



REPORT

Victoria, Canada
06-10 June 2016

Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine June, 2016



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation

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

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

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the Meeting	4
2. Administrative Matters	4
3. Updates from Relevant Bodies	4
3.1 CPM-11 (2016)	5
3.2 Standards Committee (SC) and SC-7	5
3.3 Review of the Specification for TPFQ (TP4).....	5
4. Drafting of Proposed Annex on Forest Seeds.....	5
5. Developing an Annex to ISPM 15 (<i>Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade</i>): <i>Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade</i> (2006-010) (Priority 2)	7
7. Other business.....	11
8. Follow-up Actions for Next TPFQ Meetings	11
8.1 Status of work under the TPFQ work programme	11
8.3 TPFQ Work plan 2016/2017	11
8.4 TPFQ Medium-term work plan.....	11
9. Recommendations to the SC.....	11
10. Close of the Meeting.....	12
APPENDIX 1: Agenda.....	13
APPENDIX 2: Documents list	15
APPENDIX 3: Participants list	17

1. Opening of the Meeting

[1] The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat (hereafter “Secretariat”) opened the meeting and thanked Mr Eric ALLEN (Canada) and Ms Nancy FURNESS (Canada) for hosting this meeting on behalf of their organizations respectively, the Canadian Forest Service and the Canadian Food and Inspection Agency. The Secretariat welcomed the participants, in particular recognizing the new members of the Technical Panel for Forest Quarantine (TPFQ) and thanked members who were unable to attend this meeting, their last, prior to ending their TPFQ membership terms. The Secretariat thanked the departing members for all their efforts over the years and informed the participants that the invited expert who had been selected by the Standards Committee (SC) was, at short notice, unable to attend the meeting. It was noted that the TPFQ had its first meeting at this same venue in 2005.

[2] Meeting participants introduced themselves.

[3] Mr Eric ALLEN (Canada) welcomed the participants to Victoria. He thanked the TPFQ members for their important work in aiding to harmonize standards on such a vital issue as forest quarantine that helps facilitate international trade while protecting the world’s forest resources.

[4] He explained the organization for the meeting and the Tuesday evening dinner.

Election of the Chairperson

[5] The panel elected Mr Victor AGYEMAN (Ghana) as Chairperson.

Election of the Rapporteur

[6] The panel elected Mr Adnan UZUNOVIC (Canada) as Rapporteur.

Adoption of the Agenda

[7] The panel reviewed and adopted the Agenda (Appendix 1).

2. Administrative Matters

Documents list

[8] The panel reviewed the Documents list (Appendix 2).

Participants list

[9] Panel members reviewed their contact information on the Participants list (Appendix 3) and agreed to update it on the IPP¹.

Local information

[10] The meeting organizer, Mr Eric ALLEN (IFQRG), provided further information regarding the local arrangements and logistics².

3. Updates from Relevant Bodies

[11] The Secretariat gave a brief presentation outlining the IPPC Standard setting procedure to help the TPFQ members understand the recently updated process and associated deadlines that affect the work of the panel.

[12] In particular, it was noted that a new topic for a standard can only be submitted by contracting parties or regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs). Technical panels may record any ideas for new topics in their meeting reports but can no longer submit a proposal for a new topic.

¹ [Link to IPP](#)

² 04_TPFQ_2016_Jun

3.1 CPM-11 (2016)

- [13] The Secretariat provided an oral update from CPM-11 (2016) on items of relevance to the TPFQ.
- [14] Of particular interest was the issue regarding commodity standards. The CPM agreed that there was no particular difference between commodity standards and other types of standards and that commodities and commodity classes make up a continuum, in which the draft ISPM on *International movement of wood* (206-029) would be considered a commodity class standard.

3.2 Standards Committee (SC) and SC-7

- [15] The Secretariat provided an oral update from the November 2015³ and May 2016⁴ meetings of the SC and the SC working group (SC-7) on items of relevance to the TPFQ.
- [16] In May 2016, the SC appointed Ms Marina ZLOTINA (USA) Steward of the TPFQ as the former steward had resigned from the SC, and Mr Lifeng WU (China) as the new Assistant steward. Ms Marina ZLOTINA (USA) was also appointed Steward for the Revision of ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*): *Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade* (2006-010) (Priority 2), and for the proposed Forest seed annex to the draft ISPM for the *International movement of seeds* (2009-003) (Priority 1) along with Nico HORN (The Netherlands), the Lead steward for the draft ISPM on *International movement of seeds* (2009-003) Nico HORN (The Netherlands).
- [17] In May 2016, the SC-7 approved the draft ISPM on *International movement of wood* (2006-029) for a third consultation and the draft ISPM on *International movement of seeds* (2009-003) for a second consultation, both starting July 2016. SC-7 also looked at the Inclusion of the Phytosanitary treatment *Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material* (2006-010A) in annexes 1 and 2 of ISPM 15, and 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*) (2006-010B) amendments to annexes of ISPM 15, and decided to return these to the Technical Panel for Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) to address a few technical issues.

