



REPORT

Standards Committee

Virtual meeting

9–11 and 13 May 2022

IPPC Secretariat

IPPC Secretariat. 2022. *Report of the virtual meeting of the Standards Committee, 9–11 and 13 May*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention.

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, 2022



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 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 (fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting	5
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat and SC chairperson.....	5
2.	Meeting arrangements	5
2.1	Election of the rapporteur.....	5
2.2	Adoption of the agenda	5
3.	Administrative matters	5
4.	Draft ISPMs for approval for first consultation.....	5
4.1	Draft annex to ISPM 38 (<i>International movement of seeds</i>): Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification (2029-009), priority 1	5
4.2	Draft annex to ISPM 37 (<i>Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>): Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information (2018-011), priority 3.....	9
4.3	Draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) (1994-001), priority 1.....	11
5.	Draft specifications for review and approval for consultation.....	13
5.1	Revision of ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>) (2021-010), priority 2.....	13
6.	Review of the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i>	15
7.	Standards Committee.....	17
7.1	CPM-16 (2022) outcomes relevant to the SC	17
7.2	Summary of polls and fora discussed on the e-decision site (from November 2021 to May 2022).....	18
8.	Updates and enhancing synergies.....	18
8.1	Update from the Integration and Support Team.....	18
8.2	Update from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit	18
8.3	Update on Implementation and Capacity Development Committee Implementation Review and Support System activities.....	19
8.4	Phytosanitary components page of the International Phytosanitary Portal.....	19
9.	Discussions on the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030	20
10.	Any other business.....	20
11.	Recommendations to the CPM Bureau, Strategic Planning Group or CPM-17 (2023) (if any)	21
12.	Dates and types of next SC meetings	21
13.	Evaluation of the meeting process.....	21
14.	Election of the SC chairperson	21
15.	Close of the meeting.....	21
	Appendix 1: Agenda.....	22
	Appendix 2: Documents list.....	24
	Appendix 3: Participants list	26

Appendix 4: Draft annex *Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies* (2018-011) to ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*)..... 31

Appendix 5: Draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001) ... 36

Appendix 6: Draft specification on Revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010)..... 40

Appendix 7: Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions between 2021 November and 2022 May 43

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat and SC chairperson

- [1] The Standard Setting Unit (SSU) lead, Avetik NERSISYAN, welcomed all participants to the Standards Committee (SC) meeting and invited SC members to join the celebration of the International Day of Plant Health on 12 May. He introduced the new IPPC Secretary, Osama EL-LISSY, who thanked the SC members for their valuable work in helping to achieve the IPPC mission of protecting plant health and facilitating safe trade. The IPPC secretary invited the SC members to make suggestions about ways of improving secretariat support to the SC and expressed his gratitude to the retiring SC chairperson.
- [2] The SC Chairperson, Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), thanked the IPPC secretary and the SSU lead and welcomed all SC members and observers.
- [3] The following SC members were absent: Imad (M.E) Jrouh Al-AWAD (Jordan), Alphonsine LOUHOARI TOKOZABA (Congo) and David Boas TENAKANAI (Papua New Guinea).

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Election of the rapporteur

- [4] The SC elected Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy) as rapporteur.

2.2 Adoption of the agenda

- [5] The SC adopted the agenda (Appendix 1), but agreed to consider agenda item 5 after agenda item 3.

3. Administrative matters

- [6] The documents list (Appendix 2) and the participants list (Appendix 3) had been made available to the SC before the meeting.

4. Draft ISPMs for approval for first consultation

- [7] The draft ISPMs to be considered for approval for first consultation had been reviewed by the SC in the Online Comment System (OCS) and modified by the respective stewards and assistant stewards in response to the comments from SC members. The modified drafts were presented to the SC for review.

4.1 Draft annex to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*): Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification (2029-009), priority 1

- [8] The Steward, Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America), introduced the draft ISPM and supporting documentation.¹ She introduced the background to the topic, which was based on the Regulatory Framework for Seed Health (ReFreSH) programme in the United States of America. This programme was designed to result in a more effective and efficient way of managing the pest risk associated with the movement of seed by leveraging, at critical control points, current practices used in the seed industry that reduce overall pest risk. The steward highlighted the unique regulatory challenges presented by the global nature of the seed trade, with any given seed lot potentially transiting through multiple countries. Given these challenges, she explained that the vision of ReFreSH was for a globally accepted system that was a voluntary alternative to consignment-by-consignment inspection and testing but still satisfied phytosanitary certification requirements.
- [9] The steward highlighted the main issues that had arisen during the meeting of the expert working group (EWG) and the drafting of the annex. The EWG had met in virtual mode in October 2021 and had completed their tasks, although there were still some challenges to address. The EWG had recognized that the participation of the seed industry was essential for the successful implementation of systems

¹ 2018-009; 2018-009_OCS; 05_SC_Tel_2022_May_Rev1; Specification 70: www.ippc.int/en/publications/89274; EWG meeting report: www.ippc.int/en/publications/90591

approaches for seeds but had also recognized that, for this to happen, the systems approaches would need to provide predictability and to be economically viable (i.e. not too complicated). Furthermore, the EWG had recognized that practices to manage pest risk may not all be applied in the same country, so multilateral recognition would be needed.

- [10] It had become clear during subsequent editing and review of the draft annex by the steward and editor that a new structure for the text would improve the quality of the draft, and the SC had agreed via e-forum to consider the proposed restructured version rather than the original version of the text. The steward summarized the main issues arising during the review of this restructured text. These had included: whether the proposed framework acted as a systems approach or was a framework of integrated measures for managing pest risk; the implications of there being more than one exporting country and importing country in a seed supply chain; the alternative requirements for issuing phytosanitary certificates or alternatives to a phytosanitary certificate; discussions between national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) and industry on pest lists; consistency in the use of terms; and some questions about specific parts of the text.
- [11] The SC chairperson thanked the steward and acknowledged the major challenge presented by the multiple countries through which a seed lot may move. He invited the SC to make any general comments.

The way forward for development of the draft annex

- [12] A few SC members expressed concerns about the draft annex and suggested that although it represented a good start, it still needed much work. They commented that the draft did not adequately link with ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*) and it provided insufficient guidance on how a multilateral approach would work and so it would be difficult to implement. The steward commented that ISPM 14 does not provide much guidance on multilateral approaches and the draft also had to fit within the framework of ISPM 38. She suggested, however, that the SC consider whether the issues to be addressed by the draft could be met by integrated measures (in the sense used in ISPM 36 (*Integrated measures for plants for planting*)) rather than by a systems approach.
- [13] The SC had an extensive discussion on how to progress the draft annex, including whether to review the draft text at this meeting, use the time to discuss the general conceptual issues, or defer. The SC noted the importance of seed health and that it was better to ensure that the text was sufficiently mature before submitting it to consultation rather than rushing it. A few SC members expressed the view that there was insufficient time in this SC meeting to advance the draft text to a point where it was ready for consultation and suggested that consideration of the draft be deferred to a future, in-person meeting of the SC, given that this was a particularly challenging issue to progress in virtual mode. One SC member suggested that perhaps a second meeting of the EWG could be called, but this time in person. The steward expressed a preference to at least review the SC's comments on the draft text at this meeting, so that she would know what to work on. In the end, the SC agreed to discuss some of the general issues in this SC meeting, select a small working group of SC members to progress matters after the meeting, and then consider the output from that group at a future, in-person SC meeting.
- [14] The SC and the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as "the secretariat") thanked the steward for her excellent work on a very difficult issue. The steward expressed her appreciation to the Assistant Steward, Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ (Costa Rica), for his contributions to the EWG and subsequent support.

General issues relating to the draft annex

- [15] **Seed regulatory bodies.** One SC member pointed out that in some countries seed regulatory issues are dealt with by the NPPO, but in other countries these will be dealt with by a separate regulatory body. The member asked how the latter would be accommodated within the proposed systems approaches. The steward clarified that the systems approaches would be voluntary: no country would be obliged to use a systems approach, although they may choose to do so (which might particularly be the case where an NPPO already works closely with industry). She noted that systems approaches already exist for

other commodities, but seeds are different because of the multiple countries involved in the seed supply chain.

