIX 6: Summary of standards committee e-decisions (Update November 2011 to April 2012)	53

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The Standards Officer opened the meeting and welcomed the participants, especially the 11 new members of the Standards Committee (SC), and noted the absences of four members (Mr Bakak, Cameroon; Mr Soliman, Egypt; Mr Asghari, Iran; Mr Khalil, Iraq (arrived on Tuesday)). He recalled that many recent decisions of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) would impact the IPPC standard setting area in the near future. The CPM Strategic Framework was now approved, and the SC should consider how this would tie into standard setting activities. The agreed improvements to the standard setting process would need to be implemented. He also highlighted the use of new technology for standard setting, such as virtual meetings, e-decisions, the online commenting system (OCS) and a Facebook page. Some new requirements had been put in place by donors in order to monitor use of funds, including monitoring of participation to meetings and impact.
- [2] The Standards Officer thanked the SC members that left in 2012, as well as those continuing, in particular for their roles as stewards. He also thanked the Chair for the close collaboration with the Secretariat to implement the wishes of the contracting parties.
- [3] The Chair welcomed new members, returning members and observers. The SC would face major challenges in the future to fulfil its aim of producing good quality draft ISPMs for member consultation and adoption, and good specifications for new topics. She also outlined that detailed supervision of the activities of the Technical Panels was important.

1.2 Election of the Rapporteur and Vice-Chair

- [4] On behalf of the SC, the Chair thanked the former Vice-Chair, Mr Sakamura (Japan), for his work in the past years, and invited nominations for Vice-Chair. The SC elected Mr Nahhal (Lebanon) as Vice-Chair.
- [5] The SC elected Ms Forest (Canada) as Rapporteur.

1.3 Adoption of the agenda¹

- [6] The SC reviewed the agenda and decided on the order of discussion of agenda items. The Chair mentioned two topics that would be discussed under agenda item 13 (Other business): possible decisions to be presented by the SC to CPM-8 (2013); e-decisions to be expected in the near future. The agenda was adjusted and adopted as presented in Appendix 1.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

2.1 Documents list²

- [7] The Secretariat presented the list of documents (Appendix 2), and informed the SC of additional documents and minor changes and revisions.

2.2 Participants list³

- [8] The list of participants is attached as Appendix 3. The Secretariat reminded participants to update their contact details on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int>) and informed them that the system would be demonstrated.

¹ SC_2012_Apr_01

² SC_2012_Apr_02

³ SC_2012_Apr_03

2.3 Local information

- [9] The Secretariat provided a document on local information⁴ and invited participants to notify the Secretariat of any information that required updating or was missing. The document would be completed with information on travel, visa arrangements and the FAO Preferred Hotel Programme (PHP). The Secretariat also noted that they would approach SC members staying in hotels on the PHP to complete an evaluation that will help improve the programme.

3. UPDATES FROM OTHER RELEVANT BODIES

3.1 Items arising from CPM-7 (2012)

*Summary - Draft report of CPM-7(2012)*⁵

- [10] The Secretariat reviewed the items arising from CPM-7 (2012) in March. All decisions are reported in the CPM report.
- [11] The Secretariat presented the decisions adopted by the CPM on improving the standard setting process (Appendix 4) and the IPPC standard setting procedure adopted by CPM-7 (2012) (Appendix 5). These would be considered and implemented slowly. It was agreed that the impact of the recommendations would be studied in more detail at the November meeting. However, one member noted that the change to the member consultation timing and duration had not been part of the original proposals discussed by the Focus Group, the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) and the SC, and had only been introduced at CPM. Time was needed for proper consideration and implementation, and he suggested that the SC should consider not implementing all the decisions in 2012. Another member understood the concern, but suggested that efforts should be made to implement some of the decisions before CPM-8.
- [12] It was agreed that flexibility is the key to implement the decisions. The new consultation periods will be implemented progressively, with in 2012:
- Member consultation from 1 July to 20 October;
 - Substantial concerns commenting period (drafts coming out of the SC-7, the Technical Panel for Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) and the Technical Panel for Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP)) from 15 May to 30 September (stewards will have until 22 October to send the drafts and responses to comments to the Secretariat).

One consequence of the changes to the member consultation period is that the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) meeting may have to be moved to January-February. The Secretariat will consider whether this should be done from 2013 or 2014.

- [13] The following decisions were also expected to be implemented in the near future, in relation to:
- *List of topics.* The SC will justify and review proposed topics for standards with the IPPC Strategic Framework and will recommend priorities. The *List of topics for IPPC standards* will be made available on the IPP in languages and will no longer be attached to the CPM report.
 - *Specifications.* Submissions of topics by NPPOs or RPPOs should include a draft specification and a literature review. A lead steward and possibly one or two assistants will be allocated to each topic. SC potential replacements could be considered as assistants.
 - *Editing ISPMs.* A lead editor supported by an editorial team will edit documents at various times during the process.
 - *14-days prior to CPM.* No drafting will take place during evening sessions at CPM. All standards will be subjected to formal objections, which must be received 14 days prior to CPM. In case of formal objections, the drafts will be returned to the SC.

⁴ SC_2012_Apr_04

⁵ SC_2012_Apr_22

- *Adoption of diagnostic protocols.* The SC will adopt the diagnostic protocols on behalf of the CPM (possibly via e-decision). There will be a formal objection period and, if there is no objection, the CPM will note the diagnostic protocol. The Secretariat was planning to implement this for the diagnostic protocols sent for member consultation in 2012.

[14] A task force will be formed to develop a framework for standards, subject to extra-budgetary funding. The Secretariat had also started the development of two manuals: the online comment system and a manual for new SC members. Finally, a new statement of commitment would be implemented with an additional line for supervisor's approval.

Cold treatments and formal objections⁶

[15] The Chair noted that formal objections from three contracting parties had been received 14 days prior to CPM-7 (2012) on the cold treatments presented for adoption. All the treatments were consequently returned to the SC. The Chair had prepared a document to facilitate the discussion on future steps for these cold treatments and formal objections to phytosanitary treatments. The CPM had requested the Bureau to develop some guidance on how to deal with formal objections and requested the SC provide advice.

Formal objections

[16] The SC had a full discussion on the issues associated with formal objections related to phytosanitary treatments, in particular what constituted a technically supported objection. It was noted that the formal objections presented at CPM-7 related to technical concerns in relation to two cold treatments for *Bactrocera tryoni*, but other objections related to the fact that similar treatments were under evaluation and therefore all treatments should be adopted at the same time.

[17] One issue in the current procedures is that formal objections are not well defined⁷. The Secretariat does not make a judgement on the validity of formal objections, and the drafts are automatically returned to the SC. The SC discussed that formal objections could be different for phytosanitary treatments and diagnostic protocols, as compared to other types of ISPMs.

[18] The SC generally agreed that formal objections for phytosanitary treatments or diagnostic protocols should be of a technical nature, or directly related to requirements presented in the relevant standards (ISPM 27:2006 *Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests* and ISPM 28:2007 *Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*).

[19] The SC only discussed in detail formal objections related to phytosanitary treatments.

[20] The SC discussed the appropriate body to judge whether a formal objection is technically supported. It cannot be the Secretariat's role. Involvement of the whole SC was envisaged, but some felt that it may not be realistic due to the difficulty of getting input from a large number of members.

[21] The SC suggested that a committee be formed to arbitrate which formal objections are indeed technically supported. For treatments, this could be a small group that could respond quickly. The composition was to be further discussed by the Bureau, but it was suggested that it could be composed of the Coordinator of the IPPC Secretariat, the TPPT steward and the SC Vice-Chair. If members in the small group did not agree, the formal objection would probably have to be considered as technically supported, and the standard be sent back to the SC.

[22] A small drafting group made a proposal relating to phytosanitary treatments⁸. However, there was no consensus on the paper produced, which could not be presented to the Bureau as an SC position. Some members supported that the SC, supported by technical advice from the TPPT, should be involved in the review of formal objections to ensure that they are valid; others mentioned that the process

⁶ SC_2012_Apr_18

⁷ Rule X and Annex 1, Stage 4, Step 7 of the Rules of Procedure of the CPM – CPM-3 (2008).

⁸ SC_2012_Apr_24

developed may need to take into account considerations of “political” objections and the possible need for legal advice; several members noted that the paper related only to phytosanitary treatments, but a process relating to formal objections to diagnostic protocols and other standards will also need to be developed.

Cold treatments

- [23] The SC recognized that the TPPT is fulfilling its task of evaluating the data presented. All treatments proposed for adoption are used in international trade and are supported by evidence and data on validity and efficacy. The TPPT could provide detailed explanations with each treatment sent for approval and consultation, and this may help solve some of the concerns.
- [24] However, one main issue relating to phytosanitary treatments is the apparent need to increase the confidence of contracting parties in the process for reviewing phytosanitary treatments and awareness of the different treatments used around the world.
- [25] Formal objections on cold treatments prior to CPM-7 had been made by major citrus exporting contracting parties and may have reflected a fear that the adopted treatments could hinder trade. The fact that not all similar treatments could be presented for adoption at the same time should not be a concern for contracting parties. The SC reiterated that IPPC phytosanitary treatments in ISPM 28:2007 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) are optional for countries, and provide treatment options with a stated level of efficacy that is supported by data.
- [26] Another issue affecting the cold treatments was the proposal to send all similar treatments together for adoption by CPM. The Secretariat noted that it is not always possible to present all treatments for adoption together, without holding back some treatments that are ready. Processing of treatments relies on submitters providing supporting information and responding quickly to requests for additional information. If the data were not provided, a final notice letter is sent to the submitter, and treatments are removed from the *List of topics for IPPC standards* if data are still not provided. In the case of some of the cold treatments, data was provided and treatments moved forward, while other treatments were still pending the receipt and evaluation of new data.
- [27] The SC discussed how to tackle the specific issue of the cold treatments and whether a meeting of experts should be convened to discuss the issues raised. The TPPT is currently developing a guidance document on the evaluation of cold treatments, and planned that this would be presented to the SC in November; it had suggested that this document be submitted to more experts for input. The SC supported the idea of such guidance being developed, and suggested that the TPPT produces this document with broader consultation, using appropriate expertise. This document should cover the evaluation of the treatments and the science behind the treatments proposed, and would aim at facilitating a good understanding of these treatments, their value and importance as international phytosanitary treatments.
- [28] The SC agreed that a meeting be organized under the auspices of the Secretariat using relevant experts from the TPPT and Technical Panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies (TPPF). The TPPT could help identify the best experts in the world on cold treatment, who should also be invited. Financial resources were available in support of the development of phytosanitary treatments and, if the donor agreed, a consultant could be hired to organize a meeting.
- [29] Development of similar guidance documents for other treatments, e.g. vapour heat treatments, should also be considered in the future in order to facilitate the adoption process.
- [30] It was noted that one problem with phytosanitary treatments is that the data is difficult to obtain, especially if research is done in countries where the pest does not occur. Systems such as used in the International Forestry Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG), where researchers coordinate the necessary research in other countries where the pest occurs, may be useful.

[31] The SC:

- (1) *Asked* the TPPT to consider all the formal objections received prior to CPM-7 (2012) and provide responses for consideration by the SC.
- (2) *Re-affirmed* that adoption of one phytosanitary treatment does not mean that others are not suitable for use in international trade.

3.2 Update from the IPPC Secretariat (November 2011-March 2012)

[32] The Secretary of the IPPC welcomed the SC members and welcomed the changes decided at CPM-7 (2012) to improve the standard setting process.

Standard setting group

[33] The Standards Officer reported that work will be done for resource mobilization for standards setting. He noted that Australia had contributed to the IPPC Trust Fund, for work on the development of phytosanitary treatments. Switzerland would also be providing funds, to be allocated to EWGs and possibly to the development of diagnostic protocols.

[34] The Online Comment System (OCS) is continuously being improved based on comments received from SC users, and the system will be used to present standards and for obtaining comments on various documents (e.g. specifications). The Standards Officer also noted that both Codex Alimentarius and the International Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) have expressed interest in using the OCS.

[35] Changing of the graphic image and branding of the IPPC are being put in place, and this may result in changes to the cover page of standards.

Standard setting staff

[36] The Standards Officer reviewed the staff of the standard setting group⁹, which currently comprised two permanent positions, one APO and several consultants and in-kind contributions, most employed on a part-time basis (100-5%) (three consultants; six in-kind contributions from countries and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)). He noted that the lack of continuity in the staffing had a huge impact, especially as typical standards may take up to seven years to develop. He hoped that the selection of the P3 position for standard setting would be ready for submission to the selection committee within a week.

Information exchange

[37] The Information Exchange Officer presented a short overview. In relation to IPPC reporting in general, there has been slow down of activity and a lack of update of older reports by countries. This needs to be addressed and will be considered by the Bureau and the SPTA over the next year or two.

[38] In the past months, several new information systems had been developed. The Phytosanitary Resources site (www.phytosanitary.info) includes several databases to support capacity development (e.g. <http://projects.phytosanitary.info>). The IRSS area has also been developed further, and a Question and Answer (Q&A) function and helpdesk have been launched.

[39] In terms of awareness, an IPPC brochure should be finalized in English in the near future, and will then be translated into other FAO languages. More use was made of news items on the IPP, social networking had been explored (LinkedIn, Facebook, Twitter) and the 60th anniversary website had been created. The first IPPC video was released at CPM-7 (2012) and will be translated into FAO languages as soon as funds are available.

⁹ SC_2012_Apr_10

Capacity development

- [40] The Capacity Development Officer reported on the progress of the programme. She noted that CPM-7 (2012) approved the creation of a Capacity Development Committee (CDC), which should become operational in 2013, and replace the current EWG on capacity development. The IPPC National Phytosanitary Capacity Building Strategy and its related logical framework and work plan were currently being consolidated after approval of the work plan by CPM-7 (2012). Work is being carried out on approximately 35 projects.
- [41] In response to a call by the IPPC Secretariat, NPPOs, RPPOs and other organizations had provided more than 300 technical resources. The EWG on Capacity Development will have the task to review and note them, with the aim of making available the resources used by countries to implement the IPPC and its standards on an independent website, the Phytosanitary Resources site (www.phytosanitary.info).
- [42] A trust fund for IPPC capacity development was created in December 2011. The first contribution to this Fund is a project aimed at producing “Global phytosanitary manuals, standards operating procedures and training kits”. The second one is going to be a specific contribution from Japan, to fund a P2 staff member for four years, expected to begin in July 2012.

