



REPORT

Rome, Italy
13-17 May 2013

**Standards
Committee
Working Group (SC-7)
May 2013**



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of FAO.

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the meeting	4
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat.....	4
1.2 Election of the Chairperson	4
1.3 Election of the Rapporteur.....	4
1.4 Adoption of the Agenda.....	4
2. Administrative Matters.....	4
2.1 Documents List.....	4
2.2 Participants List	4
2.3 Local Information	5
3. Updates from the Standards Committee Meeting	5
3.1 SC Meeting Updates	5
4. Review of Draft ISPMs	5
4.1 Electronic phytosanitary certificates, information on standard XML schemas and exchange mechanisms (Draft Appendix 1 to ISPM 12:2011) (2006-003).....	5
4.2 Control measures for an outbreak within a fruit fly-pest free area (for inclusion as Annex 1 of ISPM 26) (2009-007).....	8
4.3 Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) (2006-031).....	10
5. Other business	13
6. Close of the meeting.....	13
Appendix 1. Agenda.....	14
Appendix 2. Documents List.....	16

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The Standards Officer opened the meeting and welcomed the members of the Working Group of the Standards Committee (SC-7).

1.2 Election of the Chairperson

- [2] The SC-7 elected Mr Bart ROSSEL (Australia) as Chairperson.

1.3 Election of the Rapporteur

- [3] The SC-7 elected Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) as Rapporteur.

1.4 Adoption of the Agenda

- [4] The SC-7 adopted the agenda as presented in Appendix 1.

2. Administrative Matters

2.1 Documents List

- [5] The list of documents is presented in Appendix 2.

2.2 Participants List

- [6] The members of the SC that participated in the meeting were as follows:

- Ms Marie-Claude FOREST (North America)
- Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Europe)
- Mr Bart ROSSEL (Southwest Pacific)
- Mr Motoi SAKAMURA (Asia)
- Ms Ruth WOODE (Africa)

- [7] Stewards:

- Ms Julie ALIAGA (United States of America), Steward for *Control measures for an outbreak within a fruit fly-pest free area (for inclusion as Annex 1 of ISPM 26) (2009-007)*
- Mr Rui CARDOSO PEREIRA (Joint FAO/IAEA Division in Food and Agriculture), Steward for *Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) (2006-031)*

- [8] Invited Expert:

- Mr Nicolaas Maria HORN (The Netherlands) to assist with the discussion on *Electronic phytosanitary certificates, information on standard XML schemas and exchange mechanisms (Draft Appendix 1 to ISPM 12:2011) (2006-003)*.

- [9] Secretariat Support:

- Mr Brent LARSON
- Ms Adriana MOREIRA
- Ms Stephanie DUBON

- [10] Two members of the SC from the Latin America and Caribbean and Near East regions were unable to attend.

- [11] The Secretariat reminded participants to update their contact details on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP, <https://www.ippc.int>).

2.3 Local Information

- [12] The Secretariat provided a document on local information and invited participants to notify the Secretariat of any information that required updating or was missing.

3. Updates from the Standards Committee Meeting

3.1 SC Meeting Updates

- [13] There were no updates from the Standards Committee.

4. Review of Draft ISPMs¹

- [14] It was noted that the two SC members who were unable to attend the SC-7 meeting did not provide comments, additional concerns or responses from their regions to be discussed at the SC-7 meeting.

