



REPORT

Rome, Italy
12-16 May, 2014

**Standards
Committee
Working Group (SC-7)
May, 2014**



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

CONTENTS

1. Opening	3
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat.....	3
1.2 Election of the Chairperson.....	3
1.3 Election of the Rapporteur	3
1.4 Adoption of the agenda	3
2. Administrative matters	3
2.1 Documents list.....	3
2.2 Participants list	3
2.3 Local information	3
3. Update from the Standards Committee meeting.....	3
4. Draft ISPMs for review and approval for member consultation.....	3
4.1 Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004), priority 1	3
4.2 Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood (2006-029), priority 1	5
4.3 Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management (2005-010), priority 2.....	8
4.4 Draft amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms (1994-001).....	9
5. Other business.....	11
6. Close of the meeting	11

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1 - Agenda	12
Appendix 2 – Documents List.....	14
Appendix 3 – Participants list	15

1. Opening

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 Alexandre MOREIRA PALMA (Brazil) 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 Participants list, including detailed contact information, is presented in Appendix 3.

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

2.3 Local information

- [8] 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. Update from the Standards Committee meeting

- [9] The Chairperson gave a brief summary on the 2014 SC May meeting¹.

4. Draft ISPMs for review and approval for member consultation²

4.1 Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004), priority 1

- [10] The Steward introduced the subject and provided an overview of the issues for SC-7 consideration. The SC-7 reviewed the member comments, steward's responses to comments and the revised draft ISPM. The Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) comments, which were not included in the revised draft ISPM, was also considered during review by the SC-7. The major discussions by the SC-7 are provided below.

- [11] It was noted that several countries commented on the relationship between this draft International Standard on Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) and ISPM 36:2012 (*Integrated measures for plants for planting*) and whether the draft standard on *Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade* should be a standalone ISPM or be an annex or appendix to ISPM 36:2012. The SC-7 thoroughly discussed this issue and noted that ISPM 36:2012 has a narrower scope

¹ 2014 SC May meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/standards-committee>

² Compiled comments on these draft ISPMs from the 2013 member consultation can be found on the IPPC's website at: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/compiled-member-comments-draft-standards>

and does not cover all aspects related to plants for planting. The SC-7 agreed that this draft standard on *Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade* (2005-004) should be a standalone standard rather than being an annex to ISPM 36:2012.

- [12] Also, with regards to the reference to ISPM 36:2012 the SC-7 agreed to retain the reference to ISPM 36:2012 in the draft standard as it provides useful information for National plant protection organizations (NPPOs), for instance factors for determination of pest risk. The text of the draft standard (section on pest risk management) was reworded to clarify that other measures can be used, in addition to those presented in ISPM 36:2012.
- [13] To ensure consistency among ISPMs and eliminate redundancy in the initial wording of the title, the SC-7 agreed on the revised title *International movement of growing media in association with plants for planting*. The SC-7 did not agree on including *pest risk management* in the title because it considered that *management* is only one component of the pest risk analysis and the scope of the draft standard extends to the other components. With respect to the use of *movement* and *international trade*, the SC-7 agreed on the term *international movement* and made it a global change throughout the draft standard. The SC-7 noted that the TPG should consider this suggestion in future discussions.
- [14] Several countries commented on the inclusion of a definition for *soil* in the draft standard, pointing out that ISPM 5:2013 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) includes a definition for *growing media*, which covers *soil*, and therefore if a definition is provided for *soil*, the other constituents of growing media should also be defined. The SC-7 noted that the task to develop a definition for *soil* was included in the specification for the standard. The SC-7 thoroughly discussed the country comments and agreed that it was important to include a definition because out of all growing media constituents, soil is the main concern. The SC agreed on a local definition that is in line with the TPG proposal: *Naturally present growing medium (except peat), consisting of a mixture of minerals and organic material*. The SC-7 stressed that this definition would be specific to this draft standard. The question of whether a definition for *peat* is required was raised, but the SC-7 agreed that since *peat* is covered in an appendix to this draft standard, it should not require a definition. With respect to the use of *constituents* or *components*, the SC-7 agreed that the use of *constituents* is more appropriate in the context of pedology, while *component* seemed more mechanical, and the change was made throughout the draft standard. For consistency with other ISPMs, *relative phytosanitary risk* was changed throughout the draft standard to *relative pest risk*.
- [15] Throughout the draft standard, the word *contaminant* was replaced with *growing media contaminating a commodity*.
- [16] The concept of *regulated non-quarantine pests* was discussed and the text was reworded to include this concept.

