



REPORT

**Auckland, New Zealand
28 September – 02
October 2015**

Expert Working Group Meeting on the Revision of ISPM 6 September 2015



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

CONTENTS

- 1. Opening of the meeting3
- 2. Administrative Matters3
- 3. Review of specification4
- 4. Development of draft ISPM.....4
 - 4.1 Background papers4
 - 4.2 Discussion papers6
 - 4.3 Development of text for draft.....6
- 5. Next Steps.....12
- 6. Other business.....12
- 7. Close of the meeting12

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1 – Agenda.....13
- Appendix 2 – Documents List.....15
- Appendix 3 – Participants List17

Expert Working Group Meeting on the Revision of ISPM 6 (GUIDELINES FOR SURVEILLANCE) (2009-004)

28 September – 02 October 2015, Auckland, New Zealand

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The meeting was opened in the Maori fashion with a song of welcome followed by each guest being welcomed with the traditional Maori greeting, the hongi. Mr Raniera Bassett and Ms Tania Gordon performed this ceremony and they wished all the participants a pleasant stay and productive meeting.
- [2] The representative of the host organization, Mr John HEDLEY, welcomed the participants and pointed out how important the International Standard on Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) 6 (*Guidelines for surveillance*) is, being surveillance a fundamental for most of the work in plant health.
- [3] The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat (hereafter “Secretariat”) thanked the host and organizer for the meeting arrangements and also welcomed the participants. It was noted that one Expert Working Group (EWG) member, Mr Brian KOPPER (United States of America) was unable to attend the meeting as he had to cancel his travel plans just prior to the meeting.
- [4] The meeting participants introduced themselves and gave some background on the expertise they brought to the group.

Presentation on the standard setting process

- [5] The IPPC Standards Officer gave a presentation on the IPPC and described the IPPC Standard Setting Procedure¹ noting that the draft ISPM developed at this meeting would be presented to the Standards Committee (SC) soonest, as this topic is a high priority (priority 1).

Roles of the Participants

- [6] The Secretariat made a presentation on the roles of the EWG participants, highlighting that the experts were not representing their country nor region but that they should try to focus on developing a globally acceptable standard.

Election of the Chairperson

- [7] Mr Paul STEVENS (New Zealand) was elected as Chairperson.

Election of the Rapporteur

- [8] Mr Chris DALE (Australia) was elected as Rapporteur.

Adoption of the Agenda

- [9] The agenda was adopted as presented in Appendix 1.

2. Administrative Matters

Documents List

- [10] The group reviewed the documents list as presented in Appendix 2.

Participants List

¹ IPPC Standard Setting Procedure Manual: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/ippc-standard-setting-procedure-manual/>

- [11] The participants reviewed the participants list and some of the contact details were amended as presented in Appendix 3.

Local Information

- [12] The meeting organizer, Mr Paul STEVENS, reviewed the details of the local arrangements² and provided further information regarding logistics.

3. Review of specification

- [13] The Steward introduced the specification and reviewed and explained the tasks laid out in Specification 61³. One participant reminded the EWG members that it is important to ensure there are clear requirements in the draft. It was noted that the specification tasked the EWG with identifying methodologies to be used to determine reliability of different types of surveillance. It was pointed out that the SC has had several discussion on this and he felt that the task might be better reflected to consider how to determine confidence rather than reliability.
- [14] The EWG began the discussion on whether harmonized survey protocols should be developed for specific pest groups but felt this might be too detailed for an ISPM.
- [15] It was noted that a new topic for an ISPM on “Audits” was under development. Thus, the EWG agreed that only a general introduction to audits should be provided in this draft ISPM as more details would be forthcoming.
- [16] The final two standard tasks on the affect of the protection of biodiversity and the environment and, the implementation of the standard by contracting parties identifying potential operational and technical implementation issues were reviewed. The group was informed that a statement on the effects on biodiversity and the environment should be included in the draft ISPM but the identification of operational and implementation issues should be discussed by the experts and the outcome of this discussion should be presented to the SC. The SC will then identify the information that should be passed on to those in the Secretariat who deal with implementation issues.