4.1 Electronic phytosanitary certificates, information on standard XML schemas and exchange mechanisms (Draft Appendix 1 to ISPM 12:2011) (2006-003)

- [15] The steward noted that, in general, member comments were related to:
- contents of code lists referred in the draft via web links
 - procedures to maintain and manage (adding and revising) the harmonized terminology of data elements of the phytosanitary certificates as to be listed on the dedicated electronic phytosanitary certification (ePhyto) website
 - logistics for actual operation of an electronic certification (e.g. costs to establish national systems, access to or revisions of code lists).
- [16] The ePhyto Steering Committee assisted with the steward's responses to the member comments and proposals to the draft text. One member of the Steering Committee attended the SC-7 meeting as an invited expert to provide technical guidance on the concerns of member comments and the SC-7.
- [17] The Secretariat expressed concern that the new Steering Group (which took over the role of the previous Steering Committee), established at the eighth meeting of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-8 (2013)), may not be able to meet until after the 2013 Substantial Concerns Commenting Period (SCCP) has begun, noting that, if the SC wanted to wait to send this draft to the SCCP until after the Steering Group members have been identified, then the draft may not be submitted to the 2013 SCCP. Because the CPM-8 (2013) had given the draft a high priority, the SC-7 recommended that the draft be sent to 2013 SCCP, regardless of when the Steering Group will be able to meet.
- [18] It was noted during the meeting that the major points of concern identified from member comments submitted were:
- several members expressed general concern to adopt the Appendix without more information on the codes
 - one member did not agree to introduce a coding system because it is not a requirement of ISPM 12:2011
 - some members proposed that the Appendix should be an Annex in order to strongly state that the IPPC electronic certification system should be implemented in a harmonized manner
- [19] The SC-7 discussed whether this standard should be an annex or appendix to ISPM 12:2011. It was noted that annexes include requirements, and that some members would not accept the draft as an annex, once the draft was submitted to member consultation as an appendix. There were concerns by

[1] ¹ Compiled comments on these draft ISPMs from the 2012 member consultation can be found on the IPPC's website at: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/compiled-member-comments-draft-standards>

the SC-7 of using the term *should* in the standard but it was noted that there were no member comments on the use of *should*, and the entire rationale of the text would disappear without this terminology, so the SC-7 retained it.

- [20] Global changes to specify *electronic phytosanitary certificates* (instead of *certificates* or *electronic certificates*) were made through the text, where applicable.
- [21] In line with a proposal by the Steering Committee, technical requirements were added regarding the NPPO's responsibilities for setting and maintaining systems and providing a quick response in case of system failure.
- [22] There were several member comments on contents of code lists, especially on the codes for product description (commodity class) and treatment types. Several member's comments thought the content of the code lists should be consistent with the *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* (ISPM 5: 2012), *Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk* (ISPM 32:2009) and *Integrated measures for plants for planting* (ISPM 36:2012). It was also suggested that, to enhance common understanding on the descriptions of consignment and treatment types, a definition or description of categorization, clarification, explanation of each products (link 7) or treatment listed (link 10) should be added. The Appendix was adjusted by the steward based on the member comments and the lists contain harmonized terminology with possible codes to be used.
- [23] Regarding member comments that a coding system should not be introduced because it is not a requirement of ISPM 12:2011, it was noted that codes are language independent and a harmonized approach. It was also noted that, for now, harmonized terminology may not be needed, but once more NPPOs begin using electronic phytosanitary certification systems, the use of codes will be needed to facilitate electronic certification.
- [24] General concerns on logistic issues had been raised during the member consultation regarding procedures to manage and maintain code lists (updating and revising the lists). The steward noted that it may not be feasible for the Secretariat to maintain lists of codes, especially related to product description (name of products, commodity classes), because they frequently change. The Steering Group recognized that further work would be required to complete these lists and related fields, especially on the lists of treatment types, codes and pest names. Several member comments suggested that the IPPC Secretariat create and maintain separate lists of harmonized terminology or codes (e.g. in the form of files). However, the Secretariat was unsure of the resources available to manage this. The SC-7 agreed that the Steering Group should be responsible for managing the data sets (e.g. lists of codes) as defined in the draft, which will also be made available on the ePhyto website (<http://ephyto.ippc.int/>). It was noted that the Steering Group will have representatives from all seven FAO regions so that a representative harmonization can be reached.
- [25] Costs on the establishment of national systems to join the electronic certification system, on accessing lists of codes (links) and on managing (amend, update, etc.) the lists were also mentioned by several members during the member consultation. The SC-7 thought this point was not part of the standard and suggested it be considered by the Steering Group.
- [26] The SC-7 agreed to the proposal from the Steering Group by adding text that NPPOs should be responsible for establishing a security system and components necessary to maintain the electronic certification systems.
- [27] When reviewing the draft, the SC-7 discussed the following items:
- For consistency throughout the standard, it was agreed that *the system generates* electronic phytosanitary certificates and *the NPPO issues* them.
 - The phrase *XML message structure* was used instead of *XML message contents* to be consistent with ISPM 12:2011.

