



REPORT

Virtual Meeting
03 February 2016
15:00 to 17:00 GMT

Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine February, 2016



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the meeting	3
1.1. Report on June 2015 Virtual Meeting of the TPFQ	3
2. Secretariat Maintenance and Updates from relevant Bodies (inc Standards Committee)	3
3. Update on IFQRG/IPPC work programme 2015.....	3
4. Discussion/status on IPISM 15 Treatment Criteria (2006-010).....	3
5. TPFQ Work Programme for 2015	4
5.1 International Movement of Wood Products and Handicrafts made from Wood (2008-008)	4
5.2 International Movement of Wood (2006-029)	4
5.3 Emerging Phytosanitary Issues in Forestry	5
6. Other Business	6
7. Close of the meeting	6
Appendix 1 - Agenda	7

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter Secretariat) welcomed the participants to the meeting. The following Technical Panel for Forest Quarantine (TPFQ) members participated in the meeting: Mr Victor AGYEMAN (Ghana), Mr Eric ALLEN (IFQRG), Mr Mamoru MATSUI (Japan), Mr Edson Tadeu IEDE (Brazil), and Mr Thomas SCHRÖDER (Germany).
- [2] In addition Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK (Steward for the TPFQ (2004-004)), Ms Marie-Claude FOREST (Assistant Steward for the TPFQ (2004-004), Steward for the topic on the International Movement of Wood (2006-029)), and Secretariat staff members Mr Michael ORMSBY, Mr. Brent LARSON, Mr Paul HOWARD, and Mr Shane SELA also attended.
- [3] The full list of TPFQ members and their contact details can be found on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP)¹.

[4]

[5] Election of chair and rapporteur

- [6] Mr Michael ORMSBY was elected as the Chair
- [7] Mr Eric ALLEN was elected as the rapporteur.
- [8] The Chair introduced the agenda which was adopted as presented in Appendix 1 of this report.

1.1. Report on October 2015 Virtual Meeting of the TPFQ

- [9] The panel reviewed the report from the October 2015 virtual meeting of the TPFQ which had previously been approved through an e-forum.
- [10] The Secretariat informed the panel that all TPFQ assigned actions from the October 2015 virtual meeting of the TPFQ were completed as planned.

2. Secretariat Maintenance and Updates from relevant Bodies (inc Standards Committee)

- [11] The Secretariat informed the TPFQ that the November 2015 SC meeting report was posted on the IPP. Of interest to the TPFQ are the sections of the report covering discussions on the draft ISPMs on the *International movement of wood* (2006-029) and the *International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood* (2008-008).

3. Update on IFQRG/IPPC work programme 2015

- [12] The Chair of International Forest Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG) noted that a meeting of the IFQRG steering committee (and friends of the Chair) will be held immediately after the face-to-face meeting of the TPFQ (at the same location) in June 2016 to discuss the future direction and work programme of IFQRG.

4. Discussion/status on IPSM 15 Treatment Criteria (2006-010)

- [13] The Steward for TPFQ provided some background on the development of the treatment criteria for ISPM 15 (2006-010) and the need to develop and publish a scientific paper on the efficacy requirements for the criteria. A draft paper, based on the work of IFQRG that developed the “Cardiff Protocol” was shared. The purpose of this paper is to help in identifying efficacy requirements for pests that may be associated with wood packaging material moving in international trade.

¹ TPFQ membership list: <https://www.ippc.int/publications/membership-tpfq>

- [14] The question for consideration by TPFQ is whether or not the paper (once it is completed) will provide the scientific justification for establishing the final experimental sample size requirements for treatments to be included in ISPM 15.
- [15] A member noted that the level of detail will be constrained or dictated by the type of journal the paper will be published in.
- [16] The Secretariat noted that the development of the treatment criteria has been underway for some time and the completion of the draft is one of the main focuses for the face-to-face meeting in June 2016. It was stressed that the paper should be published or in the process of being published before the meeting.
- [17] The TPFQ:
- (1) *agreed* in principle that the draft scientific paper that was based on the “Cardiff Protocol” being developed by IFQRG should provide sufficient scientific justification to determine the test sample sizes to be used in the ISPM 15 treatment criteria.
- [18] Members suggested a number of experts who may be able to assist in developing the paper for publication.
- [19] A member also noted that the testing requirements need to be practical or achievable to enable treatments to be developed. Two alternative approaches are possible: either a single target efficacy for each group or to provide guidance for the treatment developers to calculate efficacy targets for each of the species they use in testing.
- [20] The TPFQ:
- (2) *agreed* that the preferred approach is to have a single target efficacy for each group of pests.