Requirements

- [17] With respect to the factors that affect the pest risk of growing media associated with plants for planting, the SC-7 clarified the text, in particular in relation to the consideration of the status of the regulated pests in the importing and exporting countries and the degree of similarity between those countries.
- [18] The SC-7 agreed to add a section on prevention of infestation under the subsection on *Pest risk management options*, because it was felt it was useful information for NPPOs. The wording was developed based on some text that was initially included in one of the annexes of this draft standard that went for member consultation and that has been deleted.
- [19] With regards to the subsection on *Prohibition*, the SC-7 made some adjustments to the text. The inclusion of some wording to introduce the concept of non-compliance was discussed, but this was not retained.

Annexes and appendixes

- [20] With respect to the two annexes, it was noted that some countries felt that they should rather be appendixes because these are non-prescriptive parts of a standard. It was noted that some countries questioned the value of the two annexes because they were not inclusive and no additional information was provided on how to assess the information contained in the tables. Thus, they should not be a prescriptive part of the standard. The SC-7 thoroughly considered these concerns, but felt that the information contained in these sections would be useful for NPPOs when conducting a pest risk analysis (PRA) and, therefore, the SC-7 decided these parts should remain as annexes. Annexes are official parts of a standard that support the core text by providing additional technical information, while appendixes provide supplemental information and are not official parts of a standard.
- [21] Regarding the annex on the relative pest risk ranking of various constituents of growing media, the SC-7 agreed that the intent is to globally harmonize a broad ranking of relative risks for growing media constituents. The SC-7 decided to modify the table to present the relative risk ranking rather than risk categorization (low, medium, high), which can vary among countries. While recognizing it is a considerable change, the SC-7 felt this change would address the country comments and that having access to a globally harmonized relative risk ranking would be a useful support for NPPOs when conducting PRAs. This decision also reinforced the maintenance of text as an annex to this draft standard.
- [22] The SC-7 only made minor non-technical changes to the content of the tables in the Annex 1, Annex 2 and Appendix 1 (e.g. replacing ‘*sphagnum moss*’ by ‘*non-viable moss (sphagnum)*’ in Annex 1) and the SC-7 considered appropriate to rely on the expertise of the EWG and the steward for the technical content.
- [23] The SC-7 agreed with the deletion of appendix 2 on *Indicative list of pests that may be of concern with respect to the movement of growing media accompanying plants for planting*, as proposed by several countries.
- [24] The SC-7 thanked the steward for all her work on the draft standard. The SC-7 also expressed thanks to the former steward.
- [25] The SC-7 recommended the draft to the Standards Committee.
- [26] The SC is invited to:
- (1) *consider recommending the draft ISPM International movement of growing media in association with plants for planting (2005-004) to the CPM for adoption.*

4.2 Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood (2006-029), priority 1

- [27] The Steward presented the draft. The SC-7 reviewed the member comments, steward’s responses to comments and the revised draft ISPM, including TPG comments. The major discussions by the SC-7 are provided below.
- [28] The steward mentioned there were 1518 comments submitted, of which 446 were editorial and 101 relating to translation issues. For the technical (979) or substantive (292) types of comments, the steward addressed them in consultation with the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ). Some countries commented there was a need for specific guidance on treatments for wood (similar to ISPM 15:2009 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*)). On this, the steward indicated there are currently no internationally approved treatments for wood so this comment was not retained.
- [29] The SC-7 agreed to change the title of the draft standard to *International movement of wood* for consistency and because the draft standard defines both the pest risks and phytosanitary measures. It

was noted that the scope of this draft standard is broader than the management component of pest risk analysis, as the previous title pointed out.