- The phrase *NPPOs may consider the merits of adopting the sets of standardized terminology* was modified to *NPPOs may use the sets of standardized terminology* because the NPPO does not adopt the terminology, but uses it.
- Per member comments, the SC-7 removed references to some groups or organizations that manage databases, lists of codes, etc. because this will all be done under the auspices of the IPPC Secretariat.
- The Steering Group had recommended that the name of the authorized officer should not be retained. However, the SC-7 agreed to keep it because it is a requirement in ISPM 12:2011.
- It was noted that the process of issuing electronic phytosanitary certificates should be as similar as possible to the process for issuing paper versions.
- The SC-7 agreed to change the terminology from *lost certificates* to *retrieval issues* because the term *retrieval issues* covers the concept of recovery and, technically, the electronic phytosanitary certificates would not be lost, but non-retrievable.
- The terms *shipment* and *ship* were replaced with *dispatchment* and *dispatch*, respectively, because these are more appropriate terminology to cover all types of movement (e.g. sea, air, land).
- When discussing certified copies of electronic phytosanitary certificates, it was noted that, in the Steering Group, there was no consensus on the template of the printout, and the Steering Committee could only agree that the printout of the certified copy should either be in the XML data in the XML format or in a template similar to the IPPC model, but always bilaterally agreed between NPPOs concerned. However, there was concern that the information may be difficult to read in XML format and could be several pages long when printed. It was noted that any printout would be certified by the NPPO of the importing country, and only in cases of re-export when the importing country requires certified paper copies (e.g. the importing country has not yet implemented an electronic phytosanitary certificate system). The SC-7 agreed that the printout should be compatible with, and in the same format as, the IPPC model phytosanitary certificate (which can be found annexed to the IPPC or ISPM 12:2011). In addition, the SC-7 added text stating that printouts in XML data and XML format would be acceptable if agreed-to by the NPPO of the importing, exporting, and/or re-exporting countries.
- There was discussion on adding a declared name and address of the consignee to the electronic phytosanitary certificate to encourage the NPPO of the exporting country to supply the name and address of a contact person that would be responsible for the consignment upon arrival in the importing country. It was noted that this should be a requirement, but this information is not always available. The SC-7 agreed to wording that NPPOs are encouraged to require this information from the exporting countries, noting that both importing and exporting countries could make this requirement.
- Discussions on whether incorporating the original paper phytosanitary certificate into the new electronic phytosanitary certificate for re-export, there was concern that the term *incorporated* could mean that the information is taken from the paper version and entered into the new electronic version and not that the PDF version is attached to the electronic phytosanitary certificate, which is the proposed meaning. It was noted that the paper version (scanned into a PDF) would not be considered *attached* to the electronic certificate but *incorporated* into the system, so it was decided to retain the term *incorporate*.
- There was a discussion on whether to include a general statement in Section 2 regarding the use of “free text” when codes are not harmonized. The SC-7 revised the text to ensure that free text is acceptable for all data entries except for the country name. However, free text should only be used if the list of harmonized terms and texts are insufficient.
- Wherever possible, the SC-7 removed the use of the terms *codes*, *coded*, *coding*, etc. in the text to reduce confusion.
- It was brought to the attention of the SC-7 that there is a harmonized list of codes available regarding declared means of conveyance and transportation available from the UNECE

- (UNECE recommendation 19, Codes for modes of transport). The SC-7 added the list to the draft.
- It was noted that the UNECE recommendation 7 on numerical representation of dates, time and periods of time, does not include time standardization, so references to time were removed.
 - It was noted that, for date and time format, it was not needed to insert the link because this information is already standardized by UN/CEFACT.