4. Development of draft ISPM

4.1 Background papers

Implementation pilot on surveillance (Presentation to the 2015 IPPC Regional Workshops)

- [17] The Secretariat introduced the paper⁴ pointing out that these were slides from a presentation given at the 2015 IPPC Regional Workshops. The slides outlined that there is a concept note on the “surveillance pilot” which will be used to present the concept to potential donors, as the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) agreed that a five year IPPC pilot implementation programme on surveillance will only move forward if funded by extra-budgetary sources. It was noted that the Implementation Facilitation Unit in the Secretariat was taking the lead on this project.
- [18] It was also mentioned that there are already several activities under the theme of surveillance including the development of a surveillance manual, the development of diagnostic protocols for regulated pests and the revision of ISPM 6.

IRSS Survey: Review of the Implementation of ISPM 6 - Challenges and Best Practices

- [19] The Secretariat explained that the Implementation, Review and Support System (IRSS) was created to provide feedback from contracting parties on implementation of the standards and the Convention and that information collected through this process is being used to identify needs that could be addressed.

² 04_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep_Rev1

³ Specification 61: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/2511/>

⁴ 12_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep

The Secretariat introduced the results of the IRSS survey for ISPM 6. It was pointed out that when developing the Specification for this revision, the SC had considered the results of this survey.

- [20] The EWG noted the results of the IRSS survey and agreed that some of the issues raised in the survey would better be addressed in guidance provided in a manual rather than in an ISPM. It was noted that the experts drafting the manual on Surveillance had considered several of these issues and had included relevant guidance in the draft manual (see subsection “IPPC Manual on Surveillance” below).

Report from the ISPM 6 APPPC Pest Surveillance Symposium Oct 27th- Nov 3rd 2012 - Seoul, Korea

- [21] Mr HEDLEY introduced the report from the ISPM 6 symposium held in Korea in 2012 and informed the EWG that this symposium had been established to help National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) develop national implementation manuals in order to help them implement ISPM 6. He noted that the IPPC and ISPMs do not, on their own, address surveillance but it is vital that they are implemented at the national level. During the workshop, an outline for a manual guide was developed and it is hoped that NPPOs will be able to use this guidance for building national implementation plans on surveillance.

Reports from the regional workshops on surveillance (ISPM 6)

- [22] The EWG noted the reports from the seven regional workshops on surveillance held in 2012. These workshops had identified issues related to developing the capacity of NPPOs to implement as well as suggestions for improvements to ISPM 6. A particular suggestion was noted that more information was needed on general surveillance because contracting parties felt that there could be cost savings by using general surveillance compared with specific surveillance.

IPPC Manual on Surveillance

- [23] Mr Chris DALE gave a brief overview of the contents of the draft manual on surveillance. The manual was drafted with input from experts during a meeting held in Puerto Rico in May 2015. Using information gathered during the IRSS survey and reviewing the reports from the regional workshops and the Global symposium on surveillance, the IPPC Secretariat, under the oversight of the Capacity Development Committee developed the draft surveillance manual with input from several experts including experts who are also EWG members. The manual is in line with the CPM adopted IPPC National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy. In parallel, another manual on diagnostics is being developed and it was emphasized how important it is to have good diagnostics in order to have reliable surveillance. It was mentioned that during the meeting in Puerto Rico, the experts discussed the various components of a manual on surveillance and the following five sections were identified and assigned to the various experts to complete the drafting: 1) Introduction, 2) Building blocks for a national surveillance system, 3) Planning and prioritization, 4) Operations and 5) Bibliography and additional references.
- [24] The manual encourages NPPOs to prioritize which pests and which commodities require surveillance. The manual also incorporated information that would help NPPOs address some of the issues identified in the IRSS surveys. The manual is structured in such a way as to provide information on “Planning and prioritization” and “Operations”, the latter includes information on general and specific surveillance. It also includes details on methods for sampling, trapping, inspection, sample coding, collection of samples, sample handling, packaging, and submission of samples to a diagnostic laboratory.
- [25] The EWG noted that there were several formatting and structure issues in the current draft of the manual, suggesting the manual may need further revision. The EWG members, who were also participants in the Puerto Rico meeting, felt that a revision of the manual would be needed before it is published to help ensure that terminology used in the manual and in the draft standard are used

consistently (for example the use of the term “response surveillance” as it is not commonly used in regards to surveillance).