3.3 Review of the Specification for TPFQ (TP4)

- [18] The Secretariat explained the purpose of the TPFQ and reviewed the specification of the panel (TP4⁵) primarily for the new members.
- [19] In a following discussion it was noted that the panel needs to move forward on the Revision of ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*): *Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade* (2006-010) as it had been on the work programme for many years (since 2006). A member stressed that there were no perfect solutions to resolving the problem, but no benefits could be accrued unless something was completed even if it was not perfect.
- [20] The Secretariat noted that if the issue could not be resolved at this meeting the SC was likely to remove this topic from the IPPC list of topics.

4. Drafting of Proposed Annex on Forest Seeds

- [21] The Secretariat updated the TPFQ on the progress of the draft ISPM on *International movement of seeds* (2009-003) and provided the background of the proposed annex on Forest seeds⁶, noting that the Steward for the ISPM was not able to attend this meeting.

³ [Link to the SC November 2015 report](#)

⁴ [Link to the SC May 2016 report](#)

⁵ Link to Specification TP4

⁶ 2009-003; 13_TPFQ_2016_Jun

- [22] The Secretariat introduced Specification 54 for developing the draft ISPM on *International movement of seeds* (2009-003)⁷, paying special note to the differences between the definitions of seed (included in the scope) and grain (excluded from the scope). Seed is considered a subset of plants for planting but does not cover any vegetative plant parts. The requirements for plants for planting are captured in ISPM 36 (*Integrated measures for plants for planting*)⁸.
- [23] The Secretariat introduced the supporting documents⁹ provided for the TPFQ to consider.
- [24] It was noted that forest seeds had been included in Specification 54, but that the expert working group (EWG) that developed the draft ISPM on *International movement of seeds* (2009-003) identified the potential need for an annex on forest seeds instead of integrating this guidance in the core standard. It was also noted that the TPFQ had previously drafted an annex on forest seed¹⁰.
- [25] The panel discussed the definition of seed-borne vs seed-transmissible pests, and was provided with an explanatory diagram¹¹ that had been produced by the SC-7. It was also noted that these concepts were explained in detail in the draft ISPM on *International movement of seeds* (2009-003).
- [26] The TPFQ reviewed the draft ISPM on *International movement of seeds* (2009-003) and discussed the following issues:
- [27] **Development of an annex or adjustment of the core ISPM.** The TPFQ agreed that it was more appropriate to modify the main text of draft ISPM rather than develop a specific annex, given that only a few changes would be required and the text of the ISPM was still in development.
- [28] The panel agreed that the guidance to be included should be for tree seeds, instead of forest tree seeds, because pest risk is related to the seeds of trees regardless of the end use (for forestry or horticulture purposes). The panel also made some minor changes to make the standard more inclusive as forestry production practices and agricultural production practices differ in some respects.
- [29] Consequently, the TPFQ deleted the proposed forest seed annex as all tree seed requirements would be included in the main text of the ISPM.
- [30] The TPFQ considered that further guidance on the movement of tree seed in trade would be valuable and recommended that an explanatory document be developed once the standard was adopted. The TPFQ recommended to the Secretariat that Mr Thomas SCHRÖDER (Germany) should be consider as the lead author for this explanatory document on tree seeds.
- [31] The TPFQ reviewed the text of the draft ISPM on *International movement of seeds* (2009-003), focusing on changes or additions that were necessary to ensure the ISPM manages any phytosanitary issue related to tree seeds and discussed the following issues:
- [32] **The issue of seed collected from the tree versus from the ground**, and the need for any specific text (e.g. whether the ISPM should say “*must take measures to ensure seed collection avoids contamination*” versus “*seed must be harvested from standing trees only*”). It was noted that most tree pathogens are not found on the ground but that some are, and that some seed only becomes infested when collected from the ground. The TPFQ felt that the general text in the current draft would be sufficient, although further guidance could be provided in an explanatory document.