- [16] **Integrated measures vs systems approach.** One SC member commented that one of the differences between a framework of integrated measures and a systems approach concerned the role of the NPPO: according to ISPM 14, a systems approach is overseen and controlled by an NPPO; according to ISPM 36, integrated measures are developed and set up by an NPPO. The member therefore highlighted the need for clarity about the role of the NPPO in order to draft the annex appropriately. Another SC member commented that the NPPO should lead, but would also need to work with the seed industry. The steward concurred that the NPPO would ultimately be responsible for whatever regulatory framework was established. This aspect was also touched upon later in the agenda item, when discussing the relationship between NPPOs and the seed industry (see below).
- [17] The steward added that a further difference was that in a systems approach at least two of the component measures had to be independent measures, which enhanced the safety of the system. She suggested that perhaps the annex could still focus on systems approaches, but refer to critical control points as in the ReFreSH programme.
- [18] **Arrangement vs agreement.** One SC member commented that the difference between “arrangement” and “agreement” was not clear in the text. The steward suggested that “arrangement” might be more acceptable in this context.
- [19] **Overlap with the core text of ISPM 38.** One SC member commented that there was some overlap between the draft annex and the core text of ISPM 38 that could be removed. Later in the agenda item, the steward concurred that the draft still much redundancy, even though the EWG had already removed a lot.
- [20] **Regulated pest lists.** One SC member noted that although the draft annex required countries participating in a given systems approach to agree on a list of seed-transmitted pests, countries differ in the pests that they regulate. The member therefore sought clarity on whether the aim was for all participating countries to regulate all the pests of concern to those countries, or that participating countries may choose whether to regulate each pest or simply to address the pest risk but not regulate the pest. The steward first reiterated that the systems approaches would be voluntary. She then explained that it would be the responsibility of each NPPO to determine which measures would be effective against its regulated pests or, if joining an existing system, to make sure that the measures addressed their own regulated pest list. She pointed out that the measures taken by industry are designed to remove all pests, not just regulated pests, and that the systems approaches would address classes of pests, not individual pests. National plant protection organizations would use audit to verify the performance of the systems approach, and would be free to choose their own methods, including diagnostic protocols (DPs). The steward also highlighted the importance of the principle of equivalence, as countries would not need to apply the measures in the systems approach if they applied equivalent measures.
- [21] **Possible appendices to the annex.** The steward commented that the annex is intended to provide a general framework for systems approaches for seeds, but specific guidance – on specific crops, for instance – could be added as appendices.
- [22] **Relationship between NPPOs and the seed industry.** The SC noted that the relationship between NPPOs and the seed industry may differ between countries, with variation in the level of political and commercial influence in the running of NPPOs. They acknowledged that they needed to be cognizant of this when developing the annex to ensure that it could be successfully implemented, but they were clear that the regulatory responsibility lay with NPPOs.
- [23] **Commodity-specific standards.** One SC member referred to the apparent desire of the seed industry for a systems approach that would cover all seed commodities, and expressed the view that this would not be possible. The member commented that if the seed industry wished to have a systems approach for a particular commodity (e.g. tomato seed), then they could submit a topic proposal for it, but even then it might not be possible to achieve global agreement. The member suggested, therefore, that it may

be better to develop guidance as commodity-specific standards rather than as this annex. The steward recalled, however, that the annexes to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) are designed to help NPPOs evaluate options for phytosanitary measures when setting phytosanitary import requirements for bilateral movements of commodities, whereas seed movements do not tend to be bilateral.

[24] **General principles.** Accepting that the draft would not be submitted to first consultation this year, the steward encouraged the SC to consider the fundamental question of whether the annex was needed or not and, if it was, what it should contain. She emphasized the importance of being clear about the purpose of the annex and what it was trying to achieve. She suggested that the annex could perhaps be redrafted to provide guidance on general IPPC principles in the context of systems approaches for seeds (e.g. NPPOs having ultimate responsibility, systems approaches including at least two independent measures, equivalence, multilateral recognition (what is meant by it)).

[25] **Pest risk assessment.** Responding to the steward's comments on general principles, one SC member acknowledged that it would be difficult to capture a general standardized framework in one document, as it might work in one part of the world but not in others, depending on the relationship between NPPO and industry. The member also pointed out that although it appeared that the starting point for systems approaches would be industry practices, for individual commodities a commodity risk assessment would be needed.

[26] The steward confirmed that the process would start with risk assessment, as each country has its own phytosanitary import requirements, but intermediate countries in the seed supply chain would need to take account of the fact that the seed may be just moving through their territory rather than being planted, which affected the pest risk it posed. It would be the responsibility of each NPPO along the supply to conduct pest risk analysis to determine whether the systems approach addressed the pest risk posed by this seed in relation to pests that the NPPO regulated.

[27] The SC:

- (1) *noted* the meeting report of the EWG on the Draft Annex to ISPM 38: Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification (2018-009); and
- (2) *selected* the following SC members to form a working group to address the main conceptual issues presented by the draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*), advance the drafting of the annex if possible, and report back to the SC at its meeting in November 2022:
 - Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America, lead and steward),
 - Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ (Costa Rica, assistant steward),
 - Harry ARIJS (Belgium),
 - Prudence ATTIPOE (Ghana),
 - Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy),
 - André Felipe C.P. da SILVA (Brazil),
 - David KAMANGIRA (Malawi),
 - Sophie PETERSON (Australia),
 - Chonticha RAKKRAI (Thailand),
 - Masahiro SAI (Japan), and
 - Joanne WILSON (New Zealand).

4.2 Draft annex to ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*): Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information (2018-011), priority 3

- [28] The Steward, Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America), introduced the draft ISPM and supporting documentation.² She explained that the aim of the annex was to help risk analysts and NPPO decision-makers in those situations where experimental studies or field trials as described in ISPM 37 are not possible and so host status needs to be based on whatever existing information is available.
- [29] The steward highlighted the main issues that had arisen during the drafting of the annex by the EWG, who had met in virtual mode in January 2022. These issues included limitations with the core text of ISPM 37, mostly concerning the definition of “conditional host”, which is restricted to the field trials under semi-natural conditions described in ISPM 37 and so is difficult to apply in real life when reviewing information from published literature. The EWG had still been able to draft some guidance, however, and had drafted criteria on assessing the reliability and applicability of available information.
- [30] The steward then summarized the main issues arising during the review of the draft annex by SC members in the OCS. These had included: a proposed change of title to “Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies”; the need to make the difference between the criteria for determination of “natural host” and those for “conditional host” clearer by bringing together common criteria; the removal of the table giving examples of terms used in the literature with possible alignment to the categories used in ISPM 37; and the problems with the current definition of “conditional host” as described in ISPM 37.
- [31] The steward also invited the SC to consider whether the annex should require fruit to be undamaged and attached in order to determine host status, and to consider the section on biodiversity and the environment drafted by the EWG for potential inclusion in the core text of ISPM 37 when it is next opened up for revision.
- [32] The SC chairperson thanked the steward and invited the SC to make any general comments.
- [33] The SC recognized that the term “conditional host” was used in the annex in a wider sense than in the core text of ISPM 37, but that this reflected the common use of the term by many countries, which covered plants that were hosts only under certain circumstances (e.g. only when they were ripe). The SC noted, however, that if there were to be a difference between the annex and the core text, then the meaning of “conditional host” in the annex would need to be very clear. The steward clarified that the EWG had not proposed that the SC change the definition in ISPM 37 as they recognized that this was a question for the future, but when elaborating the text of the draft annex the EWG had found it impossible to work with the definition from ISPM 37.
- [34] The SC then reviewed the draft ISPM and discussed the issues raised by the steward at the relevant points in the draft.

Review of draft ISPM and outstanding issues

- [35] **Title of the annex.** The SC agreed to modify the title of the draft annex to “Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies” in order to give more emphasis to the evaluation of available information.
- [36] **Host terminology: natural host.** The SC noted that the fruit in which fruit flies develop on a natural host may not remain attached to the plant throughout the life cycle of the pest. They therefore amended the text to make it clear that the requirement for the fruit to be attached to the plant only applied to the start of fruit fly development. The SC also made the same change to the description of a conditional host.