4.2 Discussion papers

- [26] Three EWG participants prepared discussion papers addressing the issues that they thought should be considered when completing the tasks assigned in the specification. Mr Robert FAVRIN (Canada)⁵, Mr Paul STEVENS⁶ and Mr Chris DALE⁷ introduced their discussion papers highlighting specific areas of ISPM 6 that need revision or identifying where they thought additional guidance was needed.
- [27] Mr Jan SCHANS (the Netherlands) presented the reports from two studies⁸ conducted by European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and highlighted parts of the reports he thought were useful to consider when revising ISPM 6.
- [28] The Secretariat introduced a paper⁹ outlining possible errors and editorials that had been identified and recorded over the years and the EWG noted these and agreed to address them in the revision. In addition it was recommended that the document entitled ‘Guidelines for surveillance for plant pests in Asia and the Pacific’¹⁰ also be considered as a discussion paper.
- [29] Some of the general discussion points are included below.
- As surveillance is an integral component to several other standards a complete list of linked ISPMs and the activities that require good surveillance will be presented in the background section of the revision.
 - The EWG did not offer specific guidance on conducting off shore surveillance as it was agreed that the same general principles and elements for surveillance should apply.
 - It was agreed that each country should have a national surveillance system which should be comprised of the necessary support infrastructure and several surveillance programmes. Each of the programmes may contain a number of elements such as general surveillance and one or more specific surveys. The programmes should be described in surveillance protocols. Each type of survey should be described in a survey protocol.

4.3 Development of text for draft

Components of National Surveillance Systems

- [30] There were several components that were deemed necessary for developing a national surveillance system.
- [31] It was agreed that it is fundamental that National surveillance systems are supported by phytosanitary legislation and policies. It should include obligations to carry out surveillance activities and to domestically report new pest finds. It was also recognized that many NPPOs use third parties to carry out surveillance work so text was added to request NPPOs to consider this point and ensure legislation allowed this, if desired.
- [32] There was a general discussion on the considerations for setting priorities for surveillance programmes. It was agreed that a higher priority should be given, for example, to surveillance programmes if there are existing bilateral or international agreements which necessitate that a survey be delivery within the current year (or other specified timeframe), or if lack of survey data would likely impede a critical file or the biological risk of a certain organism or pathway presented a high

⁵ 07_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep

⁶ 08_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep

⁷ 05_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep

⁸ 09_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep, 10_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep and 13_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep

⁹ 11_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep

¹⁰ Guidelines for surveillance for plant pests in Asia and the Pacific: <http://aci.ar.gov.au/publication/mn119>

risk to market access and the countries reputation. Several of these elements were included in the draft ISPM.

- [33] Some participants suggested the use of national committees for developing surveillance programmes, setting priorities and planning. Other felt this could be useful but would not be a requirement.
- [34] Once priorities were established detailed plans should be developed taking into account the availability of resources.
- [35] The EWG agreed that surveillance programmes need to be adequately resourced with appropriate human, financial and physical resources and some points for consideration were added.
- [36] The EWG agreed that some procedures, such as standard operating procedures and technical instructions should be documented and reference materials should be made available to staff. The EWG agreed that clear documentation helps ensure consistency and provides a bench mark for conducting audits.
- [37] Training of staff and the evaluation and re-evaluation of staff involved in surveillance programmes and diagnostics help ensure qualified staff are selected and maintained to properly deliver a surveillance programme. It was noted that when evidence of a good training programme is presented, it helps increase the confidence of trading partners. Training and evaluation can be done by supervisor checks and verification as well as through peer to peer reviews.
- [38] Regular audits are needed to maintain high standards for any programme. It was noted that a topic for a specific standard for audits is on the List of topics for IPPC Standards so, the EWG decided not to add too many detail in this section.
- [39] Communication with internal and external stakeholders is very important to keep all stakeholders informed and engaged in surveillance activities. Text was added to the draft ISPM to provide guidance on the key stakeholders NPPOs should engage with as part of a surveillance program. It was also recognized that in order to gather better data, there was a strong need to provide timely feedback to stakeholders who helped gatherer the data to help keep them motivated and maintain interest. The term “special agencies” was used in the original ISPM 6 but it was decided that it would now be more appropriate and universal to refer to “stakeholders” instead. In many cases it is fundamental to obtain the pest data and not just a report, so efforts to communicate surveillance expectations would be needed.
- [40] Several EWG members also noted the benefits of sharing information with neighboring countries on a regional level as this would help with early detection of pests.
- [41] The EWG discussed several issues related to diagnostics. It was noted that there are many new techniques and molecular techniques (e.g. barcoding, next generation sequencing) that are used in surveillance diagnostics. How to present pest specific information and the necessity for NPPOs to ensure the maintenance and preservation of “specimen material” or “reference specimens” were also discussed. The EWG agreed that information on these issues was provided in other standards. In particular, it was noted that annexes of ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*) provided sufficient guidance on how to identify and curate specific pest groups. The EWG also discussed the possible impact of the “Nagoya Protocol” (related to the Convention on Biological Diversity) on reference collections but agree it might have some impact, however, was outside the scope of this draft ISPM.
- [42] The EWG decided not to include detailed information on diagnostics (including laboratories). The group recognized that a proper diagnosis was fundamental to good surveillance but noted it was more appropriately detailed in other standards such as ISPM 27. One participant mentioned that the recently developed IPPC manual on diagnostics provides detailed information about reference collections and the EWG agreed this was sufficient.