The SC-7 recommended the draft to the Standards Committee.

[28] The SC is invited to:

- Consider recommending the draft *Electronic phytosanitary certificates, information on standard XML schemas and exchange mechanisms (Draft Appendix 1 to ISPM 12:2011)* (2006-003) to the CPM.

4.2 Control measures for an outbreak within a fruit fly-pest free area (for inclusion as Annex 1 of ISPM 26) (2009-007)

[29] The steward presented the draft and provided an overview of major concerns, noting that the Technical Panel on Pest Free Areas and Systems Approaches for Fruit Flies (TPFF) had reviewed the responses to member comments. The steward also noted that the Technical Panel on the Glossary (TPG) provided guidance on the use of terms and their definitions and on consistency between standards.

[30] The SC-7 discussed the following items:

- The SC-7 discussed whether the main text of ISPM 26:2006 *Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)* should be revised after the adoption of this annex to incorporate and update pertinent information. The Secretariat noted that this revision would need to be submitted in response to the 2013 Call for topics.
- Several member comments referred to the perceived need for capacity building to implement this standard after adoption, but it was noted that this falls outside of the scope of the standard setting process.
- The term *pest findings* was changed to *pest detections* throughout the standard, because the term is more appropriate.
- The steward had amended the title of the annex from *Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak* to *Control measures for an outbreak within a fruit fly pest free area* based on member comments and to align it with the content of the standard and the SC-7 agreed.
- Throughout the standard, better wording was suggested for the term *trade*. *Commerce, sales* and *retail* were considered, but it was decided that *sale* would be the most appropriate term.
- Based on TPG responses to member's comments, the steward had removed the section entitled "Background" because the TPG felt it was repetitive to things covered in the Requirements section, but the SC-7 agreed to keep the original text to introduce the draft and to place the requirements section elsewhere in the standard.
- The TPG noted that the use of the terms *phytosanitary measures, phytosanitary actions, quarantine area* etc. implies that the measures are applied to a quarantine pest. However, the pest may be a quarantine pest for the importing country, but not for the exporting country maintaining the pest free area (PFA). The measures would not be *phytosanitary measures* if they are decided by the exporting country in order to meet certain requirements in relation to quarantine pests of other countries. The measures would be related to domestic requirements rather than phytosanitary measures. Recognizing that the pest may not be a quarantine pest for the country implementing the PFA, the TPG suggested that alternative wordings should be used. The SC-7 agreed to the use of the terms *control measures* and *eradication areas*.

