



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



International  
Plant Protection  
Convention

# **REPORT**

## **Standards Committee Meeting**

**Virtual Meeting  
23 September 2020**

**IPPC Secretariat**

Required citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2020. *Report of the virtual meeting of the Standards Committee, 23 September 2020*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

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 or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2020



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original English edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

**Third-party materials.** Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

**Sales, rights and licensing.** FAO information products are available on the FAO website ([www.fao.org/publications](http://www.fao.org/publications)) and can be purchased through [publications-sales@fao.org](mailto:publications-sales@fao.org). Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: [www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request). Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).

## CONTENTS

|     |  |    |
|-----|--|----|
| 1.  | Opening of the Meeting .....   | 4  |
| 1.1 | Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat .....  | 4  |
| 2.  | Meeting Arrangements .....   | 4  |
| 2.1 | Election of the Rapporteur .....   | 4  |
| 2.2 | Adoption of the agenda .....   | 4  |
| 3.  | Administrative Matters .....   | 4  |
| 4.  | Updates .....  | 4  |
| 4.1 | CPM Bureau – July and September 2020 meetings .....                                  | 4  |
| 4.2 | IPPC Secretariat updates .....   | 5  |
| 4.3 | Update on recent developments regarding standard setting work.....                   | 6  |
| 5.  | SC Work Programme.....   | 7  |
| 5.1 | Outstanding issues from SC e-decisions .....   | 7  |
| 5.2 | Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ) .....                                    | 10 |
| 5.3 | Initial discussions on the SC approach to the 2020–2030 Strategic Framework .....    | 11 |
| 6.  | SC November 2020 .....   | 12 |
| 6.1 | Agenda and meeting arrangements .....  | 12 |
| 7.  | Any Other Business .....   | 12 |
| 8.  | Close of the Meeting.....  | 12 |
|     | Appendix 1: Agenda.....  | 13 |
|     | Appendix 2: Documents list .....   | 15 |
|     | Appendix 3: Participants list .....  | 16 |
|     | Appendix 4: Chart of regional workshop attendance .....                              | 21 |
|     | Appendix 5: Summary of Standards Committee e-decisions November 2019 – May 2020..... | 22 |

## 1. Opening of the Meeting

### 1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The SC Chairperson, Mr Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), opened the Standards Committee (SC) meeting, which was being held via video-conferencing, and welcomed all participants.

The IPPC Standard Setting Unit (SSU) lead, Mr Avetik Nersisyan, welcomed all participants. He explained that virtual working will be the normal mode of operation for some time to come, and thanked SC members for their involvement to date in e-decisions and e-discussions. The possibility of having a contingency plan for the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) session to be held virtually in 2021 is already being discussed, and he suggested that the SC may also need to consider contingency planning for virtual meetings in 2021. He then went on to give an update on recent changes in the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the Secretariat”), following the promotion of the IPPC Secretary, Mr Jingyuan XIA, to become Director of the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division. For the time being, Mr XIA remains as Officer-in-charge for overall IPPC issues, with the SSU lead as Officer-in-charge for day-to-day matters. The SSU lead explained, however, that the Secretariat is currently not visible in the new FAO structure agreed by FAO Council. The CPM Bureau and some contracting parties are therefore raising this through the appropriate channels within FAO, and the SSU lead expects that this will be taken to the next FAO Council meeting. The aim is to resolve the issue in such a way that gives the Secretariat a visible identity with a direct reporting line to the relevant FAO Deputy Director-General. The SSU lead reassured SC members that, in the meantime, the work of the Secretariat will continue as planned, including the various issues that the Secretariat need to work on together with the SC.

- [2] The SC Chairperson thanked the SSU lead for his update and commented that the issue raised would be good to discuss at the forthcoming Strategic Planning Group (SPG) meeting.

## 2. Meeting Arrangements

### 2.1 Election of the Rapporteur

- [3] The SC elected Mr Moses Adegboyega ADEWUMI (Nigeria) as Rapporteur.

### 2.2 Adoption of the agenda

- [4] The SC adopted the Agenda (Appendix 1).

## 3. Administrative Matters

- [5] The IPPC Secretariat introduced the Documents list (Appendix 2) and the Participants list (Appendix 3), and invited participants to notify the Secretariat of any information that required updating in the latter or was missing from it.

- [6] Immediately prior to the opening of the meeting, the Secretariat had briefly provided guidance on Zoom meetings.

## 4. Updates

### 4.1 CPM Bureau – July and September 2020 meetings

The SSU lead referred to the reports of the July and September Bureau meetings.<sup>1</sup>

- [7] During the July meeting, the Bureau had discussed the draft ISPM on *Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002) and had recommended that the SC proceed to recommend the adoption of the draft ISPM to the next CPM session. The Bureau has also discussed the SC’s proposals regarding reorganization of the standards on

---

<sup>1</sup> CPM Bureau meeting reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/bureau/>.

pest risk analysis (PRA) and recommended that the SC proceed with option 6, which would result in one overarching standard with an annex for each of the three stages of PRA. The Bureau added the topic “Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* accordingly. In other matters, the Bureau had agreed to extend the Sea Container Task Force until the end of 2021, and to establish a CPM focus group on Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems. The latter would meet virtually, possibly by the end of 2020, and the Secretariat would issue a call for experts for this group.

At the Bureau meeting in September, there had been intensive discussion about the positioning of the Secretariat within the new FAO structure. The agenda of the forthcoming Strategic Planning Group (SPG) meeting had also been reviewed, and a new Chairperson of the IPPC Finance Committee had been selected.

- [8] Finally, the SSU lead mentioned that an extraordinary meeting of the Bureau would be taking place on 24 September, mainly to discuss the IPPC Secretariat’s positioning within the FAO structure.

## 4.2 IPPC Secretariat updates

### *Implementation and Facilitation Unit and Integration and Support Unit*

- [9] The Secretariat introduced the paper giving updates from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU) and the Integration and Support Team,<sup>2</sup> and explained that members from both units were present at this meeting, so would be able to answer any questions from the SC.
- [10] Mr Dominique PELLETIER (Canada), representing the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC), highlighted three areas where the IC would welcome input from the SC:
- It would be helpful to have someone from the SC participate in the project to develop a guide on ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*), and likewise for the e-learning materials on pest risk analysis and export certification, and for the e-commerce project.
  - The IC would like the SC to formalize the selection of their representative on the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) subgroup. This had been Mr Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom), but owing to other commitments Mr BISHOP was no longer able to continue in this role. In the meantime, Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE, the SC representative on the IC, had stepped in to the breach at the last meeting, which had been held during the IC meeting.
  - Comments would be welcome on the new Phytosanitary Systems web pages on the IPP (on pest eradication, NPPO establishment and operation, phytosanitary export certification, and systems approaches).<sup>3</sup>

The SC Chairperson commented that there may not be sufficient time to discuss SC participation in each of the IC groups during this meeting, but invited comments from the SC. The IFU lead highlighted that clarity is needed sooner rather than later on the SC representative to the IRSS subgroup. He also suggested that perhaps the Steward of the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ) could follow the work of the expert group developing a guide on ISPM 15; this which would not necessarily entail attending all meetings, but just following the work and occasionally being invited to a meeting. Ms Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America), the TPFQ Steward, agreed to this suggestion.

- [11] There being no further comments from the SC, the SC Chairperson proposed that the matter be deferred and that the SC discuss it and get back to the IFU lead with a proposal.

<sup>2</sup> 04\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Sep.

<sup>3</sup> Phytosanitary System landing page: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/capacity-development/phytosanitary-system/>.

## [12] The SC:

- (1) *noted* the updates from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit and the Integration and Support Unit
- (2) *agreed* that Ms Marina ZLOTINA as the SC representative to participate in the development of the implementation guide on ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*)
- (3) *deferred* consideration of SC participation in other IC projects, including selection of the SC representative on the Implementation Review and Support System subgroup.

#### 4.3 Update on recent developments regarding standard setting work

[13] The Secretariat referred to the updated chart of SSU staff, available on the IPP,<sup>4</sup> and provided an update on recent standard setting work:<sup>5</sup>

- Staff from the SSU, as well as SC members, had supported the 2020 IPPC regional workshops, with the lead being taken by IFU. Several e-decisions had been taken, with two still ongoing – the selection of a botanist for the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) and the reorganization of PRA standards. There are also two upcoming e-decisions: one on Technical Panel for Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) membership and the other to approve the draft phytosanitary treatment (PT) Irradiation treatment for *Zeugodacus tau* (2017-025) for second consultation.
- The TPDP met virtually on 10 September 2020 and asked the Secretariat to open a call for authors for diagnostic protocol (DP) subjects being added to the work programme. The TPDP also agreed to ask the SC to change the status of the revision of DP 5 (*Phyllosticta citricarpa* (McAlpine) Aa) (2019-011) from “pending” status to “under development”.
- The Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) met virtually on 2 July and had discussed how to progress the revision of ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*). The panel had also discussed how to move forward with PTs that are currently in the work programme.
- The work programme for the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) had been agreed by the SC via e-decision, and the TPG are considering holding a virtual meeting in December to review this.
- Regarding the *Strategic framework for the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) 2020–2030* (hereafter referred to as the “IPPC Strategic Framework”), the SSU is preparing concept notes or discussion papers for the SPG on the three development agenda items assigned to the unit: commodity standards, use of third-party entities, and diagnostic laboratory networking.
- The date for the webinar on authorization of entities is now confirmed as 20 October, with the title as *Enhancing the understanding of the concept of authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions* from 12.00-14.00 CEST time. A tentative agenda has been prepared.<sup>5</sup> The NPPO from Ukraine, which has expressed concerns about the draft standard on authorization, has confirmed that it will be making a presentation at the webinar on the implications of authorization. Interpretation to Russian will be available at the webinar.
- Further to a request from the SPG last year, the Secretariat has conducted a preliminary review of the potential for combining the *Framework for standards and implementation* with the *List of topics for IPC standards* and the list of topics for implementation and capacity development resources, to avoid duplication. The outcome of this preliminary review is, firstly, that the current *List of topics for IPC standards* is a clear representation of the standard setting work programme, so one option could be to expand this to include IC topics and rename it as the “List of topics for standards and implementation”. Secondly, the new layout of the *Framework for standards and*

<sup>4</sup> Standard Setting Unit staff (2020-04-10): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/2463/>.

<sup>5</sup> 05\_SC\_Tel\_Sep.

*implementation* serves its purpose well, so to merge it with the list of topics could cause unnecessary confusion.

- [14] The SC Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for the update and invited the SC to comment. One SC member suggested that, in the webinar on authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions, it would be better to increase the time for presentations from five to ten minutes, to allow sufficient time for adequate information to be presented given the problems that have been associated with the development of this draft standard. Another SC member asked whether there was a limit to the number of participants. The Secretariat noted the suggestion about duration of presentations and said that the time allocations have not yet been finalized as the speakers are still being confirmed. The Secretariat also confirmed that the webinar platform can accommodate 1 000 or 3 000 people.
- [15] The SC noted a correction to the SC paper for this agenda item, in that Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) attended the IPPC Regional Workshop for the Pacific and had presented a paper. An updated chart with the dates, SC and IC members and IPPC Secretariat that attended each regional workshop is available in Appendix 4 of this report.
- [16] The SC:
- (4) *noted* the Standard Setting Unit update
  - (5) *changed* the status of Revision of DP 5 (*Phyllosticta citricarpa* (McAlpine) Aa) (2019-011) from “pending” to “under development” on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.<sup>6</sup>

## 5. SC Work Programme

### 5.1 Outstanding issues from SC e-decisions

- [17] The Secretariat introduced the paper on outstanding decisions from SC e-decisions.<sup>7</sup>

#### *Phytosanitary treatment (PT) objection*

- [18] The Secretariat summarized the situation regarding the objection by China in 2017 to the adoption of the draft PT Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating (2007-114).<sup>8</sup> The TPPT had reviewed the technical information related to the objection and had concluded that the problem is most likely one of implementation as the measurements taken during the trials cannot exclude the possibility of treatment failure (cold spots), but that if the treatment schedule is met it is effective in killing the target pests. The TPPT had therefore asked the SC to consider whether to propose the draft PT for adoption or remove it from the work programme. The matter had been put to the SC via e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_02), but this had not resulted in a conclusion.
- [19] The Secretariat highlighted that the treatment in this draft PT is very similar to that already adopted and approved under ISPM 15 for wood packaging material, where wood may be treated in bulk by dielectric heating before it is processed into wood packaging material.
- [20] The TPPT Steward, Mr David OPATOWSKI (Israel), commented that the problem is likely due to the new or relatively new treatment technology and lack of experience with its application, and that it might be necessary in this case to issue some kind of guidance document when the PT is adopted.
- [21] This was supported by another SC member, who also asked who would develop such guidance, as although the TPPT or the International Forestry Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG) might be able to help, it was not within their remit to develop such implementation material. The SC member referred to work being done by industry in the United States of America and Canada on developing the special

<sup>6</sup> *List of topics for IPPC standards*: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards/list>.

