



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



International  
Plant Protection  
Convention

# **REPORT**

## **Standards Committee**

**Virtual Focused Meeting  
23–24 June 2021**

**IPPC Secretariat**

IPPC Secretariat. 2021. *Report on the virtual focused meeting of the Standards Committee, 23-24 June 2021*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). 33 pages. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

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, 2021



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.	Review of technical panels' work.....	4
4.1	Technical Panel for the Glossary .....	4
4.2	Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols.....	6
4.3	Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments .....	7
4.4	Technical Panel on Commodity Standards .....	9
5.	List of topics .....	10
	Review of the List of topics for IPPC standards, including priorities .....	10
	Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (as a revision of ISPM 15) (2006-010) .....	11
6.	Standards Committee.....	14
6.1	Summary of polls and forums on e-decision site .....	14
7.	Implementation Review and Support System call for topics: Standards Committee's proposals.....	14
8.	Updates .....	15
8.1	CPM Bureau updates.....	15
8.2	Standard Setting Unit update.....	16
9.	Any other business.....	16
10.	Date and type of the next SC meeting .....	17
11.	Recommendations to CPM Bureau, Strategic Planning Group or CPM-16 (2022) .....	17
12.	Evaluation of the meeting process .....	17
13.	Close of the meeting .....	17
	Appendix 1: Agenda.....	18
	Appendix 2: Documents list .....	19
	Appendix 3: Participants list .....	20
	Appendix 4: Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions between November 2020 and May (June) 2021 .....	25

## **1. Opening of the meeting**

### **1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat**

- [1] The Chairperson of the Standards Committee (SC), Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), welcomed all participants to the SC meeting and extended a particular welcome to the new SC members. The Standard Setting Unit (SSU) Acting Officer-in-Charge for daily matters, Adriana MOREIRA, also welcomed the representative of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) as an observer and the Steward for the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) for the agenda item on the TPG. The following SC members were absent: Prudence Tonator ATTIPOE (Ghana), Xiaodong FENG (China), Olga LAVRENTJEVA (Estonia), and Chonticha RAKKRAI (Thailand).

## **2. Meeting arrangements**

### **2.1 Election of the Rapporteur**

- [2] The SC elected Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) as Rapporteur.

### **2.2 Adoption of the agenda**

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

## **3. Administrative matters**

- [4] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “Secretariat”) introduced the documents list (Appendix 2) and the participants list (Appendix 3). The Secretariat invited participants to notify the Secretariat of any information that required updating in the participants list or was missing from it.

## **4. Review of technical panels’ work**

### **4.1 Technical Panel for the Glossary**

- [5] The Secretariat, on behalf of the TPG Steward, Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France), presented an update on changes to the membership of the TPG, an overview of TPG activities carried out since May 2020 and the TPG’s work plan for 2021–2022.<sup>1</sup> The following activities and issues were highlighted.
- [6] The TPG had met twice: once in December 2020 and again in January 2021, in virtual mode. A combined report had been produced.<sup>2</sup> The next meeting is scheduled to take place in December 2021, hopefully in person in Rome, Italy.
- [7] The SC was invited to assign a new steward to the TPG, as although the current steward will remain on the TPG until the end of 2023 as a French language expert, she had completed her term on the SC. She had, however, expressed a willingness to support the new steward until the end of 2021. The TPG had recommended to the SC that the Steward be a member of the TPG, as has been the usual practice to date.
- [8] In the period 2020 to 2021, the TPG had worked on 28 terms. It had reviewed for consistency three draft standards sent for first consultation, including the corresponding consultation comments submitted. It had also reviewed consultation comments from the first consultation of the 2019–2020 Amendments to the Glossary.
- [9] The TPG had submitted its proposals for the 2021 Amendments to the Glossary to the SC May 2021 virtual meeting, and the SC had approved all the proposed terms and definitions for first consultation in 2021. There had been four “packages” of terms, including proposals for consequential revisions of four

---

<sup>1</sup> 04\_SC\_FM\_Tel\_2021\_Jun.

<sup>2</sup> TPG meeting reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-glossary-phytosanitary-terms-ispm-5/>

terms not on the work programme as these terms were inextricably linked with the terms under consideration. The SC had agreed to add these four terms to the TPG's work programme.

- [10] The TPG had reviewed ink amendments needed to ISPMs as a result of changes to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).
- [11] In its standing agenda item on explanation of Glossary terms, the TPG had noted that the word “measures” at the end of the definition of “area of low pest prevalence” is redundant because “surveillance” and “control” are sufficient. The TPG had therefore agreed to invite the SC to consider deleting “measures” from the definition to avoid redundancy.
- [12] The TPG had recalled that revision of the definition of “quarantine area” (2012-006) was dependent on the revision of ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) (2009-005), and agreed that there would be no need for revision of the term if the draft ISPM 8 submitted to the Fifteenth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-15) were to be adopted. As the revised ISPM 8 had subsequently been adopted by CPM-15 (2021), the Secretariat advised the SC that the revision of “quarantine area” would no longer be needed.
- [13] The TPG had updated its work plan for 2021–2022, which included 22 terms currently on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (LOT).
- [14] The Secretariat finished the presentation by thanking the current steward for her stewardship of the TPG.
- [15] The SC Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for the presentation and invited comments from the SC. There were no general comments, so the SC turned its attention to the two main decision points for consideration: the selection of the new steward and the proposed ink amendment to the definition of “area of low pest prevalence”.
- [16] **Selection of TPG steward.** The SC Chairperson and the Steward both reiterated that the custom-and-practice is that the Steward is a member of both the TPG and the SC. The Steward confirmed that there was only one TPG member who was also an SC member, Olga LAVRENTJEVA (Estonia), and that although she was new to the TPG, she had been a member of a relevant regional plant protection organization (RPPO) panel for many years and so was used to discussing terminology. The Assistant Steward would, together with the outgoing steward, be able to support the new steward. LAVRENTJEVA was unable to be present at this meeting but had expressed a willingness to take on the role.
- [17] **Ink amendment to “area of low pest prevalence” definition.** The SC Chairperson recalled that at CPM-15 (2021), contracting parties had commented that ink amendments should not be of a technical nature and should not change the meaning of the definition, and the CPM had formally noted that ink amendments should be reserved for changes that improve the consistency of terminology.<sup>3</sup> He emphasized, therefore, that the SC needed to make sure that this proposed change would not change the meaning of the definition. The Steward confirmed that the proposed amendment did not change the meaning but just removed a redundancy.
- [18] The SC:
- (1) *acknowledged* the 11 years' contribution of Andrei ORLINSKI (EPPO), who left the TPG in 2021;
  - (2) *acknowledged* and *thanked* Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) for her six years of TPG stewardship;
  - (3) *selected* Olga LAVRENTJEVA (Estonia) as Steward for the TPG starting from June 2021 and *noted* that the outgoing steward, Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC, would support the new TPG Steward until December 2021;

---

<sup>3</sup> CPM-15 (2021), agenda item 9.2.

- (4) *agreed* to delete the word “measures” from the end of the definition of “area of low pest prevalence” as an ink amendment to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary measures*), to be presented to CPM-16 (2021) for noting;
- (5) *noted* the TPG work plan 2021–2022 and the work performed by the TPG over the last year.

## 4.2 Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols

- [19] The Secretariat, on behalf of the Steward for the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP), Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile), presented an update on the membership of the TPDP, an overview of TPDP activities carried out from June 2020 onwards and the tentative work plan for 2021–2022.<sup>4</sup> The following activities and issues were highlighted.
- [20] The Secretariat noted that there was currently no Assistant Steward for the TPDP. The term of Robert TAYLOR (expert for bacteriology (and backup for mycology)) was coming to an end and the SC was therefore invited to extend his term for another five years.
- [21] The Secretariat presented a summary of the number of diagnostic protocols (DPs) adopted each year, showing a peak in the period 2016–2018. The current work programme is focused more on the earlier stages of DP development. No new subjects had been added to the work programme in 2020, but progress on existing subjects is slowing moving forward in 2021. The TPDP work programme currently comprises 23 subjects under various stages of development, with more than 50 authors: nine subjects are under active development, one (on identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques) has “pending” status, and the others are awaiting a call for authors.
- [22] There had been two calls for authors in 2020 and one in 2021. For some subjects, few or no nominations of experts had been received. The TPDP is trying to identify key experts in some areas to be able to form a DP drafting group, but also invited SC members to consider nominating experts within their national and regional systems and to submit their nominations to the IPPC Secretariat.
- [23] One draft DP (for *Mononychelus tanajoa* (2018-006)) had been submitted to expert consultation since June 2020.
- [24] Since June 2020, there had been six TPDP meetings (all in virtual mode),<sup>5</sup> five TPDP e-forums, one SC e-forum for scope adjustment, one DP approved for consultation, one DP approved for the notification period, and one DP submitted for expert consultation. The TPDP had also considered various cross-cutting issues.
- [25] Regarding the TPDP’s work plan, the TPDP expected five to eight DPs to be submitted for the DP expert consultation and the consultation period in 2022 and one DP to be adopted by mid-2022. The Secretariat highlighted that not all DPs in the TPDP work programme have a DP drafting group, which affects the progress of these DPs.
- [26] The Secretariat finished by thanking the TPDP Steward, TPDP members, the DP authors and the experts contributing to expert consultations.
- [27] The SC Chairperson thanked the Secretariat and invited comments from the SC. There were no comments.
- [28] **Nomination of experts for DP drafting groups.** The SC discussed the problems in attracting nominations for experts, noting that language difficulties might be a limiting factor for participation of some experts. The SC also noted that it could be beneficial to review whether there is sufficient need for the DPs concerned. The Secretariat acknowledged the value of ensuring that there is sufficient need, but noted that the DPs concerned had only recently been added to the work programme as a result of the

---

<sup>4</sup> 12\_SC\_FM\_Tel\_2021\_Jun.

