



**MINUTES OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE WORKING GROUP TO
DEVELOP A GUIDE TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION OF ISPM 15
(2017-043) (VM06)**

22 June 2021 and 06 July at 1:00 – 4:00 p.m. (Central European Summer Time, UTC+2)

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] Ms Barbara PETERSON, the IPPC Secretariat, Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU) Lead for the ISPM 15 Guide, welcomed the participants.

2. Meeting arrangements

- [2] There was no objection for the Secretariat to record the meeting.
- [3] The Working Group (WG) selected Mr Brad GETHING as chairperson and Mr Chris HOWARD as rapporteur.
- [4] The agenda for the meeting was adopted and is presented in Appendix 1.

3. Administrative matters

- [5] Mr Corrado CREMONINI, Ms Faith NDUNGE and Ms Marina ZLOTINA did not attend the first part of the meeting on 22 June. Mr Corrado CREMONINI, Mr Scott GEFROS and Ms Marina ZLOTINA did not attend the second part of the meeting on 06 July. The list of meeting participants is presented in Appendix 2.

4. Review of draft Guide

- [6] The WG discussed the comments on the draft guide that was shared using MS teams.
- [7] The WG confirmed that ISPM 15 describes phytosanitary measures intended to reduce the risk of introduction and spread of quarantine pests associated with the movement of WPMs that are made from raw wood. The WG discussed how to clarify that this guide does not cover contaminating pests or pests that infest the wood packaging material after it has been treated. The primary focus is forest quarantine pests. The WG discussed the possibility of using the term “ primary wood pests” and suggested that a definition might be developed for this term.
- [8] The Secretariat advised that the copy-editor would verify that technical terms are used consistently throughout the guide.
- [9] The WG discussed the issue of contaminating pests and how to clarify that they are outside the scope of ISPM 15. Termites were discussed as an example of pests that may infest wood packaging material after treatment. The Secretariat reminded the WG that Appendix 6 of this guide is intended to provide examples of insect species that should not be found alive in ISPM 15

compliant wood and list examples of potential secondary invaders (like termites, carpenter bees, snails) and “green wood” pests (e.g., some insects, deep-wood fungi) that may trigger quarantine actions, but do not indicate non-compliance with ISPM 15.

- [10] The Secretariat requested that the WG members submit photographs of regulated articles, exempted articles, compliant ISPM 15 marks and non-compliant ISPM 15 marks for inclusion in Appendices 1 and 2. The Secretariat explained that FAO permission forms will need to be completed to address any potential copyright issues and promised to share these forms following the meeting. The owner of the photographs will need to certify that they are the copyright holder of the material and has full power to grant this permission.
- [11] The WG confirmed that the definitions of ‘debarked wood’ and ‘dunnage’ in Sections 2 and 4.1 should be consistent with the definitions in ISPM 5 and that it is important to clarify that debarking does not necessarily result in bark-free wood.
- [12] For Section 4.2, the WG discussed clarifying the need for re-treating WPM following repairs or manufacturing. One WG member asked whether there was scientific evidence to support the statement that treated wood packaging material is unlikely to be susceptible to re-infestation. He noted that dry wood pests are often detected and while some of these infestations could be a sign of ineffective treatment others may be infestations that occurred after treatment.
- [13] For Section 4.2.1, the Secretariat suggested clarifying that various energy sources or processes may be suitable to achieve the required heat treatment (HT) parameters. Steam heating, kiln drying, heat-enabled chemical impregnation and dielectric heat (microwave, radio frequency) may all be considered heat treatments provided they meet the heat treatment specification specified in the standard of 56 degrees Celsius for 30 minutes.
- [14] The Secretariat provided draft text for Section 4.3 describing the process for submitting new treatments for approval and inclusion in ISPM 15.
- [15] A WG member suggested that the Syrex example provided in Section 4.4 may not provide a good example for justifying measures more stringent than ISPM 15 and suggested keeping the text more general or providing a better example. He also suggested that the reference to pinewood nematode is too narrow and that the initial ISPM 15 WG agreed that 56 degrees for 30 minutes would be sufficient to eliminate the vast majority of wood pests, including insects, pathogens and nematodes.
- [16] For Section 5.1, the WG discussed providing stronger wording to reinforce the fact that requiring additional documentation to certify WPM treatments or a declaration statement prior to import is not justified. The WG agreed to add text stating that if there is a compliant IPPC mark additional certification that phytosanitary treatment has occurred is not required.
- [17] For Section 5.2, the WG confirmed that the NPPOs may assign unique numbers to both authorized producers of WPM and to authorized treatment providers.