- [43] Based on the above discussions, the EWG agreed to ask the SC to change the title of the ISPM 6 from “Guidelines for surveillance” to “National surveillance systems”.
- [44] The EWG invited the SC to:
- (1) *Agree to change* the title from “Guidelines for surveillance (2009-004)” to “National surveillance systems (2009-004)” to be more descriptive and remove the word guidelines.

Surveillance design

- [45] It was also noted that the term *surveillance* is defined in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) and some participants stressed that there is a need to provide a better explanation on the differences between general surveillance and specific surveillance and as outlined in the Specification 61. The EWG also felt that some types of surveillance could be included in both categories, such as early detection.
- [46] Normally surveillance programmes often start with a literature review and general surveillance and then continue on using more specific surveillance methods. Different surveillance methodologies can be used for different purposes (e.g. early detection, delimiting survey) and for specific pests or groups of pests.
- [47] When designing a surveillance programme, NPPOs must consider several issues such as: are the pests easy to identify and try to target pests which are more recognizable and amenable for outreach programmes, is it possible to easily develop educational materials, or were their stakeholders that would benefit from the collection of data? The EWG stressed that resources available must match the type of surveillance programmes planned, as some types of programmes may be very expensive such as when costly diagnostic support is needed. Appropriate and proven methodologies need to be selected as some methodologies are not so well documented and the sensitivity of some traps is not known. Considerations of the design and availability of the information management infrastructure should also be considered. In some cases, there could be cost savings if other groups or organizations could do data entry. The EWG added several of these elements to the draft ISPM.
- [48] It was also noted that some of this information on design and data management might fit better in a manual.

General surveillance

- [49] In general surveillance, NPPOs utilize various sources of pest information and pest distribution and may use a range of approached from passive data acceptance to increasingly structured and targeted programmes run entirely by the NPPO.. These sources may include national or local governments, research institutions, universities, scientific societies, producers, the general public, and published and unpublished data. This type of surveillance may be based on many different data sources and can be classified in a number of ways. The EWG identified several issues to consider when setting up a general surveillance program. Support for general surveillance can also be considerable and requires careful planning.
- [50] General surveillance might play an important role especially if specific stakeholders with some technical expertise (professionals/technical organizations) can be identified and the scope appropriately set. Availability of expertise and means to engage experts (remote diagnostics, social media mechanisms, toll-free phone lines etc.) are also important considerations. Again it was noted that if stakeholders have a vested interest in the surveillance, they will be more willing to help and dedicate resources.
- [51] As there are many new techniques available for general surveillance the EWG agreed to add more detailed information to this section as well as offer guidance on the various approached and their components.

[52] Educational and outreach information can be used in the general surveillance programmes, even when the surveillance is focused (example when conducting surveillance activities for a pest like the giant African snail). It was agreed that it was very important to get all stakeholders involved and the development of relevant training material and information brochures was essential.

Specific surveillance

[53] Specific surveillance can be used by NPPOs to actively gather pest information in a structured manner. This type of surveillance follows official procedures and is carried out over set periods of time. Data collected can help determine the characteristics of a pest population or to determine which species are present or absent in an area. Specific surveillance can often be supported and complemented by general surveillance.

[54] The EWG determined the three main types of specific surveys that are commonly utilized: detection, delimiting and monitoring.

[55] The timing of specific surveillance and the methodology used often needs to be aligned with the biology of a pest or a pest group. The EWG discussed if survey protocols should only be for specific surveys and it was decided that you could also develop surveillance protocols. In both cases, these protocols provided more detailed guidance. It was noted that NPPOs should consider looking for existing protocols and see if they could fit their needs or can be adjusted as this could save resources.

[56] Survey design is especially important when you are targeting a specific pest

[57] It was noted that trading partners often prefer data from specific surveys rather than general surveillance as specific survey data generally includes more complete data sets detailing field such as location, host, sampling method, sampling rate, collector and identifier.