⁷ [Link to Specification 54](#)

⁸ [Link to ISPM 36](#)

⁹ 5_TPFQ_2016_Jun, 6_TPFQ_2016_Jun, 8_TPFQ_2016_Jun, 12_TPFQ_2016_Jun, 16_TPFQ_2016_Jun, 17_TPFQ_2016_Jun, 18_TPFQ_2016_Jun

¹⁰ 2009-003 (Annex 2)

¹¹ 19_TPFQ_2016_Jun

- [33] **“Harvest” versus “collection” of seeds.** The TPFQ noted that the term “collected” is most often used in forestry. The panel agreed that the two terms are mostly interchangeable although “harvest” was preferred as it was more appropriate to describe commercial trade and thus in line with the draft ISPM.
- [34] **Background.** The TPFQ recommended that “NPPOs” be changed to “contracting parties” as in some countries the activities described in this paragraph in the context of tree seed may not be under the authority of the NPPO (e.g. may be under the control of a Forestry Department), and the TPFQ felt this would allow some flexibility in managing phytosanitary issues associated with the international movement of tree seeds.
- [35] **Examples of pests that are important to tree seeds** were added to the agricultural seed examples to aid in the description of the categories of pest-association with seeds in trade.
- [36] **Adding “and harvest”** to the text wherever “production” of seed was mentioned. The panel considered this was necessary to account for tree seeds which are often “harvested” and not “produced”. For instance tree seeds may be “collected” from wild-grown trees rather than trees that are planted and felled specifically for seed production. In forestry the term production relates to wood rather than seed.
- [37] **Knowledge of potential seed-related pests.** The panel considered that for tree seeds in particular, knowledge of potential seed-related pest problems for a specific species and an understanding of the biology of the pest concerned could be used to develop effective mitigation strategies. It was recommended that text be added to make this point.
- [38] **Harvesting.** The TPFQ added text to explain all the unusual ways tree seed may be harvested, and that where there is a choice of harvesting methods, the method that minimizes pest infestation the most should be taken into consideration. Likewise, the TPFQ made text changes to highlight that practices may differ for tree seed harvesting when compared to agricultural seed production.
- [39] **Rotation.** The text was expanded to recognize that rotation of tree planting is rarely applicable while the use of mixed plantings is more common.
- [40] **Pest risk management.** The TPFQ suggesting added a bullet on the specific timing of seed harvest and a reference to a mechanical seed treatment option as these were considered significant methods for managing tree seed pest risks.
- [41] **Seed storage and transport.** The TPFQ suggested adding a new section to cover the particular issues related to desiccation-sensitive seeds as special care should be taken to adequately manage fungal development. The panel considered this addition would also be applicable to some types of agricultural seeds. The TPFQ noted that desiccation-sensitive seeds are also known as “recalcitrant seed” however the TPFQ felt that using this term would add confusion to the ISPM.
- [42] **Record keeping.** The TPFQ noted that, as some tree seeds are kept in storage for more than 10 years, phytosanitary records related to those stored seeds would need to be kept for as long as the seeds. Alterations to the text were suggested to reflect this.
- [43] **References.** The TPFQ recommended adding specific references on tree seed phytosanitary risks and management options to the reference appendix.
- [44] The TPFQ:
- (1) *Recommended* to the SC the tree seed-related amendments of the draft ISPM *International movement of seeds* (2009-003).
- 5. Developing an Annex to ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade): Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010) (Priority 2)**

- [45] The Secretariat introduced the topic and summarized the background related to the development of the draft annex to ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*): *Criteria for*

treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-003)¹². The draft annex was submitted for consultation on a previous occasion and significant issues were raised by contracting parties in response to the use of probit 9 as the level of testing required for ISPM 15 treatments.