² 2018-011; 2018-011_OCS; 06_SC_FM_Tel_2022_May_Rev1; Specification 71: www.ippc.int/en/publications/89275; EWG meeting report: www.ippc.int/en/publications/90897

- [37] **Host terminology: conditional host.** The SC noted that the description of a conditional host, which referred to natural or semi-natural conditions, differed from the definition given in the core text of ISPM 37, which referred only to the latter. The steward reiterated that the EWG had found it impossible to work with the definition from ISPM 37, as the purpose of the annex was to provide guidance on how to determine host status from existing information, but this information was often not based on the field trials under semi-natural conditions described in ISPM 37. The annex therefore needed to provide guidance on how to interpret such information and the EWG had concluded that the only way to do this would be to allow for the term “conditional host” to apply in natural or semi-natural conditions.
- [38] The SC acknowledged the difficulty but again noted that the difference between the meaning of “conditional host” in the annex and that in the core text of ISPM 37 needed to be made clear in the annex, to avoid having a conflict within the standard as a whole. The assistant steward for the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) confirmed that it should be made clear in the annex whether the explanations of the host status categories were alternatives to, or supplementary to, the definitions in the core text of ISPM 37.
- [39] The SC changed the text from “certain, clearly described natural or semi-natural conditions” to “semi-natural or certain, clearly described natural conditions”. One SC member suggested that perhaps the words “clearly described” should come before “semi-natural” so that the semi-natural conditions are also clearly described, but when the SC returned to this text later in the agenda item there were no further comments and so the SC left the text as it was.
- [40] The SC considered whether plants shown to be infested only under laboratory conditions could be considered to be conditional hosts, but noted that if the term “conditional host” extended to such plants then there could not be a requirement for the fruit to be attached to the plant. The SC noted that such plants would be considered to be “non-hosts” under ISPM 37, as there was no infestation under natural or semi-natural conditions. The steward pointed out that if infestation had only been reported from laboratory conditions, then risk analysts would say this in their determination and cite the relevant publications.
- [41] **Host terminology: non-host.** The SC simplified the elements listed for a non-host to avoid duplication.
- [42] **Terms used in the literature.** The SC reviewed the table giving examples of terms used in the literature and showing possible alignment to the categories used in ISPM 37. The steward explained that the table had been included by the EWG because one of the tasks in Specification 71 (*Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information*) was to identify different terms used in the literature and align these with the categories defined in ISPM 37. However, the table had been compiled by the EWG through an intuitive process rather than being based on specified criteria. For this reason, the steward suggested that the table be removed because the suggested alignments with ISPM 37 categories were not technically justified. The SC agreed and deleted the table.
- [43] **Criteria for determining host status.** The steward raised the comments made during the OCS review that had highlighted the repetition between the list of criteria for natural host and that for non-host. The steward suggested that the elements common to all three host categories be combined at the beginning of the section, which would then make the differences between the three categories clearer. The SC agreed, but decided to focus upon the content of the criteria in the SC meeting and leave the reorganization of the section for the steward to implement after the meeting as an editorial change.
- [44] One SC member asked whether the criteria were the items in the lists, or whether the criterion (and the most important point) was the completeness of the listed information. The steward clarified that the lists identified the information that risk analysts should consider, but it was a “wish list” more than a list of mandatory information, because in real-life situations the information available is always incomplete to some degree. She added that the completeness of the information would be reflected in the uncertainty of the host status determination. In the light of this discussion, the SC amended the introductory text for each host status category to say that the NPPO should assess the completeness, reliability and applicability of the information listed.

- [45] **Criteria for determining natural host status.** The SC reviewed the list of criteria and agreed that there was no need for a description of fruit harvesting procedures, post-harvest processing or transportation to be listed, as such information would not help determine whether a plant was a natural host or not. The SC therefore deleted reference to these activities.
- [46] The SC considered whether to also delete reference to phytosanitary treatments, as if a plant had been treated then one would not expect any pests to be present on it. The SC noted that if treatments other than phytosanitary treatments were applied in the field, then information on those may be helpful for the host status determination, but decided to retain reference to phytosanitary treatments for the time being and await the outcome of the consultation.
- [47] The SC amended the introduction to this subsection for greater consistency with that for the following subsection on criteria for conditional host status.
- [48] **Criteria for determining conditional host status.** The SC made some editorial changes to reduce redundancy.
- [49] **Assessing the reliability and applicability of available information.** The SC considered a suggestion from one SC member during the OCS review to delete the bulleted list giving examples of information sources of higher reliability. The SC discussed whether to delete it and refer to implementation materials, retain it because it was only providing general guidance, or simply delete it. Noting that ISPMs do not refer to specific implementation material, they agreed to the latter option.
- [50] **Application of the host status of a fruit to a fruit fly.** One SC member suggested that a further requirement be added to recognize that even if plant species or cultivars are classified as natural hosts, they may not all pose the same pest risk. The member suggested that, when conducting a pest risk analysis, the evidence that led to the decision of natural host status should be analysed in detail so that phytosanitary measures could be selected that were appropriate for the level of pest risk posed. The SC agreed and added the text to the draft annex.
- [51] **References.** The secretariat pointed out none of the references listed were cited in the draft annex. The SC therefore deleted the entire References section.

Potential implementation issues

- [52] The steward confirmed that the EWG had not identified any potential implementation issues.
- [53] The SC:
- (3) *noted* the meeting report of the EWG on the Draft Annex to ISPM 37: Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information (2018-011);
 - (4) *noted* that the secretariat will archive the section on Impacts on biodiversity and the environment, drafted by the EWG, for potential inclusion in the core text of ISPM 37 when it is next opened up for revision; and
 - (5) approved the draft annex *Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies* (2018-011) to ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) as modified in this meeting for submission to the first consultation (Appendix 4).

4.3 Draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001), priority 1

- [54] The TPG Assistant Steward, Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark), introduced the draft amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*), which concerned the revision of two terms: “phytosanitary action” (2020-006) and “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007).³ The assistant steward explained that the key

³ 1994-001; 1--4-001_OCS; TPG 2021-12 virtual meeting report: www.ippc.int/en/publications/90770

question in revising these definitions was whether the regulated pests referred to in the definition of “phytosanitary measure” (upon which the definition of “phytosanitary action” depended) and in the definition of “phytosanitary procedure” were regulated, in a narrow sense, by the country that established the phytosanitary measure or, in a broader sense, by a country that applied that phytosanitary measure in order to meet the phytosanitary import requirements of the former country. The assistant steward confirmed that the TPG’s proposed revisions were based on the broader sense and hence included the enabling of phytosanitary certification as an additional purpose of a phytosanitary action or procedure, as well the implementation of phytosanitary measures.

