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1. Items arising from CPM-10 (March 2015)
2. A formal objection received 14 days prior to the CPM-10 (2015) session noted that the content of the draft ISPM on *International movement of wood* (2006-029) was not consistent with current standards, which brought up the issue in general of the content of a commodity standard. It was suggested that the SC examine this issue and develop criteria for the content of commodity standard and their mode of development.
3. One CP underlined the importance of commodity standards such as ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*). They hoped that issues related to commodity standards be addressed as soon as possible, specifically those concerns related to the draft ISPMs on the *International movement of wood* (2006-029) that had received a formal objection prior to this CPM. As this CP was concerned that the SC would not have time fully to consider and discuss this issue, they suggested the CPM authorize the creation of a working group to consider the issue in order to enable the continued development of commodity standards.
4. The CPM agreed that the concept of a commodity standard should be determined and a small group was convened in the margins of the CPM with Argentina, Australia, Canada, EU, Japan, New Zealand, Sudan and United States.
5. The group reported back to the CPM with terms of reference[[1]](#footnote-1) for the working group to discuss the concept of a commodity standard. It was noted that discussion papers would be welcomed for the working group to consider.
6. ***Status of ISPM 15 Symbol Registration***
7. The FAO Legal Officer updated the CPM on the Secretariat’s efforts to facilitate the ISPM 15 symbol registration process[[2]](#footnote-2). In 2014, the IPPC Secretariat initiated new registrations for 17 countries which were identified as the first group based on the prioritization criteria. In addition, in order to raise awareness about the importance of protecting the symbol and assist NPPOs in their interaction with their respective government, a letter was sent to the responsible Minister in each country explaining the purpose of registration and highlighting the need for political and financial support in registering or renewing the registration. Another letter was also sent to NPPOs providing information on the reimbursement procedures for compensating the costs of registration renewals done in 2013. In addition, the Secretariat informed the CPM of the work plan for 2015.
8. The CPM:
9. *noted* the progress made in 2014 and the work plan for 2015 with regard to registration of the ISPM 15 symbol.
10. *encouraged* contracting parties to continuously support the process of registration of the ISPM 15 symbol, including renewals of registrations that are due to expire.
11. *encouraged* contracting parties to reimburse the IPPC Secretariat for registration and registration renewal costs as soon as practically possible.

Implementation of the ISPM 15

1. Canada and NAPPO presented the paper[[3]](#footnote-3) and spoke of the benefits of ISPM 15. They stated that due to the large volumes of wood packaging moving in international trade, the level of non-compliance continued to present a significant pest risk to forests.
2. Canada proposed that the IPPC Secretariat, NAPPO and other interested RPPOs work to organize an international workshop to discuss the challenges of implementation; recommendations to improve ISPM 15and to explore opportunities for cooperative approaches for enforcement. Some CPs and RPPOs supported this proposal.
3. CPs shared the concern regarding non-compliance and supported continued collaboration on the implementation of ISPM 15.
4. Items arising from May 2015 meeting of the SC
5. 2008-008 *International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood.* Ms Alice NDIKONTAR (Cameroon) was assigned steward and Mr Lifeng WU (China) was assigned assistant-steward. This decision was taken because the previous steward, Mr DDK SHARMA (India), had not attended this SC meeting’s discussions on the draft.
6. 2006-010A *Inclusion of the PT Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material in annexes 1 and 2 of ISPM 15*. Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK (Poland) was assigned steward and Ms Marie-Claude FOREST (Canada) was assigned assistant-steward.
7. 2006-010B *Revision of dielectric heating section in Annex 1 of ISPM 15*. Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK (Poland) was assigned steward and Ms Marie-Claude FOREST (Canada) was assigned assistant-steward.

International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood (2008-008), Priority 2