Update on 2012 Regional Workshops

- [43] The current information on regional workshops to review draft ISPMs for 2012 was presented¹⁰. All workshops will be funded by donors or the EU Trust Fund. The workshops will discuss some items in other areas of work of the IPPC Secretariat, such as IRSS, capacity development and information exchange. Regarding draft ISPMs, the Secretariat had decided that the workshops would focus on new drafts for MC, and not on the drafts in the SCCP after SC-7. One member noted that regional workshops may be a good opportunity to discuss the latter. The Secretariat explained that this was decided in order to not overload the regional workshops and because of language reasons, as SC-7 drafts are available in English only. The Standards Officer also noted that diagnostic protocols were thought to be too technical and would not be discussed in detail in regional workshops. Stewards are requested to submit their summary document and presentation to the IPPC Secretariat no later than 15 June 2012.
- [44] The Capacity Development Officer and the Standards Officer reminded the SC that the presence of SC members in regional workshops is useful. However, the Secretariat did not arrange such participation, and SC members should take steps directly at the national and regional level to ensure their participation.
- [45] One member noted that the report on regional workshops presented at CPM-7 (2012) showed the results of questionnaires filled out by participants, including the question on the relevance of the ISPMs for the participant’s country. He indicated that this question should be deleted, as the relevance of ISPMs and their priorities is decided by the SC and the CPM. The Capacity Development Officer agreed to delete this question.
- [46] The Capacity Development Officer noted that explanatory documents, as papers produced by individuals and representing guidance on standards, would be presented as technical resources according to the Bureau and SPTA 2010 decision, and the document presented to CPM-6¹¹. For this reason, they could be placed on the Phytosanitary Resources site (www.phytosanitary.info) and the clearance procedure should be performed by the SC. The SC should also consider using the word “guide” instead of “guidelines” to clearly differentiate them from standards, guidelines and recommendations under the WTO-SPS Agreement. The SC could also consider whether they should be reviewed and noted. The Standards Officer noted that this would require reconsideration of the current procedure for explanatory documents, according to which they are subject to review by SC

¹⁰ SC_2012_Apr_19

¹¹ CPM 2011/INF/19

members, but are not noted by the SC. In addition, although the work on explanatory documents was mostly discontinued, the annotated glossary is regularly updated with input from the TPG, and the explanatory document on ISPM 15:2009 (*Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade*) is being updated by the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ).

[47] The SC:

- (1) *Encouraged* SC members to work at the national and regional level and with workshop organizers to ensure they input into the regional workshops to review draft ISPMs.
- (2) *Decided* that issues linked to explanatory documents will be considered at the next SC meeting.

Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)¹²

[48] The Chair recalled that she had been selected by the SC to represent them on the Triennial review group of the IRSS. In addition the Standards Officer is also a member of this group. She reminded the SC that, at both the May and November 2011 SC meetings, the SC had been invited to provide suggestions for activities for the IRSS.

[49] The IRSS Officer emphasized that the funding for the IRSS project ended in March 2014. All subsidiary bodies are again being invited to submit ideas on activities to be considered in the remaining time available. The suggestions would be reviewed and prioritized by the Bureau, based on consideration of issues, cost and time remaining in the project, in order to decide which activities were feasible and could be added to the IRSS work programme. The IRSS Officer noted that proposals should also consider how the outcome of the activity would be used, for example in the framework of the revision of a standard as for the revisions of ISPM 4:1995 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) and ISPM 8:1998 (*Determination of pest status in an area*).

[50] In 2011, the IRSS had launched questionnaires on ISPM 6:1997 (*Guidelines for surveillance*), ISPM 4:1995 and ISPM 8:1998. The steward for ISPM 6:1997 noted that information obtained would be considered at a “global symposium on phytosanitary pest surveillance” hosted by APPPC in October 2012 in the Republic of Korea. This meeting may identify manuals or guides that need to be developed. He envisaged that such material could later be developed with the support of the capacity development team. The outcomes of the questionnaires for ISPM 4:1995 and ISPM 8:1998, which were scheduled for revision were now available. The stewards for these drafts noted that it was too early to consider whether the outcome of the review was sufficient, or whether additional information was needed. The IRSS Officer noted that input from stewards of the drafts would be useful to consider possible improvements to future questionnaires. Finally, in 2011, desk studies had also been carried out on aquatic plants and internet trade, and one had been launched on equivalence.

[51] A general IPPC implementation questionnaire was also being finalized and would be circulated in a few weeks. Through the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement (SBDS), proposals had been made for a workshop on the implementation of ISPM 15:2009 (subsequently not accepted by the Bureau) and a survey on implementation issues associated with ISPM 13:2001 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*). The survey for ISPM 13:2001 will be conducted by the IRSS as it was approved by the Bureau in March 2012. The results are needed by the SBDS for its meeting in July.

[52] One member wondered about the studies on equivalence and ISPM 13:2001 and whether the SC would be informed of the outcome of these studies. The IRSS Officer noted that the need for feedback should be included in the project request.

[53] In reaction to a comment regarding the risk of questionnaire fatigue on the NPPO side, the IRSS Officer noted that alternative methodologies were being considered and he would try to spread the questionnaires out. One SC member suggested that it may be relevant to count the number of hits on a

¹² SC_2012_Apr_20

standard on the IPP to see which ones were not used. The SC requested that the IRSS keeps the SC informed and seeks feedback from the SC members as appropriate.

[54] Considering likely proposals for the IRSS work programme in support of standard setting, the Secretariat suggested that issues linked to diagnostic protocols should be investigated through the IRSS. The Standards Officer noted that it would be useful to know if the diagnostic protocols are used in languages (or only in English), and how widely they are used.

[55] One member suggested that it might be useful to consider certain aspects related to the topic of grain, depending on the scope defined in relation to the specification, to be discussed later during the meeting. One issue at the Open-ended workshop on the international movement of grain had been the lack of representation from developing countries, as well as lack of input from importing countries. The IRSS could help identify issues that had not been dealt with at the workshop.

[56] The Chair concluded that the issue of possible IRSS activities will be considered during the meeting, and a conclusion made at the end of the meeting, taking account of the issues raised above in relation to ISPM 13:2001, ISPM 4:1995, ISPM 8:1998, grain and diagnostic protocols.

[57] During the meeting, the SC identified the following topics to be submitted to the Bureau when considering possible subjects for the IRSS:

[58] Priority topic

- Central hub for electronic certification (see agenda item 5.3).

[59] Other possible topics

- Diagnostic protocols (see paragraph [54] in the present section).
- Survey on pest interceptions on containers (see paragraph [73] under agenda item 4.3).

[60] The Secretariat would solicit assistance of some SC members to draft proposals for the Bureau, including what interaction is expected with the SC. One member noted that the IRSS works with the implementation of adopted standards. However the Chair recalled that it may also consider upcoming issues of relevance for the IPPC (such as aquatic plants and internet trade).

3.3 Items arising from the SC-7 (May 2011)

[61] The Secretariat introduced items arising from the SC-7 meeting in 2011¹³, which had not been noted by the SC in November 2011. It was noted that some activities related to requests to the TPG had already been addressed. The SC-7 had requested the SC to ask the TPG to consider the definition of *tolerance level* based on a proposal by the TPGF, and the SC agreed to this request.

[62] The SC:

- (1) *Added* the term *tolerance level* to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* as a subject, to be considered by the TPG.

4. STANDARDS COMMITTEE

4.1 Report of the SC November 2011

[63] There was no comment on the report.

4.2 Update of polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (November 2011-April 2012)

[64] The Secretariat presented updates on e-decisions since November 2011. There was no comment except for adjustments made to the order of agenda items for the meeting (consolidated in Appendix 6).

¹³ SC_2012_Apr_11

4.3 Update from the Sea containers steering committee (SCSC) (2008-001)

Report (November 2011)

[65] There was no comment on the report.

Update on activities of the SCSC

[66] The Steward provided updates¹⁴ and introduced several suggestions by the Sea containers steering committee (SCSC) to the SC. The SCSC was proposing to provide guidance on how to deal with pest movement by containers, both for the NPPO (as an ISPM) and for the industry (by discussing how their procedures could be modified). The industry already has systems in place for cleaning containers, and these could possibly be modified to help reduce the pest risk in the movement of containers. The Containers Owners' Association (COA) manages approximately 90% of the 30 million containers moving in the world and is willing to make the necessary adjustments to their systems to help address phytosanitary issues. The industry is interested in the development of an international system. The SCSC requested the SC support for their work with industry on this matter. Work would also be carried out closely with international organisations, especially with the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the World Customs Organization (WCO).

[67] The steward noted that it was hoped that industry would develop cleaning procedures immediately, and that an ISPM would be developed to provide guidance to NPPOs on oversight of the process, including the verification of containers cleanliness and the accreditation of cleaning firms. One member noted that, with the industry already implementing procedures for cleaning, it will be easier for NPPOs to implement the future ISPM as the container industry has been consulted and is aware of this issue in advance. This would help avoid issues that had arisen for the implementation of ISPM 15:2009.

[68] The following issues were discussed:

[69] Expected status of the industry guidance. The proposed SCSC liaison work with industry would be fully reported to the SC and CPM. However, the steward noted that if the approach is supported by the COA, the IMO and other relevant organisations, it is very likely to be implemented. The role of NPPOs will be further developed, but there would be no conflict between the interim industry guidance and the draft ISPM. The Secretariat noted that contracting parties would need to support any changes in IMO guidance and additional fields in the WCO database through their national representatives to these organisations.

[70] Reinfestation of containers. The steward expected that the draft ISPM would include guidance on this, but the first phase of this draft ISPM would focus on empty containers.

[71] Packing. One member noted that, when being packed, the consignment may become contaminated. While the standard would cover only empty containers in the initial phase, the issue of how to avoid contamination may need to be considered. The steward noted that empty containers would be considered first, and then contamination at packing could be one issue to be considered later.

[72] Expected level of inspection of containers by the NPPO. The steward noted that there is currently only a low percentage of containers being examined by NPPOs, but the industry does examine most containers as these are cleaned before they are used again. It is not expected that NPPOs will be closely involved in container inspections, but they would have an oversight role related to the accreditation of cleaning firms and the verification of cleanliness.

[73] One member noted that it would be useful to collect data on pest interceptions on containers. It would give a baseline for the future to demonstrate the impact of the ISPM.

¹⁴ SC_2012_Apr_21

[74] The SC:

- (1) *Agreed* that the draft ISPM should recognize the three categories of containers: empty containers ready to be packed; empty containers for repositioning, and; packed containers.
- (2) *Agreed* that during the development of this draft ISPM:
 - The draft should address sea containers defined as: *freight containers*.
 - The term *overland* would be interpreted to mean the continuation of a sea voyage.
 - Contamination at packing is a different topic related to cargo and should not be covered in this draft ISPM at this stage.
 - The following international organizations would be relevant to help reduce the pest risks associated with sea containers and should be consulted: International Maritime Organization (IMO), Container Owners' Association (COA), World Customs Organization (WCO), Institute of International Container Lessors (IICL), International Chamber of Shipping (ICS), World Shipping Council (WSC), International Organization for Standardization (ISO).
 - The Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service (AQIS) requirements for container floors should be used as the basis to help develop similar requirements for all three categories of containers.
 - A technical document should be coordinated with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the OIE and should include general recommendations about safe disposal of dunnage and wash water, use of chemicals, etc., and the draft ISPM should include wording regarding limiting the spread of invasive alien species, etc.
 - The IPPC should work with the container industry, and collaborating with other stakeholders, to supply some interim guidance.
 - The IPPC standard setting process continues to develop a draft ISPM, consulting with members and relevant international organizations.

[75] Note: additional decisions were previously made by e-decision 2012_eSC_May_02 (see Appendix 6), i.e. removal of conveyances from the scope and title, focus on empty containers, and emphasis on producing practical means of verifying the cleanliness of containers.

5. DRAFT ISPMS FROM EXPERT DRAFTING GROUPS

5.1 Draft Annex 1 to ISPM 15: Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material (2006-011), Priority 1

[76] CPM-7 (2012) had been asked to decide whether the development of the dielectric heating treatment should continue, given the limited experience with using dielectric heating treatment for wood at a commercial level. CPM-7 (2012) had agreed that sufficient experience to develop detailed operational guidance on use at a commercial scale will only be gained once the treatment is included in ISPM 15:2009, and agreed that the development of this treatment should continue.

[77] The Secretariat recalled that the draft Annex 1 to ISPM 15 is on the agenda of the SC-7, and would therefore be submitted to the substantial concerns commenting period. This draft contains information on treating wood packaging material using heat treatment by dielectric heating.

[78] However, the dielectric heating treatment was also under development as an annex to ISPM 28:2007 (*Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heat* (2007-114)), which had already been sent for member consultation, and the SC needed to consider how this treatment should be dealt with. Several solutions were envisaged: the treatment could be sent for the substantial concerns commenting period at the same time as Annex 1 to ISPM 15:2009; in that case, the SC-7 adjustments to ISPM 15:2009 may need to be integrated into the dielectric heating phytosanitary treatment; or this treatment could be put on hold. One member proposed that the dielectric heating treatment should not be developed as an Annex to ISPM 28:2007. It had been agreed that the procedures of ISPM 28:2007

should be followed for new ISPM 15:2009 treatments, but this did not imply that the treatments should be part of ISPM 28:2007.

[79] The Secretariat noted that under the new rules, the ISPM 28:2007 treatments, developed by the TPPT will not be modified by the SC-7, but by the TPPT as these standards are very technical. In addition ISPM 28:2007 treatments too would have to be made available for a substantial concerns commenting period.

[80] The SC decided to focus on Annex 1 to ISPM 15 in line with the CPM-7 (2012) decision, and reconsider at a later stage the dielectric treatment as part of ISPM 28:2007. It was noted that the dielectric heat treatment has not been used. Once integrated into ISPM 15:2009, more information will be obtained on how to operationally apply it, and this could be added to the dielectric heating phytosanitary treatment.

[81] The SC:

- (1) *Decided* that Annex 1 to ISPM 15, *Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material* (2006-011), would go from the SC-7 to the substantial concerns commenting period.
- (2) *Decided*, because of the residual concerns about practical implementation, to change the status for the dielectric heating treatment as an annex to ISPM 28:2007 (*Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heat* (2007-114)) to pending, waiting for more detailed operational guidance.