<sup>7</sup> 06\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Sep.

<sup>8</sup> Objections presented to the CPM-12 (2017): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/84146/>.



equipment and procedures that could ensure the correct application of the treatment, and asked whether the PT should be put on hold while the guidance is being developed.

- [22] The IFU lead commented that development of implementation material on ISPM 15 is already on the work programme and there has been a call for experts. Some experts have been nominated and a few of these are from IFQRG. He reminded SC members that the IC had invited the SC to assign an SC member to help with development of this material on ISPM 15. He also highlighted, however, that a major problem with developing the guidance is that it has not yet been confirmed that a facility for dielectric heat treatment actually exists.
- [23] The SC Chairperson drew the SC's attention to the two options presented in the SC paper: to withdraw the topic until the issue is resolved, or to submit the draft PT for adoption, taking into account the issues of implementation. He asked the SC whether the draft PT should be put on hold with "pending" status.
- [24] One SC member commented that putting the draft PT on pending status could appear to be contradictory, given that a very similar treatment is already in ISPM 15. The SC member suggested that objective evidence should be sought of problems in the operational implementation of this treatment.
- [25] The IFU lead responded that ISPM 15 is for wood packaging material and this draft PT is for wood in general, so the two standards are for different materials. He reiterated, however, that the IC and IFU have not yet been able to find a facility that has actually used this treatment in an operational setting.
- [26] The Secretariat suggested that perhaps the SC could invite the Phytosanitary Measures Research Group (PMRG) and IFQRG to do a search on the use of these treatments for wood and for wood packaging material – how and by which countries – and to report back to the SC. This was supported by several SC members. One SC member suggested that an online survey tool such as Survey Monkey could perhaps be used to help gather this information and the Secretariat responded that it would pass this idea to the PMRG and IFQRG.
- [27] Another SC member supported the suggestion that the draft PT be put on hold, to allow for work that is currently underway by industry in Canada and the United States of America on equipment and implementation material to be further developed.
- [28] The TPPT Steward suggested that instead of putting the draft PT on hold, it could be adopted but with a caveat issued regarding implementation issues. This was supported by another SC member, as it would avoid sending a confusing message of a treatment being already accepted in one ISPM but put on hold in another. Another SC member commented that while withdrawing the draft PT could send a confusing message, confusion might not arise if the draft PT were to be put on hold and a notice issued saying that development was pending research on implementation under commercial conditions. This was supported by a further SC member.
- [29] In light of the discussion, the SC Chairperson asked the SC whether the draft PT should be put on hold while more information on this issue is sought from the IFQRG and PMRG. He clarified that in this context, "on hold" would mean the TPPT temporarily stopping working on the topic, rather than the topic be changed to "pending" status on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. The SC agreed to this proposal.
- [30] The Secretariat commented that although the TPPT has information about the treatment and has a panel member from IFQRG, it would be more appropriate for the IC to coordinate the development of guidance material, and that IFQRG and PMRG are not official IPPC bodies. The SC Chairperson responded that it was a question of sharing the SC's concerns with these groups rather than guiding them. The Secretariat thus suggested that the SC proffer the invitation but ask the TPPT to do the liaison with the groups.

#### ***Minimum number of consultation periods for PTs***

- [31] The Secretariat explained that the SC had reviewed via e-decision the TPPT's proposal to streamline its processes (2020\_eSC\_Nov\_03), but had not been able to reach a conclusion regarding the mandatory



minimum number of consultations for PTs. The SC Chairperson expanded on this, by saying that it was his understanding from the e-forum that there was general agreement that it could be a good idea to have just one consultation when there are not substantial concerns or main comments about the content of the treatment, but that when there are substantial concerns about the content of a PT a second consultation would be needed.

- [32] The TPPT Steward supported the view that a second round of consultation should only be an option when substantial comments are submitted in the first consultation. This would help to streamline the process, especially with an increasing number of treatments being considered. However, it would need to be made clear to contracting parties that if they did have comments, they would need to submit them in the first consultation, rather than waiting until the second round.
- [33] This view was supported by several other SC members, one of whom also pointed out that although the absence of a second consultation might mean that there are more objections at CPM, it might still be a more efficient way of developing treatments. The SC Chairperson commented that the decision on whether to have a second round of consultation would need to be made on a case-by-case basis.
- [34] At this point, the Secretariat clarified some points of procedure. Firstly, in terms of individual draft PTs, the first consultation comments are reviewed by the treatment lead and then by the TPPT, after which the responses to the comments are presented to the SC, so that is the point at which the SC could decide whether a second consultation is necessary. Secondly, in terms of the procedure as a whole, even if the SC agrees to this streamlining, it could not be implemented until the Standard Setting Procedure is next revised, as PTs are considered to be ISPMs and in the Standard Setting Procedure there are two rounds of consultation for ISPMs.
- [35] One SC member commented that the problem is determining what is classed as a substantial concern. Some contracting parties submit all comments under “substantial”, and even though there is guidance regarding the difference between “technical” comments and “substantial” comments, not all submitters adhere to this. The SC member suggested that perhaps criteria could be developed for what classes as “substantial”, but that in the meantime there could perhaps still be two consultations, but both within the same year (or the second one happening as soon as the draft is ready following the first consultation).
- [36] Another SC member confirmed that it is indeed the case that not all submitters apply the categorization of “editorial”, “technical” and “substantial” in the same way, but commented that the SC can decide whether comments are substantial or not, regardless of what categories the submitters have assigned to their comments.
- [37] The SC Chairperson proposed that, because there was insufficient time to resolve the issue during this meeting, the SC note the points made and defer any decision until a future meeting of the SC. The SC agreed.
- [38] The Secretariat added that proposals to revise the Standard Setting Procedure have already been muted in the context of commodity standards, and so it would be a good idea that the points made at this meeting are also considered alongside those related to commodity standards, to avoid the issue repeatedly being brought back to the SC.

### ***Review of TPDP work programme***

- [39] The Secretariat introduced the one outstanding issue from the SC e-decision reviewing the TPDP work programme (2020\_eSC\_Nov\_05). This concerned how the TPDP should engage in activities related to diagnostic laboratory networking, which is one of the IPPC Strategic Framework development agenda items that has been assigned to the SSU. However, as this is matter is closely associated with agenda item 5.3, the SC decided to consider it under the latter agenda item.

### ***Pest risk analysis reorganization***

- [40] The Secretariat explained that the e-decision on the reorganization of PRA standards (2020\_eSC\_Nov\_09) was still ongoing and it is proposed that it be kept open until the November SC

meeting. In the proposed work plan agreed by SC during the e-decision, the Steward should be selected at this SC meeting (23 September), following which the Steward would draft the specification. During the e-decision, it was suggested there should be more than one Assistant Steward and a wider involvement of SC members, and Mr Masahiro SAI (Japan) had volunteered to be a Steward or Assistant Steward. The Secretariat therefore invited comments not only on the selection of a Steward, but also on the content of the specification.

[41] The SC discussed the selection of Steward and Assistant Stewards. One SC member suggested Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ (Costa Rica) as an Assistant Steward, and Ms Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) volunteered to be an Assistant Steward too. Mr Masahiro SAI (Japan) confirmed that he would be happy to work as either a Steward or an Assistant Steward.

[42] The Secretariat highlighted that comments on the content of the specification would be welcome in the e-forum or directly to the Steward and Assistant Stewards. The SC Chairperson reiterated this and added that comments on the composition of the drafting group would also be welcome in the e-forum.

[43] The SC:

- (6) *agreed* to invite the International Forestry Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG) and Phytosanitary Measures Research Group (PMRG) to search for information on the operational use of dielectric heat treatment for wood and for wood packaging material, including how it is used and by which countries
- (7) *invited* the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) to liaise with IFQRG and PMRG regarding the above invitation to search for information, and to report back to the SC
- (8) *advised* the TPPT to do no more work on the draft PT Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating (2007-114) while the information from IFQRG and PMRG is being sought
- (9) *noted* the points made at this meeting regarding the minimum number of consultations for draft PTs, and *deferred* further consideration until a future SC meeting (*noting* that any changes to the Standard Setting Procedure should be considered alongside those proposed for development of commodity standards)
- (10) *selected* Mr Masahiro SAI (Japan) as Steward and Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ (Costa Rica) and Ms Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) as Assistant Stewards for the reorganization of pest risk analysis standards.

## 5.2 Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ)

[44] The Steward for the TPFQ, Ms Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America), presented an update on the TPFQ:<sup>9</sup>

- There had been several changes in the membership of this panel, with two members also coming to the end of their terms in November 2020 and three more in November 2021. A decision was therefore needed on whether to extend the membership of those members whose terms end in 2020, but this would depend on whether the SC decided to suspend the panel or to put its work on hold.
- No draft standards are under development at the moment; the SC had decided to keep the panel open for topics added as a result of the call for topics in 2018, but the only topic assigned to the panel is still 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), which has been on hold pending scientific information for a number of years. As there has been no work for the panel, it has not met since 2017. Members of the panel could, however, have a role in commenting on the draft ISPM on *International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood* (2008-008) and the draft annex to ISPM 39 (*International movement*

---

<sup>9</sup> 07\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Sep.

*of wood*) on “Use of systems approaches in managing pest risks associated with the movement of wood” (2015-004).

- Meetings of IFQRG had been held in October 2018 and October 2019, with a virtual meeting to be held in the week after this SC meeting. The role of the TPFQ to maintain the relationship with IFQRG was acknowledged and the SC recognized the importance to maintain this link.
- Although there is no direct work for the panel, members of the panel may be able to participate in expert working groups and there are also some implementation projects, for instance on interceptions related to ISPM 15 and other implementation materials related to wood, where members of the panel may be able to assist because of their expertise.
- The Steward concluded by clarifying that the SC needed to decide whether to disestablish the panel or to assign new tasks to the panel. If new tasks were assigned, and particularly if these were to relate to implementation, the terms of reference for the panel (the specification) would need revising, so this would also need to be considered. If the SC decided to keep the panel as it is, the membership of the two members whose terms expire this year would need extending.

[45] It was discussed that the panel was kept going to see if there were new topics related to forestry or wood products even though the panel has not been active since 2017. Given that there will soon be a new commodity standards panel, which would include standards on wood, one SC member suggested that it might be a good idea to disestablish the TPFQ now, and established expert groups as and when needed for individual topics. This suggestion received support from several other SC members.

[46] The SC:

- (11) *noted* the changes to the membership of the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ)
- (12) *agreed* to recommend to disestablish the TPFQ to the CPM
- (13) *thanked* the members and stewards of the TPFQ for their dedicated work over the years.

### 5.3 Initial discussions on the SC approach to the 2020–2030 Strategic Framework

[47] The SC Chairperson pointed out that this agenda item also related to item 5.1 on the review of the TPDP work programme and the panel’s involvement in the development of diagnostic laboratory network as included in the IPPC Strategic Framework.

[48] The SC Chairperson introduced the agenda item by reiterating what he said during the e-forum related to the TPDP work programme, where he had explained that the SC approach to the IPPC Strategic Framework extends beyond standard setting and that the discussion should therefore involve other IPPC bodies such as the IC and CPM. It is not just a question of adding implementation tasks to the terms of reference (i.e. the specification) for the various groups – overall agreement is needed.

[49] The SSU lead emphasized the importance of the IPPC Strategic Framework and how important it is, from a strategic point of view, for the SC and SSU to plan their actions. The SC, at both SC and technical panel level, and the SSU need to start discussions and decide in what way they are going to support implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework. He highlighted that integration is needed between different units and different committees.