- [18] For Section 5.4, the Secretariat agreed to check with FAO legal to identify any additional actions that should be taken by NPPOs when there is significant fraudulent use of the ISPM 15 mark.
- [19] The WG agreed that it would be beneficial to include a case study about developing and applying legislation and regulations to support the implementation of ISPM 15, in relation to Section 6.2.
- [20] The WG also discussed the increased risk of fraud using the ISPM 15 mark when WPM is recycled or repaired and discussed procedures that may help to identify fraudulent ISPM marks.
- [21] The WG discussed the need for NPPOs to keep detailed records about authorized producers of ISPM 15 wood packaging material and ISPM 15 treatment providers. When reporting non-compliances, NPPOs in the importing country should provide sufficient information to the exporting NPPOs so that the exporting NPPO may investigate. The WG also discussed the value of making some types of information publically available and whether making such information publically available is likely to increase the risk of fraud. The WG agreed that fraud is difficult to prevent, however the risk may be reduced by NPPOs working together and providing timely and detailed information about non-compliances.
- [22] The Secretariat informed the WG that the draft ISPM on audit is currently out for country consultation and reminded the WG that the ISPM 45: Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions was adopted by CPM 15. The WG agreed to refer ISPM 45 when revising Section 7.
- [23] The lead author of Section 7.1 confirmed that the content of the flowchart on the authorization system for WPM should be reviewed and revised. One WG member suggested that the flowchart should align with the checklists for standard operating procedures that he is preparing. The two WG members agreed to work together on this.
- [24] One WG member highlighted the importance of having a traceability system in place for wood packaging material producers who source treated wood from a supplier.
- [25] The WG discussed probationary periods and concluded that specific recommendations related to the length of the probationary period should be removed from the text. The WG considered that it would be beneficial to have a case study for Section 7.2 that illustrates how an NPPO carries out audit of their wood packaging program.
- [26] For Section 7.3, the WG discussed the recycling WPM with the old ISPM 15 mark and agreed that the description will be reviewed by the responsible expert.
- [27] The WG discussed non-compliance on WPM and agreed that the responsible expert should provide an example of WPM certification scheme to illustrate Section 7.4 and provide examples of some critical and non-critical non-compliances.
- [28] For Section 7.5, the WG considered the usage of the term “authorized entities” vs “authorized facilities”, and the WG agreed to align with ISPM 45 and consider adding a text box to identify

the different types of entities that may be authorized by an NPPO under a wood packaging program.

- [29] For Section 8.2, one WG member identified a concern related to the description of the requirements to re-treat WPM that has been repaired. Two of the WG members agreed to review the two paragraphs in question, considering these comments.
- [30] For Section 8.4, the WG discussed how non-compliance on repaired WPM should be evaluated and discussed how NPPOs may provide oversight of the WPM repairs. The WG agreed that the lead authors of this section would review this text.
- [31] The WG discussed including some basic information about risk based sampling and agreed to consider whether Section 9.1 of this guide should reference the NAPPO risk based sampling manual.
- [32] For Section 9.4, the WG discussed the risk of contaminating pests on WPM and agreed to refine the text to clarify the fact that certain pests may be associated with any type of packaging or conveyance and are not associated uniquely with WPM.
- [33] For Section 9.5, one WG member suggested that data collection is also of interest for purposes of monitoring ISPM 15 implementation and evaluating ISPM 15 performance. The relevant lead authors agreed to consider combining Section 9.5 with Section 10.3.
- [34] For Section 10.2, the WG agreed to add returning a consignment to the country of origin as a possible action that may be taken against non-compliant WPM.