[58] How much detail should be added on sampling was discussed and the EWG agreed to reference ISPM 31 but also noted that there was a need to add some additional detail in this standard as sampling consignments is very different from samples collected in a field survey. Monitoring surveys are not detailed in ISPM 31 and the EWG felt it was worth mentioning to advise NPPOs to seek input from experts. Targeted sampling is based on habitat, where samples are only taken from areas where the host is present. In these cases the population is only measured in the identified areas.

[59] It was suggested that a sampling frame be used by first choosing the population and then selecting samples from that identified population. Using the words “sampling frame” will position text to be better understood by statistical experts.

[60] Sites are not just geographical, and use of sites could be confusing, sites is used to identify host or commodity but does not cover other elements such as water or soil and it was agreed that the use of the word “area” might be better.

[61] Some members agreed that statistical methods for assessing option effectiveness to reduce pest infestation should be included in the standard. Other members felt that including this information in the standard would be very difficult for global harmonization, however they felt it would also be useful but maybe this could be provided through other means.

[62] It was pointed out that one of the tasks in Specification 61 had requested the EWG to consider how to obtain reliable records on pest presence or absence. It was noted that there is sometimes confusion on the meaning of the term “reliability” as some felt it often implied some level of statistical rigor. The group agreed to add some elements on reliability and confidence level to the draft ISPM. It was also felt that when designing a survey, sampling units should be created so statistical methods could be used.

[63] It was agreed that NPPOs should state, for each survey, the level of confidence and the minimum level of detection of the pest, which are statistically related to each other and to the size of the sample (see ISPM 31 (*Methodologies for sampling of consignments*) for further information). If no pests are

detected in the sample, the prevalence of the pest in the area is below the level of detection at the stated level of confidence. If the pest is detected, the NPPO may consider phytosanitary actions, such as eradication.

- [64] The EWG also had discussions on “confidence level” and “level of efficacy”. The members felt that information on “confidence level” should be included in the standard. The group agreed to add text explaining that the range of confidence limits depends on purpose of survey.
- [65] The EWG dedicated some time to consider whether harmonized survey protocols should be developed for specific pest groups.
- [66] EWG members felt that harmonized survey protocols would be very useful. Harmonized protocols, possibly targeted for the “top 10 pests” may be achievable however international agreement on the priority pests would be difficult. It was also felt the development of survey protocols for specific pests as annexes (similar to those developed for ISPM 27), would help to harmonize the delivery and outcomes surveys. It was also noted that the EFSA study¹¹ recommended for specific surveys, a better explanation on the design, formulation of hypothesis, the confidence level in relation of incidence level be presented.
- [67] However, some concerns were expressed about the use of harmonized survey protocols as there was a range of differences among CPs as NPPOs vary greatly in their access to available resources such as trained personnel, finances, technical capabilities and available technology and because of this it could be very difficult to harmonize. It was also noted that countries are autonomous and should have the right to choose their protocols as long as the methodologies are based on science (preferably peer reviewed research). Allowing variation in methodologies could also increase the likelihood that novel and more efficient surveillance practices are developed, that in the long run, might help improve the detection methods for a given pest.
- [68] The EWG agreed that harmonized survey protocols would be very useful and they should be used when available but did not think that the effort to get agreement on a global level would be worth the effort at this time.

Information management

- [69] There was an in-depth discussion on minimum data sets and whether there should be one universally recognized data set with compulsory data fields or separate data sets for general and specific surveillance. Some members felt the current section on data management was good enough. The EWG considered keeping the data elements harmonized in ISPM 6 with those listed in ISPM 8 but noted that the elements were more or less the same. The EWG did not reach an agreement on modifying the data elements so it was agreed to maintain the data elements from the original ISPM 6 with minor modifications. These included modifications to the names of the data elements to focus the main subject of each field name identified some minimum requirements for surveillance records. EPPOs codes were also discussed, some members only wanted to request scientific names but the group agreed to maintain the request for EPPO codes as it was explained that the EPPO codes provide a link to all the know synonyms and common names.
- [70] There had been a section on record keeping but information from this former section was moved under information management. There was some discussion on the use of the word ‘records’, as in most cases the word data is associated with electronic data entry. There are no longer records but after some discussion it was decided to retain the reference to records.
- [71] NPPOs should also recognize the importance of capturing and recording negative (observational) data into their data collection systems. In many cases, countries may carry out specific surveys but not collect this information. Negative data collected during early detection, delimiting and monitoring surveys can also be used by NPPOs to support countries' pest status, pest free areas and support trade

¹¹ 09_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep & 10_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep

and market access and should be recorded in a consistent manner with specimen and positive observational data records.