[50] The Secretariat lead on the TPDP referred to the discussions held by the TPDP at their meeting in Melbourne in 2019,<sup>10</sup> where they had generated many ideas from a brainstorming session. The TPDP, while recognizing that it would need SC approval to expand its scope, was never-the-less keen to contribute to the development agenda items. On the question of integration, she commented on the value of inviting experts who are developing a standard to also participate in the development of corresponding implementation guides, but emphasized that this needed to be from an early stage in the process. She suggested that perhaps, when the TPDP felt they could contribute to a particular work item but it was

<sup>10</sup> TPDP meeting reports: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-diagnostic-protocols/>.

outside their remit, the TPDP could make a recommendation to the SC, and the SC could decide on a case-by-case basis whether to refer to the IC for consideration.

- [51] One SC member suggested that SC members be invited to bring ideas and proposals (e.g. short papers, lists of bullet points) about possible approaches to the IPPC Strategic Framework to the SC meeting in November. The SC Chairperson welcomed this proposal. The Secretariat responded that they were planning to present some short papers to the SPG meeting prior to the November SC meeting, but will welcome the thoughts from the SC.

## **6. SC November 2020**

### **6.1 Agenda and meeting arrangements**

- [52] The SC Chairperson referred to the SC paper on the arrangements for the November SC meeting.<sup>11</sup> He suggested that, as there was only limited time left to discuss the matter at this meeting, comments on the proposed agenda could perhaps be submitted by email, but that a decision did need to be taken on whether the SC meeting would follow option 1 (three hours per day with a short break) or option 2 (two hours per day).
- [53] The SC discussed the merits and otherwise of the two options, and decided that option 2 was preferable given that the start time for the meetings was very late in certain time zones.
- [54] The Secretariat commented that draft ISPMs would not be considered during the November meeting, although there would be draft specifications to approve. There would be virtual discussions beforehand, to maximize the time available for discussion during the virtual meeting itself.
- [55] One SC member asked whether observers would be allowed to join the November meeting. The SC Chairperson responded that he could not see any problem with this, and the Secretariat confirmed that the procedure would be as usual in terms of sending invitation letters and so forth.
- [56] The SC:
- (14) *agreed* that the SC meeting in November would be held over four days, with two hours per day (as per option 2 in SC paper 08\_SC\_2020\_Nov)

## **7. Any Other Business**

- [57] There was no other business.

## **8. Close of the Meeting**

- [58] The SC Chairperson thanked all participants for their valuable contributions and closed the meeting. The SSU lead thanked the SC Chairperson for chairing the meeting and keeping to time, which is particularly important for virtual meetings, and thanked everyone for their contributions.

---

<sup>11</sup> 08\_SC\_2020\_Nov.

## Appendix 1: Agenda

| AGENDA ITEM |  | DOCUMENT NO.   | PRESENTER/ Secretariat support |
|-------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
| <b>1.</b>   | <b>Opening of the Meeting</b>  |  |                                |
| 1.1         | Welcome by the Standards Committee (SC) Chair  | -  | FERRO                          |
| 1.2         | Welcome by the Standard Setting Unit (SSU) Lead  | -  | NERSISYAN                      |
| <b>2.</b>   | <b>Meeting Arrangements</b>  |  |                                |
| 2.1         | Election of the Rapporteur   | -  | FERRO                          |
| 2.2         | Adoption of the Agenda   | 01_SC_Tel_2020_Sep                                       | FERRO                          |
| <b>3.</b>   | <b>Administrative Matters</b>  |  |                                |
| 3.1         | Documents list   | 02_SC_Tel_2020_Sep                                       | CASSIN                         |
| 3.2         | Participants list  | 03_SC_Tel_2020_Sep<br><a href="#">SC membership list</a> |                                |
| 3.3         | Connections to Zoom and virtual meetings   | <a href="#">Short guideline for participants</a>         |                                |
| <b>4.</b>   | <b>Updates</b>   |  |                                |
| 4.1         | CPM Bureau: July 2020 meeting  | <a href="#">Link to Bureau meeting reports</a>           | NERSISYAN                      |
| 4.2         | IPPC Secretariat updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implementation and Facilitation unit</li> <li>- Integration and Support unit</li> </ul>  | 04_SC_Tel_2020_Sep                                       | CASSIN                         |
| 4.3         | Update on recent developments regarding the standard setting work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPDP virtual meeting on 10 Sep</li> <li>- Webinar on Authorization of Entities</li> <li>- Framework for Standards and Implementation</li> </ul>        | 05_SC_Tel_2020_Sep                                       | NERSISYAN                      |
| <b>5.</b>   | <b>SC Work Programme</b>   |  |                                |
| 5.1         | Outstanding issues from SC eDecisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Phytosanitary Treatment (PT) objection</li> <li>- Minimum number of consultation periods for PTs</li> <li>- Review of TPDP work programme</li> <li>- PRA reorganization</li> </ul> | 06_SC_Tel_2020_Sep                                       | KISS                           |
| 5.2         | Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Work programme</li> </ul>   | 07_SC_Tel_2020_Sep                                       | ZLOTINA                        |
| 5.3         | Initial discussions on the SC approach to the 2020-2030 Strategic Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Role of technical panels on implementation and their potential involvement with the IC</li> </ul>   | -  | FERRO / ALL                    |
| <b>6.</b>   | <b>SC November 2020</b>  |  |                                |

| AGENDA ITEM |                                 | DOCUMENT NO.       | PRESENTER/<br>Secretariat support |
|-------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 6.1         | Agenda and meeting arrangements | 08_SC_Tel_2020_Sep | FERRO / NERSISYAN                 |
| 7.          | <b>Any Other Business</b>       | -                  | FERRO                             |
| 8.          | <b>Close of the Meeting</b>     | -                  | FERRO                             |

**Appendix 2: Documents list**

| DOCUMENT NO.       | AGENDA ITEM | DOCUMENT TITLE  | POSTED                                 |
|--------------------|-------------|---|--|
| 01_SC_Tel_2020_Sep | 2.2         | Agenda  | 2020-08-17<br>2020-09-11<br>2020-09-16 |
| 02_SC_Tel_2020_Sep | 3.1         | Documents list  | 2020-09-11<br>2020-09-16               |
| 03_SC_Tel_2020_Sep | 3.2         | Participants list   | 2020-09-11<br>2020-09-16               |
| 04_SC_Tel_2020_Sep | 4.2         | IPPC Secretariat updates  | 2020-09-11<br>2020-09-16               |
| 05_SC_Tel_2020_Sep | 4.3         | Update on recent developments regarding the standard setting work | 2020-09-11<br>2020-09-16               |
| 06_SC_Tel_2020_Sep | 5.1         | Outstanding issues from SC eDecisions                             | 2020-09-11<br>2020-09-16               |
| 07_SC_Tel_2020_Sep | 5.2         | Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ) work programme        | 2020-09-11<br>2020-09-16               |
| 08_SC_Tel_2020_Sep | 6.1         | Agenda and meeting arrangements                                   | 2020-09-16                             |



**Appendix 3: Participants list**

| Region / Role       | Name, mailing address, telephone   | Email address  | Membership Confirmed                                    | Term expires |
|---------------------|--|--|---|--------------|
| Africa Member       | <b>Ms Alphonsine LOUHOARI TOKOZABA</b><br>Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage,<br>24, rue KiéléTenard,<br>Mfilou,<br>Brazzaville,<br><b>REPUBLIC OF CONGO</b><br>Tel: +242 01 046 53 61<br>Tel: +242 04 005 57 05   | <a href="mailto:louhouari@yahoo.fr">louhouari@yahoo.fr</a> ;<br><a href="mailto:A.louhouaritoko@gmail.com">A.louhouaritoko@gmail.com</a> | CPM-13<br>(2018)<br>1st term / 3 years                  | 2021         |
| Africa Member       | <b>Mr David KAMANGIRA</b><br>Senior Deputy Director and IPPC Focal Point<br>Department of Agricultural Research Services<br>Headquarters,<br>P.O. Box 30779,<br>Lilongwe 3<br><b>MALAWI</b><br>Tel: +265 888 342 712<br>Tel: +265 999 122 199  | <a href="mailto:davidkamangira1@gmail.com">davidkamangira1@gmail.com</a>   | CPM-11<br>(2016)<br>CPM-12<br>(2017) 2nd term / 3 years | 2022         |
| Africa Member       | <b>Mr Moses Adegboyega ADEWUMI</b><br>Head of Inspection<br>Southwest Zone<br>Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service<br>FAAN HQT Complex,<br>Ikeja, Lagos,<br>Lagos State<br><b>NIGERIA</b><br>Tel: +234 -8033913847 / 8059607047   | <a href="mailto:adegboyegamoses37@yahoo.com">adegboyegamoses37@yahoo.com</a>   | CPM-13<br>(2018)<br>1st term / 3 years                  | 2021         |
| Asia Member         | <b>Ms Chonticha RAKKRAI</b><br>Director,<br>Plant Quarantine Research Group,<br>Plant Protection Research and Development Office,<br>Department of Agriculture,<br>50 Phaholyothin Rd.,<br>Ladysao, Chatuchak,<br>Bangkok, 10900<br><b>THAILAND</b><br>Tel : (+66) 2561 2537<br>Fax : (+66) 2561 2146<br>Mobile: (+66) 8 9128 6488 | <a href="mailto:rakkrai@yahoo.com">rakkrai@yahoo.com</a> ;<br><a href="mailto:chonticha.r@doa.in.th">chonticha.r@doa.in.th</a>           | CPM-14<br>(2019) 1st term/3 years                       | 2022         |
| Asia Member<br>SC-7 | <b>Mr Masahiro SAI</b><br>Senior Researcher (Head of Section)<br>Risk Analysis Division<br>Yokohama Plant Protection Station<br>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF)<br><b>JAPAN</b><br>Tel: +81-45-211-0375   | <a href="mailto:saim@pps.maff.go.jp">saim@pps.maff.go.jp</a>   | CPM-13<br>(2018)<br>1st term / 3 years                  | 2021         |

| Region / Role  | Name, mailing address, telephone  | Email address  | Membership Confirmed  | Term expires |
|--|---|--|---|--------------|
| Europe Member  | <b>Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI</b><br>Plant Health Expert<br>Plant Protection Service<br>ERSAF - REGIONE LOMBARDIA<br>Via Pola, 12. 20124 Milano<br><b>ITALY</b><br>Tel : (+39) 3666603272  | <a href="mailto:Mariangela.Ciampitti@ersaf.lombardia.it">Mariangela.Ciampitti@ersaf.lombardia.it</a> | CPM-14 (2019)<br>1st term / 3 years                                 | 2022         |
| Europe Member<br>SC-7                                | <b>Mr Samuel BISHOP</b><br>Plant Health Policy team<br>Room 11G35<br>Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs<br>National Agri-Food Innovation Campus<br>Sand Hutton<br>York<br>North Yorkshire<br><b>UNITED KINGDOM</b><br>YO41 4LZ<br>Tel: +44 (0) 2080262506<br>Mob.: +44 (0) 7827976902 | <a href="mailto:sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk">sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk</a>                         | CPM-13 (2018)   | 2021         |
| Europe Member  | <b>Mr David OPATOWSKI</b><br>1-3 avenue de la Paix<br>1202 Geneva,<br>Switzerland<br><b>ISRAEL</b><br>Tel: (+41) 79945 7344   | <a href="mailto:dopatowski@yahoo.com">dopatowski@yahoo.com</a> ;                                     | CPM-1 (2006)<br>CPM-4 (2009)<br>CPM-12 (2017)<br>3rd term / 3 years | 2020         |
| Latin America and Caribbean Member                   | <b>Mr André Felipe C. P. da SILVA</b><br>Federal Inspector<br>Quarantine Division<br>Ministry of Agriculture, Live Stock and Food Supply<br><b>BRAZIL</b><br>Tel: (61) 3218-2925  | <a href="mailto:andre.peralta@agricultura.gov.br">andre.peralta@agricultura.gov.br</a>               | CPM-14 (2019)<br>1st term / 3 years                                 | 2022         |
| Latin America and Caribbean Member<br>SC-7           | <b>Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ</b><br>Pest RiskAnalyst<br>Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado<br>300 Sur de Teletica, Sabana Sur, San José,<br><b>COSTA RICA</b><br>Tel: +(506) 8660-8383   | <a href="mailto:hmorera@sfe.go.cr">hmorera@sfe.go.cr</a>   | CPM-13 (2018)<br>1st term / 3 years                                 | 2021         |
| Latin America and Caribbean Member<br>SC Chairperson | <b>Mr Ezequiel FERRO</b><br>Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA<br>Av.Paeso Colón 315<br>C.A. de Buenos Aires<br><b>ARGENTINA</b><br>Tel/Fax: (+5411) 4121-5091   | <a href="mailto:eferro@senasa.gov.ar">eferro@senasa.gov.ar</a>                                       | CPM-14 (2019) 3rd term / 3 years                                    | 2022         |