5.2 Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031), Priority 1

[82] The steward introduced the draft ISPM and recalled that it resulted from modifications made by the TPF in 2011 based on comments received from the SC and worked on by a small group of SC members, and input from the TPG on several definitions.

[83] To progress the draft, the SC had a general discussion and created a working group to discuss the draft in detail. The steward reported that agreement had been reached for most problematic issues. The revised draft was reviewed again in detail in plenary, and remaining comments addressed.

[84] Specific issues were discussed as follows:

[85] *Title*. One member felt that this draft Standard was not strictly a protocol and the SC agreed to change the title replacing *Protocol to determine* with *Determining*.

[86] *Scope. Paragraph 9*. The scope was clarified to acknowledge that this draft is intended to be used when there is a specific need for it (e.g. uncertain host status or disputed). It was not expected that host status determination through surveillance or field trials would be necessary for hosts for which there are no disputes.

[87] *References*. There were originally references in three places: Reference section of the ISPM, Appendix 1 and Appendix 2. Appendix 1 had been agreed for deletion as a specific publication covered that information. Key references that apply to the text would be retained in the Reference section of the ISPM, and other key additional references in Appendix 2 would be kept (now as Appendix 1).

[88] *Definitions*.

- Paragraph 14. *Host status* is intended to be a general definition that will be transferred to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*), and the other three definitions (*natural host*, *non-natural host* and *non-host*) will be definitions used specifically for fruit fly standards. The SC agreed that the definition for *host status* remains in the draft for member consultation, with a note explaining that it will be transferred to ISPM 5 after adoption.
- There was a discussion on whether *species* or *cultivar* should be used to qualify plant. As *host status* will be a general definition in ISPM 5, and the definition of plants already applies to all types of plants, these terms are not needed. However, they will be included in the *natural host*,

non-natural host and *non-host*, as this distinction is important in the determination of host status for fruit flies.

[89] *Paragraph 30.* Although the term *voucher specimen* is normally used in entomology, it was replaced by *reference specimen*, which is a glossary term in ISPM 5.

[90] *Paragraph 37 to 39.* The text referred to in several places to “fruit being classified as host”. Although it is agreed that the status of host applies to the plant, there are reasons to use this wording in the standard. Firstly, fruit flies attack fruit only. The determination of host status aims at determining which fruits (of a species or cultivar), and possibly which physiological stages of this fruit, present a risk of introducing fruit flies. Pest risk management options may then be applied to the fruit to address the risk. Operationally, phytosanitary import requirements target the fruit, not the plant, and sometimes only certain physiological stages (level of maturity). Although the host status relates to the plant species or cultivar as a host, only fruit, and possibly only some physiological stages of the fruit, may carry the pest. In addition, all the research by Aluja, referred to in the draft standard, was developed in relation to fruits, not to plants.

[91] *Paragraph 95.* The text indicated the duration of record-keeping of at least five years, which is in line with other fruit fly standards. Some members commented that the duration may need to be longer as this would support trade. The SC agreed to leave at least five years for consistency. It was noted that the issue of inconsistencies of duration of record keeping in ISPMs was under consideration in the TPG.

[92] The SC approved for member consultation the draft [Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly \(*Tephritidae*\) infestation \(2006-031\)](#) as revised during the meeting.

5.3 Draft appendix 1 to ISPM 12: Electronic certification (2006-003), Priority 1

[93] The steward presented the background on the development of the draft. The draft Appendix contained the requirements for electronic certification. Most information related to informatics was described in a background information document¹⁵ and detailed informatics information will be posted on the IPP. The reason to not include this information in the draft Appendix is that it will evolve very rapidly. At their next meeting in September 2012, the e-phyto working groups will design a system for updating informatics information.

[94] The SC discussed general issues linked to the draft Appendix.

Whether the draft should be an appendix or an annex to ISPM 12:2011

[95] Several members suggested that the draft should become an annex; this would not make electronic certification mandatory, but would ensure that the annex is implemented if electronic certification is used. Several members preferred that it should remain as an appendix as was already presented in the adopted standard. The Standards Officer noted that both appendixes and annexes followed the same standard setting process, and adoption of a revision would not be faster for an appendix. In addition, the CPM had already decided that the text should be an appendix.

[96] One member suggested that the discussion on appendix versus annex should be explained in the background document accompanying the draft for member consultation. However, there was no agreement and, this issue would only be mentioned in the SC report.

How to ensure harmonisation of electronic certification

[97] The Information Exchange Officer noted that there is no obligation to use electronic certification. Such use currently starts with a bilateral negotiation between two trading partners. Therefore, countries wishing to use electronic certification with several trading partners may need to enter into several bilateral negotiations. It is hoped that this standard will harmonize the technical aspects of electronic certification.

¹⁵ SC_2012_Apr_09

- [98] The Standards Officer noted that a central “hub” maintained by the IPPC Secretariat to manage a common global system for electronic certification had been suggested several years ago. Such a system must be available at all times (24 hours per day, 7 days per week) and with a high level of security and robustness, as any failure would impact trade. Building and maintenance of such a system would be very costly. However, the IPPC could generate revenues, for example by charging for phytosanitary certificates going through the system.
- [99] The Standards Officer noted that a central hub would provide a harmonized method for exchanging electronic phytosanitary certificates. This would reduce the efforts for every contracting party to negotiate multiple bilateral arrangements, which are very resource intensive and would put developing countries at a disadvantage.
- [100] It was noted that the Appendix is important and should be submitted to member consultation as soon as possible. Bilateral systems are expected to be used in the immediate future; however the possibility of future harmonisation through a central hub needs to be considered in order to avoid further divergence between systems. Consequently, the SC supported that a study be conducted in parallel on the costs, benefits and feasibility of a global hub for electronic certification. The SC suggested that this study be carried out through the IRSS. The study should consider whether global hubs are used by other entities or stakeholders, and also the compatibility with other existing systems, such as customs. The SC informed the IRSS Officer of this proposal, for consideration by the Bureau in June 2012 when deciding the activities to be carried out under the IRSS.

Security of the transmission

- [101] The issue of security of transmissions is crucial for electronic certification, and this aspect needs further emphasis in the Appendix. The Information Exchange Officer noted that the e-phyto working groups had discussed security, which related both to encryption and to verification, and is considered central to the electronic certification “transmission”. The level of security of systems for electronic certification should be similar to that used by banks. Further discussion would take place during the e-phyto working groups meetings in September 2012, and final technical details would be part of the separate technical information posted on the IPP. The SC noted that more details may be needed in the text, but decided to not make changes prior to member consultation.

Language of background information

- [102] Most links to websites lead to sites in English. One member noted that this would be a problem for countries using other languages. The Information Exchange Officer noted that often information for computer coding is only available in English. In a few cases, sites are available in other languages and relevant links would be provided.

Reference to codes and other information from other organizations

- [103] One member noted that the EPPO system mentioned for codes of pests and plants (EPPT) does not contain all pest and plant names. It was noted that the e-phyto working groups had identified EPPT as the best system available. One member suggested that it should be possible to use free text when a code was not available. However, others noted that free text should be avoided for technical reasons, to favour harmonisation, to avoid errors and facilitate systems communicating with each other. In the particular case of the EPPO codes, the system is maintained and updated based on requests from NPPOs, but there may be a subscription fee.
- [104] In addition, the following items were raised:
- In relation to date and time formats, and point of entry and point of destination, the SC noted that these parameters of the electronic certification systems need to be harmonised. They also wondered why the UNECE recommendations should be used, and not for example the codes of ISO. The SC decided that the text should be left as it is, and comments obtained during member consultation.

- The text mentions that the original certificates should be attached to re-export certificates. Guidance is needed on how this would be done, also when the original certificate was a paper document.
- It was noted that the requirements in paragraph 40 were different to those in ISPM 12:2011 and guidance from the Steering Committee was needed to explain the reason for this. In particular the term “to order” was used on the paper PC, but the draft text required the name and address of contact person. The Secretariat was requested to find out why this difference was introduced and include reasons in the background document for member consultation.

[105] The SC discussed whether the background information from the SC document¹⁶ should be sent for member consultation. It concluded that as Annexes 1 and 2 of this document had been created by the working groups on electronic certification, they would be open for comments with the aim of identifying products descriptions and types of treatments that are missing from the tables (but not, for example, to obtain comments on the proposed codes or on the links proposed). The SC noted that Annex 3 would not be open for comments, but the Secretariat should make sure that the text is in line with ISPM 12:2011.

[106] The following elements should be integrated in a background document to be made available to contracting parties with the draft ISPM during member consultation:

- (1) Part of the background information¹⁷, including Annex 1 and Annex 2 (for comments as suggested above in order to identify if the list is missing product descriptions and types of treatments) and Annex 3 (for information only).
- (2) Information on links and how updates to the technical information will be made, and by who.
- (3) A commitment from EPPO and other relevant organizations that manage information linked to in the draft that they will maintain this information and continuously update it rapidly as necessary.
- (4) Reference to the reports of meetings on electronic certification.
- (5) Explanations on paragraph 40 of the appendix (see paragraph [104]).

[107] The Information Exchange Officer informed the SC that a three-day workshop on electronic certification was tentatively planned in Brazil for the 3rd week of November 2012, and invited feedback on the content of the workshop.

[108] The SC:

- (1) *Approved* for member consultation the draft Appendix 1 to ISPM 12 on *Electronic certification* (2006-003) as revised during the meeting (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=207803>).
- (2) *Agreed* that the draft would be accompanied by a background document containing the elements as described above.
- (3) *Requested* the Secretariat, for all systems from other organizations mentioned in the draft, to
 - (a) obtain a written commitment from the relevant organization (where the draft does not give the possibility for free text) that their systems will be rapidly updated as necessary based on the requests from NPPOs, and
 - (b) verify that all systems mentioned will be accessible free of charge for use (including for using the codes in the NPPOs' own databases) and for requesting new codes.
- (4) *Requested* the Bureau to consider a study on the feasibility of introducing a global harmonized system for electronic certification (central hub), looking at the feasibility and cost and benefits of such a system, taking into account the needs of developing countries, as a task for the IRSS.

¹⁶ SC_2012_Apr_09

¹⁷ SC_2012_Apr_09

5.4 Draft annex to ISPM 20:2004 – Phytosanitary pre-export clearance (2005-003), Priority 3

[109] The steward introduced the draft and noted that three sets of comments had been provided in writing during the meeting. The SC first had a general discussion in plenary to identify the main issues. A working group then met to discuss the draft in detail, taking into account the comments provided. The steward reported on the outcome of the working group.

Term and definition

[110] No agreement was reached on the term to be used in the draft, i.e. *pre-clearance* or *pre-export clearance*. However, there was a general agreement that the definition of pre-clearance in ISPM 5 needs to be revised as it implies that NPPOs of importing countries issue phytosanitary certificates in an exporting country.

Use of pre-clearance

[111] There was agreement that pre-clearance occurs through a bilateral agreement between two trading partners, and is established through a voluntary agreement. It was also agreed that pre-clearance may be used for trade facilitation. It is a mutual arrangement to streamline entry of consignments into a country. For various reasons, the importing country undertakes the import inspection in the exporting country. Such arrangements may be requested by the industry, when there is a benefit (for example inspection of bulk commodities prior to packing). This is the only use of pre-clearance for which there was consensus and that could be considered in an immediate revision of the draft.

[112] It is acknowledged that there are other types of programmes in countries. However, no consensus was reached on these, and they would not be considered for the moment, such as:

- (1) for capacity-building reasons, when the exporting country has difficulty meeting the requirements of the importing country
- (2) for pest risk management, when there is no other option to address pest risks
- (3) one member also suggested that pre-clearance is sometimes used when there is a lack of trust from the importing country on the ability of the exporting country to meet phytosanitary import requirements, for example due to large numbers of non-compliances. However, another member pointed out that this was not the case; rather it depends on whether the country can mitigate the risk.

Duration of pre-clearance

[113] It was agreed that pre-clearance programmes, in the above-mentioned limited sense, may be short-term or long-term depending on the situation.

Oversight, audit, phytosanitary measures

[114] There is confusion in the draft regarding oversight and audit of procedures in the exporting country. This should be clarified in the draft. It was also noted that phytosanitary measures should not be included in the draft.

Other issues raised in plenary

[115] A number of other issues were raised in plenary regarding the draft annex:

- (1) Phytosanitary certification remains solely the exporting country's responsibility, and there is no reason to have a section in the standard.
- (2) Many pre-clearance programmes are at the request of the exporting country.
- (3) Cost-benefits are often the main reason to enter pre-clearance; they are not additional benefits as indicated in the draft.
- (4) The programmes are based on pest risk analysis.

- (5) The importing country should not interfere with the internal processes of the exporting country. The inspectors of the importing country do the same as they would normally do at the point of entry: i.e. inspection and import treatments as necessary.
- (6) One member noted that pre-clearance programmes may have an implementation cost for the industry, while oversight is usually paid by the importing country.

[116] The SC decided that the draft be reviewed by a small SC working group to focus, in the first instance, on where the importing country carries out such activities that it would normally execute at point of entry in the exporting country, as referenced in ISPM 20:2004.

[117] Mr Holtzhausen will revise the draft with a drafting group composed of Ms Castro Dorochessi, Ms Forest and Mr Rossel. Consultations with a wider group will then be organized, possibly through a forum or through the OCS. The wider group will be composed of the drafting group, plus: Ms Aliaga, Mr Dikin, Mr Hedley, Mr M'Siska, Ms Melcho, Ms Montealegre Lara, Mr Moreira Palma, Mr Ngatoko, Mr Nordbo, Ms Paulsen, Mr Sakamura and Mr Wlodarczyk.

[118] The following documents should be taken into consideration in the revision: ISPM 20:2004, the specification for the standards, SC reports, and comments received from SC members.

[119] The draft should be submitted to the Secretariat by 15 December 2012 to be submitted to the SC in April 2013.

[120] The SC thanked the steward for his work over the years.

5.5 Draft annex to ISPM 26:2006 – Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management (2005-010), Priority 2

[121] In the absence of the steward, the Secretariat presented the draft.

[122] Some members proposed that this draft should become an appendix, as the text was very technical and many elements did not relate to harmonisation. However, the Secretariat noted that the topic had been agreed as a stand-alone ISPM, which had already been changed to an annex, and it would be strange to change it to an appendix. The SC agreed that the text would remain as an annex, but noted the duplication of information between the annex and its appendix. The SC therefore requested that the appendix be eliminated and some text from the appendix be transferred to the annex. One member suggested that, as per normal usage, annexes should be reserved for information that facilitates harmonization, and appendixes for technical information.