- [46] The Secretariat introduced the supporting documents¹³ including an updated draft of the criteria developed in virtual meetings by the TPFQ¹⁴ after the consultation.
- [47] Having considered the supporting documents, the TPFQ reviewed in particular the draft scientific paper that was being developed by the lead author Michael ORMSBY (New Zealand) on the efficacy requirements for wood packaging material (WPM) in international trade because this would serve as a basis for the further review of the draft annex on ISPM 15 treatment criteria¹⁵.
- [48] The TPFQ recommended the following changes to the scientific paper to enhance its value in support of the draft annex to ISPM 15:
- [49] - The TPFQ noted that the paper suggested testing levels only while the operational conditions for treatment development are provided in the draft annex on ISPM 15 treatment criteria and in ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*). It was also noted that the hardest testing conditions required in the criteria should cover all other conditions likely to be encountered in trade.
- [50] - The TPFQ added an improved explanation of why only species of *Heterobasidion* and *Ceratocystis* were chosen as target fungi. The TPFQ noted that most regulated fungi in wood packaging are unable to produce a spore state that would enable the fungi to invade the local environment. There are, however, published instances of species of *Heterobasidion* and *Ceratocystis* producing spores from sawn wood and successfully invading new environments. It was recognized that this justification was developed by IFQRG over a number of years.
- [51] - One TPFQ member questioned the pest interception data, which had been collected only in Europe, USA, Australia, and New Zealand and queried how it related to organisms found in other regions. The TPFQ found that these interception databases include records of pests found on WPM from all regions of the world. It was also noted that while further data may become available in future that may necessitate changes to the list, decisions were needed now to provide guidance for future treatment development.
- [52] - The TPFQ agreed that further information was needed to support the levels of testing recommended for fungi and nematodes and requested the author to find and include such information.
- [53] - One TPFQ panel member was concerned that the text only referred to pallets, as not all WPM is pallets (e.g. also includes dunnage). The TPFQ agreed that the text needed to explain that pallets are the base unit used but that all types of WPM were included. The TPFQ also felt it would be valuable to acknowledge that dunnage is more likely to be infested, but that pallets are often stored together in large numbers and therefore represent a worst-case pest establishment scenario.
- [54] - The TPFQ thought it was useful to include an explanatory sentence on what the model was supposed to achieve: namely that the model provides a more accurate estimate of the required level of efficacy for treatments against the regulated pests potentially moving on wood packaging material in international trade.
- [55] - The TPFQ considered that a more detailed explanation was necessary to clarify why a maximum infestation level of 1% was justified. The TPFQ agreed that aspects such as pest distribution through

¹² 14_TPFQ_2016_Jun

¹³ 7_TPFQ_2016_Jun; 9_TPFQ_2016_Jun; 10_TPFQ_2016_Jun; 11_TPFQ_2016_Jun; 15_TPFQ_2016_Jun

¹⁴ Draft Annex: Process for testing new treatments for ISPM 15 (2006-010)

¹⁵ 15_TPFQ_2016_Jun

the wood or the tree, and the mix of pallet origin at any collection site support the assumption that infestation rates would be low.

- [56] - The TPFQ considered it was important to stress that laboratory experiments are only required where the required information is not available in literature.
- [57] - A TPFQ member noted that under the requirements of ISPM 15 a pallet may have many more than one 50 cm² piece of bark. The TPFQ agreed that the scientific paper should provide an accurate estimate for the worst-case reasonable bark coverage, and that some sort of pallet survey should be attempted to support the estimate.
- [58] - The TPFQ considered that the scientific paper should mention that, as is the case with fruit fly treatment development, when the test material has been “infested naturally” this does not mean infestation at rates that can be found under operational conditions (e.g. 1% of pallets infested). In experimental trials “infested naturally” would mean in a natural or near-natural way but under laboratory conditions (e.g. cage or no-choice infestation of all pallets, or allowing fungi to colonize into the wood matrix under optimal conditions).
- [59] The TPFQ reviewed the draft annex on *Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade* (2006-010) to ISPM 15 and discussed the following issues:
- [60] - The Lead steward for the *Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade* (2006-010) in consultation with the Secretariat proposed a title change to the draft annex, as the process for determining what new treatments should be included in ISPM 15 was described in detail and not only the criteria. The proposed title for the draft annex is *Process for testing new treatments for ISPM 15* (2006-010). The TPFQ agreed to this proposal.
- [61] - The TPFQ copied the table from the draft scientific paper, as modified in this meeting, into the draft annex.
- [62] - The TPFQ edited parts of the text for clarity and simplicity, and further concepts were added for completeness.
- [63] - The TPFQ discussed at some length the inclusion of fungi in the list of organisms to be used in the treatment testing process, and whether more fungi should be added (e.g. *Ceratocystis* sp.) or removed completely, in this respect the TPFQ considered:
- That *Ceratocystis* sp. is a risk like that of *Heterobasidion* sp. and should be included.
 - That including fungi which are more tolerant of some types of treatment (e.g. fumigation) may increase the dose with subsequent negative environmental consequences.
 - Removing fungi would support the use of fumigants which have negative environmental consequences.
 - Whether fungi are actually particularly important on this pathway given the few known examples (noting absence of evidence is not evidence of absence).
- [64] - The TPFQ agreed that both arguments for and against were strong, and that a balance was needed. The TPFQ agreed that the list of pests required for testing ISPM 15 treatments should include fungi, and that *Heterobasidion* sp. (a basidiomycete) and *Ceratocystis* sp. (an ascomycete) should be included in the list. The primary reason for this was that fungi are of international concern in relation to the international movement of WPM, and that they are both of equal concern. Mention of *Ceratocystis* sp. was therefore added throughout the text as appropriate. This decision was based on the considerations that:
- ISPM 15 should reduce the risks of all (tree related) pests moving in the international trade of WPM.
 - ISPM 15 should contain a variety of treatment types including fumigants.