<sup>5</sup> TPDP meeting reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-diagnostic-protocols/>

last call for topics. One SC member suggested that perhaps the call for experts could be reopened, but with some additional guidance on, for example, the minimum number of experts on the drafting group, or regional representation. The Secretariat confirmed that there is no minimum to the number of people on drafting groups and there is no requirement regarding geographical representation as the primary set of skills required is the technical expertise, but regional representation is desirable. The Secretariat also highlighted that, in addition to language issues, the time commitment required may also present a problem for some experts, as this extends over at least three years. One SC member suggested that, as the experts with the most expertise generally may not have sufficient time to commit to the work, the criteria could be changed to allow people with slightly less expertise but more time to start the drafting process. The SC Chairperson suggested that perhaps national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) may, in some cases, need to make a more sustained effort to identify relevant experts and contact them.

[29] The SC:

- (6) *noted* the TPDP update and the work accomplished from May 2020 to June 2021;
- (7) *renewed* the membership of Robert TAYLOR (bacteriology (and backup for mycology) for another 5-year term;
- (8) *agreed* to consider nominating experts within their national and regional systems and to submit nominations to the IPPC Secretariat by 15 August 2021 for the following subjects:
  - *Amaranthus palmeri* (2019-006)
  - *Solanum rostratum* (2019-007)
  - *Moniliophthora roreri* (2019-005)
  - *Meloidogyne mali* (2018-019)
  - *Cronartium comandrae* (2018-015)
  - *Microcyclus ulei* (2019-003)
  - Revision of DP 3 (*Trogoderma granarium* Everts) (2021-001);
- (9) *noted* the TPDP tentative work plan for June 2021 to May 2022.

### 4.3 Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments

[30] The Steward for the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT), David OPATOWSKI, presented an update on the membership of the TPPT, an overview of TPPT activities carried out since May 2020 and the tentative work plan for May 2021 to April 2022.<sup>6</sup> The following activities and issues were highlighted.

[31] The Steward noted that there is currently no Assistant Steward for the TPPT.

[32] The Steward informed the SC that as one of the TPPT members, Matthew SMYTH (Australia), had indicated his intent to resign from the panel, the panel was likely to soon comprise only seven members. The TPPT had therefore invited the SC to consider whether to open a call for new TPPT members once the membership is reduced to seven.

[33] The Steward invited the SC to approve the continued participation of Guy HALLMAN as an invited expert in the TPPT meetings, given his extensive experience of the work of the TPPT. HALLMAN is also the Assistant Steward for the revision of ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*).

[34] Since May 2020, the TPPT had met in virtual mode seven times, three of these meetings being dedicated to the revision of ISPM 18.<sup>7</sup> The TPPT had addressed comments on seven phytosanitary treatments (PTs) from second consultation, and these had been subsequently approved by the SC and adopted by

<sup>6</sup> 09\_SC\_FM\_Tel\_2021\_Jun.

<sup>7</sup> TPPT meeting reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-phytosanitary-treatments/>



CPM-15 (2021). The TPPT had reviewed six PTs from first consultation (five from 2020 and one from 2019) and recommended five of them to the SC for second consultation, with the sixth awaiting further clarification from the submitter. The TPPT had also drafted one new treatment that was approved for first consultation in 2021 and had revised ISPM 18, which the SC had subsequently approved for first consultation in 2021.

- [35] Liaison with the Ozone Secretariat and the Phytosanitary Measures Research Group (PMRG) had continued, with several members of the TPPT also being members of the latter. The Secretariat expanded on this later, saying that one of the TPPT members was also the Chairperson of the PMRG and that the PMRG were actively supporting the TPPT, including helping with those PTs where information is lacking.
- [36] The TPPT had compiled its tentative work plan. This included responding to comments on the six PTs submitted for first consultation in 2021, submitting five PTs for adoption in 2022, evaluating any treatments submitted during the year, and providing support to the Steward of the revision of ISPM 18 when addressing the comments from the first consultation.
- [37] The TPPT had noted that, for many of the draft PTs, no substantial comments had been submitted in the second consultation. The SC was therefore invited to consider whether PTs could be approved for adoption after the first round if no substantive or major technical comments are made, especially where the PT is only one or two pages long.
- [38] The SC Chairperson thanked the Steward for his presentation and invited the SC to comment. There were no comments.
- [39] The SC therefore considered the two main questions raised in the update: whether to open a new call for experts to join the TPPT; and whether to allow only one consultation period for PTs if there are no substantive issues.
- [40] **Membership of the TPPT: call for experts.** The Secretariat explained that it would be helpful to open a call for experts to allow some overlap between long-standing members of the panel and new members so that there could be a smooth transition. It would also be good to increase regional representation, although it is recognized that not all regions may be engaged in phytosanitary treatment research.
- [41] The Secretariat confirmed that Specification TP3 (*Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments*) specified the particular areas of expertise that were needed, and that the TPPT had also reaffirmed that the experts needed to be involved in the research of treatments. The Secretariat recalled that the SC had previously recognized the need for experts in modified atmosphere treatments, so the call could include a focus on this if the SC wished, but noted that there are not many modified atmosphere treatments in operation, so it is likely to be very difficult to attract nominees. The Secretariat therefore suggested that it might be better to keep the scope of the call broad, given the general difficulty in attracting nominees.
- [42] The SC noted that the first step would be to establish the particular areas of expertise needed, but acknowledged that there would be little point in specifically seeking experts in modified atmosphere treatments given that so few such treatments are being used. The Secretariat confirmed that there are a broad range of draft PTs needing work by the TPPT and so there was no need to focus on a particular area of expertise. The Steward added that the areas of expertise needed are the same as those at the time of the previous call, two years ago, as one of the experts appointed then had now left. He considered, therefore, that the wording of that call would still be valid and that, given the difficulty in attracting nominees, it would be better to have a broad call and then assess those responding to it. The SC Chairperson pointed out that if there were to be a general call, then the SC would need to establish beforehand how the submissions would be assessed, so there was still a need to be clear about the areas of expertise that needed to be covered. The SC reviewed the wording of the previous call for experts, however, and agreed that it would be suitable, except that the number of experts sought should be “up to three” as the maximum number of TPPT members is ten.



- [43] **Number of consultation periods.** One SC member commented that decisions on whether a second consultation was needed would need to be made through a formal process, rather than by *ad hoc* decisions on a case-by-case basis. The SC considered who would determine what amounts to a “substantive” comment. The Secretariat confirmed that the final decision would rest with the SC, but suggested that the TPPT could make a recommendation to the SC, supported by the consultation comments and the TPPT responses. The Secretariat also clarified that “substantive” in this context is not intended to mean the same as the “substantive” category of consultation comments on draft ISPMs, but it refers instead to changes that are likely to be a significant issue for contracting parties.
- [44] The Secretariat reminded the SC that if it agreed to recommend this change in process, the proposal would need to be submitted to the CPM for agreement as it is a change in the Standard Setting Procedure.
- [45] The SC considered whether, if there was not to be a second consultation, there could perhaps a mechanism prior to adoption similar to the notification period for DPs, to ensure that the process was transparent and fair. The Secretariat clarified, however, that the proposal from the TPPT is that PTs would still be submitted to the CPM for adoption, which would include the usual objection period, and the SC noted that this would serve the same purpose as a notification period. The SC acknowledged that the process for PTs needed to be very clear as PTs have a substantial and direct impact on trade between contracting parties, which is one of the reasons for the difference between the adoption process for PTs and that for DPs. Some SC members expressed support for the idea of having one consultation period if there were no substantive issues, provided that it was made clear at the first consultation that contracting parties may not see the draft again before it goes to the CPM for adoption.
- [46] The SC agreed that a small group of SC members, including the Steward, would work with the Secretariat to draft a paper on options, for the SC to consider later in the year.
- [47] The SC thanked the Secretariat lead for her support of the panel, particularly the virtual meetings.
- (10) Th *thanked* Andrea BEAM for her dedicated work with the TPPT;
  - (11) *agreed* to open a new call for experts for membership of the TPPT, using the same wording as the previous call but seeking up to three experts;
  - (12) *agreed* to invite Guy HALLMAN to the TPPT meetings as an invited expert;
  - (13) *agreed* that David OPATOWSKI (TPPT Steward), Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina) and Sophie PETERSON (Australia) would work with the Secretariat lead to develop a paper on the proposal that phytosanitary treatments may undergo just one consultation period, for discussion by the SC at a future meeting;
  - (14) *noted* the reports from the TPPT meetings in 2020-07, 2020-10, 2020-11, 2020-12 (including two meetings in 2021-02) and 2021-03;
  - (15) *noted* the work accomplished by the TPPT from May 2020 to June 2021;
  - (16) *noted* the TPPT tentative work plan for June 2021 to May 2020.

#### 4.4 Technical Panel on Commodity Standards

- [48] The Steward for the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS), Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), presented an update on the current status of the panel, which had been established by CPM-14 (2019).<sup>8</sup> The overarching “concept” standard – the draft ISPM on *Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008) – had been approved for second consultation by the Standard Committee Working Group (SC-7) in May 2021, with a view to presenting it for adoption to CPM-16. Regarding membership of the panel, the intention is to open a call for experts in the fourth quarter of 2021, with subsequent selection of experts by the SC by early 2022 so that the panel can be fully operational immediately after CPM-16 (2022). This would mean that the panel would be in place in case any commodity standards are added to the work programme by the CPM as a result of the 2021 call for topics.

---

<sup>8</sup> 07\_SC\_FM\_Tel\_2021\_Jun.