5. Discussion of next steps for the body of the Guide and the Annexes

- [35] The Secretariat reviewed the contents of each of appendices of the guide, and the WG agreed to provide photos to supplement those in the Explanatory document. The WG discussed the scope and content needed for the other appendices and identified a person that would be responsible for each.
- [36] The WG discussed the next steps for completing the main body of the guide, and agreed that the lead authors would finalize their chapters by mid-September. The WG agreed that lead authors should notify the other WG members via the e-forum tool as they finish revising the chapters assigned to them so that the WG members are aware that they have been updated and may review again.
- [37] The WG agreed to meet to review the final text for the first draft of the body of the guide on 21st September. The Secretariat explained the main body of the guide will be edited prior to being sent for peer review and that the Guide itself is still on track for peer review in November.
- [38] The WG also discussed the development of the two treatment annexes. The Lead author for the Heat Treatment annex indicated that this will take some time to develop and clarified that he is collaborating with other experts on this aspect. The Secretariat proposed that the two treatment

annexes should be developed independently as stand-alone treatment manuals. This would allow the main body of the guide to move forward and be published and the treatment manuals could follow when they are ready.

6. Any Other Business

[39] There was no other business.

7. Close of the meeting

[40] The Chair and the Secretariat thanked all the experts for their participation and the meeting was closed.

Appendix 1

Working Group Meeting to develop an IPPC Guide to support the implementation of ISPM 15 (VM-06)

22 June 2021 at 13:00 - 16:00 (Central European Summer Time, GMT +2)

Meeting URL: <https://fao.zoom.us/j/94810236225?from=addon>

To join by telephone: dial a number based on your current location <https://fao.zoom.us/j/94810236225?from=addon>

Passcode: 03771761 / Meeting ID: 948 1023 6225

Meeting URL: <https://fao.zoom.us/j/94810236225?from=addon>

PROVISIONAL Agenda

Dated: 2021-06-03

	AGENDA ITEM	Duration (minutes)	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1	Opening of the Meeting	10	--	Barbara PETERSON
2	Meeting Arrangements	15	--	Barbara PETERSON
2.1	Selection of the chairperson		--	Natsumi YAMADA
2.2	Selection of the rapporteur		--	Natsumi YAMADA
2.3	Adoption of the Agenda		VM06_01_ISMP15_Guide	Chairperson
3	Administrative matters	5	--	Natsumi YAMADA
3.1	Participants		VM06_02_ISPM15_Guide	Natsumi YAMADA
3.2	Working papers		IPP restricted work area	Natsumi YAMADA
4	Review of draft Guide	60		Chairperson / Lead authors
5	Discussion of next steps for the body of the Guide and the Annexes	60	--	Chairperson
6	Any Other Business	10	--	Chairperson
7	Close of the Meeting	5	--	Chairperson / IPPC Secretariat

Appendix 2

Participants List

Region/ Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
WG Member	Mr Marcel DAWSON	marcel.dawson17@gmail.com
WG Member	Mr Scott GEFROS	scott.geffros@canadianpallets.com
WG Member	Mr Brad A. GETHING	bgetting@palletcentral.com
WG Member	Mr Christopher HOWARD	chris.howard@agriculture.gov.au
WG Member	Mr Mohamed MAGDY	mm.fao.ispm15@gmail.com
WG Member	Mr Vinod PANDIT	v.pandit@CABI.org
WG Member	Ms Debora Maria RODRIGUES CRUZ	debora.cruz@agricultura.gov.br
IC Lead	Ms Faith NDUNGE	fdunge@kephis.org
IPPC Secretariat Lead	Ms Barbara PETERSON	barbara.peterson@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Natsumi YAMADA	natsumi.yamada@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Janka KISS	janka.kiss@fao.org