[123] The SC discussed whether to present the technical information in a separate document, such as a manual, or only include the main requirements as detailed information sources already exist. The Secretariat noted that not all information was covered by references, nor was the information consolidated in a format that could be easily used by experts. It would be useful to present all information in one document as this information would be useful for countries dealing with fruit flies issues. Two SC members noted that the information included in the draft would be useful for implementation in their countries. The SC favoured to wait for a new draft before considering whether some technical information should be developed in another form.

[124] Specific issues were discussed as follows:

- (1) Terminology needs to be used consistently. Inconsistencies were noted in relation to the use of *pest management*, *pest control*, *phytosanitary procedures*. In addition, *plant* is more relevant than *tree*.
- (2) The use of the term *control* should be reviewed, as in the draft it covers exclusion measures, which does not correspond to the definition in ISPM 5. It was noted that *control* is already a TPG subject in the *List of topics for IPPC standards* in order to cover exclusion in the definition.

- (3) *Section 1.1, paragraph 17, indents 1 and 2.* These relate to ALPP and not to PRA, and should not be included. The Secretariat reported that the TPF had suggested that the annex could be developed in support of all three ISPMs on fruit flies (PFA, ALPP and systems approach for fruit flies), which explained why ALPP was mentioned.
- (4) *Section 2.* This section does not give requirements for the application of phytosanitary procedures, as the title indicates, but rather methods and procedures.
- (5) *Section 2.2.* There is confusion between systems approach and the procedures themselves. A systems approach in the sense of ISPM 14:2002 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*) is not a requisite for the application of phytosanitary procedures.
- (6) *Section 2.3.* The concept of area-wide management is not well defined.
- (7) *Section 3.* The section talks about control measures, but not phytosanitary measures. These should be mentioned.
- (8) *Section 3.3.* Paragraph 59 on baiting stations is more a measure than a procedure.

[125] The SC:

- (1) *Invited* its members to submit written comments to the steward Mr Opatowski (davido@moag.gov.il), with copy to the TPF steward Ms Aliaga (julie.e.aliaga@aphis.usda.gov) and the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org), no later than 31 May 2012. The steward will redraft the document, circulate it to the TPF and resubmit it to the Secretariat no later than 15 December 2012 to be presented to the SC in April 2013 for consideration for member consultation.

5.6 Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak (2009-007)

[126] The steward presented this draft annex to ISPM 26:2006¹⁸. In particular he recalled previous discussions on which of the terms *regulated area*, *affected area* and *quarantine area* should be used. Although it had been decided to use *quarantine area*, *affected area* would be consistent with ISPM 26:2006 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*). However, the SC decided to maintain *quarantine area*, as this is the term currently defined and in use in several countries' regulations.

[127] The SC reviewed the draft in detail and discussed the following specific issues:

[128] The annex did not cover several elements, and it should be clarified that this was because they are covered in other parts of ISPM 26:2006. Cross-references to the relevant section of ISPM 26:2006 may need to be introduced. For example:

- Paragraph 10 states that non-commercial crops are not covered, as they are covered in the main text of ISPM 26:2006.
- The text does not touch upon the consequences of an eradication campaign that is not successful and where a pest free area needs to be redefined. This is covered with responses to outbreaks in Annex 1 of ISPM 26:2006.

[129] *In section 1, especially Paragraph 19, sections 1.1 & 1.2.* The text gives the impression that countries may choose to determine the boundaries of a quarantine area either by defining a suitable radius based on the biology of the target fruit fly pest (based on its dispersal capabilities) or according to administrative boundaries (e.g. countries, provinces). It should be clarified that the basis for defining the boundaries of the quarantine area is the biology of the pest (i.e. a radius).

[130] *Section 2.5.* It was questioned if processing is a phytosanitary action, i.e. if it should be part of section 2.

[131] A working group met to revise the draft. The steward reported that the main issues had been resolved.

¹⁸ 2009-007

[132] The SC:

- (1) *Approved* for member consultation the draft annex to ISPM 26:2006 on *Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak* (2009-007) as revised during the meeting (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=207803>).

6. SELECTION OF THE EQUIVALENT OF FIVE DRAFT ISPMS FOR 2012 MEMBER CONSULTATION

[133] The Secretariat recalled the draft standards that the SC has approved for member consultation:

- Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031)
- Appendix 1 to ISPM 12:2011. *Electronic certification* (2006-003)
- Annex to ISPM 26:2006. *Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak* (2009-007)
- Annex to ISPM 27:2006. *Diagnostic protocol for Guignardia citricarpa Kiely* (2004-023)
- Annex to ISPM 27:2006. *Diagnostic protocol for Tilletia indica Mitra* (2004-014)

[134] All drafts above will be sent for the member consultation beginning 1 July 2012 to 20 October 2012 (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=207803>). One member wondered whether regional workshops for draft ISPMs should last five days when the two diagnostic protocols would not be discussed in detail, and the other drafts were relatively short documents. The Secretariat answered that the workshops may also discuss issues linked to capacity development and information exchange.

7. DRAFT SPECIFICATIONS FOR REVIEW OF MEMBER COMMENTS AND APPROVAL BY THE SC

7.1 Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004), Priority 3

[135] The steward introduced the draft specification following member comments¹⁹. One modification was introduced to cover spillage that may occur when unloading the waste.

[136] The SC:

- (1) *Approved* Specification 55 [Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages](#) (2008-004) as revised in the meeting.

8. DRAFT SPECIFICATIONS FOR APPROVAL FOR MEMBER CONSULTATION

8.1 Revision of ISPM 4 – Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (2009-002), Priority 2

[137] The draft specification was deferred to a future meeting. The SC invited its members to submit written comments to the steward Ms Awosusi (awosusifunke@yahoo.com) and the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org), no later than 31 May 2012. The steward will redraft the specification based on the comments and the IRSS document on ISPM 4²⁰. The steward will resubmit it to the Secretariat no later than 15 September 2012, to be presented to the SC in November 2012 for consideration for member consultation.

¹⁹ 2008-004; SC_2012_Apr_05

²⁰ SC_2012_Apr_06

8.2 Revision of ISPM 6 – Guidelines for surveillance (2009-004), Priority 2

[138] The steward introduced the specification, accompanied with the IRSS document on ISPM 6²¹. He noted that the APPPC “global symposium on phytosanitary pest surveillance” (see also agenda item 3.1) will provide input on how the standard should be revised, and will develop a framework for manuals on pest surveillance. The steward invited comments to further improve the specification and several comments were made.

[139] The following suggestions were made to be considered in developing further the specification:

- (1) Scope. How do we expect experts to provide guidance on the quality of surveillance?
- (2) In reasons for the standard, the wording “environmental consequences” should be reconsidered.
- (3) Suggestion to change specific surveys to specific surveillance.
- (4) Urban areas could be considered in tasks 1 and 5.
- (5) Task 2. Whether “confidence” in task 2 relates to the statistical confidence.
- (6) Task 3. Could be expanded to voluntary or mandatory reporting by citizens.
- (7) Task 4. Whether some appendix is envisaged for types of pests.
- (8) Task 5. What does host surveys refer to?
- (9) Task 9. What is intended by “the recognition of new diagnostic methodologies”? It is also important to have guidelines for procedures for collecting pests. Centres of diagnosis are envisaged in some regions.
- (10) A new task could be added to provide recommendations to the SC on the possible need for revision of other ISPMs arising from the revision of ISPM 6:1997 (*Guidelines for surveillance*).
- (11) Provide guidance on dealing with data in relation to pest surveillance (such as collection, collate, extraction, usage).
- (12) Provide guidance on the implementation of surveillance programmes.

[140] The SC invited its members to submit further comments in writing to the steward Mr Hedley (john.hedley@maf.govt.nz) and the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org), no later than 31 May 2012. The steward will redraft the specification, taking also into account the comments made during the “global symposium on phytosanitary pest surveillance”. The steward will resubmit the specification to the Secretariat no later than 15 December 2012, to be presented to the SC in May 2013 for consideration for member consultation.

8.3 Revision of ISPM 8 – Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005), Priority 3

[141] The draft specification was deferred to a future meeting. The SC invited its members to submit written comments to the steward Ms Melcho (bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy) and the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org), no later than 31 May 2012. The steward will redraft the specification based on the comments and the IRSS document on ISPM 8²² and will resubmit it to the Secretariat no later than 15 September 2012, to be presented to the SC in November 2012 for consideration for member consultation.

8.4 International movement of cut flowers and foliage (2008-005), Priority 4

[142] The steward introduced the specification. A small working group considered the specification in detail and reported to the plenary. Specific issues were discussed as follows in the plenary and the working group.

[143] The term defined in ISPM 5 is *cut flowers and branches*, so this term was used throughout the draft. One member noted that in most cases, it is not branches that are traded, but only the foliage; however, this is covered in the definition of *cut flowers and branches*.

²¹ SC_2012_Apr_07

²² SC_2012_Apr_08

[144] It was noted that the standard would be restricted to the material used for ornamental purposes. In addition, the SC asked the TPG to review the current definition of *cut flowers and branches*, in particular, to state clearly in the definition of *cut flowers and branches* that they:

- (1) are for decorative/ornamental purposes only
- (2) are not intended for propagation
- (3) include fruit and other propagules for ornamental use.

[145] One member noted that the inclusion of fruit or propagules in consignments of cut flowers and branches may present higher risks than those without. It was agreed that the EWG will identify particular pest risk factors for the different types of cut flowers and branches, for example with or without fruit.

[146] It was agreed that the guidance in the standard should relate to different types of cut flowers and branches (i.e. broad categories such as woody branches, etc.), and not to individual main species or genera traded as cut flowers and branches.

[147] The SC:

- (1) [Approved for member consultation the specification for *International movement of cut flowers and branches* \(2008-005\)](#) as revised in the meeting.
- (2) *Added* the term *cut flowers and branches* as a subject to the *List of IPPC topics* under the TPG work programme.

8.5 International movement of grain (2008-007)

[148] In the absence of the steward, the Secretariat and SC Chair presented the document²³, noting that the specification on grain had been aligned with the recently-approved specification for the topic of *International movement of seed* (2009-003). The steward had worked closely with experts from Argentina, Australia and Canada to develop the specification. The Chair mentioned that CPM had requested the SC to develop a specification considering the main results from the open-ended workshop on the international movement of grain, submit the specification for member consultation and based on comments received, submit recommendations to CPM-8 (2013).

[149] Two members requested that the topic be developed as an annex to ISPM 11:2004 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms*). However, it was noted that a Friends of the Chair meeting of CPM had decided that concept ISPMs should remain independent, and not contain commodity aspects or phytosanitary measures, these being presented separately. ISPM 11:2004 covers the process of pest risk analysis, while commodity standards contain some elements of pest risk analysis specific to the commodity. ISPM 11:2004 is also not sufficient to cover issues involved in the international movement of grain. Finally, two similar topics for commodity standards were developed or are under development as stand-alone ISPMs: ISPM 36:2012 (*Integrated measures for plants for planting*) and the topic of *International movement of seed* (2009-003). ISPM 36:2012 also contained an annex on elements that may be considered in relation to PRA.

[150] One member mentioned that ISPM 32:2009 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*) contains some elements that could be useful for this topic.

[151] There was a discussion on the mention of LMOs. The IPPC does not differentiate LMOs and non-LMOs, except for LMOs that are pests. It was therefore clarified in the text that the standard does not consider issues related to LMOs that are not pests.

[152] One member suggested that the issues of non-compliance that are specific to grain should be considered by the EWG. However, it was agreed that non-compliance would be covered under ISPM 13:2001 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*).

²³ 2008-007

[153] The SC:

- (1) *Approved* for member consultation the specification for [International movement of grain](#) (2008-007) as revised in the meeting.

9. REVIEW OF TECHNICAL PANELS

9.1 Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols

[154] The Secretariat presented the activities of the TPDP²⁴. One particular item was that observer comments had been submitted by the Secretariat, with input from the TPDP, on a draft ISO standard that related to molecular methods for detection and identification of pests (draft ISO standard 13484). The Secretariat was uncertain of its role, or the TPDP role in this matter, and sought direction from the SC.

[155] One member noted that many NPPOs have laboratories that use ISO standards, and it would be useful to be informed of the relevant standards being developed, and possibly to input in the process to ensure that the content of these standards is suitable for NPPO purposes. Several members supported that the TPDP could contribute to improving ISO standards.

[156] However, other members did not think that they had sufficient information to make a decision. They were unsure of whether the TPDP should be involved in this activity. In particular, the comments should not be interpreted as the position of the IPPC.

[157] After a thorough discussion, it was agreed that the Secretariat and TPDP could continue monitoring the development of ISO standards in the particular subcommittee for which the Secretariat has observer status. Interaction should be strictly limited to draft ISO standards that may be of concern for NPPOs, and the SC should be kept properly informed and would be requested to agree to the TPDP reviewing and providing detailed comments on any given draft. It was also agreed that contracting parties should be informed when an ISO standard of relevance is open for comments. The SC also agreed that it would not review the ISO standards themselves, but should have access to comments that are to be submitted to the ISO.

[158] The Standards Officer invited input on how to motivate authors, editorial teams and TPDP members. The long development process, the regular cancellation of meetings and the lack of credit do not help motivation. One member suggested that diagnostic experts could be invited to participate more actively in other parts of the IPPC work, such as the training associated with capacity development on diagnosis of pests. Another member suggested that profiles and CVs of diagnostic experts could be added to the IPPC roster of experts posted on the IPP. The Secretariat would submit these ideas to the TPDP.

[159] The SC:

- (1) *Noted* that observer comments were made on the ISO draft 13484, and requested the Secretariat to post the comments in the SC restricted work area.
- (2) *Agreed* to add a task to the [TPDP Specification](#) to review appropriate draft ISO standards under the Subcommittee “horizontal methods for molecular biomarker analysis” (TC34/SC16), to identify standards of significance for the IPPC, and to seek guidance from the SC on whether to provide comments to ISO.
- (3) *Requested* the Secretariat, if comments are assembled, to post these comments on the work area of the SC and invite SC members to contact the TPDP through the steward if they have issues.
- (4) *Requested* the Secretariat to notify NPPOs and RPPOs when an ISO standard is of concern for them.
- (5) *Suggested* that the Bureau discusses how to deal with standards developed by other organizations (e.g. ISO) that may have an impact on the IPPC.