- As a global change, the term *occur* was replaced with *present* or *absent* to be consistent with other ISPMs.
- There was a concern about distinguishing between a fruit fly PFA where a species of fruit fly occurs around the PFA, but not in it, and in a situation where that species of fruit fly is detected as an outbreak. The steward noted that this Annex covers outbreaks in FF-PFA areas where the target fruit fly species is absent. The SC-7 noted that the concept is not within the scope of this standard, so it was not retained.
- There was concern regarding the use of the term *regulated articles* and whether it should be removed from the standard. It was noted that *regulated articles* was not in the original draft from the TPF. The TPG had suggested the term *fruit* be used instead of *regulated articles*. However, the steward noted that regulated soil and bags that accompany the fruit could be relevant pathways that need regulation. The term *regulated articles* was retained and the SC-7 added examples of regulated articles (e.g. soil, fruit, etc.) in the first instance of use.
- The SC-7 discussed the issue of expanding and contracting when determining the eradication area based on administrative or topographic boundaries. One participant noted that there would never be a reduction of the eradication area, and it would only be able to expand. However, it was noted that if a lake was on the border of the area, it may be appropriate to reduce the area because fruit flies may not be able to travel across the lake. The SC-7 agreed to change *expand or contract* the area to *adjust*.
- A few member comments had requested that one of the figures used to determine the eradication area be deleted, citing it was unnecessary and confusing. The SC-7 disagreed because it could help some NPPOs understand the process described, and, therefore, agreed to keep the figure.
- The SC-7 decided that text on auditing be deleted because it is implied in this standard.
- There was a concern from the TPG regarding the term *shipping* because it could imply only shipping by sea, and recommended the term *dispatching* as more appropriate to cover all types of movement (e.g. sea, air, land). The SC-7 agreed to use the term *dispatching*.
- The SC-7 discussed a global change to include the term *establishment* but noted that the introduction includes establishment as defined in ISPM 5:Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms, so it was not included.
- There was a suggestion to add a list of fruit fly species and their dispersal distances. However, the TPF advised that it would be very difficult for member countries to reach an agreement on dispersal distances because there are many variables to consider (e.g. the biology of the fruit fly species), so the suggestion was not incorporated.
- The SC-7 agreed that packaging material should be *insect-proof and clean*, instead of *new*.
- There were concerns about the term *cull* and whether it was a commonly used term. The SC-7 changed it to *rejected fruit* because it is a more widely recognized term.
- There was a proposal to remove the section on *phytosanitary certification* because it is already covered in ISPM 12:2011. It was noted that movement of the consignment was covered in other sections in this standard and it was agreed this section was redundant and the information can be found in other ISPMs. The SC-7 agreed to reduce the text and move it elsewhere in the standard to ensure the concept is retained.

[31] The SC-7 recommended the draft to the Standards Committee.

[32] The SC is invited to:

- Consider recommending the draft ISPM *Control measures for an outbreak within a fruit fly-pest free area (for inclusion as Annex 1 of ISPM 26) (2009-007)* to the CPM.

4.3 Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) (2006-031)

[33] The steward noted that a large number of member comments were received and that the steward had incorporated a substantial number of them into the draft, contributing to the increased quality of the document. However, some of the comments (or group of comments) had required some consultation with the TPFf.

[34] The SC-7 discussed the following items:

- The use of *conditional host* versus *non-natural host*: The steward noted that the issue with the definition was widely discussed among the TPFf, and it was recognized that there is a need to harmonize because, in the literature, there are many different terms used. The steward noted that simplifying to only three categories was the suggested approach, noting that the use of *non-natural host* complies with the proposed studies described in this standard. The SC-7 agreed.
- The steward suggested that the phrase *host of fruit flies* instead of simply *host* be incorporated throughout the text (including in the title) to ensure that it is clearly stated that this standard is only addressing issues related to fruit fly hosts.
- *fruit* or *fruit and vegetables*: The TPG had recommended that the term *vegetables* be removed from this standard because infestation would be of fruit in the botanical sense, not of the commodity class. The steward noted that the term *vegetables* was only included in the title and scope section, and that the TPFf had included a footnote in the scope that the term *fruit* would extend to its biological meaning, thereby including some fruits that are sometimes called vegetables. The SC-7 decided to remove the footnote and incorporate the footnote phrase into the text of the scope, and removed the term *vegetables* from the title of the standard.
- Regarding the scope of the standard, the SC-7 agreed that the examples of semi-natural conditions should not be moved from the scope to after the second mention of the phrase *semi-natural conditions*. It was agreed to enter a statement in the scope that this standard does not address requirements to protect plants against the introduction and spread of fruit flies. This was to accommodate several member comments on the possible regulatory effects of this standard.
- The SC-7 agreed that the term *field* should be retained in the definition of *non-natural host* because it correctly reflects the non-natural conditions (semi-natural field conditions). So, the term is not mentioned for *natural conditions*.
- Definitions of *host status*, *natural host*, *non-natural host* and *non-host*:
 - *host status*: The TPG had recommended changes to the definitions, including the deletion of the term *host status*, because it would be difficult to develop a general definition to include all pests, including fruit flies. The TPG also noted that a specific definition applying only to this standard is not needed because the standard describes the three categories of hosts (*natural*, *non-natural* and *non-*) for fruit flies. Reviewing the member comments and the comments from the TPG, the SC-7 retained the term *host status* as part of this standard and, using additional comments from the TPG, included the term *classification* instead of *categorization* in the definition.
 - *natural host*: The SC-7 discussed the definition and determined that a natural host would be able to sustain fruit fly development to adults, including the development of pupae to adults to complete the lifecycle, and re-defined the term to include this point.
 - use of the phrase *production of reproductive adults*: There was a discussion on the need for observing whether adults become reproductive or whether detection of pupae would be sufficient. The SC-7 could not reach a scientifically-based agreement on the phrase, and, therefore, agreed to change the phrase *production of reproductive adults* to *development to adults* for all four definitions and as a global change to the text.
- For consistency with other ISPMs, the SC-7 deleted *Diptera* from *Diptera:Tephritidae*.
- The term *host commodities* was replaced with *host fruit* for consistency.
- To reduce redundancy, the SC-7 removed the term *establishment* from the phrase *likelihood of pest introduction, establishment and spread*.