- [55] The assistant steward explained that there had been only one comment made by SC members during the review in the OCS, which was a suggestion to add “document checks or verification of consignment integrity” at the end of the proposed definition of “phytosanitary procedure”. The assistant steward recommended to the SC, however, that this wording not be incorporated, as the second part of the definition was merely a list of examples and was not intended to be exhaustive. He commented that the TPG tries to limit definitions to only what is essential and the essential element here was to expand the scope in terms of which pests were covered by the definition. The TPG had discussed whether to include examples at all, but had decided to retain the existing examples as these may help users understand the definition. However, the assistant steward thought that adding the extra text could result in the focus of the revision being lost and even with the extra text the list of examples would not be complete. Also, the existing examples all relate to a higher level (areas as well as consignments), whereas the proposed addition was more detailed and only applicable to consignments and therefore to import.
- [56] **“phytosanitary action” (2020-006).** The SC agreed with the TPG proposal for revision and made no changes.
- [57] **“phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007).** The SC considered the suggested extra text and noted that all the existing examples given in the definition were physical activities, which could give the impression that administrative activities could not be phytosanitary procedures. Adding the extra text would help to clarify this. The assistant steward confirmed addition of the extra text would not give rise to any significant conflict with other definitions in the Glossary, but pointed out that the examples given in the current proposed definition are exactly the same as those in the definition of “phytosanitary action” and it might cause confusion if they were different for no apparent reason (as there is a connection between the terms “phytosanitary measure”, which can be thought of as *what to do*, “phytosanitary procedure”, which is *how to do it*, and “phytosanitary action”, which is actually *doing it*).
- [58] The SC therefore agreed not to add the extra examples to the proposed definition of “phytosanitary procedure”, but did modify the text so that the list of examples was introduced with “such as” rather than “including”, to make it absolutely clear that these were a list of examples and the list was not exhaustive.
- [59] In response to a query from the SC, the assistant steward gave further clarification on the difference between “phytosanitary procedure” and “phytosanitary action”, explaining that the former refers to a method for implementing phytosanitary measures and the latter to an operation. He explained that the TPG had discussed whether “phytosanitary procedure” was needed at all, but had concluded that it was needed because in some ISPMs (e.g. ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*)) there is an intermediate step between the phytosanitary measure (as legislation) and the resulting action carried out in practice, and this intermediate step is the method (the procedure).
- [60] The SC agreed with the TPG proposal for revision as modified in this meeting.
- [61] **Future review of adopted ISPMs.** The assistant steward commented that once the draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 are adopted, the TPG would like to review the adopted ISPMs to ensure that the correct wording has been used. The SC chairperson acknowledged that this would be a future task for the TPG.

[62] The SC:

- (6) *approved* the draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001) as modified in this meeting for submission to the first consultation (Appendix 5).

5. Draft specifications for review and approval for consultation

5.1 Revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010), priority 2

[63] The SC was invited to review the draft specification for this topic, which had been added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) at its Sixteenth Session in 2022 but had been deferred from the SC focused meeting in April 2022 because of time constraints.

[64] Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) introduced the draft specification and explained the rationale for it.⁴

[65] The SC chairperson thanked Ms WILSON and invited the SC to consider the draft specification.

[66] **Reason for revision of the standard.** The SC merged and simplified two of the bullet points in this section that referred to the differences in interpretation and implementation of ISPM 26 in areas or countries where fruit flies are present versus areas or countries that are free from fruit flies. They noted that although there may be a perception that ISPM 26 was intended for countries where fruit flies are present, this is not explicit in the Scope section of ISPM 26 and it was, in any case, more important to focus on what ISPM 26 actually does rather than what the intentions for ISPM 26 had been. The SC agreed, however, that further linkages to ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) and ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) would reduce ambiguity in interpretation by countries that would normally be free of fruit flies. The SC discussed whether to refer to “countries” or “areas” in this regard and concluded that “countries” was appropriate because the interpretation would be by countries not areas.

[67] The SC reviewed the last bullet point in this section, which referred to the fact that the appendices in ISPM 26 have quickly become out of date and will require constant updating as new information becomes available. Ms WILSON explained that the idea for the proposed topic was that the appendices are removed to implementation material so that the information can more easily be kept up to date. The SC agreed, however, that although the out-of-date information was a reason for the revision, it was not possible at this stage to say that all the appendices should be removed and it was better to include a task for the EWG to consider the appendices and determine what needs to be removed. The SC therefore deleted the bullet point (there already being a task for the EWG to review the appendices and annexes).

[68] **Scope of the revision.** The SC agreed that ISPM 26 should be retained as a separate standard, rather than annexing it to ISPM 4, and so deleted the reference to the latter from the Scope section. Following the guidance in the annotated template for draft specifications, the SC also adjusted the wording to give the scope of the revision in terms of the standard itself rather than the tasks.

[69] The SC discussed the intended meaning of “generally” in the phrase “fruit fly endemic and generally fruit fly free areas”. One SC member suggested that this part of the text was attempting to make the distinction between, on the one hand, countries where fruit flies are endemic and so pest freedom may only be achievable for areas within the country (which could be established as pest free areas (PFAs)) and, on the other hand, countries that were pest free but might have an occasional incursion and establish a PFA in that area once the pest had been eradicated. Another SC member commented, however, that pest freedom is an absolute state: an area is either free of a pest or not free, and if an incursion occurs then the area loses its pest freedom until the incursion is dealt with and the area is free from the pest

⁴ 04_SC_Tel_2022_May; 2021-010.

again. The SC therefore amended the text to refer to countries rather than areas and to omit the word “generally”.

- [70] **Purpose.** The SC simplified the first bullet point in the Purpose section, which concerned the various criteria that may be used to determine whether a pest population is an incursion or outbreak, by removing the detail.
- [71] The SC agreed that the second bullet point, which concerned the inclusion of more explicit references to ISPM 4 and ISPM 8, was more important than the first and so moved it to become the first bullet point. They also amended the wording to refer to requirements rather than principles, as neither ISPM 4 nor ISPM 8 describe principles, and agreed that the aim of the revision should be to improve the alignment of ISPM 26 with ISPM 4 and ISPM 8 rather than simply referring more explicitly to them.
- [72] The SC merged the two bullet points referring to suspension and reinstatement of PFAs and added cross-references to relevant sections of ISPM 26. They also agreed that the intended meaning was that the revised standard should better describe the *criteria* for suspension and reinstatement, rather than describing *how* suspension should be activated and reinstatement applied.
- [73] One SC member commented that some of the bullet points in this section were tasks not purposes.
- [74] The SC deleted the last two bullet points in this section, concerning the purpose of removing information from the appendices of ISPM 26 to implementation material, as the removal of this information was already referred to in the preceding bullet point.
- [75] The SC then reviewed the draft tasks for the EWG.
- [76] **Linkages to ISPM 4 and ISPM 8.** The SC amended the first task, which concerned linkage to ISPM 4, to omit reference to possible annexing of the standard to ISPM 4 and to include reference to ISPM 8. The SC also amended the wording to omit reference to international trade, as this could be confusing in the context of areas of a country.
- [77] **Proposing sections of ISPM 26 for removal.** The SC amended the second task to be explicit that the destination for the material being removed was implementation material, rather than just giving this as an example. They then adjusted the wording of the corresponding bullet point in the Purpose section.
- [78] **Reducing ambiguity.** The SC recognized that, among the tasks listed for the EWG, none addressed the main purpose of the revision, which was to reduce ambiguity in interpretation by countries that would normally be free of fruit flies. They therefore created a new task for this and agreed that it should be the first task of the list.
- [79] **Developing separate implementation material.** The SC noted that development of implementation material was not within the scope of EWGs for ISPMs, but agreed that the EWG could propose what material needed to be developed. One SC member suggested that there was no need to have a separate task for this, as it was already covered by the preceding task on proposing sections for removal, but the SC decided to keep both tasks as one tasked the EWG to propose which sections should be removed and the other tasked the EWG with then proposing what implementation materials should be developed from this removed information.
- [80] **Criteria for determining incursions and outbreaks.** The SC noted that none of the tasks listed appeared to address the point made in the Purpose section about defining the criteria (or “triggers”) for determining incursions and outbreaks. They therefore added an extra task to cover this, including the detail that had been removed from the Purpose section.
- [81] **Expertise.** When reviewing the Expertise section, the SC agreed that it was expertise in the development or maintenance of *PFAs*, not the development or maintenance of *standards* for PFAs, that was important. They also agreed to refer to PFAs generically rather than PFAs for tephritid fruit flies in this context, to ensure that an expert could be found.

[82] The SC agreed to invite a member of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) to participate as an invited expert and increased the size of the EWG to seven to nine experts to allow for this. The secretariat clarified that the role of invited experts was different to that of EWG members and so should be listed separately. The SC therefore adjusted the text to make it clear that the invited expert from the IC was in addition to the experts who were appointed as EWG members.

[83] Although the SC had agreed that expertise on PFAs did not have to be specific to tephritid fruit flies (see above), the SC did nevertheless recognize that it was still important to include expertise from a country that was free from tephritid fruit flies to ensure that the interests and interpretation of such countries were represented on the EWG. The SC therefore amended the text to include an expert from the NPPO of such a country. The SC discussed whether the country in question should be one that had never experienced a tephritid infestation, one that had experienced infestation but had eradicated fruit flies, or one that was normally free from infestation but used PFAs to respond to outbreaks. The SC concluded that it was the first and last of these (i.e. a country where tephritid fruit flies had never been recorded or that was free from fruit flies through establishment of PFAs), as a country that had eradicated fruit flies would be covered by the experts “with a wide knowledge and experience in the development or maintenance of pest free areas” mentioned earlier in the Expertise section.