²⁴ SC_2012_Apr_12

- (6) *Noted* that the outcome of the review of working priorities will be presented to the SC.
- (7) *Noted* that the Secretariat will contact NPPOs of authors of diagnostic protocols for which the work has not started, and this may lead to the need for changes of authors and editorial teams, and possibly new calls.

9.2 Technical Panel on Pest Free Areas and Systems Approaches for Fruit Flies

[160] The Secretariat presented the activities of the TPF²⁵. There was no comment.

[161] The SC:

- (1) *Noted* that the TPF²⁵ reviewed the following seven definitions: *reproductive adult*, *host status*, *natural host*, *non-natural host*, *non-host*, *tolerance level* and *quarantine area* that it had previously forwarded to the Technical Panel of the Glossary (TPG) for consideration.
- (2) *Noted* that the TPF²⁵ agreed with the TPG recommendation that a definition for *reproductive adult* was not needed because the term is used in its normal biological meaning
- (3) *Added* the term *quarantine area* to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* as a subject and requested the TPG to consider the following modification:

quarantine area	An area within which a quarantine pest is present <u>or transient</u> and is being officially controlled
-----------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- (4) *Noted* that the TPF²⁵ reviewed, developed and recommended the following four draft ISPMs to the SC:
 - *Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies* (2004-022) (Adopted by CPM-7 as ISPM 35:2012)
 - *Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly infestations* (Tephritidae) (2006-031)
 - Appendix 1 of the Draft Annex to ISPM 26:2006 on *Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management* (2005-010)
 - *Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak* (2009-007)
- (5) *Noted* that all items from the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 TPF²⁵ work plans (see section 5 of the October 2010 TPF²⁵ meeting report, and section 8 and Appendix 5 of the August 2011 TPF²⁵ meeting report) have been completed, except for responding to member comments and the reorganization of fruit fly standards.

9.3 Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments

[162] The Secretariat presented the activities of the TPPT²⁶. The Chair suggested that feedback be sought from TPPT members on the advantages and disadvantages of virtual meetings as this may be used for other TPs.

[163] Decisions had been presented for a number of cold treatments, and the SC discussed whether they should be put on hold, pending the outcome of discussions on the cold treatments subject to formal objections at CPM-7 (2012). The SC decided that the TPPT work on cold treatments should continue.

[164] The SC:

- (1) *Noted* that six TPPT virtual meetings have taken place since July 2011.
- (2) *Noted* that the Secretariat sent letters to the NPPOs of Germany and Japan regarding the SC decision (based on the TPPT recommendation) to continue work on the two sulfuryl fluoride treatments.

²⁵ SC_2012_Apr_13, <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110713>

²⁶ SC_2012_Apr_14, <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110739>

- (3) *Noted* that the TPPT will continue the work on the two sulfur dioxide (SF) treatments until there is sound scientific evidence that addresses the uncertainties of the global warming potential of the SF molecule.
- (4) *Noted* the TPPT discussed the comments received from Australia and COSAVE during CPM-6 (2011) regarding the footnote and treatment section *Other relevant information* in the irradiation treatments in ISPM 28:2007. The TPPT has revised the footnote to prevent confusion between approval by a contracting party and the CPM (see the report of the August 2011 TPPT virtual meeting).
- (5) *Noted* that the TPPT finalized the TPPT responses to member comments regarding the draft phytosanitary treatments Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heating (2007-114) and Vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera cucurbitae* on *Cucumis melo* var. *reticulatus* (2006-110). Note: the dielectric heating treatment was put on hold under agenda item 5.1; the other will be submitted to the SC through e-decision.
- (6) *Noted* that the TPPT requested further information from the submitter regarding both treatments Vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Mangifera indica* (2010-107) and Vapour heat treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Mangifera indica* (2010-106).
- (7) *Noted* that the TPPT has discussed the Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus limon* (2007-206C) and Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Citrus limon* (2007-206G), which were returned from the SC due to concerns about damage to the fruit. The panel is drafting the TPPT response and hopes to finalize it at the next TPPT virtual meeting.
- (8) *Noted* that the efficacy data (ED values) are still pending for the Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus reticulata* x *C. sinensis* (2007-206B) and Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus sinensis* (2007-206A). Once the ED values are received, the treatments will be recommended to the SC.
- (9) *Noted* that there has been a call for phytosanitary treatments. The treatments being solicited are:
 - Modified atmospheres and controlled atmospheres for fruit flies
 - Soil and growing media
 - Irradiation treatments.
- (10) *Removed* the following five treatments from the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* because two letters have been sent to the submitter and no response was received, or the submitter requested the treatments be removed from the *List of Topics for IPPC standards*:
 - Vapour heat treatment for fruit flies on *Mangifera indica* (2006-132)
 - Methyl iodide fumigation for *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* and Coleoptera: Cerambycidae of wood packaging material (2007-116)
 - Heat treatment for *Bactrocera cucumis* on *Cucurbita pepo* (2009-101)
 - Vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Lycopersicon esculentum* (2009-104)
 - Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus paradisi* (2010-101).
- (11) *Noted* that the TPPT requested further information from the submitter regarding the following four treatments evaluated during the 2010 July TPPT meeting in Kyoto, Japan. No communication was received by 1 April 2012. The Secretariat will send final notice letters to the submitters in May 2012:
 - Czech Republic: HCN treatment of wood packaging material (2007-103)
 - New Zealand: High temperature forced air treatment for selected fruit fly species (Diptera: Tephritidae) on fruit (2009-105)
 - Fiji: Vapour heat treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Mangifera indica* (2009-106)
 - Fiji: Vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Mangifera indica* (2009-107).
- (12) *Noted* that the panel will continue to hold virtual meetings on a regular basis throughout 2012 for items requiring straightforward decision making.
- (13) *Asked* the TPPT to provide feedback on the use of virtual meetings.

- (14) *Asked* the TPPT to consider all the formal objections received 14 days prior to CPM-7 (2012) and provide responses for consideration by the SC.

9.4 Technical panel on forest quarantine

[165] The Secretariat presented the activities of the TPFQ²⁷. He noted some aspects of the criteria for ISPM 15:2009 treatments were still under development in the TPFQ, and a discussion document will be presented to the SC in November.

[166] The CPM had confirmed that the topics *Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood* (2008-008) and *Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood* (2006-029) are separate topic and had requested the SC to consider drafting the former as an annex to the latter. The SC decided to postpone the decision on whether it should be an annex until a draft specification is available.

[167] The SC discussed whether the draft on *Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood* (2008-008) should be developed by a EWG or the TPFQ. It was noted that the expertise in the TPFQ may not correspond exactly to the topic. If the draft was developed by a EWG, a few members of the TPFQ could also be included. In the meantime the topic will be removed from the TPFQ work plan.

[168] The steward of the draft standard on *Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood* (2006-029) noted that this draft is being revised by the TPFQ. The Secretariat informed the SC that the TPFQ may need a meeting to work further on this topic.

[169] The SC:

- (1) *Noted* the joint work programme with the IPPC Secretariat and IFQRG to support the work of the TPFQ.
- (2) *Noted* the reports from the two virtual meetings of the TPFQ (23 February and 2 April 2012)
- (3) Discussed the CPM request to consider whether the topic *Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood* (2008-008) should be an Annex to the draft ISPM on *Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood* (2006-029) and decided to postpone the decision until the specification is presented to the SC.
- (4) *Agreed* to the TPFQ work plan for 2012 without the topic *Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood* (2008-008).

9.5 Technical Panel for the Glossary

[170] The Secretariat presented the activities of the TPG²⁸. The TPG invited the SC to consider the issue of consistency of ISPMs in languages. There was no time to have a complete discussion and the issue would be considered at the SC November, based on a paper to be developed by Mr Hedley, Mr Nahhal, Ms Montealegre Lara and the Secretariat.

[171] One member supported that the term *pest list* should be defined in ISPM 5. The SC noted that there could be problems with the interpretation of the term unless it was qualified. It was agreed that the SC member would work with the Secretariat, considering ISPM 19:2003 (*Guidelines on lists of regulated pests*), to prepare a proposal for the SC November on whether this term should be defined.

[172] The SC:

- (1) *Approved* the following additions as subjects to the List of topics for IPPC standards: *contaminating pest; endangered area and protected area; production site*.
- (2) *Noted* that *consignment in transit* will be added as a subject to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (previously overlooked although part of Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001)).

²⁷ SC_2012_Apr_15

²⁸ SC_2012_Apr_16

- (3) *Noted* that the definition of *exclusion* will be reconsidered in association with those of *containment*, *suppression*, *control*, *eradication* (already on the work programme) and the definition of *consignment in transit* in association with that for *re-export of a consignment* (already on the work programme).
- (4) *Noted* the discussion in the TPG report on activities in relation to languages, and note that the TPG may look at defining terms in multiple languages, but the Secretariat is responsible for translation of ISPMs.
- (5) *Agreed* that the SC will consider the issue of consistency in languages at another meeting.
- (6) *Noted* that brief guidance on the use of “should”, “shall”, “must” and “may” for the IPPC Style Guide for ISPMs will be discussed at the next meeting.
- (7) *Noted* the work plan.
- (8) *Noted* that the medium term plan will be reviewed at the next meeting.
- (9) *Decided* that Mr M’Siska, with the Secretariat, will develop a proposal on *pest list* for the SC November meeting.

[173] Note from the Secretariat. The following terms were also added as subjects to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* under other agenda items: *tolerance level* (agenda item 3.3), *cut flowers and branches* (agenda item 8.4), *quarantine area* (agenda item 9.2).

10. LIST OF TOPICS FOR IPPC STANDARDS

10.1 Update on the List of topics for IPPC standards

[174] The Secretariat introduced the update²⁹.

[175] The SC:

- (1) *Asked* the SC Chair, Mr Hedley and the Secretariat to review the assignment of topics (in Table 1 only) to the IPPC Strategic Framework’s Strategic Objectives and report to the SC.
- (2) *Removed* the following five phytosanitary treatments from the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, as recommended by the TPPT:
 - Vapour heat treatment for fruit flies on *Mangifera indica* (2006-132) (row 91)
 - Methyl iodide fumigation for *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* and Coleoptera: Cerambycidae of wood packaging material (2007-116) (row 96)
 - Heat treatment for *Bactrocera cucumis* on *Cucurbita pepo* (2009-101) (row 87)
 - Vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Lycopersicon esculentum* (2009-104) (row 88)
 - Cold treatment for *Ceratitidis capitata* on *Citrus paradisi* (2010-101) (row 86).
- (3) *Assigned* priority 4 to the topic Review of ISPMs (2006-012) and priority 3 to the topic Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20 *Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) (2008-006).

10.2 Adjustments to stewards

[176] The SC reviewed and made modifications to stewards for draft ISPMs, and nominated assistant stewards for some topics. The updates on topics and assigned stewards are reflected in the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=207776>).

²⁹ 2011_SC_May_36_rev1

11. AGENDA ITEMS DEFERRED TO FUTURE SC MEETINGS

[177] All agenda items were discussed apart from the specifications below, for which work was organized by email (see agenda items 8.1, 8.2, 8.3):

- Revision of ISPM 4 – Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (2009-002)
- Revision of ISPM 6 – Guidelines for surveillance (2009-004)
- Revision of ISPM 8 – Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005).

12. REVIEW OF THE STANDARD SETTING CALENDAR

[178] The Secretariat presented the draft standard setting calendar for 2012 and 2013³⁰.

13. OTHER BUSINESS

13.1 SC decisions for CPM

[179] The Secretariat informed the SC that the proposal for a CPM recommendation regarding implementation of standards was submitted to the Bureau, but the Bureau decided to discuss this issue in June 2012.

[180] The Bureau was also asked to consider how to deal with standards from other organizations (paragraph [159] under agenda item 9.1).

13.2 Future e-decisions

[181] E-decisions on the following items were likely to be submitted to the SC before the next meeting:

- review of working priorities for diagnostic protocols
- some phytosanitary treatments
- selection of experts on TPs (TPPT, TPDP, TPG)
- approval of invited experts for meetings of expert drafting groups
- draft ISPM on pre-export clearance.

[182] In addition, there was a possibility that the following items be subject to e-decisions:

- issues related to ISO standards (if any).

14. CLOSE OF THE MEETING

14.1 Date and venue of the next SC Meeting

[183] The next SC meeting is scheduled on 5-9 November 2012, Rome, Italy, but the SC members were reminded to check the [calendar](#) on the IPP.

14.2 Evaluation of the meeting process

[184] The following suggestions were made:

- a) Use a forum before the meeting to decide the order of agenda item also for future meetings.
- b) Ensure that proposals from small working groups are normally reconsidered by the plenary. A procedure could be made to present clearly the outcome of the small working groups.
- c) Manage better the organization of small working groups, especially regarding topic, timing and duration.

14.3 Adoption of the report

[185] The SC adopted the report.

³⁰ 2012_SC_Apr_25

14.4 Close

[186] The Chair thanked the members of the SC for their hard work, as well as the Vice-Chair, stewards, observers and Bureau member. She also thanked others that had contributed to the success of the meeting, especially interpreters, the messenger and the Secretariat staff. On behalf of the SC, one member thanked the Chair for encouraging the participation of all members in the discussions, and for resolving all issues in a warm and gentle manner.