- ISPMs should reflect international expectations regarding an appropriate level of protection from damaging pests.
 - ISPMs should consider the environmental impacts (of treatments), as well as feasibility and applicability of the ISPM.
 - Both basidiomycetes and ascomycetes should be represented in any fungi list.
- [65] - The list of target pests now included in the annex were representative of a wide range of quarantine pests known to move with WPM and cause problems in standing forests, and were also chosen for reasons of practicality in collection, storage and rearing. The TPFQ noted that the list of required test pests was not exhaustive, however, the approach presented in the annex would reduce pest risk significantly for the international movement of WPM.
- [66] - The TPFQ also considered that Curculionidae should be used in the list rather than Scolytinae as it was now the name of the super family that includes Scolytinae (a more recent taxonomical change).
- [67] - The TPFQ considered the relevance of treatment outcomes other than “mortality” or “killing” for the management of pests in or on WPM. While other outcomes may be possible in the future, wood can be treated to a level that ensures complete mortality without it being damaged. The text was altered to state that “killing” was the required outcome and finding survivors would indicate treatment failure in treatment development. The statements regarding killing and survivorship were moved into a footnote to link better to where the concept was first mentioned in the text.
- [68] - The TPFQ discussed the need for a control for each replicate. The text was altered to include this requirement although it was recognized that careful experimental design could eliminate this need.
- [69] - The TPFQ considered adding descriptions of the different life stages of each pest that should be tested, but did not consider it a necessary change as biologists should be consulted in the design of the experiments and would provide that information.
- [70] - The TPFQ considered including text on statistics, efficacy and levels of confidence, but agreed that these issues are better addressed in published papers and in the TPPT procedures. For this reason, a reference to the TPPT procedures was added as a footnote.
- [71] - Text was added to state that “appropriate hosts should be used for each pest species to ensure an appropriate response is achieved” to manage the potential increase in treatment susceptibility caused by use of sub-optimal host material.
- [72] - Paragraphs in the text referring to a protocol for determining numbers of treated pests were simplified or removed as treated pest numbers were now provided in a table.
- [73] - A table was inserted containing the minimum number of individuals required for testing the insect families, assuming no treatment failures (e.g. survivors) would occur.
- [74] - The panel considered that the levels of testing required were adequately supported by scientific research on the biology and trade patterns of WPM¹⁶. The TPFQ agreed that these levels of testing would ensure any developed treatment would reduce the pest risk sufficiently on this pathway, and that the level of treatment efficacy was suitable for the international movement of WPM.
- [75] The TPFQ:
- (2) Recommend the title of the draft annex be changed from *Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010)* to *Process for testing new treatments for ISPM 15 (2006-010)*.

¹⁶ 09_TPFQ_2016_Jun; 10_TPFQ_2016_Jun; 15_TPFQ_2016_Jun

- (3) *Recommended* to the SC the draft annex *Process for testing new treatments for ISPM 15 to ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade)* (2006-010) as revised in this meeting.

7. Other business

- [76] Mr Eric ALLEN informed the TPFQ that the IFQRG Science Steering Committee would be meeting 13-15 June 2016 to re-evaluate the design and focus of the group going forward. The TPFQ would be represented at the meeting and be provided an opportunity to influence the future direction of the group. A number of organizations had proposed to host future IFQRG meetings in their countries, such as SCION in New Zealand and EPPO in Switzerland. The IFQRG Chair would provide a report of the IFQRG Science Steering Committee meeting to TPFQ members.
- [77] The TPFQ considered future work areas for IFQRG that would support the work of the TPFQ. Suggestions included:
- [78] - As there would likely be a call for phytosanitary treatments (annexes to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*)) in 2017, and these treatments would include those for ISPM 15 and wood in general, it would be timely for IFQRG to consider coordinating the development of submissions on wood-related treatments. One particular treatment that is in ISPM 15 but not in ISPM 28 is the heat treatment (56°C for 30 minutes), and existing information may be sufficient to support the inclusion of this ISPM 15 treatment in ISPM 28.
- [79] - There are many and significant issues related to the implementation of ISPM 15 that would benefit from some coordinated research, communications and implementation material or systems development by IFQRG.

8. Follow-up Actions for Next TPFQ Meetings

8.1 Status of work under the TPFQ work programme

The Secretariat noted that at this stage there were no further topics remaining on the TPFQ work programme.