| Region / Role                      | Name, mailing address, telephone   | Email address  | Membership Confirmed  | Term expires |
|------------------------------------|--|--|---|--------------|
| Latin America and Caribbean Member | <b>Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE</b><br>Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero<br>División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal<br>Av. Presidente Bulnes 140, 4 <sup>th</sup> floor, Santiago,<br><b>CHILE</b><br>Tel: + 56-2 234 5120                      | <a href="mailto:alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl">alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl</a>   | CPM-10 (2015)<br>CPM-13 (2018)<br>2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years  | 2021         |
| Near East Member<br><br>SC-7       | <b>Mr Nader ELBADRY</b><br>Phytosanitary Specialist,<br>Central Administration of Plant Quarantine,<br>6 Michel Bakhoum St.,<br>Dokki, Giza,<br><b>EGYPT</b><br>Tel : +201096799493  | <a href="mailto:nader.badry@gmail.com">nader.badry@gmail.com</a><br><a href="mailto:naderelbadry@hotmail.com">naderelbadry@hotmail.com</a> | <b>Replacement member for Mr Abdulqader Khudhair ABBAS</b><br><br>CPM-13 (2018)<br>1st term / 3 years                     | 2021         |
| Near East Member                   | <b>Mr Abdelmoneem Ismaeel ADRA ABDETAM</b><br>Manger of plant Quarantine and plant protection<br>Directorate, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry,<br>Khartum<br><b>SUDAN</b><br>Tel: +24991238939 / +249 912138939                       | <a href="mailto:ppdsudan@hotmail.com">ppdsudan@hotmail.com</a>   | CPM-13 (2018)<br>1st term / 3 years   | 2021         |
| North America Member<br><br>SC-7   | <b>Ms Marina ZLOTINA</b><br>IPPC Technical Director<br>USDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ)<br>4700 River Rd,<br>5c-03.37 Riverdale,<br>MD 20737<br><b>USA</b><br>Tel: 1-301-851-2200<br>Cell: 1 -301-832-0611                | <a href="mailto:Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov">Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov</a>   | CPM-10 (2015)<br>CPM-13 (2018)<br>2nd term / 3 years  | 2021         |
| North America Member               | <b>Mr Steve CÔTÉ</b><br>National Manager,<br>International Phytosanitary Standards<br>Plant Import/Export Division<br>59 Camelot Drive,<br>Ottawa, Ontario<br>K1A 0Y9<br><b>CANADA</b><br>Tel: (+1) 613-773-7368<br>Fax: (+1) 613-773-7576 | <a href="mailto:Steve.Cote@inspection.gc.ca">Steve.Cote@inspection.gc.ca</a>   | <b>Replacement member for Mr Rajash RAMARTHAN AM</b><br><br>CPM-11 (2016)<br>CPM-14 (2019) 2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years | 2022         |

| Region / Role          | Name, mailing address, telephone  | Email address  | Membership Confirmed  | Term expires |
|------------------------|---|--|---|--------------|
| Pacific Member         | <b>Ms Joanne WILSON</b><br>Principal Adviser, Risk Management<br>Plant Imports Group<br>Ministry for Primary Industries.<br><b>NEW ZEALAND</b><br>Tel: +64 489 40528<br>Mob: +64 2989 40528   | <a href="mailto:joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz">joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz</a>                   | CPM-14<br>(2019)<br>1st term / 3 years  | 2022         |
| Pacific Member<br>SC-7 | <b>Ms Sophie Alexia PETERSON</b><br>Assistant Director   Plant Health Policy   Biosecurity<br>Plant Division<br>Department of Agriculture and Water Resources<br>GPO Box 858,<br>Canberra ACT 2601<br><b>AUSTRALIA</b><br>Tel: (+61) 2 6272 3769<br>Mobile: +61 402 313 170 | <a href="mailto:sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au">sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au</a> | <b>Replacement member for Mr Bruce HANCOCKS</b><br><br>CPM-12<br>(2017)<br>1st term / 3 years | 2020         |

### Others

| Region / Role    | Name, mailing, address, telephone  | Email address  | Membership Confirmed | Term expires |
|------------------|--|--|----------------------|--------------|
| IC / Observer    | <b>Mr Dominique PELLETIER</b><br>Horticulture Program Specialist<br>Canadian Food Inspection Agency<br>Regulatory Cooperation Division T1-4<br>1400 Merivale Rd. Ottawa, Ontario,<br>K1A 0Y9<br><b>Canada</b><br>Tel: (613) 773-6492 | dominique.pelletier2@canad a.ca;<br>pelletierd@gmail.com;                              | N/A                  | N/A          |
| IPPC Secretariat | <b>Mr Avetik Nersisyan</b><br><b>Standard Setting Unit Lead</b>  | <a href="mailto:Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org">Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org</a>                 | N/A                  | N/A          |
| IPPC Secretariat | <b>Ms Adriana MOREIRA</b><br><b>Standard Setting Officer</b>   | <a href="mailto:Adriana.Moreira@fao.org">Adriana.Moreira@fao.org</a>                   | N/A                  | N/A          |
| IPPC Secretariat | <b>Mr Artur SHAMILOV</b><br><b>Standard Setting Officer</b>  | <a href="mailto:Artur.Shamilov@fao.org">Artur.Shamilov@fao.org</a>                     | N/A                  | N/A          |
| IPPC Secretariat | <b>Ms Aoife CASSIN</b><br><b>Standard Setting Associate</b>  | <a href="mailto:Aoife.Cassin@fao.org">Aoife.Cassin@fao.org</a>                         | N/A                  | N/A          |
| IPPC Secretariat | <b>Ms Janka KISS</b><br><b>Standard Setting Associate</b>  | <a href="mailto:Janka.Kiss@fao.org">Janka.Kiss@fao.org</a>                             | N/A                  | N/A          |
| IPPC Secretariat | <b>Mr Edgar MUSHEGYAN</b><br><b>Standard Setting Associate</b>   | <a href="mailto:Edgar.Mushegyan@fao.org">Edgar.Mushegyan@fao.org</a>                   | N/A                  | N/A          |
| IPPC Secretariat | <b>Ms Alejandra JIMENEZ TABARES</b><br><b>Standard Setting Assistant</b>   | <a href="mailto:Alejandra.JimenezTabares@fao.org">Alejandra.JimenezTabares@fao.org</a> | N/A                  | N/A          |
| IPPC Secretariat | <b>Ms Karen ROUEN</b><br><b>Report writer</b>  | <a href="mailto:karen.rouen@karenrouen.com">karen.rouen@karenrouen.com</a>             | N/A                  | N/A          |
| IPPC Secretariat | <b>Mr Arop DENG</b><br><b>Integration and Support Team Lead</b>  | <a href="mailto:Arop.Deng@fao.org">Arop.Deng@fao.org</a>                               | N/A                  | N/A          |

| Region / Role    | Name, mailing, address, telephone  | Email address  | Membership Confirmed | Term expires |
|------------------|--|--|----------------------|--------------|
| IPPC Secretariat | <b>Mr Brent LARSON</b><br><b>Implementation and Facilitation Unit Lead</b> | <a href="mailto:Brent.Larson@fao.org">Brent.Larson@fao.org</a> | N/A                  | N/A          |

*Members who did not attend*

| Region / Role    | Name, mailing address, telephone   | Email address  | Membership Confirmed  | Term expires |
|------------------|--|--|---|--------------|
| Asia Member      | <b>Mr Xiaodong FENG</b><br>Deputy Director of the<br>Division of Plant Quarantine,<br>NATESC<br>Ministry of Agriculture No. 20,<br>Maizidian Street, Chaoyang<br>District,<br>Beijing 100125<br><b>CHINA</b><br>Tel: (8610) 59194524   | <a href="mailto:fengxdong@agri.gov.cn">fengxdong@agri.gov.cn</a>   | CPM-13<br>(2018)<br>1st term / 3<br>years                     | 2021         |
| Europe Member    | <b>Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC</b><br>Plant health section<br>Sub-directorate for plant<br>quality, health and protection<br>Department of Sanitary<br>Action in primary production<br>General directorate for food<br>Ministry of agriculture and<br>food 251 rue de Vaugirard<br>75732 PARIS CEDEX 15<br><b>FRANCE</b><br>Tel: +33 149558437 | <a href="mailto:laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr">laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr</a> | CPM-10<br>(2015)<br>CPM-13<br>(2018)<br>2nd term / 3<br>years | 2021         |
| Near East Member | <b>Mr Nicholas EID</b><br>Ministry of Agriculture<br>building,<br>Embassies Street,<br>Bir Hassan,<br>Beirut,<br>LEBANON<br>Tel: (+961) 3 443 451<br>Fax: (+961) 1 849 628   | <a href="mailto:neid@agriculture.gov.lb">neid@agriculture.gov.lb</a>                                       | CPM-14<br>(2019)<br>1st term / 3<br>years                     | 2022         |
| Asia Member      | <b>Ms Jayani Nimanthika WATHUKARAGE</b><br>Assistant Director (Research)<br>National Plant Quarantine<br>Service,<br>Canada Friendship Road,<br>Katunayake,<br><b>SRI LANKA</b><br>Tel : +94718015660 / +94<br>112252028 - 9<br>Fax : +94112253709   | <a href="mailto:jayaninimanthika@gmail.com">jayaninimanthika@gmail.com</a>                                 | CPM-13<br>(2018)<br>1st term / 3<br>years                     | 2021         |

**Appendix 4: Chart of regional workshop attendance**

| <b>REGIONAL WORKSHOPS 2020</b>                           | <b>SC Members</b>   | <b>IC Members</b>  | <b>IPPC Secretariat representative</b>    |
|--|---|--|---|
| <b>AFRICA<br/>8 - 11 Sept</b>                            | David Kamangira<br>Alphonsine Louhouari                               | Faith Ndunge   | Deng Arop                                 |
| <b>ASIA<br/>7-11 Sept</b>                                | Masahiro Sai<br>Joanne Wilson<br>Sophie Peterson<br>Chonticha Rakkrai | Chris Dale<br>Dilli Sharma   | Brent Larson                              |
| <b>CARIBBEAN<br/>31 Aug - 3 Sept</b>                     | Hernando Morera González  | Francisco Gutiérrez  | Qingpo Yang                               |
| <b>EUROPE &amp;<br/>CENTRAL ASIA<br/>31 Aug - 1 Sept</b> | Laurence Bouhot-Delduc<br>Mariangela Ciampitti                        | Olga Lavrentjeva   | Masumi Yamamoto                           |
| <b>LATIN AMERICA<br/>2-3 Sept</b>                        | Ezequiel Ferro<br>Álvaro Sepulveda<br>André F. Carrapatoso<br>Peralta | Magda González   | Adriana Moreira /<br>Alejandra T. Jimenez |
| <b>NEAR EAST &amp;<br/>NORTH AFRICA<br/>7-10 Sept</b>    | Nicholas Eid<br>Nader Elbadry<br>Abdelmoneem Ismaeel<br>ADRA ABDETAM  | Mamoun Bakri   | Ketevan Lomsadze                          |
| <b>PACIFIC<br/>24-28 Aug</b>                             | Sophie Peterson<br>Joanne Wilson                                      | Chris Dale<br>Nilesh Chand<br>Ngatoko Ngatoko<br>Lalith Kumarasinghe | Descartes Koumba                          |

## Appendix 5: Summary of Standards Committee e-decisions November 2019 – May 2020

### Background

[59] This is a summary of the outcomes of the e-decision forums and polls that the Standards Committee (SC) has conducted between November 2019 and May 2020.