[49] The SC Chairperson invited comments from the SC. There were no comments.

[50] The SC:

(17) *noted* the update on the activities of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS).

## 5. List of topics

[51] The Secretariat updated the SC on the changes to the LOT and introduced additional proposals for the SC to consider.<sup>9</sup>

[52] The LOT had been updated to incorporate changes made by CPM-15 (2021), which had included the disestablishment of the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ), and subsequent changes agreed by the SC in May 2021. There were now some further proposals for the SC to consider:

[53] **Priorities for new DP subjects.** In January 2021, the SC had agreed that revisions of four adopted DPs be included in the TPDP work programme: revisions to DP 3 (*Trogoderma granarium*), DP 9 (Genus *Anastrepha*), DP 25 (*Xylella fastidiosa*) and DP 27 (*Ips* spp.). The TPDP had then been asked to provide a recommendation on the priority for each subject. The respective discipline leads recommended the following priorities: priority 1 for DP 3 and DP 27; priority 2 for DP 9 and DP 25.

[54] **Revision of ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*): Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010).** As this topic had made no progress in recent years, the SC was invited to consider whether it should be deleted from the SC's work programme.

[55] **Review of LOT.** The SC was invited to consider assigning stewards or assistant stewards to those topics where these roles were vacant, and to consider the way forward for topics with "pending" status".

[56] The SC Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for introducing the agenda item and emphasized the need to review the priorities of topics that were not progressing, given the pressing need for work on other topics in the work programme.

## Review of the List of topics for IPPC standards, including priorities

[57] **Reviewing the list of topics.** The SC noted that the review of the LOT would need to include those topics that have been on the list a long time and those that have not progressed (e.g. where no experts have been found). The SC would need to assess whether topics are still needed. The SC recognized, however, that even if the work on some topics cannot be progressed (i.e. priority 4 topics), it is still useful to have a list of them if there is an identified need for the topics.

[58] The SC noted that it would also be helpful to review approved specifications for topics on the LOT, as some may no longer be relevant.

[59] The SC noted that it could be helpful to identify which of the topics could potentially be annexes to the concept commodity standard – the draft ISPM on *Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008) – once it is adopted, as this might change their priority. The commodity standards that are on hold would also need to be reviewed to ensure that they were compliant with the new concept standard, although the SC recognized that some of the standards (e.g. on grain and on cut flowers) had also had associated technical issues. The Steward of the draft ISPM on *International movement of grain* (2008-007) confirmed that as grain is a broad commodity, the draft standard may not fit the requirements of the concept standard, and speculated that the same might be true for cut flowers; she suggested, therefore, that as there was still quite a lot of work to be done on these two draft standards, they needed to be retained on the list. This suggestion was supported by some other SC members.

---

<sup>9</sup> 05\_SC\_FM\_Tel\_2021\_Jun; *List of topics for IPPC standards*: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards/list>.

- [60] The SC noted that some topics had been added to the LOT by the CPM, as a result of a call for topics, without review or approval by the SC. The Secretariat clarified that topics added to the work programme from the call for topics still need to go through the Standard Setting Procedure, with the SC drafting and approving a specification.
- [61] The SC noted that some topics were pending the outcome of other initiatives. Development of the draft ISPM on *Minimizing pest movement by sea containers* (2008-001), for example, was awaiting the outcome of the Sea Containers Task Force and a possible workshop.
- [62] With regard to another “pending” topic, *Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts* (2008-002), one SC member suggested that there would perhaps be no need for a draft ISPM on this if the draft CPM Recommendation on *Facilitating safe trade by reducing the incidence of contaminating pests associated with traded goods* (2019-002), which was due to be submitted to first consultation in 2021, is adopted.
- [63] The Secretariat acknowledged that there are some topics with old specifications that would need reviewing, but confirmed that after the expert working groups (EWGs) in 2021, there were only two specifications for which an EWG could be called. One of these was the topic *Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages* (2008-04) and the other was the topic *International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood* (2008-008). However, some concerns about the latter had been raised at the CPM and so the specification for this would need to be revised, and issues had been also been raised about the former, including the suggestion that it should wait until the concept commodity standard has been adopted. So, there were no approved specifications for which an EWG could be called in 2022, except for one topic with priority 4.
- [64] One SC member commented that the SC would need to decide whether to recommend closing the topic *International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood* (2008-008), although acknowledged that some of the problems identified previously may since been resolved.
- [65] The SC noted that although it can *recommend* whether “pending” topics remain as such or are closed, the actual *decision* rests with the CPM.
- [66] To take matters forward, the SC agreed that a small group of SC members would review the LOT and identify the topics that have not advanced or have a specification that is out of date, and then identify the topics that could be removed or for which the status needs to be changed. The SC agreed that the group would prepare a paper for discussion at a future SC meeting, but that there was no need to set a specific deadline for this work.
- [67] **Priorities for new DP subjects.** No comments were made relating to the priority of the four new DP subjects.
- [68] **Glossary term “quarantine area” (2012-006).** Recalling the earlier update from the TPG (see agenda item 4.1), the SC agreed to remove “quarantine area” (2012-006) from the work programme of the TPG.

#### **Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (as a revision of ISPM 15) (2006-010)**

- [69] In the paper for this agenda item, the SC was invited to recommend to the CPM that this topic be removed from the SC’s work programme; the SC was also invited to invite the International Forest Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG) and the PMRG to consider ways in which the theme “Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade” could be addressed by the international scientific community and to provide a report back to the SC.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> 05\_SC\_FM\_Tel\_2021\_Jun.

- [70] The SC was initially inclined to agree to the proposed removal of the topic, given the lack of progress in it, and turned its attention to the proposal about approaching IFQRG and PMRG. This, however, stimulated a lengthy discussion about both matters and a re-think about removal of the topic.
- [71] The SC acknowledged that there was a known gap in the process for evaluating treatments for incorporation into ISPM 15. Treatments can be proposed through the usual routes, including through the general call for topics and, if added to the work programme, the text on such treatments would be developed through the usual standard setting process. The TPFQ used to review such submissions for their practicability and implementation, with the TPPT reviewing the scientific evidence, but with the disestablishment of the TPFQ by CPM-15 (2021), the review of treatments would now be dealt with directly by the SC. However, there are no criteria for the evaluation of such submissions. The TPFQ had tried over many years to obtain the necessary information to derive such criteria, and a paper on the type of data required to support ISPM 15 treatments had been discussed and submitted to several journals, but the paper had never been published and it had not proved possible to advance the issue.
- [72] In the light of this lack of progress, the Steward for the topic was of the opinion that an alternative, more feasible approach would be to produce an explanatory document that provided guidance for NPPOs and researchers on the development of new treatments for wood packaging material. To develop such guidance, however, new ideas would be needed from the research community: hence the proposal to invite input from IFQRG and PMRG. The Steward commented that development of an explanatory document may not necessarily be under the SC.
- [73] The proposals gave rise to two main concerns among SC members: the appropriateness of inviting input from IFQRG and PMRG when the SC has no formal link with them, and the appropriateness of continuing to work on the issue if the topic is removed from the work programme.
- [74] **Input from IFQRG and PMRG.** The SC noted that the TPFQ used to have links with the IFQRG and PMRG, but that these links had ended with the disestablishment of the TPFQ. One SC member asked whether, now that there was no technical panel on forestry quarantine, the SC could link directly to these two groups or whether the SC could ask the TPPT to liaise with IFQRG and PMRG, given that the issue concerned treatments. The Secretariat highlighted the relevant expertise among the membership of IFQRG and PMRG, and commented that, if these groups were invited to consider the issue, it might act as a driver to stimulate some action. One SC member suggested that another option was to ask IFQRG and PMRG to review ISPM 15.
- [75] **Developing guidance.** The SC noted that, as the guidance concerned was not a treatment, it could not be submitted in the same way as treatments, but it was not clear what route could be used to develop the text. The Secretariat commented that this decision could be made after the material had been drafted: the SC could decide at that stage, depending on the information produced, how best to proceed within the established IPPC processes. The Steward suggested that, if it were deemed not to be an IC issue, one solution could be to approach the scientific community and publish the resulting material on the International Phytosanitary Portal. The Secretariat emphasized that if external groups produce guidance, then it needs to be made clear that it is not endorsed by IPPC bodies.
- [76] The SC considered the possibility of opening a call to gather the necessary information. It was acknowledged that no harm could come from opening a call, but the SC noted that it would still be necessary to determine the proper way to do this in terms of procedure and to decide what was being sought (e.g. research, papers). The SC would also need to consider whether the call would be an open one or not.
- [77] One SC member, while agreeing to the removal of the topic, also commented that if there is an urgent need for revision of ISPM 15, then the topic should be retained and an EWG established.
- [78] The Steward cautioned that if an EWG were established as a result of a call, it would be unlikely to be able to address the issue in one meeting, given that the TPFQ had failed to do this after trying for many years. She therefore emphasized the need for an influx of ideas from external groups.