- [30] One country wished that the draft standard should emphasize concerns related to wood as a pathway, in addition to trees being a pathway for pests. It was perceived by the SC-7 that this draft standard addresses wood as a pathway, but that there are also some concerns with wood being moved as a commodity, and there may be confusion in the use of wording. The SC-7 discussed thoroughly this issue and decided to include information in the background section about the risks of wood being moved as a commodity.
- [31] One country proposed deletion of processed wood material from the draft standard, given that the pest risk is low. The SC-7 discussed the issue with the steward who disagreed to remove this wood commodity from the draft standard, and the SC-7 decided to keep this concept to provide guidance for NPPOs.
- [32] With respect to the use of the term *wood as a commodity class*, the SC-7 agreed with the TPG that the term should be avoided throughout the draft standard. The wording was adjusted to reflect another TPG comment on avoiding the use of *wood commodities*, keeping in mind that in some cases it would be appropriate to use the term. The SC-7 also discussed the use of specific examples of wood commodities, agreeing that the draft standard should mention the commodities that are widely used and known, and not those that are too specific and could bring confusion, such as parallam and glulam.
- [33] In regards to common names for pest groups the TPG commented that these should be avoided because they may cause translation issues and that only Latin names should be kept. The SC-7 decided to retain common names, as they are referred to in several sections of the draft standard and, in some cases, because a pest group may include more than one family and so more than one Latin name.
- [34] The SC-7 agreed that bamboo should not be covered under the draft standard because it was not included in the scope of the specification.
- [35] With respect to the text related to impact on biodiversity and the environment, some members questioned the possibility to harmonize the wording across ISPMs to ensure consistency, but it was pointed out that it would not be possible to develop a standardized wording for this section, as it varies between topics and standards. However, the text was modified for this draft standard.
- [36] The term *weed seeds* was changed to *seeds of plants as pests* throughout the draft standard for consistency with Annex 4 of ISPM 11:2013 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*).
- [37] For consistency with other ISPMs and TPG discussions, the wording *risk of introduction* was replaced by *probability of introduction*. Also, regarding the wording that bark removal is ‘unlikely to influence the *presence* of pests’, the SC-7 decided, for accuracy, to replace it by ‘unlikely to influence the *incidence* of pests’.
- [38] The SC-7 made adjustments to the scope of the draft standard, clearly stating that contaminating pests are excluded. Therefore, the SC-7 did not retain country comments related to the inclusion of wording related to contaminating pests on the surface of wood (seeds of plants as pests and mollusks) throughout the text.

Background

- [39] The SC-7 decided to keep the detailed information on technical justification and PRA in the draft standard, pointing out that some elements listed are specific to wood, and they are useful in providing guidance to member countries.
- [40] The SC-7 decided to keep the reference to the FAO publication *Global review of forest pests and diseases (2009)* in the draft standard, as it complies with the IPPC Style Guide and it provides a complement of information.

Requirements

- [41] The SC-7 discussed country comments related to the pest groups tables, including combining them. For clarity, the SC-7 decided the tables should remain separate as recommended by the TPFQ. It was also decided that a general table should be inserted at the beginning of the section. The SC-7 did only minor adjustments to the tables, because the TPFQ had provided a review of those comments. One country suggested adding a distinction between *green wood pests* and *secondary pests*, similarly to ISPM 15:2009. It was pointed out by the steward, who consulted the TPFQ, that this would be too specific, and the SC-7 decided not to retain this comment.
- [42] The section on *mechanically processed wood (excluding sawn wood)* was adjusted to address some country comments and to provide greater clarity, and to emphasize the mechanical processing of the wood that is done by reducing the size of wood pieces. Consequently, the SC-7 decided to exclude glue and heat from the text.
- [43] The text on wood chips was revised by the SC-7 according to some country comments, including the addition of wording related to strict quality standards to which the wood chips may be subjected. With respect to wood beetles being attracted to the wood and being moved with this commodity, the SC-7 questioned the intent of this text and why it does not appear for the other wood commodities. The SC-7 concluded that chipping of wood reduces the pest risk, but as wood beetles are attracted by the smell of wood chips, it may have an attractive effect on these beetles. The text was adjusted to improve clarity.
- [44] As regards to spore transmission to plants (initially spore dispersal), one country commented that the risk is dependent on the end use and this information should be in the draft. The SC-7 agreed with this comment, but indicated that the concept of intended use is covered in another section of the draft standard and therefore there was no need to add wording specific to spore transmission.
- [45] Regarding the table related to pest groups likely to be associated with wood chips and wood residue, one country pointed out an inconsistency between the pest groups less likely to be associated, and a footnote indicating that moths, aphids, adelgids and scale insects were unlikely to be found on wood chips less than 3 cm in two dimensions. The SC-7 agreed with this comment, recognizing the inconsistency. The SC-7 revised the table accordingly by removing these pest groups from the relevant cells and consequently deleting the footnote.
- [46] With respect to the country comment suggesting the addition of wording related to infestation by *secondary pests*, the SC-7 concluded this concept may differ among countries and therefore did not retain the suggestion. Some adjustments were made to the text to reflect the fact that wood products may be infested by pests that are not considered forest pests (e.g. termites, carpenter ants and powder post beetles), but that may pose a pest risk to processed wood products.