5. TPFQ Work Programme for 2015

- [21] The meeting participants discussed the following topics on the TPFQ work programme.

5.1 International Movement of Wood Products and Handicrafts made from Wood (2008-008)

- [22] The TPFQ did not discuss this agenda item.

5.2 International Movement of Wood (2006-029)

- [23] The Steward Marie-Claude **FOREST** (hereafter referred to as the *Wood Steward*) noted that the text of the draft ISPM for the *International movement of wood* (2006-029) has been re-written after reviewing the report from the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) working group on the *Concept of a commodity standard* (WG) that met in July 2015 and the report from the SC meeting in November 2015. The text was re-written to better align with the outcome of the CPM discussion on what should be considered appropriate for a commodity standard. The review also took into account the direction provided by the SC and comments made in the objection raised at CPM-10 (2015) in noting that more requirements are necessary for the standard.
- [24] The SC considered that further review was needed from TPFQ and another round of member consultation should be recommended.
- [25] The Wood Steward noted a number of issues that had been raised in the review process that will need to be considered by the TPFQ, including:
- [26] - issues with paragraph 42 (table) and the use of the term “*powder post beetles*”;
 - [27] - issues with paragraph 52 on sawn wood and whether to keep or remove this paragraph;
 - [28] - problems with section 1.3 on mechanical processing of wood and questions about paragraph 60;

- [29] - questions regarding wood residues in paragraph 67;
- [30] - paragraph 101 regarding the presence of live quarantine pests and whether to keep or remove this.
- [31] The TPFQ considered each of these issues and amended the text appropriately. The TPFQ agreed to the following changes:
- [32] - in paragraph 42 (table) moving the *powder post beetles* group in with the *wood boring beetle* group to remove the use of this unclear common name;
- [33] - in paragraph 52 (description of sawn wood), keep this extended definition of sawn wood (compared to the glossary) to provide greater clarity and readability of the text;
- [34] - questions on whether *wood residues* (paragraph 67) should include off-cuts and slabs and require a proper definition. The TPFQ considered that the text should remain and that further guidance (including pictures) would be required to fully cover the range of products included in this type of wood, and this could best be provided in an explanatory document.
- [35] - in section 2.1.2 on barked wood, a question was raised on the need to add further text to paragraph 88 to explain the effect of bark removal on pests. The TPFQ agreed that the text should be left in to provide valuable guidance to aid with understanding the context for the requirements.
- [36] - it was noted that some concerns had been raised in SC on the new paragraph (100) on treatments that introduced the concept of indicator species being used to show non-compliance with the requirements laid out in an ISPM. A member mentioned the discussion that TPFQ had on the detection of nematodes on wood and where some nematodes on the surface (e.g. non-wood nematodes) would not be appropriate indicators of treatment failure. Another member noted that the use of “*suitable*” in the text ensures that only organisms that should have been killed or removed by the specified treatment would be used as indicator species. The TPFQ agreed that the text should be left in the document. Further discussion on the use of “*fresh frass*”, which is not a living organism, considered that it may be an inappropriate indicator. The TPFQ agreed that fresh frass alone would not be an indicator but could prompt further inspection for a live organism. The TPFQ suggested that “*fresh frass*” be removed from the current sentence and a new sentence be added to indicate the detection of fresh frass be a prompt for further investigation for live organisms.
- [37] - in Appendix 1 (paragraph 122) and the illustration for bark and wood, the label for “*ingrown bark*” should be changed to “*bark pockets*” to align with the ISPM 5. The TPFQ agreed that such a change was appropriate.
- [38] The Wood Steward intends to provide an update to the SC at its meeting in May 2016 and she requested all comments on the draft ISPM from the TPFQ be sent before the 12th February 2016.
- [39] One member noted that under paragraph 133 it states that some chemical treatments (spraying or dipping) result in limited penetration into sapwood or heartwood, but not all tree species have a clear differentiation between the two. The panel considered that referring to just “wood” rather than “sapwood” or “heartwood” may be more appropriate, given sawn wood may contain a mixture of both.
- [40] The TPFQ:
- (3) *agreed* to provide comments on the re-drafted ISPM for Wood by the 12th February, in time for the document to be revised and submitted to the SC meeting in May 2016.