- [79] **Procedural issues.** The Secretariat reminded SC members that when the SC recommends the removal of a topic to the CPM, a justification needs to be given. So, if the SC did decide to recommend removal, the Secretariat suggested that, as part of this justification, it would be good to be able to suggest some possible solutions to address the problem of there being no criteria for evaluating potential ISPM 15 treatments.
- [80] The Secretariat supported the idea of either opening a call or asking the TPPT to approach IFQRG and PMRG, and confirmed that, as the issue concerned the addition of treatments to a standard, rather than implementation of that standard, it was a standard setting issue rather than an implementation issue.
- [81] **The way forward.** The SC recognized that there was a need for guidance to be developed and that the information to do this was not currently available, but it was not able to reach consensus on how best to proceed. One option suggested was to seek advice from the CPM or the Strategic Planning Group, and another was to ask the CPM to move the topic to “pending” status. In the end, the SC decided to defer making any decisions about the removal of the topic or about inviting input from IFQRG and PMRG to the next SC meeting, with a paper on the matter to be prepared by the Secretariat (taking the lead) and the Steward. The Secretariat suggested that the Steward could approach Eric Allen, the former IFQRG Chair and former member of the TPFQ, to seek ideas on possible solutions, but that it would also be good to have ideas from other SC members. The Secretariat would be liaising with IFQRG and PMRG in any case, as part of the ongoing liaison with these groups.
- [82] The SC Chairperson encouraged SC members to consider the matter in advance of the next meeting, to minimize the time needed for the discussion at the meeting.
- [83] The SC:
- (18) *noted* the revised *List of topics for IPPC standards*;
  - (19) *agreed* with the priorities for new DP subjects:
    - Revision of DP 03 *Trogoderma granarium* (2021-001), priority 1
    - Revision of DP 27 *Ips* spp. (2021-004), priority 1
    - Revision of DP 09 Genus *Anastrepha* (2021-002), priority 2
    - Revision of DP 25 *Xylella fastidiosa* (2021-003), priority 2
  - (20) *agreed* that a small group of SC members, comprising Sophie PETERSON (Australia, lead), Steve CÔTÉ (Canada), Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ (Costa Rica), Masahiro SAI (Japan) and Joanne WILSON (New Zealand), would review the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and prepare a paper for discussion by the SC at a future SC meeting;
  - (21) *deferred* decisions on the priorities of the topics in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*;
  - (22) *deferred* consideration of the assignments of stewards or assistant stewards to topics until after the small group of SC members tasked with reviewing the *List of topics for IPPC standards* had reported back to the SC;
  - (23) *requested* that the Secretariat add an item on the topic *Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade* (as a revision of ISPM 15) (2006-010) to the agenda for the next SC meeting, and that the Secretariat and Steward prepare a paper for this agenda item, explaining the history and background to the current impasse on this topic;
  - (24) *agreed* to remove “quarantine area” (2012-006) from the work programme of the TPG and *requested* that the Secretariat update the *List of topics for IPPC standards* accordingly.



## 6. Standards Committee

### 6.1 Summary of polls and forums on e-decision site

- [84] The Secretariat presented a summary of the polls and fora held on the e-decision site from November 2020 to June 2021.<sup>11</sup>
- [85] The Secretariat presented the outcome of the final e-forum listed in the paper, which had only closed on 23 June. It related to the selection of experts for the EWG on the Annex (Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information (2018-011)) to ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*). Thirteen nominations had been received, but two of these had lacked the required information. The Secretariat presented the remaining nominees in order of the number of SC members supporting the candidate.
- [86] The SC noted that the specification for the topic (Specification 71) specified that the EWG should comprise six to eight experts, but two nominees were in equal eighth place. The SC discussed the two nominees, and concluded that both would make an equally valuable contribution to the EWG. The SC therefore agreed to select one of the two nominees as an EWG member and to invite the other as an invited expert, which is permitted by the guidelines on the composition for EWGs agreed by the CPM.<sup>12</sup> The Secretariat emphasized the need to be clear and transparent about this decision when announcing the EWG composition.
- [87] The Secretariat noted that the tentative timing for this EWG, July, would probably need to be changed to allow sufficient time for papers to be prepared.
- [88] The SC:
- (25) *agreed* that the “Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions between November 2020–2021 May” accurately reflected the outcome of the SC e-decisions (Appendix 4);
  - (26) *selected* the following members to form the EWG on the Annex (Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information (2018-011)) to ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*): Peter BAUFELD (Germany), Jocelyn Asha BERRY (New Zealand), Trace Christen HARDIN (United States of America), Craig HULL (Australia), Tatsuya INOUE (Japan), Zhihong LI (China), Aruna MANRAKHAN (South Africa) and Marco André SAVARIS (Brazil);
  - (27) *agreed* that Rui Cardoso PEREIRA (FAO/International Atomic Energy Agency) should be invited to participate in the EWG on the Annex (Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information (2018-011)) to ISPM 37, as an invited expert.

## 7. Implementation Review and Support System call for topics: Standards Committee’s proposals

- [89] The SC representative to the IC, Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile), presented an update on the activities of the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) subgroup of the IC.<sup>13</sup> The following activities and issues were highlighted.
- [90] The group had met on 28 April 2021 in virtual mode. It had received an analysis of the two previous IPPC general surveys and had discussed the IRSS third cycle, which had been extended to May 2022 to accommodate delays in 2020. The group had assigned priorities to some IRSS topics, including topics on risk-based border management, the third IPPC General Survey, the use of diagnostic protocols, global participation in the IPPC community, and the development of baseline measures to monitor the impact

<sup>11</sup> 10\_SC\_FM\_Tel\_2021\_Jun.

<sup>12</sup> Guidelines for composition and organizations of expert working groups, *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*, section 6.1: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/ippc-standard-setting-procedure-manual/>

<sup>13</sup> 06\_SC\_FM\_Tel\_2021\_Jun.

of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030. The group had agreed to develop a paper on the latter for the CPM Focus Group on the Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework’s 2020–2030 Development Agenda Items. In other matters, the group had agreed to oversee the IPPC Secretariat’s work on monitoring and evaluation, approved its work plan for 2021, and agreed to develop further its proposals on the future financial sustainability of the IRSS. Finally, the group had considered having input from a communication expert on how best to promote the IRSS.

- [91] The 2021 call for IRSS topics had been opened in March 2021 and had closed on 18 June. The IRSS subgroup had noted that the SC would provide its suggestions for new topics only after its June meeting.
- [92] The SC Chairperson thanked the SC representative to the IC for the update and invited comments from the SC, including any proposals for IRSS topics.
- [93] The Secretariat confirmed that proposals for new topics can be submitted at any time, but as there is a subgroup meeting in July, at which submissions will be discussed, the deadline for any SC proposals is the end of June. The Secretariat also clarified that the list of IRSS topics is quite full and resources are currently available only for those topics already on the list, but if new topics are added, a resource mobilization process would be initiated to secure funding.
- [94] There were no comments or proposals from SC members. The SC Chairperson therefore encouraged SC members to share ideas with the Secretariat after the meeting.
- [95] The SC:
  - (28) *noted* that SC members wishing to propose new topics for IRSS studies and surveys through the call for IRSS topics should share their ideas with the Secretariat by 30 June.

## 8. Updates

### 8.1 CPM Bureau updates

- [96] As the CPM Bureau representative was not able to attend the meeting, the Secretariat presented an update on CPM Bureau meetings since CPM-15 (2021) on her behalf.<sup>14</sup>
- [97] The Bureau had met in virtual mode in May and June, and then again for a special session in June. At its May meeting, the CPM Bureau had reviewed the Secretariat’s proposals to allocate savings made in 2021. It had discussed the inclusion of observers at Bureau meetings to build capacity and had received updates on the upcoming webinars and closing events for the International Year of Plant Health. The Bureau had noted the decisions of the SC to invite IC members to attend EWGs and to allow extra NPPO representatives as “silent observers” in virtual SC meetings. The Bureau had discussed requests from the private sector to be allowed to comment on draft CPM recommendations, but had deferred further discussion until a later meeting. The CPM Bureau had also received updates on the IRSS call for topics, the selection of the new IPPC Secretary and on the situation and activities undertaken by the IPPC Secretariat on the IC subgroup on the banana *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* tropical race 4 (TR4).
- [98] At its 2021 June meeting, the CPM Bureau had discussed and endorsed some of the nominations received for the CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 Development Agenda Items. The Bureau had noted the updated terms of reference for the consultant to work on diagnostic laboratory networks, which was being funded through the savings. The Bureau had also received financial updates, discussed the Cargo Integrity Group Joint Statement on Invasive Pest Transfer, received an update on banana fusarium wilt TR4, and received an update on the selection process for the IPPC Secretary. Finally, the Bureau had received an update on revising the dispute settlement process.

---

<sup>14</sup> 11\_SC\_FM\_Tel\_2021\_Jun.



[99] At its special meeting on 17 June, the Bureau had reviewed the nominations received for the CPM Focus on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues and the CPM Focus Group on Communications, but had deferred final decisions to subsequent electronic decision.

[100] The Secretariat referred SC members to the Bureau reports for further information.<sup>15</sup>

[101] The SC Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for the update and sought further information about the Bureau's discussions on expanding the involvement of the private sector in the development of CPM recommendations. The Secretariat commented that there had perhaps been a misunderstanding on the part of the Bureau about this, as the approaches from the private sector were not generic but were related to input from specific private bodies, represented by the Cargo Integrity Group, to a specific draft CPM recommendation, the draft CPM Recommendation on *Facilitating safe trade by reducing the incidence of contaminating pests associated with traded goods* (2019-002). The Bureau had agreed to encourage the private sector to channel any comments through their national or RPPO contact points, but had also agreed to set up one account for an industry representative to submit comments on behalf of all the concerned industries during the 2021 consultation on the draft CPM recommendation in question.

[102] The SC:

(29) *noted* the Bureau update.

## 8.2 Standard Setting Unit update

[103] The Secretariat presented a brief update on recent developments in standard setting work, considering the outcomes of the SC and SC-7 meetings in May.<sup>16</sup> This included details of forthcoming consultations, statistics on the participation of SC members in recent virtual SC meetings, and the dates and tentative agenda items of forthcoming SC meetings. The Secretariat highlighted the ongoing 2021 call for topics and confirmed that a webinar providing guidance on submission of proposals had been held on 21 June. Finally, the Secretariat presented a list of SC members and Secretariat leads contributing to the organization of the 2021 IPPC regional workshops.