[84] **References.** The SC added ISPM 4 and ISPM 8 to the list of references.

[85] The SC:

- (7) *approved* the draft specification on Revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010) as modified in this meeting for first consultation (Appendix 6).

6. Review of the *List of topics for IPPC standards*

[86] The secretariat presented the paper for this agenda item, which included the updated *List of topics for IPPC standards* (LOT) that incorporated the changes made by CPM-16 (2022).⁵ The secretariat explained that stewards and assistant stewards were needed for some topics, including a steward for the TPG. The secretariat also invited the SC to consider four new phytosanitary treatment subjects that had been recommended by the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) for inclusion into the work programme with a priority of 1.

Topics and subjects

[87] The SC noted that the status column needed updating for a few of the topics. The secretariat updated some during the meeting and confirmed that they would check all entries.

[88] One SC member commented that the publication dates given on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) were not always the correct date. The member gave one example of an item which was up to date and with a correct publication date but the publication date given for it on the landing page for the LOT (from where it was linked) was out of date and so gave the impression that the material itself was out of date. The SC chairperson asked the secretariat to address this.

Assignment of stewards

[89] The SC reviewed and assigned or changed stewards for some topics on the LOT.

[90] **Technical Panel for the Glossary (2006-013).** The SC recalled their decision to accept the offer from the former TPG steward, Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France), to act as TPG steward on a temporary basis, with the intention that a new steward be assigned at the SC meeting in May 2022.⁶ The SC assigned Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile) as steward for the TPG.

⁵ 07_SC_Tel_2022_May.

⁶ SC 2021-09, agenda item 6; SC 2021-11 (regular meeting), agenda item 6.1.

- [91] **Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (2019-009)**. The SC noted that the current steward, Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), would be retiring from the SC at the end of the SC-7 meeting that followed this SC meeting. The SC therefore assigned Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom) as steward, but noted his request that this be reviewed again at their meeting in November 2022 because he may not be available to remain as steward over the long term.
- [92] **Minimizing pest movement by sea containers (2008-001)**. Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) was assigned as assistant steward.
- [93] **Annex to ISPM 46 (Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures): International movement of mango (*Mangifera indica*) fruit (2021-011)**. Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) was assigned as steward and Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ as assistant steward.
- [94] **Annex to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection): Field inspection (including growing season inspection) (2021-018)**. Masahiro SAI (Japan) was assigned as steward and Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy) as assistant steward.
- [95] **Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (*Tephritidae*)) (2021-010)**. Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) was assigned as steward and Prudence Tonator ATTIPOE (Ghana) as assistant steward.
- [96] **Revision of ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade): Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010)**. David KAMANGIRA (Malawi) was assigned assistant steward. Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America) asked to step down as steward of this topic. The SC was unable to find a replacement steward, so the role of steward was left as being vacant. The secretariat recalled that CPM-16 (2022) had agreed to retain this topic because of recently published information, but suggested that if no decision could be made on a steward at this meeting, the SC could perhaps defer it to their meeting in November. The SC deferred it.
- [97] **Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (Annex to ISPM 39: International movement of wood)**. Harry ARIJS (Belgium) was assigned as assistant steward.
- [98] **Use of specific import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006)**. The SC noted that the current steward, Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), would soon be retiring from the SC. The SC therefore assigned Álvaro SEPULVEDA LUQUE (Chile) as steward, but deferred the selection of an assistant steward.
- [99] The SC:
- (8) *noted* the modified *List of topics for IPPC standards* that was adopted by CPM-16 (2022);
 - (9) *agreed* to add the following new phytosanitary treatments to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* with priority 1:
 - Cold treatment of *Drosophila suzukii* on *Vitis vinifera* (2021-027),
 - Vapour heat treatment of *Planococcus lilacinus* on *Selenicereus undatus* (2021-028),
 - Irradiation treatment for all stages *Aspidiotis destructor* (2021-029), and
 - Irradiation treatment for all stages *Pseudaulacaspis pentagona* (2021-030);
 - (10) *noted* the assignment of new discipline leads and referees for diagnostic protocols;
 - (11) *agreed* to assign stewards and assistant stewards as discussed in this meeting; and
 - (12) *agreed* to review the stewardship of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (2019-009), and to consider the selection of a steward for Revision of ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*): *Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade* (2006-010) and an assistant steward for *Use of specific import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system)* (2008-006), at their meeting in November 2022.

7. Standards Committee

7.1 CPM-16 (2022) outcomes relevant to the SC

[100] The SC chairperson introduced a paper prepared by the secretariat, summarizing items arising from the CPM-16 (2022) that were relevant to the SC.⁷ He highlighted two of the most relevant points for SC decision, relating to the CPM focus groups on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS) and on Safe Provision of Food and other Humanitarian Aid.

[101] **CPM Focus Group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems.** The SC chairperson recalled that, following the report from this focus group, CPM-16 (2022) had agreed to establish a POARS Steering Group and had also invited the SC to invite the TPG to consider the term “emerging pest” for inclusion in ISPM 5 and the suggestion made by the POARS Focus Group for the definition of this term.⁸ He clarified that the subject “emerging pest” was already on the TPG’s work programme with “pending” status, so the decision for the SC to consider was whether to change the status of this TPG subject.

[102] **CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and other Humanitarian Aid.** The SC chairperson recalled that CPM-16 (2022) had agreed to establish this focus group and had approved the terms of reference for it and requested that the secretariat open a call for focus group members.⁹ He explained that these terms of reference said that the membership of the focus group would include one representative from the SC. The SC selected a representative.

[103] The SC chairperson then invited the SC to comment on any other aspects of the paper.

[104] **Adjustments to the standard setting process to facilitate the development of phytosanitary treatments.** The secretariat drew the attention of the SC to the invitation by CPM-16 (2022) to consider the suggestions made at CPM-16 about the standard setting process for the development of phytosanitary treatments (PTs).¹⁰ The SC initially supported the idea of inviting the TPPT to consider this and then to share suggestions or options with the SC, but subsequently agreed to discuss the matter at a focused SC meeting first, before passing the issue to the TPPT.

[105] **ISPM 46 and ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*).** One SC member drew the attention of the SC to the decisions made by CPM-16 (2022) following comments made by a contracting party during the CPM-16 session: one was to request that the SC consider the possible changes to ISPM 46 proposed at CPM-16 and advise CPM-17 (2023) accordingly, and the other was an acknowledgement that the relevant subsidiary bodies would consider a possible future review of ISPM 47. The member asked for time to be allowed in the next SC meeting for the SC to comment on the issues raised at CPM-16 (2022). The SC agreed that this would be a good idea for a future focused meeting.

[106] The SC:

- (13) *invited* the Technical Panel for the Glossary to consider the term “emerging pest” for inclusion in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) and the suggestion made by the CPM Focus Group on Pest Outbreak and Alert Response Systems for the definition of this term;
- (14) *selected* Sophie PETERSON (Australia) as a representative for the CPM Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and other Humanitarian Aid;
- (15) *agreed* to consider the suggestions made at CPM-16 (2022) about adjustments to the standard setting process for phytosanitary treatments at a future focused meeting of the SC;

⁷ 08_SC_Tel_2022_May.

⁸ CPM-16 (2022), agenda item 8.8.1.

⁹ CPM-16 (2022), agenda item 9.3.3.

¹⁰ CPM-16 (2022), agenda item 9.3.2.

- (16) *agreed* to consider the comments made at CPM-16 (2022) about ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) and ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*) at a future focused meeting of the SC; and
- (17) *noted* the CPM-16 (2022) updates.

