



REPORT

Virtual Meeting
05 July 2016

Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments July, 2016



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

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
Election of rapporteur.....	4
2. Secretariat updates.....	4
TPPT meeting Tokyo-2016	4
Follow-up actions from the Standard Committee	5
3. TPPT work programme	5
4. Follow-up actions from previous TPPT meetings.....	6
4.1 <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> population research results – preliminary results	6
4.2 Estimated numbers of treated pests using both direct and modified (formula) calculation (and the document on “Instructions to assist NPPOs and RPPOs in proper and complete treatment submissions”).....	7
5. Other business	7
6. Close of the meeting.....	7
AGENDA (attachment 01).....	8

1. Opening of the meeting

[1] The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat (hereafter referred to “Secretariat”) lead for Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) chaired the meeting and welcomed the following participants:

1. Mr Glenn BOWMAN (Australia)
2. Mr Toshi DOHINO (Japan)
3. Mr Guy HALLMAN (FAO/IAEA)
4. Mr Scott MYERS (USA)
5. Mr Mike ORMSBY (New Zealand)
6. Mr Andrew PARKER (FAO/IAEA)
7. Mr Eduardo WILLINK (Argentina)
8. Mr Daojian YU (China)
9. Mr Brent LARSON (IPPC Senior Standards officer)
10. Ms Adriana G. MOREIRA (IPPC Secretariat lead)
11. Ms Eva MOLLER (IPPC Secretariat support)
12. Mr Martin FARREN (IPPC Secretariat support)
13. Ms Janka KISS (IPPC Secretariat support)

[2] The full list of TPPT members and their contact details can be found on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP)¹.

[3] The Secretariat reminded the participants of the use of the Adobe Connect tool.

[4] The Secretariat introduced the agenda and it was adopted as presented in Appendix 1 of this report.

Election of rapporteur

[5] Mr Eduardo WILLINK was elected as the rapporteur.

2. IPPC Secretariat Updates

Secretariat updates

[6] The IPPC Secretariat updated the TPPT about the development of a phytosanitary treatment searchable database based on the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures Tenth Session (CPM-10 (2015))² decision. The creation of the database was encouraged during the Standards Committee (SC) in May 2016.

[7] The Secretariat updated the TPPT on the progress of this database and the results of a recent survey conducted by the Secretariat with largely positive results. The survey was sent to TPPT and PMRG members. The panel were asked to consider providing expertise in extracting data from phytosanitary treatments that may be submitted by NPPOs and RPPOs and would be made available on the phytosanitary resources page of the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP)³. It was mentioned that this is still a work in progress. The TPPT congratulated the Secretariat for their efforts and welcomed the development of the searchable database.

TPPT meeting Tokyo-2016

[8] The Secretariat informed the TPPT of the upcoming face to face meeting in Tokyo, Japan (29 August – 02 September 2016). Members were reminded that all documents pertaining to the meeting such as discussion papers, draft ISPMs and draft PTs should be sent to the Secretariat no later than the 25 July.

¹ TPPT membership list: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81655/>

² <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/cpm/>

³ <https://www.ippc.int/en/>

Follow-up actions from the Standard Committee

- [9] The TPPT were also updated on follow-up actions from the SC in May 2016⁴. The TPPT were invited to discuss the term “process load” as the TPG requested clarification regarding the usefulness of having this term in the glossary as it is only used once in ISPM 18. The SC consequently asked the TPPT to investigate this issue further. Some members suggested the need for this term as it is extensively used in the area of irradiation processing and suggested that it could be used for heat treatments as well. Other members held a contra-view suggesting to using a more commonly understood term that does not require a definition in the glossary. The TPPT did not reach a decision but unanimously agreed to discuss this matter at the face to face meeting. The TPPT invited Mr Guy HALLMAN (FAO/IAEA) to prepare a discussion paper in relation to the term “process load” and its usage for the Tokyo meeting in September 2016.
- [10] The Secretariat also updated the panel on the draft revisions to ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) as well as annex 1 and 2 for the inclusion of the phytosanitary treatment Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material (2006-010A) and the revision of the dielectric heating section in Annex 1 of ISPM 15 (2006-010B) as requested by the Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7)⁵.
- [11] The Secretariat informed the panel that there was a new steward assigned to this draft ISPM and for the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ). It was informed that the SC-7 discussed two issues, raised in the consultation comments that had been pointed out by the former Steward as requiring further discussion: The efficacy of the sulfuryl fluoride (SF) treatment at different temperatures and different concentrations, and; the method to calculate the concentration-time (CT). The SC-7 had a lengthy discussion on the points and comments raised by the former steward, in particular the comments submitted during the consultation period requesting more information on the efficacy of the treatments and the proposed schedules.
- [12] Due to time constraints, discussion on the draft revisions to ISPM 15 (2006-010A) and (2006-010B), as requested by the SC-7, will be made at the next TPPT face to face meeting in September 2016.

3. TPPT work programme

- [13] The TPPT was informed on the status of the current thirteen draft PTs and five draft ISPMs under the TPPT work programme⁶.
- [14] The Secretariat reminded the treatment leads to review the nine draft PTs currently under pending status taking into account the formal objections in certain cases and the responses from contracting parties in relation to the preliminary results on the *Ceratitis capitata* population (see agenda item 4.1) and to be discussed at the next face to face meeting.
- [15] It was noted that new treatment leads should be assigned. The TPPT agreed to assign the following TPPT members as treatment leads and assistant leads for the following two draft phytosanitary treatments:
- Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus reticulata* x *C. sinensis* (2007-206B) Mr Eduardo WILLINK as treatment lead, and Mr Mike ORMSBY and assistant lead
 - Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus paradisi* (2007-210) Mr Daojian YU as treatment lead and Mr Scott MYERS as assistant lead.