1. The SC discussed the following general issues:
2. The need for the standard to describe the practical aspects related to the production of wood products and handicrafts made from wood that may affect pest risk (task 4 of the specification). Some members felt that this aspect had not been elaborated sufficiently in order to identify all products that fall under the scope and group them into categories, nor were the processes that would affect pest risk clearly identified and explained, and lastly it was not clear which phytosanitary measures could be applied.
3. *[*Scope. The SC agreed with the small SC group’s proposal to narrow the scope to handicrafts instead of the EWG proposal to cover manufactured or crafted products. The Assistant-steward noted that the draft should continue to include bamboo products because the pest risks are similar to wood, although this should be reviewed by the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ) and there were several issues to be considered further such as the range of species covered by the term “bamboo”, for example, other cane material and associated risks, and what is intended to be covered by “handicrafts”.
4. ISPM 15 wood treatments as the basis for treatments. Some members stressed that ISPM 15 treatments are only approved for wood packaging material and hence the standard should not refer to these treatments. The SC agreed that reference to ISPM 15 treatments be left out of the draft and other risk management options be considered.
5. Customs harmonized codes. Also, customs harmonized codes were not considered appropriate for use in the draft as it would be hard to maintain them and keep them up-to-date.
6. Need for a list of products and major pest groups. Several members noted that this would be helpful to include in the draft as an appendix.
7. Official mark or symbol / certificate of compliance. It was pointed out that it was difficult to envisage the application of an official mark or symbol and it was not clear if this was a nationally authorized mark or symbol or an IPPC mark or symbol. The Secretariat warned of the resource implications of the latter. It was also not clear how the certificates of compliance would operate or whether they would replace phytosanitary certificates. This should be clarified or consider removal from the draft.
8. Commercial vs personal import. One member found that the import of wood products and handicrafts of a personal nature was not properly addressed and that some countries require declarations for “personal import” of such items, while others do not. It was not clear how this issue could be handled, but it was suggested that perhaps a label attesting the phytosanitary compliance could be used, as seen in The Netherlands for bulbs for personal use that are sold for export to USA and Canada.
9. PRA and justification to develop this standard. Several members felt the standard was providing conflicting views: on one hand it was too difficult to do a PRA as there were so many different types of products from so many different areas. On the other hand, the EWG concluded there was sufficient pest risk to warrant the development of mandatory requirements in this standard. Some SC members considered the draft standard needed more work on this because, as currently worded, it could mean that any kind of phytosanitary measure was technically justified. They felt pest risk still needed to be identified, considering the categories of wood and bamboo handicrafts.
10. It was suggested that Table 2 could be used to identify the pest risks and the level of processing that affect the pest risk, and based on this information, countries could evaluate if there was justification for applying phytosanitary measures. Nevertheless, the processing methods listed in Table 2 should be further developed. Several members stressed that it would be challenging to carry out PRA on handicrafts which are often made from different types of wood or bamboo derived from different origins and having been subjected to different levels of processing. They felt there may be an opportunity to take an “ISPM 15” type approach where phytosanitary measures could be agreed globally for certain categories of products.
11. The SC felt that the draft standard needed additional work by experts and agreed that the Assistant-steward (lead because Steward was absent at the SC May 2015) and Steward should revise the draft based on SC member comments and forward the revised draft to the TPFQ for their review.
12. The SC discussed the EWG recommendations.
13. Regarding the EWG’s proposal for liaison with the World Customs Organization, several members felt it was important to include this organization as much as possible in the development of the draft, while others felt that it may be better to wait until the draft is ready for member consultation. This also applied to notification of industry stakeholders and other international organizations, recognizing that many NPPOs do this as a normal practice at member consultation.
14. Regarding setting up a system on the IPP to display examples of certificates of compliance, the SC felt this issue needed to be discussed after the final content of the draft was decided.
15. The SC:
16. (3) *invited* SC members to forward comments on the draft ISPM on *International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood* (2008-008) to Steward Alice NDIKONTAR (copy to the Secretariat) by 15 June 2015.
17. (4) *requested* the Steward to work with the TPFQ to revise the draft ISPM on the *International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood* (2008-008), taking into account SC May 2015 comments for improvement, and submit the revised draft to the next SC meeting.
18. (5) *noted* that the EWG had included, in the scope of the ISPM, products made from the hardened stems and culms of monocotyledonous plants otherwise known as bamboo (e.g. mainly but not exclusively species in the genera *Phyllostachys* and *Bambusa*) but requested this be further investigated.
19. (6) regarding the EWG invitation to consider establishing a centralized system on the IPP for posting NPPO samples of certificates of compliance, *deferred* this discussion to after a final draft ISPM was agreed to.
20. (7) *noted* the need for additional phytosanitary treatments for wood and bamboo products to be developed.
21. (8) regarding the EWG invitation to consider establishing a centralized system on the IPP for recording and responding to non-compliances raised by contacting parties, *noted* that this issue had been raised by other groups but that it was not a priority for the SC to facilitate the development of a system for bilateral purposes, and *asked* the Secretariat to discuss the issue within the Secretariat.
22. (9) regarding the EWG recommendations on encouraging comments from industry stakeholders and international organizations, *deferred* decision on these points until the draft ISPM has been developed.
23. (10) *noted* the EWG recommendation on considering notifying the World Customs Organization of the development of this standard but *deferred* decision on this until the draft ISPM has been developed.
24. (11) *noted* that there may be operational challenges to implementing the certification system described in the current draft ISPM.