Phytosanitary measures

- [47] The SC-7 discussed the relevance in this draft standard of the text related to NPPOs monitoring and supervising the application of phytosanitary measures to verify compliance with phytosanitary import requirements. The SC-7 agreed that this is well covered in other ISPMs and therefore this text was deleted from the draft standard.
- [48] Some countries commented that the procedures to be carried out by the NPPO of the importing country should not be harmonized in an international standard. The SC-7 considered this comment, but some members felt it would be valuable to harmonize the idea that importing countries should provide options to be as little trade restrictive as possible. The SC-7 decided to retain the concept and made some adjustments to the text.
- [49] The SC-7 agreed with some countries that suggested re-organizing the text related to specific requirements for the verification of phytosanitary measures, bark removal and other treatment application, in order to relocate these elements under the relevant sections of the standard.

- [50] The SC-7 revised the text related to verification of treatments, in particular with respect to indications of treatment failures and how these should be addressed. The issue with the detection of live pests is not solely related to quarantine pests but also to suitable indicator pests, which may not always be of quarantine significance. The SC-7 adjusted the text to reflect that suitable indicator organisms found in the wood indicating a treatment failure may also be deemed non-compliance. To avoid repetition of this concept, the SC-7 agreed to remove it from the section on non-compliance and move it to the section on treatments.
- [51] One country requested additional data to support the text related to modified atmosphere treatments which can be applied to round wood, sawn wood, wood chips and bark. The steward indicated that there is currently no internationally approved treatment for wood, and pointed out that once data will be provided and assessed by the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT), the treatment(s) could be submitted for consultation and adoption. This will then be further considered by the SC.
- [52] The SC-7 re-arranged the text related to inspection and testing for clarity. The SC-7 agreed on some text providing a clearer distinction between the detection of any signs or symptoms of quarantine pests and the detection of suitable organisms, which may indicate treatment failure.
- [53] The SC-7 recommended the draft to the Standards Committee.
- [54] The SC is invited to:
- (2) *consider recommending the draft ISPM International movement of wood (2006-029) to the CPM for adoption.*

4.3 Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management (2005-010), priority 2

- [55] The Steward presented the draft. The SC-7 reviewed the member comments, steward's responses to comments and the revised draft, including TPG comments. The major discussions by the SC-7 are provided below.
- [56] Some IPPC members commented that the text should be presented as an appendix, rather than an annex, because they felt it was too detailed and more similar to a manual or appendix. It was recalled that the SC has reworded the draft several times to state requirements rather than only provide descriptions. The SC-7 decided to keep the text as an annex to be included into ISPM 26:2006 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*).
- [57] With respect to the country comments to use *phytosanitary measures* instead of *phytosanitary procedures*, the SC-7 did not retain this comment based on the TPG recommendation that the draft standard deals with implementation of measures and therefore with procedures. The SC-7 decided to keep *phytosanitary procedures*.
- [58] One country commented that the annex covers information relevant to ISPMs 26:2006, 30:2008 (*Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) and 35:2012 (*Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) and that neither suppression nor containment meet the criteria for a pest free area (PFA), but because it includes information relevant to fruit fly-PFA (FFPFA) and fruit fly-areas of low pest prevalence (FFALPP), a caveat should be added in the appropriate sections (i.e. suppression and containment) to state that the content does not pertain to PFA or area of low pest prevalence (ALPP). The steward considered the comment but indicated that these sections already contained an explanation on when these actions could be relevant. The SC-7 agreed with the steward's response and decided not to retain the comment. It was also noted that the Technical Panel on Fruit Flies (TPFF) will review all standards related to fruit flies, including a re-organization of them.
- [59] The SC-7 discussed the use of the words *program* or *strategy* when talking about fruit fly management. As indicated by the steward, the decision actions are different for management strategies

and management programs. It was explained that programs can include education programs, survey programs, trapping programs, but there are only four strategies for managing fruit flies: suppression, containment, eradication and exclusion. The SC-7 agreed with this explanation and decided to keep the word *strategy*, which is consistent with ISPM 26:2006.