[60] The SC reviewed these via e-decision (2020\_eSC\_Nov\_07) due to the cancellation of the May 2020 SC meeting and agreed to attach them to the next meeting report.

**Table 1: SC e-decisions presented between November 2019 and May 2020**

| E-decision number | SC decision  | SC members commenting in the forum | Polls (yes/no) – participation in the poll |
|-------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|
| 2020_eSC_May_01   | Modified atmosphere usage in irradiation treatments  | 15                                 |  |
| 2020_eSC_May_02   | Review of the objection to the Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating (2007-114)  | 9                                  |  |
| 2020_eSC_May_03   | Selection of TPPT members  | 18                                 | 6/0  |
| 2020_eSC_May_04   | Selection of TPDP members  | 16                                 | 15/0                                       |
| 2020_eSC_May_05   | Approval of CPM paper on Authorization   | 4                                  |  |
| 2020_eSC_May_06   | Approval of CPM paper on PRA reorganization  | 5                                  |  |
| 2020_eSC_May_07   | Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for Tortricidae (2017-011)  | 15                                 | 19/0                                       |
| 2020_eSC_May_08   | Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28 on Cold treatment for <i>Thaumatotibia leucotreta</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i> (2017-029)   | 14                                 | 18/0                                       |
| 2020_eSC_May_09   | Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28 on Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera zonata</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i> (2017-013)  | 16                                 | 17/0                                       |
| 2020_eSC_May_10   | Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Vapour heat - modified atmosphere treatment for <i>Cydia pomonella</i> and <i>Grapholita molesta</i> in fruit of <i>Malus pumila</i> and <i>Prunus persica</i> (2017-038) | 15                                 | 18/0                                       |
| 2020_eSC_May_11   | Approval for consultation of the Specification on Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (Annex to ISPM 38) (2018-009)  | 15                                 | 16/0                                       |
| 2020_eSC_May_12   | Approval for consultation of the Specification on Criteria for the determination of host status for fruit flies based on available information (Annex to ISPM 37) (2018-011)   | 14                                 | 17/0                                       |
| 2020_eSC_May_13   | Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Prunus avium</i> , <i>Prunus salicina</i> and <i>Prunus persica</i> (2017-022A)  | 19                                 |  |
| 2020_eSC_May_14   | Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Prunus avium</i> , <i>Prunus salicina</i> and <i>Prunus persica</i> (2017-022B)   | 19                                 |  |



|                 |  |    |  |
|-----------------|--|----|--|
| 2020_eSC_May_15 | Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Vitis vinifera</i> (2017-023B)                | 19 |  |
| 2020_eSC_May_16 | Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Vitis vinifera</i> (2017-023B)                | 18 |  |
| 2020_eSC_May_17 | Approval for consultation: 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ) (1994-001)   | 19 |  |
| 2020_eSC_May_18 | Approval for consultation: Draft ISPM on the Focused revision of ISPM 12 ( <i>Phytosanitary certificates</i> ) in relation to re-export (2015-011) | 14 |  |
| 2020_eSC_May_19 | Approval for consultation: Draft ISPM: Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014)   | 17 |  |
| 2020_eSC_May_20 | Approval of Draft PT for consultation: Irradiation treatment for <i>Carposina sasakii</i> (2017-026)   | 17 |  |
| 2020_eSC_May_21 | Approval of Draft PT for consultation: Irradiation treatment for <i>Sternonchetus frigidus</i> (2017-036)  | 17 |  |
| 2020_eSC_May_22 | Approval of Draft PT for consultation: Irradiation treatment for <i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i> (2017-015)   | 17 |  |
| 2020_eSC_May_23 | Approval of Draft PT for consultation: Irradiation treatment for the genus <i>Anastrepha</i> (2017-031)  | 17 |  |

## 2020\_eSC\_May\_01: Modified atmosphere usage in irradiation treatments

### Summary of SC e-forum discussion

- [61] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_01), the SC was invited to consider the study on the effects of low oxygen on irradiation efficacy and the recommendation of the TPPT to remove the restriction from irradiation PTs for Tephritidae fruit flies.
- [62] The SC e-forum was open from 20 November to 04 December 2019. 15 SC members commented in the forum.
- [63] It was clarified that the removal of the disclaimer from irradiation treatments for Tephritid fruit flies, the issue will be presented to the CPM-15 as ink amendments to the following adopted PTs:
- - PT 1: Irradiation treatment for *Anastrepha ludens* (2009)
  - - PT 2: Irradiation treatment for *Anastrepha obliqua* (2009)
  - - PT 3: Irradiation treatment for *Anastrepha serpentina* (2009)
  - - PT 4: Irradiation treatment for *Bactrocera jarvisi* (2009)
  - - PT 5: Irradiation treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* (2009)
  - - PT 7: Irradiation treatment for fruit flies of the family Tephritidae generic) (2009)
  - - PT 14: Irradiation treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* (2011)

### SC e-decision

- [64] Based on the forum discussion the SC agreed with recommendation of the TPPT to remove the restriction from the irradiation PTs for Tephritidae fruit flies as ink amendments.

## 2020\_eSC\_May\_02: Review of the objection to the Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating (2007-114)

### Summary of SC e-forum discussion

- [65] During the SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_02) the SC was invited to note the TPPT's review of the objection; and *decide* whether the draft PT should be withdrawn from adoption by the CPM and removed from the TPPT work programme *or consider* how the issues with the operational implementation of dielectric heat treatments by contracting parties should be resolved and whether to submit the draft PT for adoption.
- [66] The SC e-forum was open from 4-11 December 2019 and 9 SC members provided comments, which are summarized below.
- [67] One SC member was concerned with the TPPT statement "It cannot be concluded with certainty that the detection of survivors in the operational trials were due to a failure in the treatment schedule rather than a failure in the application of dielectric heating to achieve the treatment schedule;" She considered that, if it is only a question of implementation, it is concerning that even for treatments carried out in experimental conditions, it is difficult to provide confidence that the required temperature/duration is achieved through the entire wood sample from single probe placement, unless the cold spot is identified with the wood. She questioned if the treatment schedule gives sufficient requirements to give the assurance that the HT treatment will be correctly implemented. She was further concerned with the paragraph [18] of Draft annex to ISPM 28: Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating" may also be too vague: "Because some sources of dielectric heating will result in limited or uneven initial heat penetration, sufficient time may be required after heating to allow heat diffusion throughout the profile of the wood (including the surface) in order to achieve the treatment schedule."
- [68] She proposed to contact the authors of the publication: Dubey, M., Janowiak, J., Mack, R., Elder, P. & Hoover, K. 2016. Comparative study of radio frequency and microwave heating for phytosanitary treatment of wood. European Journal of Wood and Wood Products, doi:10.1007/s00107-016-1025-2. " to ask how they interpret the Chinese results.
- [69] She also noted that the dielectric heat treatment was adopted in ISPM 15, without limitations of wood thickness but with only the sentence "For wood exceeding 5 cm in thickness, dielectric heating at 2.45 GHz requires bidirectional application or multiple waveguides for the delivery of microwave energy to ensure uniformity of heating."
- [70] Another SC felt that the PT was based on sound evidence when it was developed and she wasn't fully convinced that the counter-evidence is strong enough to prove that it does not work. She also considered that if it is an implementation issue then this should be managed through implementation systems and IC rather than deferring the adoption of the standard.
- [71] After consulting with the Treatment Lead for this draft the Secretariat clarified that the TPPT has concluded that although the submitter of the objection obligingly provided all information they had, the temperature measurements taken during the application of the treatment were not sufficient to conclude that the treatment schedule have been achieved (60oC / 1 min throughout the profile of the wood). In other words the possibility of a cold spot could not be excluded. With this in mind the TPPT confirmed their confidence in the treatment schedule itself, however they acknowledged that there are operational limits to the utility of this treatment schedule for wood (considering that ISPM 15 applies to wood packaging material only).
- [72] It has also been clarified that the authors of the aforementioned paper supporting the PT have been informally consulted, as they are members of IFQRG along with the Treatment Lead of this PT. There seemed to be a possibility to develop implementation guidance via the collaboration between the IFQRG and the IPPC Secretariat, however the development of the guide have been postponed, and the authors are still working on how to deal with the operational issues.

- [73] The TPPT felt<sup>12</sup> that they have provided as much technical assessment as it was possible based on the available information from the submitter, and thus needed the SC's guidance on the course of action regarding this PT. They also thought that the implementation issues are beyond the scope of the TPPT.
- [74] The SC member explained her concerns with the operational issues as the beginning of ANNEX 1 (Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material (2018)) of ISPM 15 states: "The approved treatments may be applied to units of wood packaging material or to pieces of wood that are to be made into wood packaging material.". This suggest that operators are authorized to treat larger pieces of wood (e.g. logs) and then build the wood packaging material, using the dielectric heat treated wood.
- [75] Another member thought if the TPPT are comfortable that the treatment (exposure to 60°C for 1 minute) is sufficient to kill not less than 99.99683% of all life stages of *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus*, then the issue seems to be one of implementation. He suggested that a guide to support implementation of this treatment is required. This could provide information on issues including the placement of probes and the amount of time required, in different thicknesses for example, to achieve this exposure uniformly through the item being treated especially considering the treatment is already accepted as part of ISPM 15 and so the development of guidance material may be of increased priority if the treatment option is being used as part of the implementation of that standard.
- [76] Another member felt that as the TPPT is confident in the efficacy of the treatment (also considering ISPM 15) and in their analysis of the supporting evidence, and they identified a possibility of a "cold spot" which is clearly an implementation issue, the treatment should be recommended to the CPM for adoption based on its technical merits, not the current implementation shortcomings. Some SC members agreed, that as the problem is clearly the application and not the treatment itself, the treatments should be recommended for adoption by the CPM.
- [77] Another member noted that many factors could affect the application of dielectric processing technology, such as the generation energy of micro-blog equipment, temperature uniformity, wood materials, size and moisture. He considered that, the standard technical parameters are only derived from experimental data in the laboratory, and large-scale verification data for commercial dielectric processing facilities have not been obtained. He also suggested that operational guidelines for the application of dielectric heat treatment should be formulated to clarify the determination of the lowest temperature point of the processing object, the number and position of probes and other technical operation points.
- [78] One member also noted, that the treatment schedule "a minimum temperature of 60 °C for the minimum duration of one minute" has been already approved in ISPM 15, so it is an effective schedule based on scientific evidence. Therefore the same result for a wood cab be achieved, if applied it correctly. In the case of wood packaging material, the shape and size of the material are determined as "less than 3 cm in width (regardless of the length) or greater than 3 cm in width, with the total surface area of an individual piece of bark less than 50 square cm". He pointed out however, that under this treatment for wood, there is no limitation of the size and thickness of a wood. He suggested that if the thickness of the wood is causing the difficulty in implementing the treatment, the PT should set limitation of thickness of a wood.
- [79] He also pointed out that according to "4.2.5 Dielectric heat treatment" of ISPM 42, "Dielectric heat treatment requires monitoring of the temperature at the coolest region of the commodity", which ensures that even if the thickness and shape is not determined, the treatment schedule be effective. He thought it is preferable to provide appropriate operational information such as the placement of probes and how to monitor the temperature, to supplement the standard, at least soon after approval of this standard. Several members expressed similar opinions and suggested providing operational guidance.

<sup>12</sup> The report of the 2019-07 TPPT meeting (section 4.12 on the objection): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87681/>

- [80] Another member considered that this identification of where the coldest parts were likely to be found is a complex issue. Another member suggested that experience from the application of the treatment at a commercial scale would be of great resource to resolve implementation problems, and clarify issues regarding cold spots.

### ***SC e-decision***

- [81] Considering general the SC members diverging opinions on how to move forward with the objection, no clear conclusion was reached. Further discussion of, the topic is deferred to a face to face meeting.