7.2 Summary of polls and fora discussed on the e-decision site (from November 2021 to May 2022)

[107] The secretariat presented a summary of polls and fora discussed on the SC e-decision site between November 2021 and May 2022.¹¹ The secretariat noted that the summary did not include the last two issues that had been the subject of a poll or forum: the e-decision on the EWG on the Use of Systems Approaches in Managing the Pest Risks Associated with the Movement of Wood (2015-004) had been decided at the SC's focused meeting in April and the selection of a member for the Chinese language for the Technical Panel for the Glossary had been deferred to a future SC meeting.¹²

[108] The SC was invited to comment.

[109] The SC discussed the selection of the member for the Chinese language for the Technical Panel for the Glossary. The secretariat clarified that recent practice when using e-decisions for such selection was to hold an e-forum first, then draw up a list of the preferred candidates and have a poll to confirm consensus; if any SC member said "no" in the poll, the matter was then deferred to an SC meeting. The SC discussed the issue and agreed to hold a poll to confirm the selection of the candidate preferred by a slightly higher number of SC members in the e-forum.

[110] The SC:

- (18) *agreed* that the "Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions between 2021 November and 2022 May" reflects the outcome of the SC e-decisions (Appendix 7); and
- (19) *requested* that the secretariat open a poll to confirm the selection of the member for the Chinese language for the Technical Panel for the Glossary.

8. Updates and enhancing synergies

8.1 Update from the Integration and Support Team

[111] The secretariat introduced the update on the activities of the Integration and Support Team.¹³ The secretariat invited the SC to comment and also encouraged SC members to raise questions after the meeting, too.

[112] There were no comments.

[113] The SC:

- (20) *noted* the update by the IPPC Integration and Support Team.

8.2 Update from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit

[114] The secretariat introduced the update on the activities of the Implementation and Facilitation Unit,¹⁴ and invited the SC to comment.

[115] One SC member asked whether there would be any feedback on comments submitted by SC members on the draft IPPC guide to ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*). The member was particularly interested to see how one of the comments, which related to some elements

¹¹ 13_SC_Tel_2022_May.

¹² SC 2022-04, agenda item 7.1.

¹³ 09_SC_Tel_2022_May.

¹⁴ 10_SC_Tel_2022_May.

of the guide going too far beyond the provisions of ISPM 15, had been addressed. The SC member following the guide, Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America) confirmed that the working group for the guide were currently working on addressing the comments and a meeting of the group was scheduled for 24 May to discuss it. She advised the SC member who raised the question to contact the Implementation and Facilitation Unit lead before 24 May, so that she could raise it at the meeting. The secretariat clarified that draft IPPC guides are not usually shared with the SC during development, but an exception had been made in this case because it was proposed that the guide could replace the current explanatory document on ISPM 15.

[116] One SC member commented that SC members had also been invited to comment on the revision to the IPPC guide on surveillance, but there had been no feedback.

[117] The secretariat suggested that the SC representative on the IC could perhaps raise the generic issue of feedback on SC comments on draft IPPC guides at an IC meeting, and the SC representative on the IC agreed to do this. The secretariat also suggested that this could be an issue to discuss at a joint IC–SC meeting, if this were to be held at some point.

[118] The SC:

- (21) *noted* the update from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit; and
- (22) *requested* that the SC representative on the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) ask the IC about the possibility of SC members receiving feedback on comments submitted on draft IPPC guides.

8.3 Update on Implementation and Capacity Development Committee Implementation Review and Support System activities

[119] The secretariat introduced the update on the Implementation Review and Support System,¹⁵ and invited the SC to comment.

[120] There were no comments.

[121] The SC chairperson thanked all secretariat staff involved in the work of the Integration and Support Team, Implementation and Facilitation Unit and Implementation Review and Support System described in the items under agenda item 8.

[122] The SC:

- (23) *noted* the update on Implementation Review and Support System activities.

8.4 Phytosanitary components page of the International Phytosanitary Portal

[123] At the end of agenda item 8, the SC representative on the IC conveyed a concern that had been raised at the IC meeting in November 2021.¹⁶ He explained that a page on the essential elements of a phytosanitary system had been launched on the IPP in September 2020.¹⁷ The aim of this page and its various component pages was to provide resources to help NPPO staff. The IC had pointed out, however, that the Phytosanitary system page was not easy to find and needed to be more obvious. The secretariat had confirmed to the IC that they had requested greater visibility for these pages, but without success. Some communication specialists had also suggested some improvements to the pages. The IC had therefore invited the SC to engage in a joint effort to promote the Phytosanitary system component pages to a more prominent position on the IPP.

¹⁵ 11_SC_Tel_2022_May.

¹⁶ IC 2021-11, agenda item 13.

¹⁷ Phytosanitary system page on the IPP: www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/phytosanitary-system

[124] The SSU lead confirmed that the SSU would work with the Integration and Support Team to seek to address this matter.

[125] The SC:

(24) *requested* that the secretariat seek to bring greater visibility to the Phytosanitary system component pages of the IPP.

9. Discussions on the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030

[126] The SC representative on the CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 Development Agenda Items, Andre Felipe C.P. da SILVA (Brazil), presented an update.¹⁸ He explained that the development agenda items were all at different stages, and highlighted the progress made on the development agenda items that were being coordinated by the SSU: commodity standards, development of guidance on the use of third-party entities, and diagnostic laboratory networking.

[127] The SC was invited to comment.

[128] The SC chairperson queried one of the goals for commodity standards set out in the SC paper: “adoption and implementation of specific commodities standards with, as required, accompanying diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments to support their implementation”. He commented that the development of DPs and PTs should not become a constraint to progress with commodity standards, as such standards may include a long list of pests and it should not be expected that there would be DPs and PTs for all of them. He suggested that it might be better to say that although it is desirable to have DPs and PTs, they will not be available for all of the pests listed.

[129] The SC chairperson also commented that another of the stated goals for commodity standards – “increased number of multilateral (instead of bilateral) agreements to manage pest risks associated with a commodity or pathway” was not in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 and the intended meaning was not clear. The SC representative on the focus group replied that the focus group were trying to express their intention, and another SC member commented that the focus should be on what can be achieved in practice.

[130] There being no further comments, the secretariat encouraged SC members to take a proactive role in making suggestions regarding the implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework and confirmed that an overarching plan for implementation was expected to be presented to CPM-17 (2023).

[131] The SC:

(25) *requested* that the secretariat include the implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 as an agenda item at one of the forthcoming SC meetings.

10. Any other business

[132] Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom) gave a brief update on the first International Plant Health Conference, which was scheduled to be held on 21–23 September in London, United Kingdom. He explained that the organizing committee was in the process of finalizing the agenda for the conference and would soon be seeking speakers and sending out letters of invitation to potential participants. He clarified that although some meetings of IPPC bodies were going to be held in London during the week of the conference, these were not connected to the conference itself.

[133] One SC member asked whether there would be a live webcast of the conference. The secretariat replied that they understood this was being investigated.

¹⁸ 12_SC_Tel_2022_May.

[134] Another SC member asked whether NPPOs could suggest topics or present papers. Mr BISHOP confirmed that there would be a call for side sessions shortly and a group would then review the submissions to select the ones that would be included.

[135] A further SC member asked the secretariat to ensure that the various meetings of IPPC bodies being held that week do not clash. The secretariat confirmed that they were trying their best to ensure this, to the extent possible, although noted that the reason for the large number of such meetings was that the conference might be the only opportunity for NPPO representatives to meet in one place this year and for the IPPC secretariat to be authorized to go to provide support.

[136] The SC:

(26) *noted* the update on the first International Plant Health Conference.

11. Recommendations to the CPM Bureau, Strategic Planning Group or CPM-17 (2023) (if any)

[137] The SC noted that there were no recommendations for the CPM Bureau, the Strategic Planning Group or CPM-17 (2023) at this time.

12. Dates and types of next SC meetings

[138] The secretariat drew the attention of SC members to the calendar of meetings on the IPP.¹⁹

[139] The next SC meeting is scheduled for 13–14 July 2022, to be held in virtual mode. This will be a focused meeting.

13. Evaluation of the meeting process

[140] 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.

14. Election of the SC chairperson

[141] The SC elected Sophie PETERSON (Australia) as chairperson to the SC.