[60] The SC-7 discussed the addition of a section pertaining to area delimitation, and agreed to include it in the section on *requirements for the application of phytosanitary procedures*.

[61] Throughout the draft standard, the wording was revised to avoid the use of *orchard* as the draft standard applies to fruit in the botanical sense, and it is preferable to use *field* or *production site*.

Phytosanitary procedures used in fruit fly management strategies

[62] Regarding the use of *primary host*, some countries expressed concerns that this was not a harmonized term and may cause confusion. The TPG supported this comment, suggesting the use of another term. One SC-7 member pointed out that there is a standard in development on *Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)* (2006-031), but the wording to be used has not yet been agreed upon. The SC-7 discussed alternative terms, including *preferred host* and *main host*. One SC-7 member commented that the chosen term should not imply that it relates to only one host. The SC-7 decided to use *preferred host*.

[63] Regarding the text on ground and aerial application of insecticide bait, the SC-7 revised the text because it was felt the initial text was too specific and not useful in a standard.

[64] The text on *bait stations* was streamlined for more clarity of the information to provide a better guidance for NPPOs.

[65] The text included in the subsections on *ground sterile fly release* and *aerial fly release* was simplified because the SC-7 considered that the level of detail included in the initial text was not required in this annex, and NPPOs could consult the reference provided for more information and guidance. In addition, both sections were merged and the resulting text was included in the section on *sterile fly release*.

[66] The SC-7 decided to merge the sections on *Verification of strategies and phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly management* and *Documentation and record-keeping* into one section on *Verification and documentation*, as it was felt more logical to have the information included under one heading. The SC-7 also added some wording related to the responsibilities of NPPOs.

[67] The SC-7 thanked the steward for his great work. Members pointed out that a manual on fruit flies would be very useful.

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

[69] The SC is invited to:

- (3) *consider recommending the draft ISPM Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management* (2005-010) to the CPM for adoption.

4.4 Draft amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms (1994-001)

[70] The Steward presented the draft. The SC-7 reviewed the member comments and the revised draft ISPM. The major discussions by the SC-7 are provided below.

[71] **Exclusion, suppression, eradication, containment and control:** According to the discussion that took place during the SC May 2014, the proposed revision to these terms was withdrawn from the *Amendments to the Glossary* (2013) until the SC has discussed and clarified the understanding of *phytosanitary measure*.

[72] Regarding the understanding of the term *phytosanitary measure* in the IPPC context, the TPG had asked that the SC to discuss it because IPPC members have different understandings of this term. The

TPG Steward explained the two understandings that the TPG had outlined: a ‘narrow understanding’ which would include only measures established by the importing country (‘official measure’ would be used in the exporting country), and a ‘broad understanding’, which would include measures established by either the importing or the exporting country. In any case, it was highlighted that *phytosanitary measures* should be used in relation to regulated pests only.

- [73] **Production site:** the steward pointed out some editorial changes proposed by member comments and incorporated by the TPG to clarify the definition. The SC-7 agreed to the term and definition as proposed by the TPG.
- [74] **Point of entry:** the steward pointed out that the definition was revised according to member comments, in particular regarding the usefulness of including examples. Some IPPC members commented that the point of entry should be the first point of arrival in the country of destination. However, the TPG felt that this should not be included in the Glossary. The core understanding of the term is that it is the importing country that declares where it will accept imports. Some members found the term *passenger* was too restrictive and the TPG had replaced it with *persons*. The SC-7 agreed to the definition as now proposed by the TPG.
- [75] **Systems approach:** the definition was revised to provide more clarity and precision, in particular to explain that individual measures (whether official or not) when combined, form a pest risk management option. Regarding the exclusion of *appropriate level of protection*, the TPG explained that it would be inappropriate to prejudge the successful outcome of the systems approach. The SC-7 agreed to the definition as now proposed by the TPG.
- [76] **Place of production and pest free production site:** these two terms were revised as purely consequential changes to defining *production site* as a new Glossary term. The steward explained that no change was made to the proposed revised definitions as a result of member consultation, but TPG had suggested *specified* instead of *specific* in the definition of *pest free production site* for enhanced precision. With respect to adding *collection of premises* to the *place of production* term, the TPG felt it was unnecessary. The SC-7 decided to retain the initial intention, and only make consequential changes (hence, retaining *specific*), and the definition was adjusted accordingly.
- [77] Regarding the proposed deletions (**controlled area, naturally occurring, occurrence, protected area, organism, restriction**), the steward pointed out that these terms are very seldom used in ISPMs or used in different ways, often conflicting with their definitions. He also noted that their meaning is still understandable in the context of the ISPMs in which they are used. They have no particular IPPC meaning. The SC-7 agreed to their deletion.
- [78] Regarding the proposed deletion of the term **contaminating pest** the steward summarized the discussion from the SC May 2014, which agreed on withdrawing the proposed deletion of *contaminating pest* from the *Amendments to the Glossary* (2013), and the addition of *contamination* to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (under the same topic number as *contaminating pest*). The TPG will further discuss these terms at its next meeting and make a proposal to the SC May 2015.
- [79] **Section 4, understanding of plants:** One country had commented that it is important to keep in mind the potential repercussions on trade, legislative aspects and the feasibility of regulating terrestrial versus aquatic plants. Another country asked that the rationale why algae and fungi need to be protected should be clarified. The SC-7 acknowledged those comments and suggested that the proposed confirmation of the original scope of the taxa *plant* is in line with the CPM Recommendation CPM-9/2014/01 *IPPC coverage of aquatic plants*. When the IPPC was created in 1953, *plants* were understood to cover algae and fungi. To clarify that the IPPC simply maintains this original coverage and is not now expanding its coverage, the TPG amended the text to read that the IPPC *continues to include algae and fungi*. Furthermore, the steward explained that regarding bacteria and archaea, there is a lack of experience and no immediate prospect of protecting those taxa or how to protect them, hence they were kept out of the proposal. The SC-7 agreed to the text in the scope of ISPM 5 as now proposed by the TPG.