## **2020\_eSC\_May\_03: Selection of TPPT members**

### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [82] During the SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_03) the SC was invited to consider the nominations and select member(s) for the TPPT for a 5-year term starting 2020.
- [83] The SC e-forum was open from 20 November to 4 December 2019 and 18 members provided comments, which are summarized below.
- [84] Some SC members noted that Ms Andrea Beam has veterinary background, works with phytosanitary treatments, provides evidence of wide experience in treatments and other relevant issues and thus supported her nomination to the TPPT. Her membership of the Phytosanitary measures research group (PMRG) was also considered an asset.
- [85] Another member considered that Mr Mostafa Abdelaziz have extensive agriculture-related background adding to his experience in NPPO (phytosanitary schemes) though both candidates were qualified, recommended Mr Mostafa Abdelaziz.
- [86] Another SC member thought that both experts have very good CVs and that they would meet the needs that the TPPT currently has. However he considered that according to the discussion at the SC May 2019 meeting, it was expected that new members should have detailed expertise in treatment developments and cover issues specially related to grains/seeds, chemical treatments and modified atmospheres. It was proposed to possibly repeat the call at a later date to receive more nominations.
- [87] Another member noted that although the TPPT noted these areas to be less well covered the panel did not consider these to be the major qualifying factors for selecting new experts and referred to the SC for guidance on what expertise would be desirable. The SC in May 2019 expressed support for selecting experts actively involved in developing PTs.
- [88] Considering general support of the membership of Ms Andrea Beam a poll was opened to confirm SC agreement with selecting Ms Andrea Beam as a member for the TPPT for a 5-year term starting 2020.

### ***SC e-decision***

- [90] The poll was open from 6 to 13 December 2019 to and 6 SC members participated confirming the selection of Ms Andrea BEAM as a TPPT member for a 5 year term starting in 2020.

## **2020\_eSC\_May\_04: Selection of TPDP members**

### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [91] During the SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_04) the SC was invited to consider the nominations and select member(s) for the TPDP for a 5-year term starting in December 2019.
- [92] The SC e-forum was open from 20 November to 11 December 2019 and 16 members provided comments.
- [93] SC members generally agreed that all candidates are well qualified. Considering that according to the TPDP Specification TP 1, members of this panel should primarily have diagnostic expertise (where

appropriate taxonomic) with at least one member representing each discipline: entomology, acarology, nematology, mycology, bacteriology, virology (including viroids and phytoplasma) and botany. However, currently the TPDP has 0 mycologist, 1 virologist and 1 botanist.

[94] Assessing the comments of SC members, most SC members favored the following candidates:

[95] Mycologists:

- Ms Julie PATTEMORE (13 supporters)
- Ms Yazmin Rivera RIVERA (13 supporters)

[96] Virologist:

- Ms Vessela Assenova MAVRODIEVA (15 supporters)

[97] The SC members considered that the panel still requires the selection of a botanist and agreed to open a new call later for a botanist.

[98] *SC e-decision*

[99] A poll was opened to confirm SC agreement with selecting the above listed 3 members for the TPDP for a 5-year term starting 2020.

### **2020\_eSC\_May\_05: Approval of CPM paper on Authorization**

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[100] During the SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_05) the SC was invited to review the paper summarizing the concerns for CPM-15 (2020) regarding the ISPM on authorization.

[101] The SC e-forum was open from 05-19 December 2019 and 4 members provided comments.

[102] *SC e-decision*

[103] SC members endorsed and provided suggestions to the paper summarizing the concerns for CPM-15 (2020) regarding the ISPM on authorization.

### **2020\_eSC\_May\_06: Approval of CPM paper on PRA reorganization**

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[104] During the SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_06) the SC was invited to review the paper the proposal to reorganize the pest risk analysis standards into a suite of standards to be presented to CPM-15 (2020).

[105] The SC e-forum was open from 06-20 December 2019 and 5 members provided comments.

[106] *SC e-decision*

[107] SC members endorsed and provided suggestions to the paper summarizing the proposal to reorganize the pest risk analysis standards into a suite of standards to be presented to CPM-15 (2020).

### **2020\_eSC\_May\_07: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for Tortricidae (2017-011)**

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[108] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_07), the SC was invited to review the draft in order to approve it for consultation in 2020 in 2020.

- [109] The SC e-forum was open from 16 January to 06 February 2020. 15 SC members commented in the forum and suggested the following changes to the draft.
- [110] Considering that the TPPT has restricted the scope of the treatment to fruits, one SC member suggested to remove the mention of vegetables from the draft. Another SC member agreed and suggested to include in the treatment description that the treatment is for fruits.
- [111] One SC member queried why was the scope narrowed to fruits, when irradiation treatments usually can be applied to any commodity due to the possibility to measure (dose mapping) the absorbed dose precisely. It was clarified that the restriction was done to avoid the possible presence of tortricid pupae in leafy vegetables and all leaves that are considered a host for leaf roller species.
- [112] The SC members agreed with the proposals, however a poll was opened to determine a clear consensus on the revised draft.
- [113] The poll was open from the 25 February to 03 March 2020 and 19 SC members participated.
- [114] **SC e-decision**
- [115] Based on the poll, the SC approved the approved the revised draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for Tortricidae (2017-011) for consultation

**2020\_eSC\_May\_08: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28 on Cold treatment for *Thaumatotibia leucotreta* on *Citrus sinensis* (2017-029)**

**Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [116] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_08), the SC was invited to review the draft in order to approve it for consultation in 2020 in 2020.
- [117] The SC e-forum was open from 16 January to 06 February 2020. 14 SC members commented in the forum and suggested the following changes to the draft.
- [118] The SC noted that some editorial changes were still needed, and some modifications regarding the references listed in the draft.
- [119] One member suggested to replace the "Cold treatment for *Thaumatotibia leucotreta* on *Citrus sinensis*" with "Cold treatment for *Thaumatotibia leucotreta* in fruit of *Citrus sinensis*" for more precision and consistency with the target regulated article section. However as none of the adopted PTs (1 to 32) have "fruit" in the title, even when the target regulated articles are restricted to fruit, the inclusion would require ink amendments to the relevant adopted PTs. The SC may discuss the issue of the titles of all PTs to increase clarity but for now retained the title as consistent with the adopted PTs.
- [120] Another member proposed amendments to provide additional guidance on the temperature measurements however the Treatment Lead considered that the ISPM 42 says "it should be appropriate for the ...relevant technical standards and phytosanitary import requirements", and that the original wording describes better what is meant.
- [121] The SC members agreed with the proposals, however a poll was opened to determine a clear consensus on the revised draft.
- [122] The poll was open from the 25 February to 03 March 2020 and 18 SC members participated.
- [123] **SC e-decision**
- [124] Based on the poll, the SC approved the approved the revised draft annex to ISPM 28: Cold treatment for *Thaumatotibia leucotreta* on *Citrus sinensis* (2017-029) for consultation.



### **2020\_eSC\_May\_09: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28 on Cold treatment for *Bactrocera zonata* on *Citrus sinensis* (2017-013)**

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [125] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_09), the SC was invited to review the draft in order to approve it for consultation in 2020.
- [126] The SC e-forum was open from 16 January to 06 February 2020. 16 SC members commented in the forum and suggested the following changes to the draft.
- [127] The SC noted that some editorial changes were still needed, and some modifications regarding the references listed in the draft.
- [128] One member recommended to specify the monitoring intervals for recording the treatment parameters. However the Treatment Lead considered that the ISPM 42 says “it should be appropriate for the ...relevant technical standards and phytosanitary import requirements” and that the original wording describes better what is meant.
- [129] One member suggested to replace the "Cold treatment for *Bactrocera zonata* on *Citrus sinensis*" with "Cold treatment for *Bactrocera zonata* in fruit of *Citrus sinensis*" for more precision and consistency with the target regulated article section. However as none of the adopted PTs (1 to 32) have “fruit” in the title, even when the target regulated articles are restricted to fruit, the inclusion would require ink amendments to the relevant adopted PTs. The SC may discuss the issue of the titles of all PTs to increase clarity but for now retained the title as consistent with the adopted PTs.
- [130] The SC members agreed with the proposals, however a poll was opened to determine a clear consensus on the revised draft.
- [131] The poll was open from the 25 February to 03 March 2020 and 17 SC members participated.
- [132] **SC e-decision**
- [133] Based on the poll, the SC approved the approved the revised draft annex to ISPM 28 on Cold treatment for *Bactrocera zonata* on *Citrus sinensis* (2017-013) for consultation.

### **2020\_eSC\_May\_10: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Vapour heat - modified atmosphere treatment for *Cydia pomonella* and *Grapholita molesta* in fruit of *Malus pumila* and *Prunus persica* (2017-038)**

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [134] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_10), the SC was invited to review the draft in order to approve it for consultation in 2020.
- [135] The SC e-forum was open from 16 January to 06 February 2020. 15 SC members commented in the forum and suggested the following changes to the draft.
- [136] The SC noted that some editorial changes were still needed, and some modifications regarding the references listed in the draft. The Scope was also modified in order to align with the rest of the draft.
- [137] Some SC members also suggested rewording the description of the treatment for clarity. The Treatment Lead provided additional wording to clarify that the required oxygen and carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere in the enclosure can be maintained by balancing it with nitrogen.
- [138] One member suggested to replace "on *Malus pumila* and *Prunus persica*" with "in fruit of *Malus pumila* and *Prunus persica*" in the treatment description for consistency with the title however as none of the adopted PTs (1 to 32) have “fruit” in the title, and the editor removed “fruit” from the title thus the addition become unnecessary.



[139] Another member pointed out that the apple size where the treatment was tested (and proved its efficacy) was not specified in neither articles from Neven et al. (2006a and 2006b) only for the size for peaches and nectarines (from 32 to 64). The SC members queried if the treatment will be efficacious on commercial size apples. The Treatment Lead contacted the author of the paper that the draft is based on, and she kindly provided information, confirming that the apples in the trial were 100 to 64 mm which covers most internationally traded apple sizes.

[140] The SC members agreed with the proposals, however a poll was opened to determine a clear consensus on the revised draft.

[141] The poll was open from the 25 February to 03 March 2020 and 18 SC members participated.

#### [142] *SC e-decision*

[143] Based on the poll, the SC approved the approved the revised draft annex to ISPM 28 on Vapour heat - modified atmosphere treatment for *Cydia pomonella* and *Grapholita molesta* in fruit of *Malus pumila* and *Prunus persica* (2017-038) for consultation.

### **2020\_eSC\_May\_11: Approval for consultation of the Specification on Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (Annex to ISPM 38) (2018-009)**

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[144] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_11), the SC was invited to review and revise the draft specification as necessary in order to approve it for consultation in 2020.

[145] The SC e-forum was open from 16 January to 06 February 2020. 15 SC members commented in the forum and suggested the following changes to the Specification.

[146] One SC member commented on the overlap between the content of the "Expertise" and the "Participants" section, and proposed to modify the Specification to state the skills needed in the "Expertise" section and in the number of participants in the "Participants" section.

[147] In general, the comments provided by the SC agreed that System approach is "efficient alternative to consignment-by-consignment phytosanitary certification" but cannot a replace the certification process.

[148] The SC noted that the phytosanitary certificate is needed and NPPO will be ultimately responsible for issuing the phytosanitary certificate but its issuance can be simplified once the Systems Approach is agreed. Hence, an exporting country will issue a phytosanitary certificate if so required by an importing country, and the NPPO of the exporting country would indicate that a systems approach was followed for the seeds consignment if this option is allowed in the phytosanitary import requirements.

[149] It was noted that the systems approach could be an alternative to the procedures usually involved on phytosanitary certification of seeds (mainly field inspection and laboratory analysis) to every consignment to be exported. Once the NPPO certifies the seed lot under the Systems Approach, the consignment certification (with part of that seed lot) could be "automatic", with the exemption of new laboratory analysis.

[150] It was noted that it is likely that consignment-by-consignment certification is not necessarily avoidable; perhaps a reduction of exporting country and importing country testing for same pathogens is a more reasonable approach, as an outcome of a systems approach for seeds.

[151] Another member noted that when the Systems Approach for seed production is authorized by NPPO, the usual testing and sampling are part of this authorization, as well as all other steps that comprise this Systems Approach. When Systems Approach are proven to work well, the reduction of certain

phytosanitary procedures can take place. These could include reduction of number of tests. Systems Approach for seeds would be important simplification if we develop commodity standards for seeds.

[152] A poll was opened to determine a clear consensus on the draft Specification, that was revised by the Steward based on the suggestions at the e-decision forum.

[153] The poll was open from the 25 February to 03 March 2020 and 16 SC members participated.