APPENDIX 1: Agenda**COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES****STANDARDS COMMITTEE****23-27 April 2012****German Room C-269, FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy**

23 April start time: 10:00 hrs (coffee at 09:30hrs)

Daily Schedule:

Monday 10:00-13:00 and 14:30-17:30 and the rest of the week 09:00-12:00 and 14:00-17:00

Coffee: Monday welcome coffee 9:30, rest of the week at 10:30 and 15:30

Monday **Cocktail** 18:00Tuesday **Dinner** 19:30 (Grappolo d'Oro, P.zza della Cancelleria 80)**PROVISIONAL AGENDA***(Updated: 9 May 2012)*

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	---	LARSON
1.2 Election of the Rapporteur and Vice-Chair	---	CHARD
1.3 Adoption of the Agenda	SC_2012_Apr_01	CHARD
2. Administrative Matters		
2.1 Documents List	SC_2012_Apr_02	LARSON
2.2 Participants List	SC_2012_Apr_03	LARSON
2.3 Local Information	SC_2012_Apr_04	LARSON
3. Updates from other relevant bodies		
3.1 Items arising from CPM-7 (2012)		
❖ Summary- Draft report of CPM	SC_2012_Apr_22	LARSON
❖ Cold Treatments and Formal Objections	SC_2012_Apr_18	CHARD
❖ Recommendations from the SC to the Bureau on formal objections	SC_2012_Apr_24	HEDLEY/MELC HO
3.2 Update from the IPPC Secretariat (November 2011- March 2012)		
❖ Standard Setting Group		LARSON
❖ Standard setting staff	SC_2012_Apr_10	LARSON
❖ Information Exchange		NOWELL

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
❖ Capacity development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Update on 2012 Regional Workshops 	SC_2012_Apr_19	PERALTA
❖ Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)	SC_2012_Apr_20	CHARD / SOSA
3.3 Items arising from the SC-7 (May 2011)	SC_2012_Apr_11	DUBON
4. Standards Committee		
4.1 Report of the SC November 2011	https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355	CHARD
4.2 Update of polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (November 2011-April 2012)	SC_2012_Apr_23	LARSON
4.3 Update from the Sea containers steering committee (SCSC) (2008-001) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Report (November 2011) 	https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=179725	LARSON / HEDLEY / ASHBY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Update on activities of the SCSC 	SC_2012_Apr_21	
5. Draft ISPMs from expert drafting groups		
5.1. Draft Annex 1 to ISPM 15: Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material (2006-011), Priority 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Thomas Schröder 	SC-7 restricted work area https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1111086	LARSON
5.2. Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031), Priority 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Rui Pereira Cardoso 	ocs.ippc.int/index.html	CARDOSO
5.3. Draft appendix 1 to ISPM 12: Electronic certification (2006-003), Priority 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Motoi Sakamura ❖ Steward's notes and background information 	ocs.ippc.int/index.html SC_2012_Apr_09	SAKAMURA
5.4. Draft annex to ISPM 20:2004 – Phytosanitary pre-export clearance (2005-003), Priority 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Mike Holtzhausen 	ocs.ippc.int/index.html	HOLTZHAUSEN
5.5. Draft annex to ISPM 26:2006 – Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management (2005-010), Priority 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: David Opatowski 	ocs.ippc.int/index.html	OPATOWSKI
5.6. Draft annex to ISPM 26:2006 Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak (2009-007), Priority 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stewards: Bart Rossel (Lead), Jaime Gonzalez (Technical) 	ocs.ippc.int/index.html	ROSSEL
6. Selection of the equivalent of five draft ISPMs for 2012 member consultation (MC)		

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
6.1 Draft diagnostic protocol <i>Guignardia citricarpa</i> Kiely (2004-023) – SC approved for MC 2011-10 by e-decision, for information when considering drafts for MC in 2012. - Steward: Jane Chard	Queued area of the IPP Doc. No: 2004-023 https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110769	CHARD
6.2 Draft diagnostic protocol <i>Tilletia indica</i> Mitra (2004-014) – SC approved for MC 2011-10 by e-decision, for information when considering drafts for MC in 2012. - Steward: Jane Chard	Queued area of the IPP Doc. No: 2004-014 https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110769	CHARD
7. Draft specifications for review of member comments and approval by the SC		
7.1 Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004), Priority 3 - Steward: Bart Rossel ❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response)	2008-004 SC_2012_Apr_05	ROSSEL
8. Draft Specifications for approval for member consultation		
8.1 Revision of ISPM 4 – Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (2009-002), Priority 2 - Steward: Olufunke AWOSUSI ❖ Reports from IRSS regional workshops ❖ IRSS document on ISPM 4	2009-002 https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1111059&L=0#irssactivities SC_2012_Apr_06	OLUSOLA-AWOSUSI
8.2 Revision of ISPM 6 – Guidelines for surveillance (2009-004), Priority 2 - Steward: John HEDLEY ❖ Reports from IRSS regional workshops ❖ IRSS document on ISPM 6	2009-004 https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1111059&L=0#irssactivities SC_2012_Apr_07	HEDLEY
8.3 Revision of ISPM 8 – Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005), Priority 3 - Steward: Beatriz MELCHO ❖ Reports from IRSS regional workshops ❖ IRSS document on ISPM 8	2009-005 https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1111059&L=0#irssactivities SC_2012_Apr_08	MELCHO
8.4 International movement of cut flowers and foliage (2008-005), Priority 4 - Steward: Magda GONZALES	2008-005	LARSON
8.5 International movement of grain (2008-007), Priority 1 - - Steward: Jens Unger	2008-007	CHARD

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
9. Review of Technical Panels		
9.1 Technical panel to develop diagnostic protocols for specific pests (TPDP) ❖ Update on activities of the TPDP	https://www.ippc.int/in dex.php?id=1110710 SC_2012_Apr_12	GROUSSET/ CHARD GROUSSET
9.2 Technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies (TPFF) ❖ TPFF meeting report ❖ Update on activities of the TPFF	https://www.ippc.int/in dex.php?id=1110713 SC_2012_Apr_13	DUBON DUBON
9.3 Technical panel on phytosanitary treatments (TPPT) ❖ TPPT virtual meeting reports ❖ Update on activities of the TPPT	https://www.ippc.int/in dex.php?id=1110739 SC_2012_Apr_14	DUBON DUBON
9.4 Technical panel on forest quarantine (TPFQ) ❖ TPFQ virtual meeting reports ❖ Update on activities of the TPFQ	https://www.ippc.int/in dex.php?id=1110711 SC_2012_Apr_15	LARSON LARSON
9.5 Technical panel for the Glossary (TPG) ❖ TPG Meeting Report ❖ Update on activities of the TPG	https://www.ippc.int/in dex.php?id=1110712 SC_2012_Apr_16	GROUSSET GROUSSET
10. List of Topics for IPPC standards		
10.1 Update on the List of topics for IPPC standards	SC_2012_Apr_17	DUBON
10.2 Adjustments to stewards		CHARD
11. Agenda items deferred to future SC Meetings	---	CHARD
12. Review of the standard setting calendar	SC_2012_Apr_25	MOLLER
13. Other business		
13.1 SC decisions for CPM		LARSON
13.2 Future e-decisions		LARSON
14. Close of the meeting		
14.1 Date and venue of the next SC Meeting	--	LARSON
14.2 Evaluation of the meeting process	--	CHARD
14.3 Adoption of the report	--	CHARD
14.4 Close	--	LARSON

APPENDIX 2: Documents list**COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES****STANDARDS COMMITTEE****23-27 April 2012****German Room C-269, FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy****DOCUMENTS LIST***(Updated: 27 April 2012)*

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
Draft ISPMs				
2006-011	5.1	Draft Annex 1 to ISPM 15: Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material	CPs, RPPOs and SC	1 March 2012
2006-031	5.2	Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation	CPs, RPPOs and SC	1 March 2012
2006-003	5.3	Draft appendix 1 to ISPM 12: Electronic certification	CPs, RPPOs and SC	2 April 2012
2005-003	5.4	Draft annex to ISPM 20:2004 – Phytosanitary pre-export clearance	CPs, RPPOs and SC	1 March 2012
2005-010	5.5	Draft annex to ISPM 26:2006 – Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management	CPs, RPPOs and SC	1 March 2012
2009-007	5.6	Draft annex to ISPM 26:2006 Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak	CPs, RPPOs and SC	1 March 2012
2004-023	6.1	Draft diagnostic protocol <i>Guignardia citricarpa</i> Kiely	CPs, RPPOs and SC	1 March 2012
2004-014	6.2	Draft diagnostic protocol <i>Tilletia indica</i> Mitra	CPs, RPPOs and SC	4 April 2012
Draft Specifications				
2008-004	7.1	Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages	SC only	12 March 2012
2009-002	8.1	Revision of ISPM 4 – Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas	SC only	12 March 2012
2009-004	8.2	Revision of ISPM 6 – Guidelines for surveillance	SC only	12 March 2012
2009-005	8.3	Revision of ISPM 8 – Determination of pest status in an area	SC only	12 March 2012

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
2008-005	8.4	International movement of cut flowers and foliage	SC only	12 March 2012
2008-007	8.5	International movement of grain	SC Only	13 April 2012
Other Documents				
SC_2012_Apr_01	1.3	Agenda	CPs, RPPOs and SC	13 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_02	2.1	Documents list	CPs, RPPOs and SC	13 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_03	2.2	Participants list	CPs, RPPOs and SC	13 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_04	2.3	Local information	CPs, RPPOs and SC	1 March 2012
SC_2012_Apr_05	7.1	Compiled comments: draft specification on <i>Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages</i>	SC only	12 March 2012
SC_2012_Apr_06	8.1	IRSS document on ISPM 4	SC only	5 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_07	8.2	IRSS document on ISPM 6	SC only	5 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_08	8.3	IRSS document on ISPM 8	SC only	5 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_09	5.3	Steward's notes and background information regarding the draft Appendix 1 to ISPM 12:2011: Electronic certification, information on standard xml schemas and exchange mechanisms (2006-003)	SC only	4 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_10	3.2	IPPC Contact list – Standard Setting Group	SC only	5 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_11	3.3	Recommendations to the SC from the 2011 May SC-7 Meeting	SC only	5 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_12	9.1	Update on activities of the TPDP	SC only	12 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_13	9.2	Update on activities of the TPFf	SC only	12 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_14	9.3	Update on activities of the TPPT	SC only	12 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_15	9.4	Update on activities of the TPFQ	SC only	13 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_16	9.5	Update on activities of the TPG	SC only	12 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_17	10.1	Update on the List of Topics for IPPC Standards	SC only	12 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_18	3.1	Discussion paper on cold Treatments and Formal Objections	SC only	12 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_19	3.2	Capacity development – Regional workshops on draft ISPMs	SC only	13 April 2012

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
SC_2012_Apr_20	3.2	Report from the Triennial Review Group of the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)	SC only	13 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_21	4.3	Update on activities of the Steering Committee for Sea Containers	SC only	13 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_22	3.1	Summary- Draft report of CPM	SC only	13 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_23	4.2	Update of polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (November 2011-April 2012)	SC only	20 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_24	3.1	Recommendations by the SC to the Bureau on formal objections	SC only	26 April 2012
SC_2012_Apr_25	12	Standard setting calendar	SC only	27 April 2012

APPENDIX 3: Participants list**COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES****STANDARDS COMMITTEE****23-27 April 2012****German Room C-269, FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy****PARTICIPANTS LIST***Up-dated 9 May 2012*

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates confirmed attendance at the meeting.
Members not attending have been taken off the list.

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Africa Member	Mr Lahcen ABAHA Regional Directorate of the Sanitary and Food Safety National Office - Souss-Massa Drâa Region - BP 40/S, Agadir 80 000, Hay Essalam MOROCCO Tel: (+212) 673 997 855 / 0528 23 7875 Fax: (+212) 528-237874	abahalahcen@yahoo.fr	CPM-4 (2009) CPM-7(2012) 2 nd term / 3 years	2015
✓	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

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Africa Member	<p>Mr Kenneth M'SISKA Principal Agriculture Research Office Plant Quarantine and Phytosanitary Service Zambia Agriculture Research Institute P/B 07 Mount Makulu Research Station PIB7 Chilanga ZAMBIA Tel: (+260) 211-278141/130 Mobile: (+260) 977-771503/+260-955300632 Fax: (+260) 211-278141/130</p>	msiska12@yahoo.co.uk	CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years	2015
✓	Asia Member SC-7	<p>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</p>	antario_dikin@yahoo.com	CPM-5 (2010) 1st term / 3 years	2013
✓	Asia Member	<p>Mr Motoi SAKAMURA Director, Operation Department, Kobe Plant Protection Station, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 1-1,Hatobacho, Chuouku Kobe 6500042 JAPAN Tel: (+81) 78 331 3430 Fax: (+81) 78 391 1757</p>	sakamuram@pps.maff.go.jp	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) CPM-7 (2012) 3rd term / 3 years	2015
✓	Asia Member	<p>Mr Mohammad Ayub HOSSAIN Program Director Plant Protection Wing Department of Agricultural Extension Khamarbari, Farmgate Dhaka-1215 BANGLADESH Tel: (+880) 2-8115313 / (+880) 1715137612 Tel/Fax: (+880) 2-8115313</p>	ayubppw@yahoo.com; k_ayub@yahoo.com	CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years	2015

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Asia Member	Ms Thanh Huong HA Principal Official Plant Protection Department 149 Ho Dac Di Street Dong Da district Hanoi City VIET NAM Tel: (+844) 35331033 Fax: (+844) 35330043	ppdhuong@yahoo.com ; ppdhuong@gmail.com	CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years	2015
✓	Europe Member Chair	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	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) 2nd term / 3 years	2014
✓	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
✓	Europe Member	Ms Hilde Kristin PAULSEN Senior Advisor Norwegian Food Safety Authority, Felles Postmottak P.O.Box 383 N-2381 Brumunddal NORWAY Tel: (+47) 64 94 43 46 Fax: (+47) 64 94 44 10	Hilde.paulsen@mattilsynet.no	CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years	2015
✓	Europe Member	Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK Wojewodzki Inspektorat Ochrony Roslin I Nasiennictwa w Lublinie ul. Diamentowa 6 20-447 Lublin POLAND Tel: (+48) 81 7440326 Fax: (+48) 81 7447363	p.wlodarczyk@piorin.gov.pl	CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years	2015

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	Ms Maria Soledad CASTRO DOROCHESSI Plant Protection Division Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero Av. Bulnes 140, Piso 3 Santiago CHILE Tel: (+562) 3451200 Fax: (+56 2) 3451203	soledad.castro@sag.gob.cl	CPM-5 (2010) 1st term / 3 years	2013
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	Ms Ana Lilia MONTEALEGRE LARA Jefe de Organismos Internacionales de Protección Fitosanitaria Dirección General de Sanidad Vegetal SENASICA/SAGARPA Guillermo Pérez Valenzuela No. 127, Col. Del Carmen Coyoacán C.P. 04100 MEXICO Tel: (+11) 52-55-5090-3000 ext 51341	ana.montealegre@senasica.gob.mx	CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years	2015
✓	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
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	Mr Alexandre MOREIRA PALMA Chief of Phytosanitary Certification Division Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supply Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D Anexo B, Sala 310 Brasilia DF 70043900 BRAZIL Tel: (+55) 61 3218 2898 Fax: (+55) 61 3224 3874	alexandre.palma@agricultura.gov.br	CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years	2015