[104] The SC Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for the update and invited comments from the SC.

[105] The Secretariat confirmed that the dates for the SC meeting in September had changed from 7–8 September to 14–15 September because of conflicts with other major FAO meetings and availability of interpretation services. The Secretariat referred SC members to the calendar on the IPP.<sup>17</sup>

[106] The SC noted that the dates for the regional workshop for the Near East and North Africa were 3, 5 and 10 August, and the Secretariat noted this amendment to the dates given in the SC paper.

[107] The SSU Acting Officer-in-Charge for daily matters thanked the SSU team for their hard work and diligence, and encouraged SC members to contact the SSU with any enquiries or concerns they might have.

[108] The SC:

(30) *noted* the update from the Standard Setting Unit.

## 9. Any other business

[109] There was no other business.

---

<sup>15</sup> CPM Bureau reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/bureau/>

<sup>16</sup> 08\_SC\_FM\_Tel\_2021\_Jun.

<sup>17</sup> Calendar of events on the IPP: <https://www.ippc.int/en/year/calendar/>

## **10. Date and type of the next SC meeting**

- [110] The next SC meeting will be a focused meeting, scheduled for 13–14 July (FM 2021/03) in virtual mode. Agenda items will include the discussion paper on how to progress the topic *Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade* (as a revision of ISPM 15) (2006-010) (see agenda item 5 of this meeting).

## **11. Recommendations to CPM Bureau, Strategic Planning Group or CPM-16 (2022)**

- [111] The SC noted that there were no recommendations for the CPM Bureau, the Strategic Planning Group or CPM-16 (2022) at this time.

## **12. Evaluation of the meeting process**

- [112] The SC Chairperson encouraged all SC members and observers to complete the evaluation of the meeting via the link provided on the agenda for this meeting.

## **13. Close of the meeting**

- [113] The SC Chairperson thanked SC members for their contributions and their support.

- [114] The SC Chairperson closed the meeting.

**Appendix 1: Agenda**

N	Agenda item	Document number / link	Presenter / IPPC Secretariat support
<b>1.</b>	<b>Opening of the Meeting</b>		
1.1.	Welcome By the IPPC Secretariat By the SC Chairperson		MOREIRA (OiC for SSU daily matters) <b>FERRO (SC Chairperson)</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>		
2.1.	Election of the Rapporteur	–	<b>Chairperson</b>
2.2.	Adoption of the Agenda	01_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	<b>Chairperson</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Administrative Matters</b>		
3.1.	Documents list	02_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	MUSHEGYAN
3.2.	Participants list	03_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun <a href="#">SC membership list</a>	MUSHEGYAN
<b>4.</b>	<b>Review of technical panels work</b>		
4.1.	Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG)	04_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	<b>BOUHOT-DELDUC</b> / SHAMILOV / MUSHEGYAN
4.2.	Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP)	12_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	<b>SEPULVEDA</b> / MOREIRA / CASSIN / MANGILI
4.3.	Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT)	09_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	<b>OPATOWSKI</b> / KISS
4.4.	Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)	07_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	<b>FERRO</b> / MOREIRA
<b>5.</b>	<b>List of Topics</b>		
5.1.	Review of: • topics, subjects, and priorities • stewards and assistant stewards	<a href="#">Link to List of Topics for IPPC standards</a> 05_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	CASSIN
<b>6.</b>	<b>Standards Committee</b>		
6.1.	Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (from November 2020 to June 2021)	10_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	KISS
<b>7.</b>	<b>IRSS call for topics: SC's proposals</b>		
7.1.	Background and update on the IRSS subgroup and topic proposal process	06_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	<b>SEPULVEDA</b> / KISS
<b>8.</b>	<b>Updates</b>		
8.1.	CPM Bureau updates	11_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	<b>GATT</b> / Secretariat
8.2.	Standard Setting Unit (SSU) update	08_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	MOREIRA
<b>9.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>		
<b>10.</b>	<b>Next meeting date and type</b> 13-14 July: SC Focused meeting (FM: 2021/03)		
<b>11.</b>	<b>Recommendations to CPM Bureau, SPG or CPM-16 (if any)</b>		
<b>12.</b>	<b>Evaluation of the meeting process</b>		
		<a href="#">Link to survey</a>	<b>Chairperson</b>
<b>13.</b>	<b>Close of the meeting</b>		
			<b>Chairperson</b>

**Appendix 2: Documents list**

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
<b>Meeting documents</b>			
01_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	2.2	Agenda	2021-05-19
02_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	3.1	Documents list	2021-05-31
03_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	3.2	Participants list	2021-05-31 2021-06-16
04_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	4.1	Update on activities of the TPG	2021-06-16
05_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	5.1	Adjustments to the List of topics and the stewards	2021-06-16
06_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	7.1	Call for IRSS topics	2021-06-16
07_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	4.4	Update Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)	2021-06-17
08_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	8.2	Standard Setting Unit (SSU) update	2021-06-17
09_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun_rev1	4.3	Update Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT)	2021-06-18
10_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	6.1	Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (from November 2020 to May 2021)	2021-06-18
11_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	8.1	CPM Bureau updates	2021-06-19
12_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jun	4.2	Update Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP)	2021-06-21

**Documents links** (presented in the order of the agenda items)

Links	Agenda item	Document link
SC membership list	3.2	<a href="#">SC membership list</a>
Review of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• topics, subjects, and priorities</li> <li>• stewards and assistant stewards</li> </ul>	5.1	<a href="#">Link to List of Topics for IPPC standards</a>
Evaluation of the meeting process	12	<a href="#">Link to survey</a>

**Appendix 3: Participants list**

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates attendance at the meeting.

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Africa Member	<b>Ms Alphonsine LOUHOARI TOKOZABA</b> Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage, 24, rue Kiélé Tenard, Mfilou, Brazzaville, <b>REPUBLIC OF CONGO</b> Tel: +242 01 046 53 61 Tel: +242 04 005 57 05	<a href="mailto:louhouari@yahoo.fr">louhouari@yahoo.fr</a> <a href="mailto:A.louhouaritoko@gmail.com">A.louhouaritoko@gmail.com</a>	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021)  2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Africa Member  SC-7	<b>Mr David KAMANGIRA</b> Senior Deputy Director and IPPC Focal Point Department of Agricultural Research Services Headquarters, P.O. Box 30779, Lilongwe 3 <b>MALAWI</b> Tel: +265 888 342 712 Tel: +265 999 122 199	<a href="mailto:davidkamangira1@gmail.com">davidkamangira1@gmail.com</a>	CPM-11 (2016) CPM-14 (2019)  2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years	2022
✓	Africa Member	<b>Mr Theophilus Mwendwa MUTUI</b> Acting Director, Technical Services Division. National Biosafety Authority, Pest Control Products Board (PCPB) Building, Loresho, off Waiyaki way P.O. Box 28251-00100 Nairobi <b>KENYA</b> Tel: +254 20 267 8667 Mob: +254 725 294445	<a href="mailto:mutuitm@yahoo.com">mutuitm@yahoo.com</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024
-	Africa Member	<b>Mr Prudence Tonator ATTIPOE</b> Deputy Director, Head Plant Quarantine Division. Ministry of Food and Agriculture P.O. Box AM 94 Amasaman-Accra <b>GHANA</b> Tel: 0209793292, 0262235397	<a href="mailto:tonattipoe@yahoo.co.uk">tonattipoe@yahoo.co.uk</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024
-	Asia Member	<b>Ms Chonticha RAKKRAI</b> Director, Plant Quarantine Research Group, Plant Protection Research and Development Office, Department of Agriculture, 50 Phaholyothin Rd., Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok, 10900 <b>THAILAND</b> Tel: (+66) 2561 2537 Fax: (+66) 2561 2146 Mob: (+66) 8 9128 6488	<a href="mailto:rakkrai@yahoo.com">rakkrai@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:chonticha.r@doa.in.th">chonticha.r@doa.in.th</a>	CPM-14 (2019)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2022

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Asia Member	<b>Mr. Gerald Glenn F. PANGANIBAN</b> Assistant Director for Operations and Administration, Bureau of Plant Industry, 692 San Andres Street, Malate, Manila, <b>PHILIPPINES</b> Tel: +639153141568	<a href="mailto:gfpanganiban@gmail.com">gfpanganiban@gmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:gerald_glenn97@hotmail.com">gerald_glenn97@hotmail.com</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Asia Member SC-7	<b>Mr Masahiro SAI</b> Senior Researcher (Head of Section) Planning and Coordination Section, Research Division Yokohama Plant Protection Station Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) <b>JAPAN</b> Tel: +81-45-211-7165	<a href="mailto:masahiro_sai670@maff.go.jp">masahiro_sai670@maff.go.jp</a>	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021)  2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years	2024
-	Asia Member	<b>Mr Xiaodong FENG</b> Deputy Director of the Division of Plant Quarantine, NATESC Ministry of Agriculture No. 20, Maizidian Street, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100125 <b>CHINA</b> Tel: (8610)59194524	<a href="mailto:fengxdong@agri.gov.cn">fengxdong@agri.gov.cn</a>	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021)  2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years	2024
-	Europe Member	<b>Ms Olga LAVRENTJEVA</b> Adviser of the Plant Health Department Ministry of Rural Affairs Lai tn 39 // Lai tn 41 15056 Tallinn <b>ESTONIA</b> Tel: 00372 518789	<a href="mailto:olga.lavrentjeva@gmail.com">olga.lavrentjeva@gmail.com</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Europe Member	<b>Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI</b> Servizio Fitosanitario DG Agricoltura Regione Lombardia Piazza Città di Lombardia 1 20124 Milano <b>ITALY</b> Tel: (+39) 3666603272	<a href="mailto:mariangela_ciampitti@regione.lombardia.it">mariangela_ciampitti@regione.lombardia.it</a>	CPM-14 (2019)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2022
✓	Europe Member SC-7	<b>Mr Samuel BISHOP</b> Plant Health Policy team Room 11G35 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs National Agri-Food Innovation Campus Sand Hutton York North Yorkshire <b>UNITED KINGDOM</b> YO41 4LZ Tel: +44 (0) 2080262506 Mob: +44 (0) 7827976902	<a href="mailto:sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk">sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk</a>	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021)  2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years	2024