[80] The definitions of **commodity, pest list, habitat, pest free area, surveillance** and **survey** had not received comments during member consultation and will therefore not be open for comments during the substantial concerns commenting period (SCCP).

[81] The SC-7 thanked the steward for his great work.

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

[83] The SC is invited to:

- (4) *consider* recommending the draft Amendments to ISPM 5 *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* (1994-001) to the CPM for adoption.

5. Other business

[84] There was no other business.

6. Close of the meeting

[85] The SC-7 thanked the IPPC members for providing comments during the 2013 member consultation.

[86] The SC-7 also thanked the stewards for attending parts of the meeting and providing useful explanations during the discussion related to the standard they are in charge of. SC-7 members echoed this highlighting that with the high number of comments received during member consultation, the steward's support at the SC-7 meeting is imperative and helps SC-7 members gain a better understanding of the nature of the comments and the main issues.

[87] The Chairperson thanked the Rapporteur for his work and the Secretariat for their support during the meeting. Sincere thanks were expressed to Mr Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark), who is completing his term as an SC-7 member, for his excellent work over the years.

[88] The Chairperson thanked the participants for a productive meeting and closed the meeting.

Appendix 1 - Agenda

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	-	LARSON
1.2 Election of the Chairperson	-	LARSON
1.3 Election of the Rapporteur	-	CHAIRPERSON
1.4 Adoption of the Agenda	01_SC7_2014_May	MOREIRA
2. Administrative Matters		
2.1 Documents List	02_SC7_2014_May	MOREIRA
2.2 Participants List	03_SC7_2014_May	MOREIRA
2.3 Local Information (refer to the 2014 May SC Local Information document)	IPP link to local information	MOREIRA
3. Updates from the Standards Committee Meeting	-	CHAIRPERSON
4. Review of Draft ISPMs		
4.1 Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004), Priority 1	2005-004	PAULSEN
- Steward: Hilde PAULSEN		
• Steward's Response to Comments from 2013 Member Consultation	04_SC7_2013_May	PAULSEN
• Steward's additional notes	10_SC7_2013_May	PAULSEN
• TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency with steward's responses	07_SC7_2013_May	PAULSEN
4.2 Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood (2006-029), Priority 1	2006-029	FOREST
- Steward: Marie-Claude FOREST		
• Steward's Response to Comments from 2013 Member Consultation	05_SC7_2013_May	FOREST
• Steward's additional notes	08_SC7_2013_May	FOREST
• TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency with steward's responses	09_SC7_2013_May	FOREST
4.3 Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management (2005-010), Priority 2	2005-010	OPATOWSKI
- Steward: David OPATOWSKI		
• Steward's Response to Comments from 2013 Member Consultation	06_SC7_2013_May	OPATOWSKI
• Steward's additional notes	11_SC7_2013_May	OPATOWSKI
• TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency with steward's responses	12_SC7_2013_May	OPATOWSKI
• Steward's response to TPG comments	14_SC7_2014_May	OPATOWSKI