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Near East Member	Mr Basim Mustafa KHALIL Director State Board of Plant Protection, Ministry of Agriculture, Abu-Graib Baghdad IRAQ Tel:(+964) 1 511 2602 Mobile: (+964) 7903 721 480 or (+964) 7700 400 452	crop_prot@moagr.org; bmustafa52@yahoo.com	CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years	2015
✓	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
✓	North America Member	Ms Marie-Claude FOREST National Manager and International Standards Advisor Plant Biosecurity and Forestry Division Import, Export and Technical Standards Section Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 CANADA Tel: (+1) 613-773-7235 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7204	marie-claude.forest@inspection.gc.ca ; ippc-contact@inspection.gc.ca	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) 2nd term / 3 years	2014

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Pacific Member	<p>Mr John HEDLEY Principal Adviser International Organizations Policy Branch, Ministry for Primary Industries P.O. Box 2526 Wellington NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0742</p>	john.hedley@mpi.govt.nz	<p>CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) CPM-7 (2012) 3rd term / 3 years</p>	2015
✓	Pacific Member	<p>Mr Ngatoko NGATOKO Director Biosecurity Service, Ministry of Agriculture P.O.Box 96, Rarotonga COOK ISLANDS Telephone: (+682) 28 711 Fax: (+682) 21 881</p>	nngatoko@agriculture.gov.ck; biosecurity@agriculture.gov.ck	<p>CPM-7 (2012) 1st term / 3 years</p>	2015
✓	Pacific Member SC7	<p>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</p>	bart.rossel@daff.gov.au	<p>CPM-6 (2011) 1st term / 3 years</p>	2014

Non attending

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership confirmed	Term Expires
	Africa Member	Mr Marcel BAKAK Head, Plant Quarantine Ministry of Agriculture Minader, Yaoundé CAMEROON Tel: (+237) 99961337 FAX: (+237) 22310268	Mandjek4@yahoo.fr	CPM-5 (2010) 1st term / 3 years	2013
	Near East Member	Mr Ali Mahmoud Mohammed SOLIMAN Supervisor of Central Administration of Plant Quarantine 3 El. Amir Fatma Ismail St., Dokki Giza EGYPT Tel: (+201) 117800037 Fax: (+202) 33363582	Ali.mm.soliman@gmail.com	CPM- 7(2012) 1st term / 3 years	2015
	Near East Member	Mr Mohammad Reza ASGHARI Plant Protection Organization, No.2 Plant Protection Organization Charman Highway Yaman Street Tehran IRAN Tel.: (+98) -21-23091119; 22402712; 22402046-9 Fax: (+98)-21-22309137 Mobile: (+98)-912-1044851	asghari@ppo.ir; asghari.massoud@gmail.com	CPM- 7(2012) 1st term / 3 years	2015

Others

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership confirmed	Term Expires
✓	Steward	Mr Mike HOLTZHAUSEN Previous Deputy Director Agricultural Products Inspection Services Private Bag X258 Pretoria 0001 SOUTH AFRICA Tel: (+27) 12 309 8703 Mobile: (+27) 82 787 7788 Fax: (+27) 12 309 8775	mikeh@nda.agric.za ; netmike@absamail.co.za ;		

✓	Observer	Mr Jeremiah Adekanmi OLUITAN Chief Agriculture Officer, Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service South West Zonal Headquarters, Murtala Mohammed Airport Lagos NIGERIA Tel: (+234) 8033084082	jeremiaholuitan@yahoo.co.uk		
✓	Observer Bureau Member	M. Lucien Konan KOUAME Directeur Ministère de l'Agriculture Direction de protection des végétaux, du contrôle et de la qualité' B.P. V7 Abidjan COTE D'IVOIRE Tel: (+225) 20222260/ 07903754 Fax: (+225) 20 21 20 32	l_kouame@yahoo.fr; isysphyt@aviso.ci		
✓	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 Joint FAO/IAEA Division	Mr Rui CARDOSO PEREIRA Insect and Pest Control Section Joint FAO/IAEA Division in Food and Agriculture Wagramerstrasse 5 PO Box 100, 1400 Vienna AUSTRIA Tel.: (+43) 1 260026077 Fax: (+43) 1 26000	r.cardoso-pereira@iaea.org	N/A	N/A
✓	Secretariat	Ms Fabienne GROUSSET Support	Fabienne.Grousset@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	Secretariat	Ms Eva MOLLER Administrative support staff	Eva.Moller@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	Secretariat	Ms Celine GERMAIN Support	Celine.Germain@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	Secretariat	Ms Marie-Pierre Mignault Support	mariepierre.mignault@fao.org	N/A	N/A

APPENDIX 4: CPM decisions on improving the standard setting process, adopted at CPM-7 (2012)

Excerpt from the draft report of CPM-7 (2012)

CPM Decision 1

There should be no drafting of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) at the annual CPM meeting.

CPM Decision 2

The existing opportunity for IPPC members to review SC-7 revisions of draft ISPMs should be formalized. This process should allow IPPC members to review SC-7 approved draft ISPMs and should focus on substantial concerns. All comments should be entered via the OCS and made available to regional SC members. The regional SC members should review comments submitted, and forward those comments deemed to be most important to the steward, accompanied by suggestions on how to address them. The steward should review the comments and prepare responses to the comments and a revised draft ISPM, both to be submitted to the IPPC Secretariat for presentation to the November SC. The SC reviews the substantial concerns submitted, revises the draft ISPM and communicates its reasoning to IPPC members.

CPM Decision 3

All draft ISPMs presented to CPM for adoption shall be subject to a formal objection. If a contracting party has a formal objection, the formal objection shall be submitted with the technical justification and suggestions for improvement to the draft ISPM to the Secretariat no later than 14 days prior to CPM. The draft ISPM should not be considered for adoption by the CPM and returned to the SC. In exceptional circumstances, for non-technical ISPMs, there should be an opportunity for the CPM Chair, in consultation with the SC Chair and the Secretariat, to propose a discussion of a formal objection at CPM with the aim that the formal objection can be lifted and the ISPM be adopted.

CPM Decision 4

If the draft ISPM had been previously included on the agenda of the CPM and was subject to a formal objection, the SC could recommend the draft ISPM to the CPM for adoption through a vote (i.e. not under the formal objection process).

CPM Decision 5

Diagnostic protocols (DPs) are valuable documents that should be adopted by the CPM (see Decision 8 for the process of adoption of DPs).

CPM Decision 6

Phytosanitary treatments (PTs) shall continue to be adopted by the CPM.

CPM Decision 7

All ISPMs shall be developed following the same IPPC standard setting process (see Annex 1 of the CPM Rules of Procedure). Some slight variations, such as electronic decision-making should continue to apply to DPs and PTs.

The following variations to the proposed IPPC standard setting process would apply in these cases:

- Steps in the standard setting process are not restricted to any specific time of the year, although member consultation would be at defined times.
- The SC can make decisions electronically.
- Unlike other draft ISPMs, DPs and PTs are not considered by the SC-7, but are considered and resolved by the relevant technical panel (TP). The SC approves these drafts for member consultation by e-decision and these are made available to IPPC contracting parties (CP) only after approval, because they are not SC meeting documents.

CPM Decision 8

The CPM delegates its authority to the SC to adopt DPs on its behalf. The DP adoption process shall be that once the SC approves the DP, it is posted publicly and contracting parties are notified. The notification period for approved DPs shall be twice a year on defined dates. CPs shall have 45 days to review the draft DP and submit a formal objection, if any. If no formal objection is received, the SC, on behalf of the CPM, adopts the DP. DPs adopted through this process shall be noted at the following meeting of the CPM.

CPM Decision 9

Procedures should be developed for the process in CPM Decision 8 (i.e. notification of CPs and process for formal objections) and would be applicable to DPs only.

CPM Decision 10

When a technical revision is required for an adopted DP, the SC may approve this revision via electronic means. The SC should develop criteria for approving these revisions to adopted DPs. The revised DPs shall be posted on the IPP as soon as the SC approves them.

CPM Decision 11

A draft specification and literature review must be included with the topic submission.

CPM Decision 12

Submitters of topics should be encouraged to gain support from other IPPC members and/or regions to indicate a broader need for the proposed topic.

CPM Decision 13

The SC shall use the IPPC Strategic Framework and the Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics when reviewing submissions of topics. As a result, the submitted topics shall no longer be presented to the SPTA.

CPM Decision 14

The SC should endeavour to submit draft specifications for member consultation immediately after new topics have been added to the List of topics for IPPC standards by the CPM.

CPM Decision 15

A task force should be formed to develop a Framework for Standards, funded by extra budgetary resources.

CPM Decision 16

The SC should be encouraged to assign a lead steward and one or two assistants for each topic. These assistants could be from outside the SC such as potential replacement members, former SC members, technical panel members or expert working group members..

CPM Decision 17

The SC should develop guidance on developing the capacities of new SC members, such as mentoring.

CPM Decision 18

If a region considers it valuable, the region should be encouraged to assign one or more members of the SC from its region to help play a lead role in facilitating the communication between the SC and National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPO) and Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPO) within their region.

CPM Decision 19

The IPPC Statement of Commitment should include a signature line for a senior person in authority from the organization that employs the nominee to ensure the senior person is well aware of the workload of an SC member for the period of the nominee's term.

CPM Decision 20

An editorial team should be created to help improve the quality of draft ISPMs. This editorial team should be selected by the SC and should be composed of three to four experts, nominated by NPPOs or RPPOs, with expertise in technical writing, working on documents in English. One member should be a non-native English speaker. A minimum of a three year commitment would be required, but longer commitment is preferred. This team would work virtually with the stewards and the IPPC Secretariat.

CPM Decision 21

The CPM should allow, and the regions should encourage, staggering the terms of SC membership to ensure continuity of expertise. The SC should also consider this same principle for other groups working under the SC.

CPM Decision 22

The SC should develop a set of questions for expert drafting groups to provide guidance on biodiversity and environmental considerations and ensure concerns are addressed.

CPM Decision 23

The SC should consult with external experts on technical subjects as needed.

CPM Decision 24

The current 100 day member consultation shall be extended to 150 days to allow better scrutiny of draft ISPMs.

APPENDIX 5: IPPC standard setting procedure adopted by the CPM-7 (2012)

Excerpt from the draft report of CPM-7 (2012)

INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION STANDARD SETTING PROCEDURE (ANNEX 1 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES)

Adopted by CPM-7 (2012)

The process for the development of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) is divided into four stages:

- Stage 1: Developing the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) standard setting work programme
- Stage 2: Drafting
- Stage 3: Member consultation for draft ISPMs
- Stage 4: Adoption and publication.

Relevant Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM) / Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) decisions on many aspects of the standard setting process have been compiled in the IPPC Procedure Manual which is available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP, www.ippc.int).

Stage 1: Developing the List of topics for IPPC standards

Step 1: Call for topics

The IPPC Secretariat makes a call for topics³¹ every two years. IPPC members³² and Technical Panels (TPs) submit detailed proposals for new topics or for the revision of existing ISPMs to the IPPC Secretariat. Submissions should be accompanied with a draft specification, a literature review and justification that the proposed topic meets the CPM-approved criteria for topics (available in the IPPC Procedure Manual). To indicate a broader need for the proposed topic, submitters are encouraged to gain support from other IPPC members and/or regions.

The IPPC Secretariat compiles a list of the proposed topics from the submissions received. Submissions from previous years are not included, but IPPC members may re-submit these, as appropriate.

The Standards Committee (SC), taking into account the IPPC Strategic Framework and the *Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics*, reviews the existing List of topics for IPPC standards and the compiled list of proposed topics. The SC recommends a revised List of topics for IPPC standards (including subjects), adding topics from the compiled list, deleting or modifying topics in the existing List of topics for IPPC standards as appropriate, giving each topic a recommended priority.

Step 2: Adjustment and adoption of the list of topics for IPPC standards

³¹ Calls for topics include "technical area", "topic" and "subject", see the *Hierarchy of terms for standards* in the IPPC Procedure Manual.

³² In annex 1 of the rules of procedure of the CPM, IPPC members are defined as: Contracting parties, National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs), Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) and relevant international organizations.

The CPM reviews the List of topics for IPPC standards recommended by the SC. The CPM adjusts and adopts the List of topics for IPPC standards, including assigning a priority for each topic. A revised List of topics for IPPC standards is made available.

In any year, when a situation arises in which an ISPM is required urgently, the CPM may insert such a topic into the List of topics for IPPC standards.

Stage 2: Drafting

Step 3: Development of a specification

The SC should be encouraged to assign a lead steward and one or two assistants for each topic. These assistants could be from outside the SC, such as potential SC replacement members, former SC members, TP members or expert working group members.

The SC reviews the draft specification. The SC should endeavour to approve draft specifications for member consultation at the SC meeting following the CPM meeting when new topics have been added to the List of topics for IPPC standards.

Once the SC approves the draft specification for member consultation, the Secretariat makes it publicly available and notifies IPPC members. The length of member consultation for draft specifications is 60 days. The IPPC contact point submits comments to the Secretariat using the OCS.

The Secretariat compiles the comments received, makes them publicly available and submits them to the steward(s) and SC for consideration. The specification is revised and approved by the SC and made publicly available.

Step 4: Preparation of a draft ISPM³³

An expert drafting group (EDG, expert working group (EWG) or TP) drafts or revises the draft ISPM in accordance with the relevant specification. The resulting draft ISPM is recommended to the SC.

The SC or SC-7 reviews the draft ISPM at a meeting (for a Diagnostic Protocol (DP) or Phytosanitary Treatment (PT), the SC reviews it electronically) and decides whether to approve it for member consultation, to return it to the steward(s) or an EDG or to put it on hold. When the SC-7 meets, comments from any SC members should be taken into account.

Stage 3: Member consultation for draft ISPMs

Step 5: Member consultation for draft ISPMs

Once the SC approves the draft ISPM for member consultation, the Secretariat makes it publicly available and notifies IPPC members. The length of member consultation for draft ISPMs is 150 days. The IPPC contact point submits comments to the Secretariat using the OCS.

The Secretariat compiles the comments received, makes them publicly available and submits them to the steward(s) for consideration. The steward(s) reviews the comments, prepares responses to the comments, revises the draft ISPM and submits them to the Secretariat. These are made available to the SC.

Step 6: Review of the draft ISPM prior to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures meeting

³³ This procedure refers to "draft ISPMs" and "standards" to simplify wording, but also applies to any part of an ISPM, including annexes, appendices or supplements.