- [72] For general surveillance, some data that is gathered may need to be adjusted to align with the information management systems
- [73] Some members felt that the use of information generated by CABI and how it could be used by contracting parties should be provided. Other members felt that the pest distribution information provided by CABI was not always accepted by NPPOs and that in some cases, NPPOs did not agree with the CABI data and noted it was hard to update validated data so the group decided to only refer to advice NPPOs to use current distribution lists when available.
- [74] It was recognized that good information management would utilize data from many sources and the EWG encouraged NPPOs to also work at the regional level where possible.
- [75] The experts agreed that having a harmonized global database would be very useful but they did not believe it would be possible to get all countries to agree so agreed that some general guidance would be more useful.
- [76] It was noted that there is a lot of new technology that could be used, such as using a mobile phone application that records and sends GPS information along with a photo and a message but they also cautioned that the development and maintenance of this type of technology and the associated data could be very resource intensive and not accessible to all countries.

Implementation challenges

- [77] The EWG discussed the potential issues and challenges associated with implementing the revised standard and it was agreed that the revised standard needed to reflect the capability and capacity of both developed and developing country members. It was agreed that the revised standard should provide simple but technically relevant and scientifically sound guidance for both the technical and governance components of a surveillance system to ensure effective and achievable implementation.
- [78] The EWG discussed the approach taken for the revision on ISPM 6. The EWG agreed that it would be more logical to have the revised standard before the manual was finalized as the content of the standard might affect the implementation, especially if there are sections of the standard that are modified during the negotiation process and then the standard and manual might not align.
- [79] It was noted that it was beneficial to have had the broad range of discussions from the regional and international workshops prior to developing the specification for the revision of ISPM 6 and holding the EWG as these discussions helped highlight what needed to be revised. However the EWG felt it might have been more prudent to revise the standard and get it adopted before finalizing the manual to help with its implementation.
- [80] The Symposium in Korea resulted in some raw brainstorming on identifying sections for the proposed manual and it was felt this was too rushed and a more thoughtful process might have provided a more thoughtful review. It was felt the symposium could have focused more on phytosanitary issues rather than so much on pest management.
- [81] The EWG considered ways NPPOs could cooperate with each other on surveillance; for example, on diagnostic protocols, data banks and surveillance methodologies. It was noted that there are several regional initiatives to help coordinate this type of collaboration but there were no known international efforts in this regard. It was also noted that international cooperation is one of the provisions of the IPPC and experts discussed if more efforts on this might be worthwhile.

Development of text for draft

- [82] In general the EWG, after reviewing the ISPM 6, addressing the tasks outlined in Specification 61 and discussing several points, concluded that the revised ISPM 6 should have a broader overview of

surveillance. The EWG members agreed that several fundamental areas should be addressed and described as they were the building blocks for all types of surveillance. These would include the essential components of a national surveillance system. The EWG agreed that detailed guidance should be given on how to carry out general and specific surveillance and what were the similarities, commonalities and differences between these two types of surveillance.

- [83] As information is fundamental to all types of surveillance, a separate section was created which covered how to design, collect, consolidate, manage and validate data, emphasizing the importance of proper analysis of the data to support reporting.
- [84] Most of the discussions (Section 4.2) resulted in modifications to existing text or additions to the revised ISPM.
- [85] The EWG considered the many points raised in their discussions and developed an outline for the revised standard. Existing text from the current standard was moved and revised. In most cases, the text from the current standard was either reworded, clarified or elaborated. In some cases, EWG members were assigned to revise or develop text.
- [86] The various components were compiled together and the EWG further revised the text for ease of flow and consistency between the sections.

5. Next Steps

- [87] As the finalization of the draft could not be completed during the five day meeting, sections were assigned to various EWG members and it was agreed that the sections would be compiled and presented back to the group using Google documents. The EWG would meet virtually to review the draft, which will then be edited and only if needed would the Steward seek further input before presenting the revised ISPM to the SC.