[154] **SC e-decision**

[155] Based on the poll, the SC approved the following revised draft Specification for consultation: *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (Annex to ISPM 38) (2018-009)*

### **2020\_eSC\_May\_12: Approval for consultation of the Specification on Criteria for the determination of host status for fruit flies based on available information (Annex to ISPM 37) (2018-011)**

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[156] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_12), the SC was invited to review and revise the draft specification as necessary in order to approve it for consultation in 2020.

[157] The SC e-forum was open from 16 January to 06 February 2020. 14 SC members commented in the forum and suggested the following changes to the Specification.

[158] One SC member commented on the overlap between the content of the "Expertise" and the "Participants" section, and proposed to modify the Specification to state the skills needed in the "Expertise" section and in the number of participants in the "Participants" section.

[159] Another SC member proposed to add an additional regional standard to the references section (RSPM 4. 2005. Guidelines for the confirmation of non-host status of fruit and vegetables to Tephritid Fruit Flies. Bangkok, APPPC.).

[160] Other SC members proposed changes to one of the tasks of the expert working group described in the Specification: to consider not only the plant species but the cultivar when evaluating its host status for a fruit fly.

[161] The SC members agreed with the proposals, however a poll was opened to determine a clear consensus on the revised draft Specification.

[162] The poll was open from the 25 February to 03 March 2020 and 17 SC members participated.

[163] **SC e-decision**

[164] Based on the poll, the SC approved the following revised draft Specification for consultation: *Specification on Criteria for the determination of host status for fruit flies based on available information (Annex to ISPM 37) (2018-011)*.

### **2020\_eSC\_May\_13: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica* (2017-022A)**

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[165] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_13), the SC was invited to review the responses to comments and the draft in order to approve it for second consultation in 2020.

[166] The SC e-forum was open from 14-28 April to 2020. 19 SC members commented in the forum.

[167] It was clarified that the target regulated article had to be changed as the study that the treatment was based on used Japanese plums (*Prunus salicina*) and consequently this treatment will not apply to “common” plums (*Prunus domestica*).

[168] One member noted one of the comments regarding other treatments in use in international trade. He agreed that these should be submitted in order to be considered as Annex to ISPM 28.

[169] **SC e-decision**

[170] Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the responses to the comments and approved the revised draft annex to ISPM 28: *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica* (2017-022B) for second consultation.

**2020\_eSC\_May\_14: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica* (2017-022B)**

**Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[171] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_14), the SC was invited to review the responses to comments and the draft in order to approve it for second consultation in 2020.

[172] The SC e-forum was open from 14-28 April to 2020. 19 SC members commented in the forum.

[173] It was clarified that the target regulated article had to be changed as the study that the treatment was based on used Japanese plums (*Prunus salicina*) and consequently this treatment will not apply to “common” plums (*Prunus domestica*).

[174] One member noted one of the comments regarding other treatments in use in international trade. He agreed that these should be submitted in order to be considered as Annex to ISPM 28.

[175] **SC e-decision**

[176] Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the responses to the comments and approved the revised draft annex to ISPM 28: *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica* (2017-022B) for second consultation.

**2020\_eSC\_May\_15: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Vitis vinifera* (2017-023B)**

**Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[177] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_15), the SC was invited to review the responses to comments and the draft in order to approve it for second consultation in 2020.

[178] The SC e-forum was open from 14-28 April to 2020. 19 SC members commented in the forum.

[179] One member noted one of the comments regarding other treatments in use in international trade. He agreed that these should be submitted in order to be considered as Annex to ISPM 28.

[180] **SC e-decision**

[181] Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the responses to the comments and approved the revised draft annex to ISPM 28: Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Vitis vinifera* (2017-023B) for second consultation.

## **2020\_eSC\_May\_16: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Vitis vinifera* (2017-023B)**

### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[182] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_16), the SC was invited to review the responses to comments and the draft in order to approve it for second consultation in 2020.

[183] The SC e-forum was open from 14-28 April to 2020. 18 SC members commented in the forum.

[184] One member noted one of the comments regarding other treatments in use in international trade. He agreed that these should be submitted in order to be considered as Annex to ISPM 28.

### **[185] SC e-decision**

[186] Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the responses to the comments and approved the revised draft annex to ISPM 28: Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Vitis vinifera* (2017-023B) for second consultation.

## **2020\_eSC\_May\_17: Approval for consultation: 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)**

### **Summary of the review**

#### **Deletion of the term “incidence”**

[187] The SC discussed the second explanation point related to the proposed deletion of the term “incidence”: “*The dictionary definitions of “incidence” appear to be consistent with its Glossary definition, which simply makes the term more specific to plant protection*”, because it might seem contradictory to the first explanatory point that states that: “*The current Glossary definition of “incidence”, although fitting well with the use of the term in plant protection, corresponds to the epidemiological definition of “prevalence” as used in human and animal health.*”

[188] The SC agreed that the second explanatory point is needed, because without it one could conclude that all occurrences of the term “incidence” in adopted standards have to be replaced with the term “prevalence”, which is not necessary.

[189] After having reviewed examples of the definition of the term “incidence” from different conventional dictionaries, as opposed to definitions that apply for scientific subject fields such as medicine or epidemiology, the SC agreed to clarify the second explanatory point as following: “*The general meaning of “incidence” in conventional dictionaries is consistent with its Glossary definition that simply makes the term more specific to plant protection.*”

#### **Revision of the term “emergency action”**

[190] The SC reviewed the proposal for the revision of the definition of “emergency action” and agreed to clarify the first paragraph of the explanations as following: “*...discussed how the term “emergency action” would apply for a new, non-yet regulated, pest discovered for instance in an imported consignment*”.

#### **Revision of the term “clearance (of a consignment)”**

[191] The SC reviewed the proposal for the revision of the definition of “clearance (of a consignment)” and agreed to clarify the second sentence of the explanations by writing: “*The TPG therefore recommended to revise the definition of “clearance” to explicitly refer to the process of verifying a consignment's compliance with phytosanitary regulations, and not to the authorization of the import or export of a consignment.*”.

[192] The SC also discussed the addition of “official” to “process” that is proposed in the revised definition to emphasize that clearance of consignments is the responsibility of NPPOs. The SC agreed that in some countries, the clearance of consignments is conducted by other border agencies (e.g., Customs

and Border Protection in the USA) and that despite these functions they are not NPPO. However, if these other border agencies verify the compliance of consignments with phytosanitary regulations, they do it following the instructions of the NPPO or at least in agreement with the NPPO, and therefore that they are authorized by the NPPO, meaning that the process is “official” according to the Glossary definition of that term.

### Summary of SC e-forum discussion

- [193] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_17), the SC was first invited to review and revise the draft Amendments via the OCS, where the Steward addressed and incorporated the suggestions of SC members.
- [194] Subsequently, the SC reviewed the revised version and was invited to approve the draft 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001) for consultation.
- [195] The OCS review of the draft Amendments took place from 27 April to 03 May 2020 and the subsequent review of the draft via e-decision took place from 11 to 18 May 2020. 1 SC member proposed changes to the draft and 19 SC members expressed their agreement in the e-decision forum.
- [196] The SC members noted the difficulty of addressing certain issues without a face-to-face meeting; however, they agreed to the revised version of the draft and approved it for first consultation.
- [197] *SC e-decision*
- [198] Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the draft 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001) for consultation.

### 2020\_eSC\_May\_18: Approval for consultation: Draft ISPM on the Focused revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011)

#### Summary of the revision of the draft

- [199] **Consistency changes not in relation to re-export.** The EWG proposed few consistency changes in sentences not dealing with re-export and the SC was invited to consider if it was appropriate to present these in the draft going for consultation. Although these consistency changes were recognized to be beyond the scope of the specification, and would normally follow the process for ink amendments, the EWG considered that including them would facilitate global view and full understanding of the revised standard.
- [200] Considering the proposal, the SC agreed to keeping the consistency changes not in relation to re-export in the draft revised ISPM 12.

#### Outline of requirements

- [201] The SC agreed to add in the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence of the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: “A phytosanitary certificate for re-export is issued by the NPPO of the country of re-export (a country where the commodity has not be grown or processed **to change its nature**)...”, because it is an important precision to be given for consistency with section 1.2 (3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph) and section 6.1 (2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph).

#### 4. Specific Considerations for the Preparation and Issuance of Phytosanitary Certificates

- [202] Although it is not related to re-export, the SC agreed to modify the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph as following: “Phytosanitary certificates should only be issued if **the NPPO confirms** ~~it is confirmed~~ that the phytosanitary import requirements are met.” because it is important to indicate who is responsible for verifying compliance with phytosanitary import requirements and therefore to refer to the NPPO as in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of section 6.1 (“The NPPO should issue a phytosanitary certificate for re-export only if it is confident that the phytosanitary import requirements are met.”).
- [203] The SC also agreed to make the following addition in the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence of the 7<sup>th</sup> paragraph for clarity: “...the specific phytosanitary import requirements **of the country of destination**...”.



In the 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence about the support of the re-export process, the following addition was made: “...upon request **by the NPPO of the re-exporting country or by exporters...**” to better clarify the procedure by also mentioning the NPPO of the re-exporting country and not only the exporters as in the current ISPM 12.

## 5. Guidelines and Requirements for Completing Sections of a Phytosanitary Certificate for Export

**TO: Plant Protection Organization(s) of \_\_**

- [204] In the last sentence, the following brackets: “(i.e. the country of re-export and country of destination)” that had been added by the EWG was moved from after the 2<sup>nd</sup> to the 1<sup>st</sup> mention of “both countries”, for more clarity.

### Place of origin

- [205] The SC did not agree with the EWG’s proposal to delete the following sentence: “In all cases, the name of the country or countries of origin should be stated.” from the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph because it is an important requirement.
- [206] The SC agreed to modify the wording of the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph for clarity, and to reinstate repackaging and storing in the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence because they are the main reasons why the movement of commodities may lead to their possible infestation or contamination by regulated pests.
- [207] The SC also moved the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph to become the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, to provide a more logical order and therefore improve understanding, because the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph describes the situation where the commodity was possibly exposed to infestation or contamination by regulated pests in both the country of origin and the country of export, while the new 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph describes the situation where imported plants have subsequently been grown long enough to consider that the pest risk is no longer determined by the country of origin but is determined only by the country of further growth that therefore became the country of origin.

## 6. Considerations for Re-Export Situations

### 6.1 Considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export

- [208] In the last sentence of the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, the SC made the following change: “...whether ~~the phytosanitary certificate for re-export is accompanied by~~ the original phytosanitary certificate or a certified copy **is attached to the phytosanitary certificate for re-export**...”, for consistency with Annex 2 (Model phytosanitary for re-export) and Appendix 1 (Electronic phytosanitary certificates, information on standard XML schemas and exchange mechanisms) of ISPM 12 that both say that the phytosanitary certificate for export should be “attached” to the phytosanitary certificate for re-export (and not that the phytosanitary certificate for export should “accompany” the phytosanitary certificate for re-export).
- [209] In the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> sentence, the SC agreed to clarify footnote 3 that had been inserted by the EWG and applies to the whole section 6.1, with the exception of the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph of subsection 6.1.3 where the specific requirements for multiple re-exports are explicitly described, as following: “Some commodities, in particular seeds, are often re-exported multiple times to various countries of destination. Consignments that have been re-exported on multiple occasions would entail a series of phytosanitary certificates that have been issued by successive NPPOs. However, to keep the description simple **in this standard**, the requirements set out for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export **usually** mention only a country of origin (issuing a phytosanitary certificate for export), a country of re-export (issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export) and a country of destination”. Moreover, the call for footnote 3 was moved to the beginning of the sentence, after “then exported to another”.
- [210] The SC agreed with proposals from EWG who had substantively modified the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph by introducing four new indents describing the requirements to be met to issue a phytosanitary certificate for re-export. The SC also agreed to clarify the 1<sup>st</sup> indent as following: “...~~imported~~ plants, plant products or other regulated articles **that have been imported**” and the 2<sup>nd</sup> indent as following: “~~The~~

consignment for re-export consists entirely of **All the** plants, plant products or other regulated articles **of the consignment for re-export are** covered...”.