Taking the comments into account, the SC-7 or TP (for DPs or PTs) revises the draft ISPM and recommends the draft ISPM to the SC.

Once the SC-7 or TP recommends the draft ISPM to the SC, the Secretariat makes it available to IPPC members for the substantial concerns commenting period and notifies IPPC members. The length of the substantial concerns commenting period for draft ISPMs is 120 days and should focus their comments on substantial concerns. The IPPC contact point submits the comments to the Secretariat using the OCS. The SC members should review comments submitted from their region and identify the comments deemed to be most important to the steward(s), accompanied by suggestions on how to address them.

The steward(s) reviews the comments, prepares responses to the comments, revises the draft ISPM and submits them to the Secretariat. These are made available to the SC and the draft ISPM is made available to IPPC members.

The SC reviews the comments, the steward(s)' responses to the comments and the revised draft ISPM. The SC provides a summary of the major issues discussed by the SC for the draft ISPM. These summaries are recorded in the report of the SC meeting. The SC decides whether to recommend the draft ISPM to the CPM, or to put it on hold, return it to the steward(s) or an EDG or submit it for another round of member consultation.

The Secretariat should make the draft ISPM available in the languages of the organization as soon as possible and at least six weeks prior to the opening of the CPM meeting.

Stage 4: Adoption and publication

Step 7: Adoption

Following approval by the SC, the draft ISPM is included on the agenda of the CPM meeting.

All draft ISPMs presented to the CPM are subject to a formal objection³⁴. If a contracting party (CP) has a formal objection, the CP submits the formal objection along with the technical justification and suggestions for improvement of the draft ISPM to the Secretariat no later than 14 days prior to the CPM meeting and the draft ISPM should be returned to the SC. If no formal objection is received, the CPM should adopt the ISPM without discussion. In exceptional circumstances, not including DPs and PTs, there should be an opportunity for the CPM Chair, in consultation with the SC Chair and the Secretariat, to propose a discussion of the formal objection at the CPM meeting with the aim that the formal objection can be lifted and the ISPM be adopted.

If the draft ISPM had been previously included on the agenda of the CPM and was subjected to a formal objection, the SC may decide to forward the draft ISPM to the CPM for a vote with no option for a formal objection.

For DPs, the CPM has delegated its authority to the SC to adopt DPs on its behalf. Once the SC approves the DP, the Secretariat makes it available and CPs are notified³⁵. The notification period for approved DPs is twice a year on defined dates. CPs have 45 days to review the approved DP and submit a formal objection, if any. If no formal objection is received, the SC, on behalf of the CPM,

³⁴ A formal objection should be a technically supported objection to the adoption of the draft standard in its current form, sent through the official IPPC contact point. The Secretariat would not make any judgement about the validity of the objection – an objection with some technical discussion of the issue would be accepted as a formal objection.

³⁵ For translation of DPs, members would follow the mechanism for requesting the translation for DPs into FAO languages posted on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110995>).

adopts the DP. DPs adopted through this process are noted by the CPM and attached to the report of the CPM meeting.

When a technical revision is required for an adopted DP, the SC can adopt the updates to adopted DPs via electronic means. The revised DPs shall be made publicly available as soon as the SC adopts them. DPs revised through this process are noted by the CPM and attached to the report of the CPM meeting.

Step 8: Publication

The adopted ISPM is made publicly available and noted in the report of the CPM meeting.

IPPC members may form a Language Review Group (LRG) and, following the CPM-agreed LRG process³⁶, may propose modifications to translations of adopted ISPMs to be noted at the following CPM meeting.

³⁶ <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110770>

APPENDIX 6: Summary of standards committee e-decisions (Update November 2011 to April 2012)

This paper provides a summary of the outcome of the forums and polls that the Standards Committee (SC) has discussed on the e-decision website since its last meeting in November 2011.

Table 1: SC e-decisions presented between November 2011 and April 2012

No. e-decision (2012_eSC_May_XX)	Title	Numbers of	
		Forum Comments	Polls Yes/No
Forum 01 Poll 01	Draft diagnostic protocol for <i>Trogoderma granarium</i> (2004-006)	3	7/0
Forum 02 Poll 02	SC approval of requesting the CPM-7 (2012) decision on the sea container standard (2008-001) development	9	7/3
Forum 03	SC April 2012 Agenda Discussions	14	No poll

01. Recommending the draft diagnostic protocol on *Trogoderma granarium* (2004-006) for adoption at CPM-7 (2012)

Background

The SC was requested to review the draft diagnostic protocol for *Trogoderma granarium* (2004-006) and decide whether to send it to the CPM-7 (2012) for adoption under special process. This draft DP was sent for the 100 day member consultation in June-September 2011. It was modified in response to member comments and reviewed by the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP). (see below).

The main amendments made as a result of member consultation were some rearrangement of the text and clarifications, and the addition of good quality photographs. Some member comments suggested the inclusion of more species into the draft for comparison, but this could not be done in the present version as it would require further study. In addition to the amended draft, the TPDP considered two general issues raised by member comments:

- The TPDP decided to not include the common name in the title, although it was well-known. This is for consistency between protocols and also to avoid confusion as there might not be only one well-known name for the pest, and there might be several widely used names in other languages.
- The TPDP decided to not add the date to the authorities (apart from in the section on Taxonomic information). There are different conventions for different disciplines and the TPDP favoured a simple and common approach to all protocols.

For more background information, please consult the support documents, with the URL below: <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110877>

Forum (01) summary – 17 December 2011

The SC was invited to engage in an on-line discussion forum, which was opened for 2 weeks. The forum closed on 17 December 2011.

There was no comment in the forum requesting changes to the draft protocol. 3 SC members supported that the draft be presented to CPM-7 for adoption.

Please note however that the authors, as a follow-up on some previous comments and as an improvement to the protocol, added scale bars to figures where necessary (Fig. 2, 4, 6, 15, 16, 17). This was the only change made to the draft protocol.

Poll (01) summary – 05 January 2012

After the forum took place, the draft diagnostic protocol was submitted to a poll, which closed on 5 January 2012.

Question: Do you agree to recommend the draft diagnostic protocol on *Trogoderma granarium* for adoption at CPM-7 (2012) ?

No SC member raised any objection on this recommendation.

SC decision

Recommend the draft diagnostic protocol for *Trogoderma granarium* (2004-006) for adoption at CPM-7 (2012).

02. SC approval of requesting the CPM-7 (2012) decision on the sea container standard (2008-001) development

Background

The Steward for *Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade* (2008-001) outlined activities regarding the development of this draft standard at the November 2011 SC meeting.

He noted that this is a complex issue and the scope might have to be restricted (possibly excluding conveyances and initially only dealing with empty containers). In regards to working with industry, it was recognized that industry would play a key role in helping to reduce pest movement by sea containers and that specific guidance would need to be developed to assist them. In addition he felt it would be prudent to also try to help contracting parties deal with their responsibilities in regards to preventing any threats posed to biodiversity by the movement of pests on sea containers. He invited SC members to send him contributions and views on these issues.

A small group of experts (a “Steering Committee”) from the expert working group further discussed this topic in the week following the SC November 2011 meeting and agreed with the assessment of the Steward. They agreed that the standard should be developed in a phased approach. Discussions with industry led to containers being limited to sea containers only excluding inland, intermodal freight, ferry, coastal, domestic and offshore. As the majority of sea containers are cleaned when they are empty, it was felt that targeting empty sea containers would have the greatest impact and that tackling conveyances in this draft would add too many new considerations and would therefore be overwhelming. The steering group recommended that the standard should initially deal only with empty containers and that conveyances should not be included in the scope.

It was agreed that it would be beneficial to liaise with:

- International industry organizations dealing with sea containers to develop specific guidance to incorporate into their operational procedures;
- Other international organizations to help ensure issues concerning biodiversity and the protection of the environment are addressed appropriately;

- The World Customs Organization (WCO) to explore the means of verifying the cleanliness of sea containers.

It was also noted that the Technical Consultation among RPPOs had requested that a side session on this issue be held at CPM-7 (2012); this would provide another opportunity for contacting parties to discuss the way forward on this topic.

Consultations between the SC Chair, the Steward and the Secretariat gave rise to the recommendation to keep the CPM informed of the issues associated with this high profile topic. An agreement from the SC was needed in order to inform the CPM on this issue and request its decision.

The whole background information and the initial draft text for submission to CPM-7 (2012) can be found from the URL below:

https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110885&no_cache=1&L=0&view=single_thread&cat_uid=19&conf_uid=27&thread_uid=87

Forum summary (02) – 13 January 2012

The SC was invited to engage in an on-line discussion forum, from 22 December 2011 to 13 January 2012, in order to decide whether the SC agreed to present to CPM-7(2012) the text mentioned above on the development of the Sea Container standard and to request the associated decisions from CPM.

There were good contributions from several SC members. Most SC members felt that the SC should focus on developing guidelines for NPPOs which may be applied to industry. SC members also agreed that industry should be involved in the development of such guidance from the beginning but any guidance should be directed to NPPOs. The SC agreed to propose removal of conveyances from the scope and title and that the standard should focus on empty containers initially. Emphasis was placed on producing practical means of verifying the cleanliness of containers.

Poll summary (02) – 23 January 2012

The SC Chair, in consultation with IPPC Secretariat, revised the text to be presented to CPM-7 (2012) based on SC forum discussion which closed on 13 January 2012. The revised draft text for submission to CPM-7 (2012) can be found in the support documents from the URL below:

[https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110877&frompage=1110877&tx_publication_pi1\[showUid\]=2183345&type=publication&L=0](https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110877&frompage=1110877&tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=2183345&type=publication&L=0)

The following revised text was then recommended to the SC for a request for decision by CPM-7:

“The CPM is requested to:

1. *note* that the topic, *Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade* (2008-001) is a complex issue and the standard will be developed in a phased approach with the initial standard being limited to empty sea containers.
2. *agree* that conveyances will be excluded from the scope and title of the draft.
3. *note* that it will be beneficial to liaise with international industry organizations dealing with sea containers to develop specific guidance for NPPOs.
4. *note* that efforts will be made to collaborate with other international organizations to help ensure wider biodiversity issues are addressed appropriately in the standard.”

The SC was then invited to engage in an on line poll, which closed on 23 January 2012.

The Chair of the SC and the Secretariat reviewed the opinions expressed in the poll.

It was concluded that the SC agreed to propose removal of conveyances from the scope and title and that the standard should focus on empty containers initially. Emphasis was placed on producing

practical means of verifying the cleanliness of containers. Most SC members felt that the SC should focus on developing guidelines for NPPOs which may be applied to industry. However, from the poll results there was no consensus to move this issue forward to the CPM-7 (2012) at this time. It was considered whether to have an additional forum but there would not be enough time to come to a conclusion before CPM-7 (2012). The Chair included a paragraph on the issue in her report (CPM 2012/INF/10Rev1) and verbally covered the main points in her report to CPM-7 (2012).

For an update from the Sea containers steering committee, please see also document SC_2012_Apr_21 (Agenda item 4.3 of the April 2012 SC meeting).

03. SC April 2012 Agenda Discussions

Background

The agenda for April 2012 SC meeting should be reduced with fewer items in order to have more in depth discussions on specific items. In particular, the draft ISPMs with highest profile or more “ready” profile could be discussed first.

It is essential to update the SC on recent decisions by other bodies as many of these will affect the way the SC will work. In addition, technical panels and ongoing expert working groups will need SC guidance and some decisions to continue their work.

Forum summary (03) – 18 April 2012

The SC was invited to engage in an on-line discussion forum to consider the agenda posted in the SC restricted work area (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1111076>) and the points raised in the attached support document 2012_eSC_May_03. This would help the SC to determine the level of detail that would be needed for the discussion on the agenda items below and determine which discussions could be postponed.

The attached support document 2012_eSC_May_03 can be found in the support documents from the URL below:

[https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110877&frompage=1110877&tx_publication_pi1\[showUid\]=2184021&type=publication&L=0](https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110877&frompage=1110877&tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=2184021&type=publication&L=0)

Question: The SC agrees to consider the items on the SC April 2012 Agenda to the level of detail indicated in the attached support document 2012_eSC_May_03 and to postpone the discussion on some items.

The closing date was 18 April 2012.

There were good contributions from several SC members. The Secretariat and the SC Chair reviewed the comments and, in response to input from SC members, suggested some modifications to the order according which the agenda items would be addressed. In addition, the SC felt they should assign a new steward for the *International movement of cut flowers and foliage* (2008-005) after agenda item 6, and that they should discuss the draft specification for *International movement of cut flowers and foliage* (2008-005) after agenda item 8.5 and try to approve it for member consultation. Hence, it was decided that the agenda items be addressed in the following order:

Agenda order:

1 to 4. As indicated.

5. Draft ISPMs from expert drafting groups

Brief general discussion on each draft ISPM (5 minutes each)

5.1. Draft Annex 1 to ISPM 15: Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material (2006-011) - strategic discussion and review of approval timing.

5.3. Draft appendix 1 to ISPM 12: Electronic certification (2006-003) - detailed discussion, consider trying to approve for member consultation.

5.2. Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031) - detailed discussion with the aim to approve for MC

5.4. Draft annex to ISPM 20:2004 – Phytosanitary pre-export clearance (2005-003) - detailed discussion, consider trying to approve for MC or determine method for moving forward

5.5. Draft annex to ISPM 26:2006 – Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management (2005-010) – minor discussion, some guidance to steward and written comments to steward

5.6. Draft annex to ISPM 26:2006 Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak (2009-007) – minor discussion, some guidance to steward and written comments to steward

6. Selection of the equivalent of five draft ISPMs for 2012 member consultation - Order given

10.2 Adjustments to stewards**7. Draft specifications for review of member comments and approval by the SC**

7.1. Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004) – try to approve

8. Draft Specifications for approval for member consultation

8.5. International movement of grain (2008-007) - try to approve for MC

8.4. International movement of cut flowers and foliage (2008-005) – try to approve for MC

8.2. Revision of ISPM 6 – Guidelines for surveillance (2009-004) - try to approve for MC or have detailed discussion and provide guidance to steward

8.1. Revision of ISPM 4 – Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (2009-002) – minor discussion, some guidance to steward and written comments to steward

8.3. Revision of ISPM 8 – Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005) – minor discussion, some guidance to steward and written comments to steward

Remainder of agenda items (9 to14) - In order