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
4.4 Draft amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001)		
- Steward: John HEDLEY	1994-001	HEDLEY
• TPG Response to Comments from 2013 Member Consultation	13_SC7_2013_May	HEDLEY
• Steward's additional notes	-	HEDLEY
5. Other business		CHAIRPERSON
6. Close of the meeting		LARSON/ CHAIRPERSON

Appendix 2 – Documents List

DOCUMENT NUMBER	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE
01_SC7_2014_May	1.4	Agenda
02_SC7_2014_May	2.1	Documents List
03_SC7_2014_May	2.2	Participants List
2005-004 Rev.01	4.1	Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004), Priority 1
04_SC7_2014_May	4.1	2005-004: Steward's Response to Comments from 2013 Member Consultation
10_SC7_2014_May	4.1	2005-004: Steward's additional notes
07_SC7_2014_May	4.1	2005-004: TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency with steward's responses
2006-029 Rev.01	4.2	Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood (2006-029), Priority 1
05_SC7_2014_May	4.2	2006-029: Steward's Response to Comments from 2013 Member Consultation
08_SC7_2014_May	4.2	2006-029: Steward's additional notes
09_SC7_2014_May	4.2	2006-029: TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency with steward's responses
2005-010 Rev.01	4.3	Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management (2005-010), Priority 2
06_SC7_2014_May	4.3	2005-010: Steward's Response to Comments from 2013 Member Consultation
11_SC7_2014_May	4.3	2005-010: Steward's additional notes
12_SC7_2014_May	4.3	2005-010: TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency with steward's responses
14_SC7_2014_May	4.3	2005-010: Steward's response to TPG comments
1994-001	4.4	Draft amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001)
13_SC7_2014_May	4.4	1994-001: TPG Response to Comments from 2013 Member Consultation

Appendix 3 – Participants list**MEETING OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE****WORKING GROUP (SC-7)***12-16 May 2014**Rome, Italy*

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Africa Member SC-7	Ms Ruth WOODE Deputy Director of Agriculture Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate Ministry of Food and Agriculture P.O.Box M37 Accra GHANA Tel: (+233) 244507687	wooderuth@yahoo.com	CPM-8 (2013) 1 st term / 3 years	2016
Asia Member SC-7	Mr Motoi SAKAMURA Administrator -Operation, Kobe Plant Protection Station, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 1-1,Hatobacho, Chuouku Kobe 6500042 JAPAN Tel: (+81) 78 331 0969 Fax: (+81) 78 332 2796	sakamuram@pps.maff.go.jp	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) CPM-7 (2012) 3 rd term / 3 years	2015
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@naturehverv.dk	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) 2 nd term / 3 years	2014
Latin America & Caribbean Member SC-7	Mr Alexandre MOREIRA PALMA Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supply – Plant Health Department Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D Anexo B, Sala 310 Brasilia DF 70043900 BRAZIL Tel: (+55) 61 3218 28 50 Fax: (+55) 61 3224 3874	alexandre.palma@agricultura.gov.br	CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2015

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Near East Member SC-7	Mr Gamil Anwar Mohammed RAMADHAN Head of Plant Quarantine Department (Director) General Department of Plant Protection Department Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation REPUBLIC OF YEMEN Tel: 0096701563328 (Office) 00967733802618 (Mobile) 00967770712209 (Mobile)	dr.gamel_ramadan@yahoo.com ; Anvar.gamel@mail.ru ;	CPM-8(2013) 1st term / 3 years (2)	2016
North America Member SC7	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) 2 nd term / 3 years	2014
Pacific Member SC7	Mr Jan Bart ROSSEL Director International Plant Health Program Office of the Chief Plant Protection Officer Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry AUSTRALIA Tel: (+61) 2 6272 5056 / 0408625413 Fax: (+61) 2 6272 5835	bart.rossel@daff.gov.au	CPM-6 (2011) 1 st term / 3 years	2014

IPPC Secretariat

Mr Brent LARSON , Standards Officer	Brent.Larson@fao.org	N/A	N/A
Ms Adriana MOREIRA , Support	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org	N/A	N/A
Ms Marie-Pierre MIGNAULT , Support	MariePierre.Mignault@fao.org	N/A	N/A