- [211] Furthermore, the following wording: “In addition with the above requirements,” was added at the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph to make a link with the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, clarifying that meeting the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination is an additional requirement that needs to be met. The SC agreed with the EWG’s proposal to keep this requirement separated from the requirements of the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph that only apply to the issuance of a phytosanitary certificate for re-export (and not to the issuance of a phytosanitary certificate for export in certain re-export cases).

#### 6.1.1 Examination of the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination

- [212] The SC agreed on the importance of the NPPO examining the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination, as indicated in the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph as modified by the EWG. The SC also agreed with the proposal from the EWG to delete the text dealing with the examination of the degree of similarity between the phytosanitary import requirements of the re-exporting country and those of the country of destination. The reason is that the comparison of the phytosanitary import requirements of the re-exporting country and of the country of destination is one way of doing it, but it is not the only one and it is not always relevant. Details and explanations on how the NPPO of the country of re-export may proceed to determine if the re-exported consignment meets the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination can be given in implementation material.

#### 6.1.2 Repacking, storing, splitting or combining consignments

- [213] The SC agreed with the EWG’s proposals and added “storing” to the heading of the new subsection 6.1.2 because storage is mentioned in the “Place of origin” subsection of section 5, in the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of subsection 6.1.2 and in the certifying statement of the model phytosanitary certificate for re-export.
- [214] The SC agreed to include a part of the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph which had been deleted by the EWG from subsection 6.1.1 with modifications at the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of subsection 6.1.2 to provide additional guidance: “If a **possible** risk of infestation or contamination is identified, **an** additional inspection should be carried out **to verify that the consignment has not been exposed to infestation or contamination by pests.**”. The additions are intended to ensure consistency with the model phytosanitary certificate for re-export which requires that “during storage in \_\_\_ (contracting party of re-export), the consignment has not been subjected to the risk of infestation or infection”.

#### 6.2 Consideration for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for export in certain re-export cases

- [215] The SC agreed to add a new paragraph at the end of the new section 6.2:
- [216] **“Additional declarations from the original phytosanitary certificate or its certified copy may be transferred to the phytosanitary certificate for export to attest compliance with phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination (e.g. growing season inspection, soil testing) which cannot be fulfilled by the country of re-export. Documents such as the original phytosanitary certificate or its certified copy may be attached to the phytosanitary certificate for export if they contain information from the country of origin that was used to complete the phytosanitary certificate for export.”**
- [217] This paragraph is intended to give more guidance with regard when a phytosanitary certificate for re-export cannot be issued by the country of re-export, but information from the country of origin is required to attest compliance with the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination (e.g. growing season inspection, soil testing). This new paragraph may help implementation of ISPM 12 for example for the export of consignments consisting of a mix of imported articles and articles produced in the country of re-export (e.g. compound or blended commodities).

#### 6.3 General considerations for re-export situations

- [218] The SC agreed to move the last paragraph of section 6.1 (Considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export) in a new section **“6.3 General considerations for re-export situations”**, because when re-exports routinely occur or are started the procedures that may be agreed between the NPPOs of the countries of origin and re-export may be relevant for all situations of re-export and



not only for the cases when the NPPO of the re-exporting country will ultimately issue a phytosanitary certificate for re-export.

## [219] **7. Considerations for Transit**

[220] The SC agreed with the EWG that re-export and transit are two distinct issues and that for greater clarity it is preferable to dedicate section 6 to considerations for re-export situations (subject of the focused revision) and section 7 (previously section 6.2) to transit. The SC also agreed to clarify the heading of section 7 as following: “**Considerations for Transit**”, by symmetry with the heading of section 6: “Considerations for Re-Export Situations”.

### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[221] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_18), the SC was first invited to review and revise the draft ISPM via the OCS, where the Steward addressed and incorporated the suggestions of SC members.

[222] Subsequently, the SC reviewed the revised version and was invited to decide whether the consistency changes not in relation to re-export should be kept in or withdrawn from the document sent for consultation.

[223] The OCS review of the draft ISPM took place from 13 to 19 April 2020 and the subsequent review of the draft via e-decision took place from 11 to 18 May 2020. 14 SC members proposed changes to the draft and 19 SC members expressed their agreement in the e-decision forum.

[224] The SC members noted the difficulty of addressing certain issues without a face-to-face meeting; however, they agreed to the revised version of the draft and approved it for first consultation.

### [225] *SC e-decision*

[226] Based on the forum discussion, the SC agreed that the consistency changes not in relation to re-export should be kept in the document sent for consultation and approved the revised draft ISPM on Focused revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011) for consultation.

## **2020\_eSC\_May\_19: Approval for consultation: Draft ISPM: Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014)**

### **Summary of the revision of the draft**

[227] The EWG considered all the elements indicated in Specification No. 66, proposing a definition for “audit” in the phytosanitary context; describing the various purposes, scopes and potential triggers for performing audits; describing the criteria, procedures and the requirements for approving and selecting auditors that would enable NPPOs (or entities authorized by them) to conduct audits, and considered, how NPPOs may manage conflicts of interest and confidentiality in order to maintain the integrity of an audit system.

[228] **Authorizing entities to conduct audits.** The draft considered that the NPPO may authorize third parties to conduct audits on its behalf to verify the systems and procedures of entities, as indicated in the task 8 of the specification 66. It was proposed that these Authorized third parties may audit:

- 1. Entities authorized to perform phytosanitary actions in its territory and
- 2. Entities participating in the system of the exporting country.

[229] “Entities participating in the system” could possibly include the NPPO’s own system (e.g. laboratories).

[230] Some members thought, the authorized entity should not audit part of the exporting NPPOs system, however others thought that authorized entities could audit both in the territory of the authorizing NPPO or in the territory of exporting country *on behalf of the importing NPPO*, depending on the agreement between both NPPOs.

- [231] One member was concerned with the distinction between the requirements for audits of entities by an NPPO in its own territory and requirements for systems audits carried out by an NPPO in the territory of another NPPO and suggested several edits to clarify these.
- [232] Some members thought that as the current version of the draft links with text related to audit currently in the draft standard on Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002). If the Authorization standard does not proceed or the text related to audit is removed from the Authorization standard, this draft will need to be revisited/redrafted from that basis, especially the section on Specific responsibilities of entities authorized to conduct an audit.
- [233] **Triggers.** Some SC members commented on the list of items that may trigger audit, and highlighted that this is not an exclusive list and the mentioned that these triggers don't automatically result in an audit, however it was agreed that the "may trigger and audit" in the chapeau sentence clarifies this.
- [234] **System vs verification audit.** Some members requested further clarification to be included to distinguish between the two types of audits, and revised the wording for clarity.
- [235] **Reorganization of the sections.** Several comments suggested moving sections or incorporating them in other sections. In an attempt to improve clarity, the Sections were rearranged to discuss firstly the general activities, that are considered important to highlight and are part of establishing the Audit System in advance of the audit (for example Sections on Frequency of audits; Financial Arrangements; Conflicts of interest and others), and secondly the performance of an audit (Sections on Steps in the audit process, planning, preparation and performance of an audit).

### Summary of SC e-forum discussion

- [236] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_19), the SC was first invited to review and revise the draft ISPM via the OCS, where the Steward addressed and incorporated the suggestions of SC members, and later to approve the revised draft ISPM on Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014) for consultation 2020 via an e-forum.
- [237] The OCS review of the Draft ISPM started on the 20 April 2020 and the subsequent review of the draft via e-decision took place 11- 18 May 2020. 16 SC members proposed changes to the draft and 17 SC members expressed their agreement in the e-decision forum.
- [238] The SC members noted the difficulty of addressing certain issues without a face-to-face meeting; however, they agreed to the revised version of the draft and approved it for first consultation.
- [239] **SC e-decision**
- [240] Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the revised draft ISPM on Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014) for consultation.

### 2020\_eSC\_May\_20: Approval of Draft PT for consultation: Irradiation treatment for *Carposina sasakii* (2017-026)

### Summary of SC e-forum discussion

- [241] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_20), the SC was invited to review the responses to comments and the draft in order to approve it for second consultation in 2020.
- [242] The SC e-forum was open from 09-23 June 2020. 17 SC members commented in the forum.
- [243] One member queried if inspectors may encounter "...deformed adults" during the inspection (paragraph 37 of the draft), given that this species pupate on the surface of the soil. Given standard postharvest practices in the packinghouse, perhaps pupae and adults are unlikely to be in the shipment. It was clarified that the TPPT included the wording under the "Other relevant information" section to account for the four (deformed) adults emerging after the treatment in the trials of Zhan et al. (2014). The TPPT

defined the end point as “prevent the emergence of viable adults” to indicate that the few adults that might emerge will still not be able to survive or reproduce.

[244] The treatment lead agreed that it would be very unlikely, but not impossible for pupae to accompany the host commodity.

[245] **SC e-decision**

[246] Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved responses to consultation comments and the following draft PT for second consultation: Irradiation treatment for *Carposina sasakii* (2017-026).

**2020\_eSC\_May\_21: Approval of Draft PT for consultation: Irradiation treatment for *Sternochetus frigidus* (2017-036)**

**Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[247] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_21), the SC was invited approve the draft PT for second consultation in 2020.

[248] The SC e-forum was open from 09-23 June 2020. 17 SC members commented in the forum.

[249] **SC e-decision**

[250] Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the following draft PT for first consultation: Irradiation treatment for *Sternochetus frigidus* (2017-036)

**2020\_eSC\_May\_22: Approval of Draft PT for consultation: Irradiation treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis* (2017-015)**

**Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[251] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_22), the SC was invited to review the responses to comments and the draft in order to approve it for second consultation in 2020.

[252] The SC e-forum was open from 09-23 June 2020. 17 SC members commented in the forum.

[253] One member queried if the disclaimer in paragraph 35: "This treatment should not be applied to fruits and vegetables stored in modified atmospheres because modified atmospheres may affect the treatment efficacy" should be kept, because according to document CPM 2020/17, in laboratory trials no difference in survival of four Tephritid fruit fly species was found when stored in low oxygen before and during irradiation. Therefore the SC agreed, based on the TPPT's recommendation, to present to CPM-15 (2020) as ink amendments the removal of this disclaimer from the seven already adopted irradiation treatments for Tephritid fruit flies as Annexes to ISPM 28.

[254] This issue has been considered by the TPPT when reviewing the treatment in March 2020 and it was proposed to remove the disclaimer after the CPM decision on incorporating the ink amendments - as the CPM meeting was cancelled the disclaimer remained, and was going to be removed all at once from all irradiation treatments on fruit flies once endorsed by the CPM.

[255] The SC agreed to keep the disclaimer for now, noting that a contracting party could oppose to the removal of the disclaimer at CPM-15.

[256] **SC e-decision**

[257] Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved responses to consultation comments and the following draft PT for second consultation: Irradiation treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis* (2017-015)

## **2020\_eSC\_May\_23: Approval of Draft PT for consultation: Irradiation treatment for the genus *Anastrepha* (2017-031)**

### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[258] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_May\_23), the SC was invited to review the responses to comments and the draft in order to approve it for second consultation in 2020.

[259] The SC e-forum was open from 09-23 June 2020. 17 SC members commented in the forum.

[260] One member queried if the disclaimer in paragraph 35: "This treatment should not be applied to fruits and vegetables stored in modified atmospheres because modified atmospheres may affect the treatment efficacy" should be kept, because according to document CPM 2020/17, in laboratory trials no difference in survival of four Tephritid fruit fly species was found when stored in low oxygen before and during irradiation. Therefore the SC agreed, based on the TPPT's recommendation, to present to CPM-15 (2020) as ink amendments the removal of this disclaimer from the seven already adopted irradiation treatments for Tephritid fruit flies as Annexes to ISPM 28.

[261] This issue has been considered by the TPPT when reviewing the treatment in March 2020 and it was proposed to remove the disclaimer after the CPM decision on incorporating the ink amendments - as the CPM meeting was cancelled the disclaimer remained, and was going to be removed all at once from all irradiation treatments on fruit flies once endorsed by the CPM.

[262] The SC agreed to keep the disclaimer for now, noting that a contracting party could oppose to the removal of the disclaimer at CPM-15.

### **[263] *SC e-decision***

Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved responses to consultation comments and the following draft PT for second consultation: Irradiation treatment for the genus *Anastrepha* (2017-031).