- The SC-7 discussed removing the references to *Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)* (ISPM 26:2006), *Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (Tephritidae)* (ISMP 30:2008) and *Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)* (ISPM 35:2012) from the background. The steward was concerned that this is the only location in the standard where these are referenced, and suggested that they be placed elsewhere in the text, if appropriate. The references were kept in the background but moved to a more appropriate location.
- The SC-7 removed the phrase *avoiding unnecessary trade restrictions* because the main goal of international standards is to protect plants, not to promote trade.
- In response to a member comment, it was proposed to add text that the host status may change over time based on biological and climatic conditions. However, it was noted that the host status of a fruit fly would not change based on climate change. The SC-7 agreed that only biological conditions should be retained, because it was in the background section of this standard and, therefore, not a requirement.
- The SC-7 discussed whether the reference *Aluja and Mangan, 2008* should be added to this standard because there were several member comments to remove this reference from the text and place it in *Appendix I: Additional references*. The SC-7 agreed to move the reference to Appendix I to respond to agree to the member comments and to retain the information, which it considered important.
- There was a suggestion to add a footnote to clarify that, in this standard, the term *infestation* refers to the infestation of a fruit by a target fruit fly species. This could be considered redundant, but would clarify its meaning when referring to the term in the text. As a consequence to the addition of the footnote, the phrase *fruit infestation* was replaced with *infestation in* for simplicity.
- The SC-7 changed the term *fruit* to *plant* because the plant species or cultivar is categorized as the host, not the botanical fruit itself.
- Because it was not considered necessary, the SC-7 removed text regarding host conditions.
- The steward noted that a figure explaining the steps for fruit fly host status determination had changed from its original version, but noted that, to simplify the figure would be nearly impossible. The SC-7 made changes to the diagram based on revisions to the text of the standard and member comments, adding a new step *Other evidence found* after *No fruit infestation found* to ensure that all research for evidence is exhausted.
- The SC-7 changed *trade data* to *trade or interception data* based on member comments.
- There was a discussion on the addition of the phrase *based on PRA or other relevant considerations* when determining host status, which had been inserted based on a member comment. There were concerns of what the relevant considerations refer to and whether they could be described in the standard. The entire phrase was removed because the PRA is normally performed after the host status determination exercise, and the other relevant considerations (e.g. identifying information in journal articles) would be done prior to beginning field trials.
- Under the specific requirements section, the text on laboratory tests was modified to clarify and strengthen the message that results of laboratory tests may adequately assign a plant to non-host status, but, because of the risk for false-positives, laboratory tests alone must not be used for determining natural or non-natural host status.
- The phrase *viable adult* was reduced to *adults* because viability may not necessarily be related to host status.
- The phrase *maturity and physical stages* was replaced with *physiological and physical stages* because it is more appropriate terminology.
- It was suggested to move text regarding the variability of fruits to an appendix because, though the text contains very useful information, it does not constitute requirements. The SC-7 decided to place the information in the background section in paragraph form (not as a bulleted list).