8.3 TPFQ Work plan 2016/2017

- [80] The TPFQ reviewed the work plan for 2016-2017¹⁷.
- [81] It was noted that completing the draft ISPM 15 treatment criteria would require the publication of one of the key supporting documents (see also section 5 of this report). TPFQ members indicated their availability to support the timely publication of this supporting document.
- [82] The TPFQ agreed to hold a virtual meeting in October 2016.

8.4 TPFQ Medium-term work plan

- [83] The TPFQ noted that two of the EWG members that drafted the ISPM on *International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood* (2008-008) are now TPFQ members, and that the TPFQ for this reason may be used to support the further development of this draft ISPM.

9. Recommendations to the SC

For the recommendations to the SC, refer to the individual sections of this report.

¹⁷ [Link to TPFQ Work Plan 2016-2017](#)

10. Close of the Meeting

- [84] The Secretariat reminded the panel to check the IPP calendar for updated information on IPPC related meetings¹⁸.
- [85] The Secretariat thanked Canada and in particular the Canadian Forest Service for their generous hospitality in hosting this meeting, the reception and the excellent organization of the local arrangements. The Secretariat also thanked all the TPFQ members for their essential contributions and gave special recognition to the previous TPFQ members Mr Marcos Beéche CISTERNAS (Chile), Mr Edson Tadeu IEDE (Brazil) and Mr Sven Christer MAGNUSSON (Norway) for their contributions to the work of the TPFQ over the last 11 years.
- [86] The TPFQ Steward thanked the TPFQ members for their contributions and the contracting parties who provide the experts to this panel, recognizing not only the time needed to attend the meeting but also the time and efforts needed to prepare appropriately for it. Without the support from the national agencies, the experts would not have the possibility to contribute to developing international standards that have major impact on food security and international trade.
- [87] The panel thanked the Chairperson and the Rapporteur for their efforts.
- [88] The Chairperson also extended his gratitude to Canada for hosting and supporting the meeting in Victoria and to the TPFQ Steward and Secretariat for their support during the meeting. The Chairperson closed the meeting.

¹⁸ Link to the [IPPC Secretariat calendar on the IPP](#).

APPENDIX 1: Agenda

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		IPPC SECRETARIAT
❖ Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat		LARSON
❖ Opening Remarks by the Host Agency		ALLEN
❖ Election of the Chairperson		ORMSBY
❖ Election of the Rapporteur		CHAIRPERSON
❖ Adoption of the Agenda	01_TPFQ_2016_Jun	CHAIRPERSON
❖ Overview of the IPPC standard setting procedure	Link to Spec TP4	LARSON
2. Administrative Matters		CHAIRPERSON
❖ Documents List	02_TPFQ_2016_Jun	ORMSBY
❖ Participants List	03_TPFQ_2016_Jun	ORMSBY
❖ Local Information	04_TPFQ_2016_Jun	ALLEN
3. Updates from Relevant Bodies		CHAIRPERSON
3.1 Items arising from CPM		
3.2 Items arising from SC		
4. Drafting of Forest Seed, Proposed Annex to draft Seed ISPM, (Priority 1)		ORMSBY
- Steward: Mr. Nico HORN (Netherlands)		
❖ Specification 54	Link to Spec 54	
❖ International Seed Testing Association (ISTA)	Link to ISTA	
4.1 Background document on the draft ISPM for Forest Tree Seed	13_TPFQ_2016_Jun	
4.2 Draft ISPM: International movement of seeds	2009-003_Draft ISPM	
4.3 Review Draft Annex 2 Forest Tree Seeds	2009-003 (Annex 2)	
❖ Review of Supporting Papers		
- A guideline for the detection of selected plant viruses in forest tree seed	05_TPFQ_2016_Jun	
- Infectious diseases in forest trees caused by viruses	06_TPFQ_2016_Jun	
- Risk related to pest groups that affect forest seeds - micro fungi	08_TPFQ_2016_Jun	
- Seeds as vehicles for pathogen importation	12_TPFQ_2016_Jun	
- International regulatory aspects that affect seed trade	16_TPFQ_2016_Jun	
- OECD forest seed and plant scheme: Rules and Regulations	17_TPFQ_2016_Jun	
- Potential invasion of China by exotic insect pests associated with tree seed	18_TPFQ_2016_Jun	