Inclusion of the phytosanitary treatment Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material (2006-010A) in Annexes 1 and 2 of ISPM 15, Priority 2

1. The SC *approved* the draft amendments to Annex 1 and Annex 2 of ISPM 15 for inclusion of the phytosanitary treatment *Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material* (2006-010A) for member consultation.

Revision of dielectric heating section in Annex 1 (Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material) to ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade), (2006-010B), Priority 2

1. The SC:
2. (13) *approved* the revision of Annex 1 to ISPM 15 in regards the section on dielectric heating for member consultation (2006-010B) (Appendix 6).
3. (14) *agreed* that the revisions to Annex 1 and 2 of ISPM 15 for inclusion of the phytosanitary treatment *Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material* (2006-010A) and the revision of the dielectric heating section in Annex 1 of ISPM 15 (2006-010B) would be presented together for member consultation.
4. ***Draft ISPM on International movement of wood (2006-029), Priority 1***
5. The SC Chairperson noted that, as a result of the formal objection, the CPM had discussed the issue of the concept of a commodity standard, and had decided that a working group meeting be held on this on 20-24 July 2015 to discuss this issue
6. The SC discussed that a way forward for the draft standard would be for the Steward to work with the TPFQ to try adding additional requirements. Some members felt it was important to take into consideration the outcomes from the working group to discuss the concept of the commodity standard, while others pointed out that the outcomes of this meeting, after discussions by the SPG, the SC and CPM, may change significantly. The SC, acknowledging that the final outcomes may change, agreed that the Steward and the TPFQ should still consider the outcomes when revising the draft standard.
7. The SC:
8. (95) *agreed* that the Steward in collaboration with the TPFQ would revise the draft ISPM on the *International movement of wood* (2006-029), taking into consideration the outcomes from the working group discussing the concept of a commodity standard, and present the revised draft to the SC November 2015 (to be received by the Secretariat before 2 October 2015).

Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ)

1. The Secretariat noted that the TPFQ will continue to meet virtually in 2015 to progress their work programme, specifically in regards:
2. - Revision of ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade): *Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade* (2006-010).
3. - Drafting the forest seed annex to the draft ISPM for the *International movement of seed* (2009-003). The SC felt it would be useful to consult the draft annex when reviewing the draft ISPM for the *International movement of seed* (2009-003) after SCCP.
4. – Assisting the Steward in responding to the formal objection on the draft ISPM on the *International movement of wood* (2006-029) and improving the draft.
5. - Responding to member comments; the TPFQ may be asked to assist the Steward on the revision of dielectric heating section (Annex 1 (*Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material*) to ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) (2006-010AB).
6. - Help review the draft ISPM on the *International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood* (2008-008).
7. The SC:
8. (85) *noted* the following TPFQ meeting reports: July 2014, October 2014, and December 2014 virtual meeting reports.
9. (86) *noted* the work carried out by the TPFQ since May
10. (86) *noted* the work carried out by the TPFQ since May 2015.
11. (87) *noted* the tentative TPFQ work plan for the period May 2015-April 2016.
12. (88) *requested* the TPFQ to set as a high priority the development of the draft annex on forest seeds (2009-003) in order to submit it to the SC November 2015 meeting.
13. **Initial proposals for topics for CPM-11 (2016) discussions on concepts and implementation issues related to draft or adopted standards**
14. Possible side-sessions for CPM-11:
15. ISPM 15:
16. 1. Outcomes from the 2015 Regional plant protection workshops
17. 2. Discuss the new treatments under MC 2015
18. 3. Possible results from IRSS survey on ISPM 15
19. Wood handicrafts:
20. 1. Large number of handcrafts with different risks (discussion on the understanding of “handicrafts”)
21. 2. Proposal to have an ISPM 15-type approach for certain high risk handicrafts
22. 3. Possible proposal to introduce the concept of a “certificate of compliance” or mark / symbol for handicrafts
23. 4. Lack of available treatments
24. 5. Issues associated with commercial vs. personal import
25. 6. Possible implementation issues (e.g. small producers / determining compliance)
1. CPM 2015/CRP/08 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. CPM 2015/12 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. CPM 2015/INF/10 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)