6. Other business

- [88] On Wednesday morning the EWG members were taken to the National diagnostic laboratory that supports the national surveillance programme in New Zealand to see how samples are processed, specimens identified and information is managed.
- [89] The group was also taken into the field to observe the activities of staff from a company that was contracted by the New Zealand government to conduct some of their surveillance programmes. The group observed how some of the long term surveillance programmes were being implemented which included building long term relationships with different stakeholders for activities such as setting traps in private back yards over a period of many years. As well, the EWG followed staff conducting some transit surveys in public areas. Data for these activities was collected using specifically designed applications (iPad) which also transmitted the data to a central location for analysis and storage.
- [90] The field visit was appreciated by the group and some of the points raised during the visit were further discussed during the revision of the draft ISPM.

7. Close of the meeting

- [91] The Steward thanked the chair for his efforts in keeping the members on track with their tasks and also for his role as host. The Secretariat, on behalf of the EWG members expressed their thanks to the government of New Zealand for hosting the meeting and in particular for the unique New Zealand greeting they received from the Maori representatives on the first day. The Secretariat outlined the next steps the draft ISPM would go through and thanked the experts for all their contributions and closed the meeting.

Appendix 1 – Agenda

EXPERT WORKING GROUP MEETING
Revision of ISPM 6 (Guidelines for surveillance) (2009-004)
 28 September – 02 October 2015, Auckland, New Zealand

AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat Welcome by the meeting host & organizer 	--	LARSON New Zealand NPPO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introductions 	--	LARSON
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation on the standard setting process Roles of the Participants 	--	LARSON MOREIRA
1.1 Election of the Chairperson and Rapporteur	--	MOREIRA
1.2 Adoption of the Agenda	01_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	CHAIRPERSON
2. Administrative Matters		CHAIRPERSON
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents List Participants List Local Information 	02_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep 03_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep 04_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep_Rev1	MOREIRA
3. Review of Specification	Spec 61: Revision of ISPM 6. (Guidelines for surveillance)	WLODARCZYK
4. Development of draft ISPM		
4.1 Background papers		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation pilot on surveillance (Presentation to the 2015 IPPC Regional Workshops) 	12_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	MOREIRA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IRSS Survey: Review of the Implementation of ISPM 6 - Challenges and Best Practices 	Summary report Full report	LARSON
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report from the ISPM 6 APPPC Pest Surveillance Symposium Oct 27th- Nov 3rd 2012 - Seoul, Korea 	2012-11/12 Seoul, Korea	HEDLEY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports from the regional workshops on Surveillance (ISPM 6) 	2012-02 Santiago, Chile (Es) 2012-02 Accra, Ghana 2012-02 Chiang Rai, Thailand 2012-01 Bridgetown, Barbados 2012-01 Yerevan, Armenia 2012-01 Cairo, Egypt	LARSON
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IPPC Manual on Surveillance 	06_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	DALE
4.2 Discussion papers		

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
· Discussion paper	07_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	FAVRIN
· Discussion paper	08_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	STEVENS
· Discussion paper: EFSA Guidance on methodology for evaluation of the effectiveness of options for reducing the risk in the EU	09_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	SCHANS
· Discussion paper: EFSA PERSEUS Report on plant health surveys for the EU territory	10_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep 13_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	SCHANS
· Discussion paper	05_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	DALE
· Discussion paper: Guidelines for surveillance in Asia and the Pacific	14_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	DALE
· Editorials errors tracking sheet	11_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	MOREIRA
4.3 Development of text for draft¹²	(At the meeting)	CHAIRPERSON
5. Next Steps		CHAIRPERSON
6. Other business		CHAIRPERSON
7. Close of the meeting		IPPC SECRETARIAT / CHAIRPERSON

¹² For reference: IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/development-standards/>

Appendix 2 – Documents List

EXPERT WORKING GROUP MEETING Revision of ISPM 6 (*Guidelines for surveillance*) (2009-004)

DOCUMENTS LIST

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)
01_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	1.3	Agenda
02_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	2	Documents list
03_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	2	Participants list
04_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	2	Local information
05_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	4.2	Discussion paper (prepared by Chris Dale)
06_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	4.1	IPPC Manual on Surveillance (DRAFT)
07_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	4.2	Discussion paper (prepared by Robert Favrin)
08_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	4.2	Discussion paper (prepared by Paul Stevens)
09_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	4.2	Discussion paper – EFSA Guidance on methodology for evaluation of the effectiveness of options for reducing the risk in the EU (Shared by Jan Schans)
10_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	4.2	Discussion paper – EFSA PERSEUS Report on plant health surveys for the EU territory (Shared by Jan Schans)
11_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	4.2	Editorials errors tracking sheet
12_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	4.1	Implementation pilot on surveillance (PowerPoint presentation to the 2015 IPPC Regional Workshops)
13_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	4.2	Discussion paper – EFSA PERSEUS Appendix to Report on plant health surveys for the EU territory
14_EWG_ISPM6_2015_Sep	4.2	Discussion paper - Guidelines for surveillance for Asia and the Pacific