5.3 Emerging Phytosanitary Issues in Forestry

- [41] No new emerging phytosanitary risks in forestry were raised at the meeting.

6. Other Business

[42] A member raised an issue about the definition of processed wood. The current wording states that processed wood must have been clued, put under pressure OR heated, or a combination thereof. Some processed wood is clued and pressed but not heated, meaning that any associated risks may not have been appropriately managed.

[43] A possible solution may be to provide guidance in the explanatory document. The Steward considered that a forum on this subject would be appropriate before the face-to-face meeting in June 2016.

[44] The TPFQ:

- (4) *agreed* to undertake a e-forum to discuss the potential issues with the wording around the types of processed wood.

[45] The Secretariat formally notified the panel that Mr. Shane **SELA** has resigned from the TPFQ. A call for new members is currently underway and panel members are encouraged to identify those who could apply.

[46] The Secretariat also encouraged members to identify tropical seed experts for the call for experts.

[47] The Steward for TPFQ mentioned that the response to member comments on the revised treatment annex to ISPM 15 is currently being drafted. One particular and substantive comment queried the validity of the treatment protocol in killing all nematodes at 20°C. The Steward requested comment from TPFQ members. The Technical Panel for Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) lead for the same treatment under ISPM 28 has received the same comment and had already formulated a response.

[48] The TPFQ Steward:

- (5) *agreed* to circulate the question to TPFQ members via email for discussion.

7. Close of the meeting

[49] The Secretariat thanked the TPFQ and SC members for their participation and closed the meeting.

Appendix 1 - Agenda**2016 FEBRUARY VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL PANEL FOR****FOREST QUARANTINE****03 February 2016****PROVISIONAL AGENDA**

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
1.1 Orientation Refresher for Adobe Connect	https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/virtual-tools	
1.2 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	01_TPFQ_2016_Feb_Agenda	ORMSBY
1.3 Introductions	https://www.ippc.int/publications/membership-tpfq	ORMSBY
1.4 Report of last meetings	02_TPFQ_2016_Feb_Report_DRAFT_TPFQ_2015_Oct	ORMSBY
2. Secretariat Maintenance and Updates from relevant Bodies (inc Standards Committee)	03_TPFQ_2016_Feb_Secretariat Update	ORMSBY
3. Update on IFQRG/IPPC work programme 2015	-	ALLEN
4. Discussion/status on IPSM 15 Treatment Criteria (2006-010)	04_TPFQ_2016_Feb_Efficacy paper	WLODARCZYK
5. Work Programme for 2016	05_TPFQ_2016_Feb_Work Programme	ALL
5.1 ISPM 15 (2009) explanatory document	https://www.ippc.int/publications/ispm-15-explanatory-document-shane-sela-lead-author-thomas-schroeder-matsui-mamoru-and	SELA
5.2 Annex 1&2 SF schedule for ISPM15 (2006-010A)	-	WLODARCZYK
5.3 Annex 1 DH schedule for ISPM15 (2006-010B)	-	WLODARCZYK
5.4 Wood handicrafts ISPM (draft) (2008-008)	-	NDIKONTAR
5.5 Wood ISPM (draft) (2006-029)	06_TPFQ_2016_Feb_Draft Wood ISPM	FOREST
5.6 Tree seed annex to Seed ISPM (2009-004)	-	HORN
5.7 Emerging Phytosanitary Issues in Forestry	-	ALL (TPFQ)
6. Recommendations to the SC (if applicable)		ORMSBY
7. Other business		ORMSBY
	-	
8. Follow-up Actions for next TPFQ Virtual Meeting		ORMSBY
9. Close of the meeting		ORMSBY