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Europe Member	<b>Mr David OPATOWSKI</b> Head, Plant Biosecurity, Plant Protection and Inspection Services (PPIS), P.O. Box 78, Bet Dagan, 50250 <b>ISRAEL</b> Tel: 972-(0)3-9681518 Mob: 972-(0)506-241885 Fax: 972-(0)3-9681571	<a href="mailto:dopatowski@yahoo.com">dopatowski@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:davido@moag.gov.il">davido@moag.gov.il</a>	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) CPM-12 (2017) CPM-15 (2021)  4 <sup>th</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	<b>Mr André Felipe C. P. da SILVA</b> Federal Inspector Quarantine Division Ministry of Agriculture, Live Stock and Food Supply <b>BRAZIL</b> Tel: (61) 3218-2925	<a href="mailto:andre.peralta@agricultura.gov.br">andre.peralta@agricultura.gov.br</a>	CPM-14 (2019)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2022
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member  SC- 7	<b>Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ</b> Pest Risk Analyst Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado 300 Sur de Teletica, Sabana Sur, San José, <b>COSTA RICA</b> Tel: +(506) 8660-8383	<a href="mailto:hmorera@sfe.go.cr">hmorera@sfe.go.cr</a>	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021)  2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member  SC Chairperson	<b>Mr Ezequiel FERRO</b> Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA Av. Paeso Colón 315 C.A. de Buenos Aires <b>ARGENTINA</b> Tel/Fax: (+5411) 4121-5091	<a href="mailto:eferro@senasa.gov.ar">eferro@senasa.gov.ar</a>	CPM-14 (2019)  3 <sup>rd</sup> term / 3 years	2022
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	<b>Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE</b> Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal Av. Presidente Bulnes 140, 4 <sup>th</sup> floor, Santiago, <b>CHILE</b> Tel: + 56-2 234 5120	<a href="mailto:alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl">alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl</a>	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021)  3 <sup>rd</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Near East Member	<b>Ms Maryam Jalili MOGHADAM</b> Head of Phytosanitary and Plant Quarantine Bureau, Plant Protection Organization, Agriculture Ministry. No.24, the Eastern first floor, Eastern Shahrokh Alley, Mordad Street, Golha (flowers) Square, Fatemi Square, Tehran. Postal code: 1413973143 <b>IRAN</b> Cel: 00989126049255	<a href="mailto:marypaya@yahoo.com">marypaya@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:jalili@ppo.ir">jalili@ppo.ir</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Near East Member  SC-7	<b>Mr Nader ELBADRY</b> Phytosanitary Specialist, Central Administration of Plant Quarantine, 6 Michel Bakhoum St., Dokki, Giza, <b>EGYPT</b> Tel: +201096799493	<a href="mailto:nader.badry@gmail.com">nader.badry@gmail.com</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024



✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Near East Member	<b>Mr Imad (M.E) Jrouh AL-AWAD</b> Director Assistant of plant protection & Phytosanitary Department / Ministry of Agriculture. <b>JORDAN</b> Tel: 0096265686151 Ext. 309 Mob: 00962795363297	<a href="mailto:alawademad@yahoo.com">alawademad@yahoo.com</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Near East Member	<b>Mr Mohamed Lahbib BEN JAMAA</b> Direction of Plant Health and Control of Agricultural Inputs, 30, Rue Alain Savary, 1002-Tunis. <b>TUNISIA</b> Mob: +216.98.265.525	<a href="mailto:benjamaaml@gmail.com">benjamaaml@gmail.com</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	North America Member  SC-7	<b>Ms Marina ZLOTINA</b> IPPC Technical Director USDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) 4700 River Rd, 5c-03.37 Riverdale, MD 20737 <b>USA</b> Tel: 1-301-851-2200 Cell: 1 -301-832-0611	<a href="mailto:Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov">Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov</a>	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021)  3 <sup>rd</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	North America Member	<b>Mr Steve CÔTÉ</b> National Manager, International Phytosanitary Standards Plant Import/Export Division 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 <b>CANADA</b> Tel: (+1) 613-773-7368 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7576	<a href="mailto:Steve.Cote@canada.ca">Steve.Cote@canada.ca</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Southwest Pacific Member	<b>Ms Joanne WILSON</b> Principal Adviser, Risk Management Plant Imports Group Ministry for Primary Industries. <b>NEW ZEALAND</b> Tel: +64 489 40528 Mob: +64 2989 40528	<a href="mailto:joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz">joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz</a>	CPM-14 (2019)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2022
✓	Southwest Pacific Member  SC-7	<b>Ms Sophie Alexia PETERSON</b> Assistant Director   Plant Health Policy   Biosecurity Plant Division Department of Agriculture and Water Resources GPO Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601 <b>AUSTRALIA</b> Tel: (+61) 2 6272 3769 Mob: +61 402 313 170	<a href="mailto:sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au">sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Southwest Pacific Member	<b>Mr David Boas TENAKANAI</b> General Manager- Technical & Advisory Division, National Agriculture Quarantine & Inspection Authority (NAQIA) P. O. Box 741, Port Moresby, NCD, PNG <b>PAPUA NEW GUINEA</b> Tel: (675) 3136900 Mob: (675) 74482319	<a href="mailto:DTenakanai@naqia.gov.pg">DTenakanai@naqia.gov.pg</a> <a href="mailto:denakanai@gmail.com">denakanai@gmail.com</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024

Role	Name	Email address
IC / Observer	<b>Mr Ahmed M. Abdellah ABDELMOTTALEB</b>	<a href="mailto:bidoeng@yahoo.com">bidoeng@yahoo.com</a>
IC / Observer	<b>Mr Nilesh Ami CHAND</b>	<a href="mailto:pranavrchand@hotmail.com">pranavrchand@hotmail.com</a>
TPG Lead Steward	<b>Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC</b>	<a href="mailto:laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr">laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Adriana MOREIRA</b> Standard Setting Officer, OiC for SSU	<a href="mailto:Adriana.Moreira@fao.org">Adriana.Moreira@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Artur SHAMILOV</b> Standard Setting Officer	<a href="mailto:Artur.Shamilov@fao.org">Artur.Shamilov@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Erika MANGILI ANDRÉ</b> Standard Setting Specialist	<a href="mailto:Erika.MangiliAndre@fao.org">Erika.MangiliAndre@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Alejandra JIMENEZ TABARES</b> Standard Setting Assistant	<a href="mailto:Alejandra.JimenezTabares@fao.org">Alejandra.JimenezTabares@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Aoife CASSIN</b> Standard Setting Associate	<a href="mailto:Aoife.Cassin@fao.org">Aoife.Cassin@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Janka KISS</b> Standard Setting Associate	<a href="mailto:Janka.Kiss@fao.org">Janka.Kiss@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Edgar MUSHEGYAN</b> Standard Setting Associate	<a href="mailto:Edgar.Mushegyan@fao.org">Edgar.Mushegyan@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Karen ROUEN</b> Report writer	<a href="mailto:karen@karenrouen.com">karen@karenrouen.com</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Brent LARSON</b> Implementation and Facilitation Unit Lead	<a href="mailto:Brent.Larson@fao.org">Brent.Larson@fao.org</a>

# Appendix 4: Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions between November 2020 and May (June) 2021

E-decision number	SC decision	SC members commenting in the forum	Polls (yes/no)
2021_eSC_May_01	Draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for <i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i> (2017-015)	17	
2021_eSC_May_02	Draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for <i>Carposina sasakii</i> (2017-026)	17	
2021_eSC_May_03	Draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for the genus <i>Anastrepha</i> (2017-031)	16	
2021_eSC_May_04	Draft PT for adoption: Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Prunus avium</i> , <i>Prunus salicina</i> and <i>Prunus persica</i> (2017-022A)	15	
2021_eSC_May_05	Draft PT for adoption: Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Prunus avium</i> , <i>Prunus salicina</i> and <i>Prunus persica</i> (2017-022B)	15	
2021_eSC_May_06	Approval of Draft PT for consultation: Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Vitis vinifera</i> (2017-023A)	15	
2021_eSC_May_07	Approval of Draft PT for consultation: Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Vitis vinifera</i> (2017-023B)	14	
2021_eSC_May_08	Selection of SC representatives on the subgroups of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee	14	
2021_eSC_May_09	Selection of experts for the Russian language for the Technical Panel for the Glossary	14	
2021_eSC_May_10	Recommendations for the revision of adopted diagnostic protocols	16	6/0
2021_eSC_May_11	Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Vapour heat-modified atmosphere treatment for <i>Cydia pomonella</i> and <i>Grapholita molesta</i> on <i>Malus pumila</i> and <i>Prunus persica</i> (2017-037 and 2017-038)	15	
2021_eSC_May_12	Approval of Draft PT for consultation: Irradiation treatment for <i>Pseudococcus jackbeardsleyi</i> (2017-027)	15	
2021_eSC_May_13	Approval of Draft PT for consultation: Irradiation treatment for <i>Zeugodacus tau</i> (2017-025)	15	
2021_eSC_May_14	Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for Tortricidae on fruits (2017-011)	16	
2021_eSC_May_15	Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28 on Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera zonata</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i> (2017-013)	16	
2021_eSC_May_16	Irradiation treatment for <i>Sternonchetus frigidus</i> on <i>Mangifera indica</i> (2017-036)	16	
2021_eSC_May_17	Recommendations for the definition of scope for DP Genus <i>Ceratitis</i> (2016-001)	15	
2021_eSC_May_18	Draft DP for adoption: <i>Striga</i> spp. (2008-009)	15	
2021_eSC_May_19	Approval of draft DP for consultation: <i>Candidatus Liberibacter</i> spp. on <i>Citrus</i> spp. (2004-010)	15	
2021_eSC_May_20	Selection of experts for the EWG on the Annex (Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on	17	

	available information (2018-011)) to ISPM 37 ( <i>Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies</i> ( <i>Tephritidae</i> ))		
--	--	--	--

### **2021\_eSC\_May\_01: Draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis* (2017-015)**

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

[115] During the SC e-decision (2021\_eSC\_May\_01), the SC was invited to approve the TPPT responses to the consultation comments and recommend the following draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis* (2017-015).