- In the fruit sampling section, the reference to confidence level of 95% for fruit sample would be a matter of NPPO decision or negotiation, and could not be harmonized in this standard, so it was deleted.
- In the fruit sampling section, the SC-7 proposed to delete text regarding the determination of the host status and confidence levels using controls because it was obvious information. However, the steward did not agree because this is in regards to the control and it is only with the control that these activities are taken, and thus this information was maintained.
- There was a concern of using the term *voucher specimen* in the standard because it is a very technical term and some NPPOs may not be familiar with it. It was noted that the term is used in *Guidelines for surveillance* (ISPM 6:1997) and *Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)* (ISPM 26:2006), so it was retained.
- The SC-7 clarified that, for the requirements to operational procedures pertaining to the fruit flies used in field trials, the female fruit fly should be used only once, and not reused in many field trials, for better trials results.
- There was a proposal to introduce the term *exposed fruit*, in relation to fruit handling and emergence, but it was noted that the fruit could be collected from natural conditions, so was not incorporated.
- The phrase *a subsample of fruit may be taken to calculate the percentage of fruit infestation* in brackets was deleted because it is not considered a holding condition.
- The concept of *parameters being considered when analysing data* was not understood by some SC-7 members. There was also a concern of the specific meaning of the phrase *data should be analysed* and whether quantification was implied as a new requirement. The concept was rephrased to indicate that quantification may be useful, but not a requirement.
- The SC-7 agreed to provide examples of levels of infestation (e.g. larvae per kg of fruit, larvae per fruit and percentage of infested fruit) to clarify to members the possible ways that this information can be determined.
- The SC-7 recommended deleting the concept of keeping records for a period of five years. The steward noted that it had been inserted because *five years* is found in many ISPMs. However, it was noted that a specific time period should not be included, based on TPG review, so it was deleted.
- Regarding the exclusion of the laboratory tests from the draft, it was noted that this was agreed by the SC at its April 2012 meeting, before the draft was sent for member consultation. Additionally, as correctly mentioned in the member comments, the laboratory tests can cause a large number of false positives (i.e. fruits that were infested in small cages in laboratory, when tested in semi-natural conditions, were never infested and, for this reason, are non-hosts). However, it was decided to include text to clarify that, when the status of non-host is the result of a laboratory testing, it may be accepted; otherwise the only acceptable way is to conduct the host status studies in semi-natural conditions (i.e. *laboratory tests may be useful for demonstrating non-host status, but field trials are necessary to demonstrate that a fruit is a host*).
- The SC-7 discussed the issue of retaining the list of additional references or deleting it as in the proposed *appendix*, because there were member comments for both cases. It was noted that some of the references are not accessible online. There was a proposal to post the list on the phytosanitary.info webpage, but then the information may be lost and countries may not know that the information is available. It was also noted that ISPM 26:2006 has a list of additional references. The SC-7 decided to retain the list, changing the section name to *Bibliography*, as this was felt to be more appropriate, but requested the SC to discuss this issue further.

[35] The SC-7 recommended the draft to the Standards Committee.

[36] The SC is invited to:

- Consider recommending the draft ISPM Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) (2006-031) to the CPM.

5. Other business

[37] There was no other business.

6. Close of the meeting

[38] Secretariat thanked the SC-7 members, attending stewards and invited expert for their productive work in the meeting. The SC-7 agreed to finalize the meeting report via email.