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
- Definitions of seed borne versus seed transmitted pests	19_TPFQ_2016_Jun	
5. Revision of ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade): Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010) (Priority 2)		ZLOTINA
- Steward: Ms. Marina ZLOTINA (USA)		
5.1 Draft ISPM 15 Treatment Criteria	2006-010_Draft Annex	ORMSBY
❖ Specification 31	Link to Spec 31	
5.2 Background document on ISPM 15 Treatment Criteria	14_TPFQ_2016_Jun	ORMSBY
❖ ISPM 15	Link to ISPM 15	
❖ ISPM 15 (explanatory document)	Link to ISPM 15 (explanatory document)	
❖ ISPM 28	Link to ISPM 28	
❖ Review of Supporting Papers:		ORMSBY
- Predicting how alter propagule pressure changes establishment rates of biological invaders	07_TPFQ_2016_Jun	
- Seeking alternatives to Probit 9	09_TPFQ_2016_Jun	
- Treatments for timber and timber commodities	10_TPFQ_2016_Jun	
- What is the Allee effect?	11_TPFQ_2016_Jun	
- Alternative levels of efficacy for WPM	15_TPFQ_2016_Jun	
6. Other business		CHAIRPERSON
7. Follow-up Actions for next TPFQ Meetings		CHAIRPERSON
❖ TPFQ Work Plan 2016/2017	Link to TPFQ Work Plan 2016-2017	
❖ Points for consideration		
7.2 TPFQ Medium-Term Work Plan (next 5 years)	(To be developed at the meeting)	
8. Recommendations to the SC		CHAIRPERSON
9. Close of the meeting		CHAIRPERSON
❖ Date and venue of the next TPFQ meeting	Calendar on IPP	
❖ Evaluation of the meeting process		
❖ Close		

APPENDIX 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
Draft ISPMs and Annexes			
2009-003	4.2	Draft ISPM: International movement of seeds	2016-05-27
2009-003 (Annex 2)	4.3	Annex 2 – Forest Tree Seeds (Draft Rev2)	2016-05-27
2006-010	5.1	Draft Annex: Process for testing new treatments for ISPM 15 (2006-010)	2016-05-27
Other working papers			
01_TPFQ_2016_Jun	1.3	Agenda	2016-05-27
02_TPFQ_2016_Jun	2	Documents list	2016-05-27
03_TPFQ_2016_Jun	2	Participants list	2016-06-07
04_TPFQ_2016_Jun	2	Local Information	2016-05-27
05_TPFQ_2016_Jun	4	A guideline for the detection of selected plant viruses in forest tree seed	2016-05-27
06_TPFQ_2016_Jun	4	Infectious diseases in forest trees caused by viruses	2016-05-27
07_TPFQ_2016_Jun	5	Predicting how alter propagule pressure changes establishment rates of biological invaders	2016-05-27
08_TPFQ_2016_Jun	4	Risk related to pest groups that affect forest seeds - micro fungi	2016-05-27
09_TPFQ_2016_Jun	5	Seeking alternatives to Probit 9	2016-05-27
10_TPFQ_2016_Jun	5	Treatments for timber and timber commodities	2016-05-27
11_TPFQ_2016_Jun	5	What is the Allee effect?	2016-05-27
12_TPFQ_2016_Jun	4	Seeds as vehicles for pathogen importation	2016-05-27
13_TPFQ_2016_Jun	4.1	Background document on the draft ISPM for Forest Tree Seed	2016-05-27
14_TPFQ_2016_Jun	5.2	Background document on ISPM 15 Treatment Criteria	2016-05-28
15_TPFQ_2016_Jun	5	Alternative levels of efficacy	2016-05-28
16_TPFQ_2016_Jun	4	International regulatory aspects that affect seed trade	2016-05-30
17_TPFQ_2016_Jun	4	OECD forest seed and plant scheme: Rules and Regulations	2016-05-30
18_TPFQ_2016_Jun	4	Potential invasion of China by exotic insect pests associated with tree seed	2016-06-06
19_TPFQ_2016_Jun	4	Definitions of seed borne versus seed transmitted pests	2016-06-06

IPP LINKS:	Agenda item
Link to Specification TP4 (for TPFQ)	
Link to Specification 54 (for seed ISPM)	4
Link to ISTA	4
Link to Specification 31 (for ISPM 15 criteria)	5
Link to ISPM 15	5
Link to ISPM 15 (explanatory document)	5
Link to ISPM 28	5
Link to the IPP calendar	9