[116] The SC e-forum was open 3 - 17 December 2020, and 17 members provided their comments.

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

[117] Based on the forum discussions, the SC unanimously approved the TPPT responses to the consultation comments and recommended the following draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis* (2017-015).

### **2021\_eSC\_May\_02: Draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for *Carposina sasakii* (2017-026)**

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

[118] During the SC e-decision (2021\_eSC\_May\_02), the SC was invited to approve the TPPT responses to the consultation comments and recommend the following draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for *Carposina sasakii* (2017-026).

[119] The SC e-forum was open 3 - 17 December 2020, and 17 members provided their comments.

[120] One SC member noted the consistency issues, where section “Other relevant information” refers to the fact the inspectors may encounter live, but non-viable “eggs, larvae or deformed adults”, while PT 6 and 10 (for Lepidoptera as well) refer to “larvae and/or pupae”.

[121] The IPPC Secretariat referred to the Treatment Lead’s explanation to clarify why the current wording was proposed: although this insect does not typically lay eggs on fruit, preferring to lay them on twigs and the undersides of leaves, if there is leaf left attached to the fruit there could be eggs there (although really uncommon). He noted that treatments do have different end points which explains the reference to non-viable adults. Hence, PT 6 and 10 are “to prevent the emergence of adults”, whereas this one is “to prevent the emergence of viable adults”.

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

[122] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the TPPT responses to the consultation comments and recommended the following draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for *Carposina sasakii* (2017-026).;

### **2021\_eSC\_May\_03: Draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for the genus *Anastrepha* (2017-031)**

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

[123] During the SC e-decision (2021\_eSC\_May\_03), the SC was invited to approve the TPPT responses to the consultation comments and recommend the following draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for the genus *Anastrepha* (2017-031).

[124] The SC e-forum was open 3 - 17 December 2020, and 16 members provided their comments.

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

[125] Based on the forum discussions, the SC unanimously approved the the TPPT responses to the consultation comments and recommended the following draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for the genus *Anastrepha* (2017-031).

#### **2021\_eSC\_May\_04: Draft PT for adoption: Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica* (2017-022A)**

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

[126] During the SC e-decision (2021\_eSC\_May\_04), the SC was invited to approve the TPPT responses to the consultation comments and recommend the following draft PT for adoption: Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica* (2017-022A).

[127] The SC e-forum was open 3 - 17 December 2020, and 15 members provided their comments.

[128] During the discussions, some SC members indicated that, without prejudice to the PT's approval, mentioning the varieties where the treatments were tested does not bring any clarification and should be avoided since PTs are adopted for application at the species level. They noted that although treatments provide information on the varieties tested for the development of the PT and is not intended to show the difference in effect between the tested varieties, in terms of implementation, it could lead to confusion when applied. They added that quoting this information through the References would avoid possible misinterpretation and, at the same time, meet the objective of being able to find more background information if needed. At the end they noted that while the varieties are already quoted in other adopted PTs, the concerns are still relevant, even though there is no objective to stop the treatment's adoption but rather to share the understanding regarding citation of varieties in the core text of a PT.

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

[129] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the TPPT responses to the consultation comments and recommended the following draft PT for adoption: Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica* (2017-022A).

#### **2021\_eSC\_May\_05: Draft PT for adoption: Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica* (2017-022B)**

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

[130] During the SC e-decision, the SC was invited to approve the TPPT responses to the consultation comments recommend the following draft PT for adoption: Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica* (2017-022B).

[131] The SC e-forum was open 3 - 17 December 2020, and 15 members provided their comments.

[132] During the discussions, some SC members indicated that, without prejudice to the PT's approval, mentioning the varieties where the treatments were tested does not bring any clarification and should be avoided since PTs are adopted for application at the species level. They noted that although treatments provide information on the varieties tested for the development of the PT and is not intended to show the difference in effect between the tested varieties, in terms of implementation, it could lead to confusion when applied. They added that quoting this information through the References would avoid possible misinterpretation and, at the same time, meet the objective of being able to find more background information if needed. At the end they noted that while the varieties are already quoted in other adopted PTs, the concerns are still relevant, even though there is no objective to stop the treatment's adoption but rather to share the understanding regarding citation of varieties in the core text of a PT.

### *SC e-decision*

- [133] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the TPPT responses to the consultation comments recommended the following draft PT for adoption: Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica* (2017-022B).

### **2021\_eSC\_May\_06: Approval of Draft PT for consultation: Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Vitis vinifera* (2017-023A)**

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

- [134] During the SC e-decision (2021\_eSC\_May\_06), the SC was invited to approve the TPPT responses to the consultation comments and recommend the following draft PT for adoption: Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Vitis vinifera* (2017-023A).
- [135] The SC e-forum was open 3 - 17 December 2020, and 15 members provided their comments.
- [136] During the discussions, some SC members indicated that, without prejudice to the PT's approval, mentioning the varieties where the treatments were tested does not bring any clarification and should be avoided since PTs are adopted for application at the species level. They noted that although treatments provide information on the varieties tested for the development of the PT and is not intended to show the difference in effect between the tested varieties, in terms of implementation, it could lead to confusion when applied. They added that quoting this information through the References would avoid possible misinterpretation and, at the same time, meet the objective of being able to find more background information if needed. At the end they noted that while the varieties are already quoted in other adopted PTs, the concerns are still relevant, even though there is no objective to stop the treatment's adoption but rather to share the understanding regarding citation of varieties in the core text of a PT.

### *SC e-decision*

- [137] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the TPPT responses to the consultation comments and recommended the following draft PT for adoption: Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Vitis vinifera* (2017-023A).

### **2021\_eSC\_May\_07: Approval of Draft PT for consultation: Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Vitis vinifera* (2017-023B)**

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

- [138] During the SC e-decision (2021\_eSC\_May\_07), the SC was invited to approve the TPPT responses to the consultation comments and recommend the following draft PT for adoption: Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Vitis vinifera* (2017-023B).
- [139] The SC e-forum was open 3 - 17 December 2020, and 14 members provided their comments.
- [140] During the discussions, some SC members indicated that, without prejudice to the PT's approval, mentioning the varieties where the treatments were tested does not bring any clarification and should be avoided since PTs are adopted for application at the species level. They noted that although treatments provide information on the varieties tested for the development of the PT and is not intended to show the difference in effect between the tested varieties, in terms of implementation, it could lead to confusion when applied. They added that quoting this information through the References would avoid possible misinterpretation and, at the same time, meet the objective of being able to find more background information if needed. At the end they noted that while the varieties are already quoted in other adopted PTs, the concerns are still relevant, even though there is no objective to stop the treatment's adoption but rather to share the understanding regarding citation of varieties in the core text of a PT.

- [141] *SC e-decision*

- [142] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the TPPT responses to the consultation comments and recommended the following draft PT for adoption: Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Vitis vinifera* (2017-023B).

### **2021\_eSC\_May\_08: Selection of SC representatives on the subgroups of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee**

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

- [143] During the SC e-decision, the SC was invited to note the current representatives of the SC in the various groups as presented in the table, and nominate the SC representative to the informal e-Commerce network and be involved in the e-Commerce programme, which are currently under the remit of the IC and coordinated by the IFU of the IPPC Secretariat.
- [144] The SC e-forum was open 3 - 17 December 2020 with one-week extension till 24 December, and 14 members provided their comments.
- [145] During the discussions, one of the SC members, Mr Samuel BISHOP, offered his candidacy, which the rest of the SC members unanimously supported.

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

- [146] Based on the forum discussions, the SC agreed to nominate Mr Samuel BISHOP as the SC representative to the informal e-Commerce network and be involved in the e-Commerce programme.

### **2021\_eSC\_May\_09: Selection of experts for the Russian language for the Technical Panel for the Glossary**

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

- [147] During the SC e-decision (2021\_eSC\_May\_09), the SC was invited to consider the nomination and select an expert for the Russian language for the Technical Panel for the Glossary.
- [148] The SC e-forum was open 16 December 2020 - 5 January 2021, and 14 members provided their comments.

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

- [149] Based on the forum discussions, the SC unanimously agreed that Ms Olga LAVRENTJEVA would be an expert for the Russian language for the Technical Panel for the Glossary, starting the term from 2021.