[39] The Chairperson closed the meeting.

Appendix 1. Agenda

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	-	SECRETARIAT
1.2 Election of the Chairperson	-	SECRETARIAT
1.3 Election of the Rapporteur	-	CHAIRPERSON
1.4 Adoption of the Agenda	SC7_2013_May_01	MOREIRA
2. Administrative Matters		
2.1 Documents List	SC7_2013_May_02	MOREIRA
2.2 Participants List	SC7_2013_May_03	MOREIRA
2.3 Local Information (refer to the 2013 May SC Local Information document)	https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110798&frompage=1110514&tx_publication_pi1[showUId]=2184224&type=publication&L=0	MOREIRA
3. Updates from the Standards Committee Meeting		
3.1 SC Meeting Updates	-	CHAIRPERSON
4. Review of Draft ISPMs		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.1 Appendix to ISPM 12 on Electronic certification, information on standard XML schemes and exchange mechanisms (2006-003), Priority 1 - Steward: Motoi SAKAMURA (will attend and present) • Steward's Response to Comments from 2012 Member Consultation • Steward's additional notes • TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency with steward's responses 	<p style="text-align: center;">2006-003</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SC7_2013_May_04</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SC7_2013_May_05</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SC7_2013_May_06</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">SAKAMURA</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SAKAMURA</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SAKAMURA</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SAKAMURA</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.2 Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak (for inclusion as Annex 1 of ISPM 26) (2009-007), Priority 3 - Steward: Jaime GONZALEZ - Assistant stewards: Julie ALIAGA (will attend and present) Soledad CASTRO-DOROCHESSI • Steward's Response to Comments from 2012 Member Consultation • Steward's additional notes 	<p style="text-align: center;">2009-007</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SC7_2013_May_07</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SC7_2013_May_08</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">ALIAGA</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ALIAGA</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ALIAGA</p>

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency with steward's responses 	SC7_2013_May_11	ALIAGA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.3 Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031), Priority 1 - Steward: Rui PEREIRA-CARDOSO (will attend and present) • Steward's Response to Comments from 2012 Member Consultation • Steward's additional notes • TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency with steward's responses 	<p style="text-align: center;">2006-031</p> <p>SC7_2013_May_09</p> <p>SC7_2013_May_10</p> <p>SC7_2013_May_12</p>	<p>PEREIRA-CARDOSO</p> <p>PEREIRA-CARDOSO</p> <p>PEREIRA-CARDOSO</p> <p>PEREIRA-CARDOSO</p>
5. Other business		CHAIRPERSON
6. Close of the meeting		CHAIRPERSON

Appendix 2. Documents List (by document number)

DOCUMENT NUMBER	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE
2006-003	4.1	Appendix to ISPM 12 on Electronic certification, information on standard XML schemes and exchange mechanisms (2006-003), Priority 1
2006-031	4.3	Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031), Priority 1
2009-007	4.2	Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak (for inclusion as Annex 1 of ISPM 26) (2009-007), Priority 3
SC7_2013_May_01	1.4	Agenda
SC7_2013_May_02	2.1	Documents List
SC7_2013_May_03	2.2	Participants List
SC7_2013_May_04	4.1	2006-003: Steward's Response to Comments from 2012 Member Consultation
SC7_2013_May_05	4.1	2006-003: Steward's additional notes
SC7_2013_May_06	4.1	2006-003: TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency with steward's responses
SC7_2013_May_07	4.2	2009-007: Steward's Response to Comments from 2012 Member Consultation
SC7_2013_May_08	4.2	2009-007: Steward's additional notes
SC7_2013_May_09	4.3	2006-031: Steward's Response to Comments from 2012 Member Consultation
SC7_2013_May_10	4.3	2006-031: Steward's additional notes
SC7_2013_May_11	4.2	2009-007: TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency with steward's responses
SC7_2013_May_12	4.3	2006-031: TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency with steward's responses