[142] The SC and the secretariat thanked the retiring SC chairperson for his skilful leadership of the SC. He, in turn, thanked the secretariat, the SC vice-chairperson, the other SC members, interpreters and other support staff for their support during his time as SC chairperson, and wished the new SC chairperson every success in the role.

15. Close of the meeting

[143] The SC chairperson thanked all participants for their contributions and closed the meeting.

¹⁹ Calendar on the IPP: www.ippc.int/en/year/calendar

Appendix 1: Agenda

N	Agenda item	Document number / link	Presenter / IPPC Secretariat support
1.	Opening of the Meeting		
1.1.	Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By the IPPC Secretariat - By the SC Chairperson 	–	EL-LISSY (Secretary) NERSISYAN (SSU Team Lead) FERRO (SC Chairperson)
2.	Meeting Arrangements		
2.1.	Election of the Rapporteur	–	Chairperson
2.2.	Adoption of the Agenda	01_SC_Tel_2022_May	Chairperson
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1.	Documents list	02_SC_Tel_2022_May	MUSHEGIAN
3.2.	Participants list	03_SC_Tel_2022_May SC membership list	MUSHEGIAN
4.	Draft ISPMs for approval for the first consultation		
4.1.	Draft Annex <i>Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (International movement of seeds)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Priority 1 - Steward: Ms Marina ZLOTINA - Assistant steward: Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ 	2018-009 2018-009_OCS	ZLOTINA / CASSIN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Specification 70 (for information) 	Specification 70	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Steward's notes 	05_SC_Tel_2022_May_Rev1	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o EWG meeting report 	2021-10: Report of the EWG on Annex to ISPM 38	
4.2.	Draft Annex <i>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))</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Priority 3 - Steward: Ms Marina ZLOTINA 	2018-011 2018-011_OCS	ZLOTINA / MANGILI / KISS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Specification 71 (for information) 	Specification 71	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Steward's notes 	06_SC_Tel_2022_May_Rev1	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o EWG meeting report 	2022-01: Report of the EWG on Annex to ISPM 37	
4.3.	Draft 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) (1994-001) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Priority 1 - Steward: Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC 	1994-001 1994-001_OCS	NORDBO / SHAMILOV / MUSHEGIAN

N	Agenda item	Document number / link	Presenter / IPPC Secretariat support
	- Assistant steward: Mr Ebbe NORDBO TPG December 2021 virtual meeting report	TPG December 2021 virtual meeting report	
5.	Draft specifications for review and approval for consultation		
5.1.	Revision of ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>) (2021-010) - Priority 2 Draft Specification for approval for consultation	04_SC_Tel_2022_May 2021-010	WILSON / KISS
6.	Review of the List of Topics for IPPC standards (LOT)		
6.1.	Review of: - topics, subjects, and priorities - stewards and assistant stewards	07_SC_Tel_2022_May_Rev1 Link to List of Topics for IPPC standards	MUSHEGIAN
7.	Standards Committee		
7.1.	CPM-16 (2022) outcomes relevant to the SC	08_SC_Tel_2022_May CPM-16 (2022) (draft) report (20 April 2022)	FERRO / MUSHEGIAN
7.2.	Summary of polls and forums discussed on the e-decision site (from November 2021 to May 2022)	13_SC_Tel_2022_May	KISS
8.	Updates and enhancing synergies		
8.1.	Updates from the IST	09_SC_Tel_2022_May	MUSHEGIAN / DENG
8.2.	Updates from the IFU	10_SC_Tel_2022_May	MUSHEGIAN / KOUMBA
8.3.	Updates on IC Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) activities	11_SC_Tel_2022_May	KOUMBA / KISS
9.	Discussions on the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030		
9.1.	Recent updates and next steps on development agenda items: - Commodity- and pathway-specific ISPMs - Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities - Diagnostic laboratory networking	12_SC_Tel_2022_May	SILVA / NERSISYAN / MOREIRA
10.	Any other business		Chairperson
11.	Recommendations to CPM Bureau, SPG, or CPM-17 (if any)		Chairperson
12.	Next meetings dates and types	Link to the IPP calendar	MUSHEGIAN
13.	Evaluation of the meeting process	Link to survey	Chairperson
14.	Election of the SC Chairperson		SC
15.	Close of the meeting		Chairperson

Appendix 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / UPDATED
Draft ISPMs (before and after OCS review)			
2018-009 2018-009_OCS	4.1	Draft Annex <i>Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds</i> (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (<i>International movement of seeds</i>), Priority 1	2022-04-11 2022-05-01
2018-011 2018-011_OCS	4.2	Draft Annex <i>Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information</i> (2018-011) to ISPM 37 (<i>Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>), Priority 3	2022-04-11 2022-05-01
1994-001 1994-001_OCS	4.3	Draft 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms (1994-001), Priority 1	2022-04-11 2022-05-01
Draft specifications			
2021-010	5.1	Revision of ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>) (2021-010), Priority 2	2022-05-01
Meeting documents			
01_SC_Tel_2022_May	2.2	Provisional agenda	2022-04-11 2022-05-01 2022-05-02 2022-05-05
02_SC_Tel_2022_May	3.1	Documents list	2022-04-11 2022-05-01 2022-05-02 2022-05-05
03_SC_Tel_2022_May	3.2	Participants list	2022-04-11 2022-05-01 2022-05-05
05_SC_Tel_2022_May_Rev1	4.1	Steward's notes (2018-009)	2022-04-11 2022-05-01
06_SC_Tel_2022_May_Rev1	4.2	Steward's notes (2018-011)	2022-04-11 2022-05-02
04_SC_Tel_2022_May	5.1	Revision of ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>) (2021-010), Priority 2	2022-05-01
07_SC_Tel_2022_May_Rev1	6.1	Review of the List of Topics for IPPC standards (LOT)	2022-05-01 2022-05-05
08_SC_Tel_2022_May	7.1	CPM-16 outcomes – key issues	2022-05-01
09_SC_Tel_2022_May	8.1	Updates from the IST	2022-05-01
10_SC_Tel_2022_May	8.2	Updates from the IFU	2022-05-01
11_SC_Tel_2022_May	8.3	Updates on IC Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) activities	2022-05-01
12_SC_Tel_2022_May	9.1	Discussions on the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030	2022-05-05
13_SC_Tel_2022_May	7.2	Summary of polls and forums discussed on the e-decision site (from November 2021 to May 2022)	2022-05-05

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

Links	Agenda item	Document link
SC membership list	3.2	SC membership list
Specification 70 (for information)	4.1	Specification 70
EWG meeting report	4.1	2021-10: Report of the EWG on Annex to ISPM 38
Specification 71 (for information)	4.2	Specification 71
EWG meeting report	4.2	2022-01: Report of the EWG on Annex to ISPM 37
TPG December 2021 virtual meeting report	4.3	TPG December 2021 virtual meeting report
Review of List of Topics for IPPC standards (LOT)	6.1	Link to List of Topics for IPPC standards
CPM-16 (2022) (draft) report (20 April 2022)	7.1	CPM-16 (2022) (draft) report
Next meetings dates and types	12	Link to the IPP calendar
Evaluation of the meeting process	13	Link to survey

Appendix 3: Participants list

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
	Africa Member	Ms Alphonsine LOUHOARI TOKOZABA Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage, 24, rue Kiélé Tenard, Mfilou, Brazzaville, REPUBLIC OF CONGO Tel: +242 01 046 53 61 Tel: +242 04 005 57 05	louhouari@yahoo.fr A.louhouaritoko@gmail.com	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 2 nd term / 3 years	2024
✓	Africa Member SC-7	Mr David KAMANGIRA Senior Deputy Director and IPPC Focal Point Department of Agricultural Research Services Headquarters, P.O. Box 30779, Lilongwe 3 MALAWI Tel: +265 888 342 712 Tel: +265 999 122 199	davidkamangira1@gmail.com	CPM-11 (2016) CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022) 3 rd term / 3 years	2025
✓	Africa Member	Mr Theophilus Mwendwa MUTUI Acting Director, Technical Services Division. National Biosafety Authority, Pest Control Products Board (PCPB) Building, Loresho, off Waiyaki way P.O. Box 28251-00100 Nairobi KENYA Tel: +254 20 267 8667 Mob: +254 725 294445	tmutui@kephis.org	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Africa Member	Mr Prudence Tonator ATTIPOE Deputy Director, Head Plant Quarantine Division. Ministry of Food and Agriculture P.O. Box AM 94 Amasaman-Accra GHANA Tel: 0209793292, 0262235397	tonattipoe@yahoo.co.uk	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Asia Member	Ms Chonticha RAKKRAI Director, Plant Quarantine Research Group, Plant Protection Research and Development Office, Department of Agriculture, 50 Phaholyothin Rd., Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok, 10900 THAILAND Tel: (+66) 2561 2537 Fax: (+66) 2561 2146 Mob: (+66) 8 9128 6488	chonticha.r@doa.in.th	CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022) 2 nd term / 3 years	2025