### **2021\_eSC\_May\_10: Recommendations for the revision of adopted diagnostic protocols**

- [150] During the SC e-decision (2021\_eSC\_May\_10), the SC was invited to agree to add the revisions of DP 03, DP 09, DP 25 and DP 27 to the TPDP work programme.
- [151] The SC e-forum was open 20 January 2021 until the 10 February, and 16 members provided their comments.
- [152] Two members were concerned with adding the revision of DP 3 and DP 25 as it was considered that the existing still correctly identifies the pests, and there is no immediate need for technical revision. Another member thought that DP 3 and DP 9 still correctly identifies the pest and does not necessarily need the inclusion of molecular methods, however he did not oppose adding them to the work programme of the TPDP
- [153] The Secretariat explained, that regarding the request for revision of DP 03: *Trogoderma granarium* and DP 09 Genus *Anastrepha*, the addition of molecular methods, as it is being proposed, would be important for immature insect identification, as from the TPDP request and analysis.



[154] All SC members agreed with the recommendation for the revision of DP 09 Genus *Anastrepha*, and the Secretariat opened a poll to agree for the revisions of the following 3 DPs to be added to the TPDP work programme.

- Revision of DP 03: *Trogoderma granarium* Everts
- Revisiosn of DP 09 Genus *Anastrepha*
- Revision of DP 25 *Xylella fastidiosa*

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

[155] A total of 6 SC members contributed to the poll. Based on the forum discussions and the poll, the SC agreed to add the revisions of all 4 DPs, i.e. DP 03, DP 09, DP 25 and DP 27 to the TPDP work programme.

### **2021\_eSC\_May\_11: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Vapour heat–modified atmosphere treatment for *Cydia pomonella* and *Grapholita molesta* on *Malus pumila* and *Prunus persica* (2017-037 and 2017-038)**

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

[156] During the SC e-decision (2021\_eSC\_May\_11), the SC was invited to approve the responses to the comments and the following draft PT for second consultation: Vapour heat–modified atmosphere treatment for *Cydia pomonella* and *Grapholita molesta* on *Malus pumila* and *Prunus persica* (2017-037 and 2017-038).

[157] The SC e-forum was open 9-23 March 2021, and 15 members provided their comments.

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

[158] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the responses to the comments and the following draft PT for second consultation: Vapour heat–modified atmosphere treatment for *Cydia pomonella* and *Grapholita molesta* on *Malus pumila* and *Prunus persica* (2017-037 and 2017-038).

### **2021\_eSC\_May\_12: Approval of Draft PT for consultation: Irradiation treatment for *Pseudococcus jackbeardsleyi* (2017-027)**

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

[159] During the SC e-decision (2021\_eSC\_May\_12), the SC was invited to approve the following draft PT for first consultation: Irradiation treatment *Pseudococcus jackbeardsleyi* (2017-027).

[160] The SC e-forum was open 9-23 March 2021, and 15 members provided their comments.

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

[161] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the following draft PT for first consultation: Irradiation treatment *Pseudococcus jackbeardsleyi* (2017-027).

### **2021\_eSC\_May\_13: Approval of Draft PT for consultation: Irradiation treatment for *Zeugodacus tau* (2017-025)**

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

[162] During the SC e-decision (2021\_eSC\_May\_13), the SC was invited to approve the the responses to the comments and following draft PT for second consultation: Irradiation treatment for *Zeugodacus tau* (2017-025)).

[163] One SC member noted the need to include in the draft the fact that the taxonomic name was changed from *Bactrocera tau* to *Zeugodacus tau* as "Bactrocera tau" or "Bactrocera (*Zeugodacus*) tau" is still

used as the scientific name among many countries and scientists. Consequently the following footnote was included”: "Species names is in accordance with Doorenweerd et al. (2018), following the elevation of the subgenus *Bactrocera* (*Zeugodacus*) to genus level (Virgilio et al. 2015)."

[164] The SC e-forum was open 9-23 March 2021, and 15 members provided their comments.

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

[165] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the responses to the comments and the following draft PT for second consultation: Irradiation treatment for *Zeugodacus tau* (2017-025).

### **2021\_eSC\_May\_14: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for Tortricidae on fruits (2017-011)**

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

[166] During the SC e-decision (2021\_eSC\_May\_14), the SC was invited to approve the responses to the comments and following draft PT for second consultation: Irradiation treatment for Tortricidae on fruits (2017-011).

[167] The SC e-forum was open 6-20 May 2021, and 16 members provided their comments.

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

[168] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the comments and the following draft PT for second consultation: Irradiation treatment for Tortricidae on fruits (2017-011).

### **2021\_eSC\_May\_15: 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**

[169] During the SC e-decision (2021\_eSC\_May\_15), the SC was invited to approve responses to the comments and the following draft PT for second consultation: Cold treatment for *Bactrocera zonata* on *Citrus sinensis* (2017-013).

[170] The SC e-forum was open 6-20 May 2021, and 16 members provided their comments.

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

[171] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the comments and the following draft PT for second consultation: Cold treatment for *Bactrocera zonata* on *Citrus sinensis* (2017-013).

### **2021\_eSC\_May\_16: Irradiation treatment for *Sternochetus frigidus* on *Mangifera indica* (2017-036)**

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

[172] During the SC e-decision (2021\_eSC\_May\_16), the SC was invited to approve responses to the comments and the following draft PT for second consultation: Irradiation treatment for *Sternochetus frigidus* on *Mangifera indica* (2017-036).

[173] The SC e-forum was open 6-20 May 2021, and 16 members provided their comments.

[174] One member noted that "on *Mangifera indica*" was added in the title and in paragraph, whereas the already adopted irradiated treatments are relevant for all fruits and vegetables. It was clarified that addition of the target regulated article (mangoes) to the title was an editorial proposal to not to confuse with other irradiation treatments that are for all fruits and vegetables. The mango seed weevil is a pest specific to mangoes; it does not infest any other commercial plant.

- [175] Another member was concerned, if one of the comments regarding the low "number of pests to be experimented" has been properly answered as the response is more related to the efficacy than the number of insects. The treatment lead explained that the response focuses on the efficacy, because efficacy is closely related to the number of insects tested. The higher the number of insects tested, the higher the efficacy is. The response implicitly says, that the number of tested insects yields a moderate level of efficacy, but that no eggs were laid (0 survivor) and countries may decide whether it meets their acceptable level of protection. The number of tested insects is stated in the text of the draft to facilitate the understanding of this concept.

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

- [176] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the comments and the following draft PT for second consultation: Irradiation treatment for *Sternochetus frigidus* on *Mangifera indica* (2017-036).

#### **2021\_eSC\_May\_17: Recommendations for the definition of scope for DP Genus *Ceratitis* (2016-001)**

- [177] During the SC e-decision (2021\_eSC\_May\_17), the SC was invited to review the background information and justification agree to define the scope of "Genus *Ceratitis*" (2016-001) to the diagnosis of the genus and six species.

- [178] The SC e-forum was open 24 May – 14 June 2021, and 15 members provided their comments.

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

- [179] Based on the forum discussions, the SC agreed to define the scope of "Genus *Ceratitis*" (2016-001) to the diagnosis of the genus and six species.

#### **2021\_eSC\_May\_18: Draft DP For adoption: *Striga* Spp. (2008-009)**

- [180] During the SC e-decision the SC was invited to approve the responses to the comments and agree to submit the draft DP for *Striga* spp. (2008-009) to the DP Notification Period, starting 1 July 2021

- [181] The SC e-forum was open 31 May to June 16 2021, and 15 members provided their comments.

- [182] On member noted that the sampling size rules of the International Seed Testing Association (ISTA) are not applicable to examining *Striga* contamination, but for examining germination, disease or moisture in seeds. He felt that the sample size given in the DP should be a requirement given regardless of the ISTA rules, and proposed to remove the reference. The IPPC Secretariat clarified that the TPDP debated in keeping some reference to ISTA rules, to highlight that the ISTA rules does not apply in this case. Consequently the text was revised to clarify the above and enhance the text.

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

- [183] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the responses to the comments and agree to submit the draft DP for *Striga* spp. (2008-009) to the DP Notification Period, starting 1 July 2021 as modified at the e-decision.

#### **2021\_eSC\_May\_19: Approval of draft DP for consultation: *Candidatus Liberibacter* spp. on *Citrus* spp. (2004-010)**

- [184] During the SC e-decision the SC was invited to approve the draft DP for *Candidatus Liberibacter* spp. on *Citrus* spp. (2004-010) for consultation.

- [185] The SC e-forum was open 31 May to June 14 2021, and 15 members provided their comments.

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

- [186] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the draft DP for *Candidatus Liberibacter* spp. on *Citrus* spp. (2004-010) for consultation.

**2021\_eSC\_May\_20: Selection of experts for the EWG on the Annex (Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information (2018-011)) to ISPM 37 (Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae))**

[187] During the SC e-decision (2021\_eSC\_May\_20) the SC was invited to consider the nominations and *select* six to eight member(s) for the EWG on the Annex to the ISPM 37.

[188] The SC e-forum was open from 09-23 June 2021. 17 SC members provided comments and indicated which experts they thought were most suitable to perform the tasks of the EWG.

[189] The Specification allows 6-8 members to be selected. The decision on the final membership was made at the June 2021 Focused SC meeting. Because Mr Tatsuya Inoue and Mr Rui Cardoso Pereira received an equal amount of support, the SC decided to include Mr Inoue as the 8<sup>th</sup> member and Mr Pereira as an invited expert.

[190] Based on the forum discussion and the discussion at the made at the June 2021 Focused SC meeting, the SC selected the following 8 experts for the EWG:

- (31) Ms Aruna MANRAKHAN
- (32) Mr Peter BAUFELD
- (33) Mr Trace Christen HARDIN
- (34) Mr Craig HULL
- (35) Dr Jocelyn Asha BERRY
- (36) Ms Zhihong LI
- (37) Mr Marcoandre SAVARIS
- (38) Mr Tatsuya INOUE

[191] The SC decided to invite Mr Rui CARDOSO PEREIRA as an invited expert.