Other documents links

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT LINK (public pages)
Specification 61: Revision of ISPM 6. (Guidelines for surveillance)	3	Spec 61: Revision of ISPM 6. (Guidelines for surveillance)
IRSS Survey: Review of the Implementation of ISPM 6 - Challenges and Best Practices	4.1	Summary report Full report
Report from the ISPM 6 APPPC Pest Surveillance Symposium Oct 27th- Nov 3rd 2012 - Seoul, Korea	4.1	2012-11/12 Seoul, Korea

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT LINK (public pages)
Reports from the regional workshops on Surveillance (ISPM 6)	4.1	2012-02 Santiago, Chile 2012-02 Accra, Ghana 2012-02 Chiang Rai, Thailand 2012-01 Bridgetown, Barbados 2012-01 Yerevan, Armenia 2012-01 Cairo, Egypt
IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates	-	IPPC Style Guide page
ISPM 6. (Guidelines for surveillance)	-	ISPM 6. (Guidelines for surveillance)
Guidelines for surveillance for plant pests in Asia and the Pacific	4.2	http://aci-ar.gov.au/publication/mn119

Appendix 3 – Participants List

EXPERT WORKING GROUP MEETING Revision of ISPM 6 (Guidelines for surveillance) (2009-004)

PARTICIPANTS LIST

Participant role / Country	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
Steward / SC member	Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK Wojewodzki Inspektorat Ochrony Roslin I Nasiennictwa w Lublinie ul. Diamentowa 6 20-447 Lublin POLAND Tel: (+48) 81 7440326 Fax: (+48) 81 7447363	P.Wlodarczyk@piorin.gov.pl ;
Member / Argentina	Mr Pablo Luis CORTESE Director for Phytosanitary Surveillance and Monitoring Dirección de Vigilancia y Monitoreo Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria –SENASA / Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal Paseo Colon 315 4º piso DTO B (CABA – ARGENTINA) ARGENTINA Phone: (+54) 11 4121-5183	PCortese@senasa.gov.ar ; pablo.cortese@arnet.com.ar ;
Member / Australia	Mr Chris DALE Assistant Director International Plant Health Program / Plant Health Policy Branch / Plant Division Department of Agriculture 7 London Circuit, Canberra ACT 2601 GPO Box 858 Canberra 2601 AUSTRALIA Phone: +61 6272-5192	Chris.Dale@agriculture.gov.au ;
Member / Canada	Mr Robert FAVRIN National Manager, Plant Health Risk Assessment Unit Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) 1400 Merivale Road, T1-1-123 Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 CANADA Phone: (+1) 613-773-5266 Fax: (+1) 613-773-5390	Robert.Favrin@inspection.gc.ca ;
Member / Netherlands	Mr Jan SCHANS Senior Officer for Plant Health Netherlands Plant Protection Service P.O.Box 9102, 6700 HC Wageningen THE NETHERLANDS Phone: +31610164951	J.Schans@nvwa.nl ;
Organizer/ New Zealand	Mr Paul STEVENS Ministry for Primary Industries P.O. Box 2095 Auckland NEW ZEALAND Phone +64 29 894 0194	Paul.Stevens@mpi.govt.nz ;

Participant role / Country	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
Host / New Zealand	Mr John HEDLEY Principal Adviser, International Standards Organisations Ministry for Primary Industries Pastoral House 25 The Terrace PO Box 2526 Wellington NEW ZEALAND Phone +64 4 894 0428	John.Hedley@mpi.govt.nz
IPPC Secretariat / EWG Secretariat lead	Ms Adriana MOREIRA Standard Setting Programme Specialist FAO , Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 1 00153 - Rome ITALY Phone: +39 06 570 55809	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Brent LARSON Standards Officer FAO , Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 1 00153 - Rome ITALY Phone: +39 06 570 53803	Brent.Larson@fao.org

Unable to attend

Participant role / Country	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
Member / USA	Mr Brian Joseph KOPPER National Operations Manager For Surveillance United States of America – US Department Of Agriculture 920 MAIN CAMPUS DRIVE RALEIGH, NC 27606 USA Phone: (+1) 919-855-7318	Brian.J.Kopper@aphis.usda.gov