⁴ SC May 2016 meeting report: https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2016/06/Report_SC_May_2016_XXVIII_2016-05-24.pdf

⁵ SC-7 May 2016 meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/standards-committee/> (not available yet)

⁶ 03_TPPT_2016_Jul

- [16] The Secretariat encouraged the stewards of the draft ISPMs to submit to the Secretariat if they are sufficiently developed, so they can be discussed in detail at the next face to face meeting, following in order of Priority.
- [17] The Secretariat also informed the TPPT the tentative date for next year's face to face meeting which is tentatively scheduled to take place in July 2017. This earlier date is to enable sufficient time to discuss and finalize any drafts for recommendation for adoption in the following year.

4. Follow-up actions from previous TPPT meetings

4.1 *Ceratitis capitata* population research results – preliminary results

- [18] Mr Guy HALLMAN presented the preliminary results on the *Ceratitis capitata* populations⁷ studies from his research conducted in the FAO/IAEA joint division. The results address the seven cold treatments, which have been on pending status, but not necessarily the vapour heat treatments. It was mentioned that the research was conducted to determine the most tolerant life stage of *Ceratitis capitata* and to compare the cold tolerance of different geographical populations of the species. The wild insects were acquired from Argentina, Western Australia and Spain. The populations were bred in laboratory conditions to multiply the quantity of insects sufficiently to conduct the experiment. All external conditions were the same for the different populations during this time.
- [19] It was highlighted that while other experiments provided artificial conditions for the laying of eggs of the medfly, in this experiment the conditions were kept as close as possible to the one occurring in natural conditions. The experiment objective was to establish the most cold-tolerant stage by applying the discriminating dose and observing the number of surviving insects after various days of exposure to cold treatment. Mr HALLMAN concluded that cold tolerance in three populations of *Ceratitis capitata* generally increased as the insect developed; thus, the third instar being the most tolerant life stage found in fruit. The three populations did not differ appreciably in cold tolerance.
- [20] It was mentioned by some TPPT members that there are some other research findings that may differ. However, it was acknowledged that most of the research found the third instar to be the most cold tolerant, but variations might occur from country to country due to differences in temperature usage as well as the environment setting.
- [21] It was also noted that this was not a complete analysis, and data from the final trials is still being gathered, so there may be slight differences in what is reported, and the final analysis, which will later be organized for publication. The TPPT had some concerns over whether or not these results (once published) could refute other studies.
- [22] One TPPT member suggested asking the Phytosanitary Measures Research Group (PMRG) to conduct similar research but the TPPT concluded that in terms of workload and budget, this would be quite difficult. It was reiterated that every laboratory would have slight variations, thus proving to be problematic in establishing a standard set of results.
- [23] It was concluded that most of the differences in studies and results may be caused by the different methodologies involved, like the artificial conditions in which the larvae were raised, rather than the difference in cold hardiness. It may not be possible to test all assumptions that could affect efficacy among the populations to a degree that removes all major concerns; meanwhile, regulatory decisions must be made in order to progress with the draft phytosanitary treatments on pending status.
- [24] The TPPT agreed to discuss these results further at their next face to face, analyzing in depth the comments from the consultation period and the formal objection.

⁷ 06_TPPT_2016_Jul

4.2 Estimated numbers of treated pests using both direct and modified (formula) calculation (and the document on “Instructions to assist NPPOs and RPPOs in proper and complete treatment submissions”)

[25] Due to time constraints, this agenda item was deferred to a future meeting.

5. Other business

[26] No other business was discussed.

6. Close of the meeting

[27] The Secretariat thanked all panel members for their participation in the meeting and reminded the TPPT about the posting deadline of documents for the meeting in Tokyo. The Secretariat closed the meeting.

2016 JULY VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL PANEL ON PHYTOSANITARY TREATMENTS (TPPT)

05 July 2016

Time 13:00-15:00 (GMT +1)

Adobe Connect

AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat and introductions 	02_TPPT_2016_Jul	MOREIRA / ALL
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption of the agenda and election of rapporteur 	01_TPPT_2016_Jul	
2. IPPC Secretariat Updates		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat updates • TPPT meeting Tokyo • Follow-up actions from the Standard Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussion on the term “process load” ▪ Draft revisions to ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) - Annex 1 and 2 for inclusion of the phytosanitary treatment Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material (2006-010A) and the revision of the dielectric heating section in Annex 1 of ISPM 15 (2006-010B) 	-	KISS
	05_TPPT_2016_Jul	MOREIRA
3. TPPT work programme		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports on individual draft Phytosanitary treatments and draft ISPMs status by treatment leads (status of drafts) 	03_TPPT_2016_Jul	MOREIRA / ALL
4. Follow-up actions from previous TPPT meetings		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.1 <i>Ceratitidis captitata</i> population research results – preliminary results 	06_TPPT_2016_Jul	HALLMAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.2 Estimated numbers of treated pests using both direct and modified (formula) calculation (and the document on “Instructions to assist NPPOs and RPPOs in proper and complete treatment submissions”) 	04_TPPT_2016_Jul	ORMSBY
5. Other business	-	MOREIRA
6. Close of the meeting	-	MOREIRA