APPENDIX 3: Participants list

Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Steward	Ms Marina ZLOTINA IPPC Technical Director, USDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ), 4700 River Rd. Riverdale, MD 20737, USA Tel: (+1) 301-832-0611	Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov	-	-
Member	Mr John Tyrone JONES Trade Director and Export Specialist of Forestry Products, USDA, 4700 River Rd, Riverdale, MD 20737, USA Tel: (+1) 301-851-2344	John.T.Jones@aphis.usda.gov	2016 (SC May)	2021
Member	Mr Lucio MONTECCHIO Professor of Forest Pathology and Wood Alterations University of Padova viale dell'Università 16, 35020 Legnaro PD, ITALY Tel: (+39) 0039 049 8272883	montecchio@unipd.it	2016 (SC May)	2021
Member	Mr Krzysztof SUPRUNIUK Senior Specialist, Forest Reproductive Material Office, Biuro Nasiennictwa Leśnego, ul. Rakowiecka 30, 02-528 Warszawa, POLAND Tel: (+48) 606 759 907	krzysztof.supruniuk@bnl.gov.pl	2016 (SC May)	2021
Member	Mr Victor AGYEMAN Director, Forestry Research Institute of Ghana (FORIG) University Box 63, KNUST, Kumasi, GHANA Tel: (+233) 24 484 4171 or 516 0122	agyemanvictor@yahoo.com	2015 (SC Nov)	2020
Member as Chair of IFQRG	Mr Eric ALLEN Chair, International Forestry Quarantine Research Group, and Research Scientist Canadian Forest Service Natural Resources Canada Pacific Forestry Centre 506 West Burnside Road Victoria, BC V8Z 1M5, CANADA Tel: (+1) 250 298 2350	eric.allen@canada.ca	2015 (SC Nov)	2020

Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Member	Mr Thomas SCHRÖDER Scientist/project manager Julius Kuhn-Institut Federal Research Centre for Cultivated Plants Institute for Plant Health Messeweg 11/12 38104 – Braunschweig, GERMANY Tel: (+49) 531 299 3381	thomas.schroeder@bmel.bund.de	2015 (SC Nov)	2020
Member	Mr Mamoru MATSUI Section Manager Kobe Plant Protection Station (Osaka), (Domestic and Export), Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) 4-10-3, Chikko, Minato-ku, Osaka, 5520021, JAPAN Tel: (+81) 6 6571 0804	matsuim@pps.maff.go.jp	2015 (SC Nov)	2020
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Michael ORMSBY Senior Adviser, Science and Risk Assessment Ministry for Primary Industries P.O. Box 2526 Wellington, NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 4 894 0486	Michael.Ormsby@fao.org	-	-
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Brent LARSON Standards Officer SSU – IPPC Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, ITALY Tel: (+39) 06 5705 4915	brent.larson@fao.org	-	-
Canada NPPO Observer	Ms Nancy FURNESS Senior Specialist Forestry Section, CFIA. 4321 Still Creek Drive, Floor 4, Room 400 Burnaby, British Columbia V5C 6S7 Canada Tel: (+1) 604-292-5675	Nancy.Furness@inspection.gc.ca	-	-
Canada NPPO Observer	Mr Adnan UZUNOVIC Research Scientist, Mycologist 2665, East Mall, Vancouver, (BC), Canada, V6T 1W5 Tel: (+1) 604-222-5729	adnan.uzunovic@fpinnovations.ca	-	-

Not attending

Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Assistant Steward	Mr Lifeng WU Division Director National Agro-Tech Extension and Service Centre Ministry of Agriculture No.20 Mai Zi Dian Street Chaoyang District, Beijing 100125 CHINA Tel: (+86) 10 5919-4524	wulifeng@agri.gov.cn	-	-
Member	Mr Zong SHIXIANG Professor at Forestry College, Beijing Forestry University, P.R.C., Beijing, Hai-dian District, Tsing Hua East Road No.35, Mail Box 113, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA. Tel: (+233) 010-62336302	zongsx@126.com	2016 (SC May)	2021
Member	Mr Marcos Beéche CISTERNAS Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero Division de Protección Agrícola Subdepartamento de Vigilancia y Control de Plagas Forestales Av. Bulnes 140, Piso 3 Santiago, CHILE Tel: (+56) 2 345 1200	marcos.beeche@sag.gob.cl	2011 (SC Nov)	2016
Member	Mr Edson Tadeu IEDE EMBRAPA Centro Nacional de Pesquisa de Florestas Estrada da Ribeira Km 111 CEP: 83.411-000 Colombo, Paraná, BRAZIL Tel: (+55) 41 3675 5600 / 5727	edson.iede@embrapa.br	2011 (SC Nov)	2016
Member	Mr Sven Christer MAGNUSSON Research manager, Plant Health and Plant Protection Division Department of Entomology Bioforsk Plantehelse Fellesbygget, N-1432 Ås, NORWAY Tel: (+47) 952 05 304	christer.magnusson@bioforsk.no	2011 (SC Nov)	2016