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Asia Member	Mr. Gerald Glenn F. PANGANIBAN Assistant Director for Operations and Administration, Bureau of Plant Industry, 692 San Andres Street, Malate, Manila, PHILIPPINES Tel: +639153141568	gfpanganiban@gmail.com gerald_glenn97@hotmail.com	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Asia Member SC-7	Mr Masahiro SAI Senior Researcher (Head of Section) Planning and Coordination Section, Research Division Yokohama Plant Protection Station Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) JAPAN Tel: +81-45-211-7165	masahiro_sai670@maff.go.jp	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 2 nd term / 3 years	2024
✓	Asia Member	Mr Xiaodong FENG Deputy Director of the Division of Plant Quarantine, NATESC Ministry of Agriculture No. 20, Maizidian Street, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100125 CHINA Tel: (8610)59194524	fengxdong@agri.gov.cn	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 2 nd term / 3 years	2024
✓	Europe Member	Mr Harry ARIJS European Commission, DG Sante G-1, Plant Health Rue Froissart 101, 6/60 1040 Brussels BELGIUM Tel: +3222987645	Harry.ARIJS@ec.europa.eu	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Europe Member	Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI Servizio Fitosanitario DG Agricoltura Regione Lombardia Piazza Città di Lombardia 1 20124 Milano ITALY Tel: (+39) 3666603272	mariangela_ciampitti@regione.lombardia.it	CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022) 2 nd term / 3 years	2025
✓	Europe Member SC-7	Mr Samuel BISHOP Plant Health Policy team Room 11G35 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs National Agri-Food Innovation Campus Sand Hutton York North Yorkshire UNITED KINGDOM YO41 4LZ Tel: +44 (0) 2080262506 Mob: +44 (0) 7827976902	sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 2 nd term / 3 years	2024

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Europe Member	Mr David OPATOWSKI Head, Plant Biosecurity, Plant Protection and Inspection Services (PPIS), P.O. Box 78, Bet Dagan, 50250 ISRAEL Tel: 972-(0)3-9681518 Mob: 972-(0)506-241885 Fax: 972-(0)3-9681571	dopatowski@yahoo.com davido@moag.gov.il	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) CPM-12 (2017) CPM-15 (2021) 4 th term / 3 years	2024
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	Mr André Felipe C. P. da SILVA Federal Inspector Quarantine Division Ministry of Agriculture, Live Stock and Food Supply BRAZIL Tel: (61) 3218-2925	andre.peralta@agricultura.gov.br	CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022) 2 nd term / 3 years	2025
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member SC-7	Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ Pest Risk Analyst Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado 300 Sur de Teletica, Sabana Sur, San José, COSTA RICA Tel: +(506) 8660-8383	hmorera@sfe.go.cr	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 2 nd term / 3 years	2024
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member SC Chairperson	Mr Ezequiel FERRO Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA Av. Paeso Colón 315 C.A. de Buenos Aires ARGENTINA Tel/Fax: (+5411) 4121-5091	eferro@senasa.gov.ar	CPM-14 (2019) 3 rd term / 3 years	2022
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal Av. Presidente Bulnes 140, 4 th floor, Santiago, CHILE Tel: + 56-2 234 5120	alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gov.cl	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 3 rd term / 3 years	2024
✓	Near East Member	Ms Maryam Jalili MOGHADAM 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 IRAN Cel: 00989126049255	marypaya@yahoo.com jalili@ppo.ir	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Near East Member SC-7	Mr Nader ELBADRY Phytosanitary Specialist, Central Administration of Plant Quarantine, 6 Michel Bakhom St., Dokki, Giza, EGYPT Tel: +201096799493	nader.badry@gmail.com	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
	Near East Member	Mr Imad (M.E) Jrouh Al-Awad Director Assistant of plant protection & Phytosanitary Department / Ministry of Agriculture. JORDAN Tel: 0096265686151 Ext. 309 Mob: 00962795363297	alawademad@yahoo.com	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Near East Member	Mr Mohamed Lahbib BEN JAMÂA Direction of Plant Health and Control of Agricultural Inputs, 30, Rue Alain Savary, 1002-Tunis. TUNISIA Mob: +216.98.265.525	benjamaaml@gmail.com	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	North America Member SC-7	Ms Marina ZLOTINA IPPC Technical Director USDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) 4700 River Rd, 5c-03.37 Riverdale, MD 20737 USA Tel: 1-301-851-2200 Cell: 1 -301-832-0611	Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 3 rd term / 3 years	2024
✓	North America Member	Mr Steve CÔTÉ National Manager, International Phytosanitary Standards Plant Import/Export Division 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 CANADA Tel: (+1) 613-773-7368 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7576	Steve.Cote@inspection.gc.ca	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Southwest Pacific Member	Ms Joanne WILSON Principal Adviser, Risk Management Plant Imports Group Ministry for Primary Industries. NEW ZEALAND Tel: +64 489 40528 Mob: +64 2989 40528	joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz	CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022) 2 nd term / 3 years	2025
✓	Southwest Pacific Member SC-7	Ms Sophie Alexia PETERSON Director, Pacific Engagement and International Plant Health Australian Chief Plant Protection Office Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment AUSTRALIA Tel: +61 2 6272 3769 Mob: +61 466 867 519	sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
	Southwest Pacific Member	Mr David Boas TENAKANAI General Manager- Technical & Advisory Division, National Agriculture Quarantine & Inspection Authority (NAQIA) P. O. Box 741, Port Moresby, NCD, PNG PAPUA NEW GUINEA Tel: (675) 3136900 Mob: (675) 74482319	DTenakanai@naqia.gov.pg dtenakanai@gmail.com	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024

Role	Name	Email address
Assistant Steward ISPM 5	Mr Ebbe Nordbo	ebbenordbo@outlook.com
Silent observer (Argentina)	Mr Matías Gonzalez Buttera	mbuttera@senasa.gob.ar
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Osama EL-LISSY IPPC Secretary	Osama.ELIssy@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Avetik NERSISYAN Standard Setting Unit Lead	Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Adriana MOREIRA Standard Setting Officer	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Artur SHAMILOV Standard Setting Officer	Artur.Shamilov@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Erika MANGILI ANDRÉ Standard Setting Specialist	Erika.MangiliAndre@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Alejandra JIMENEZ TABARES Standard Setting Assistant	Alejandra.JimenezTabares@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Aoife CASSIN Standard Setting Associate	Aoife.Cassin@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Janka KISS Standard Setting Associate	Janka.Kiss@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Edgar MUSHEGIAN Standard Setting Associate	Edgar.Mushegian@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Aixa DEL GRECO Standard Setting Specialist	Aixa.DelGreco@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Karen ROUEN Report writer	karen@karenrouen.com
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Descartes KOUMBA Agricultural Officer	Descartes.Koumba@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Arop DENG Integration Support Team (IST) Lead	Arop.Deng@fao.org

Appendix 4: Draft annex *Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (2018-011)* to ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*)

DRAFT ANNEX to ISPM 37: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (2018-011)

Status box

This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
Date of this document	2022-05-16
Document category	Draft annex to ISPM 37
Current document stage	To first consultation
Major stages	2019-04 CPM-14 added topic <i>Criteria for the determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information (Annex to ISPM 37) (2018-011)</i> with priority 3. 2020-11 Standard Committee (SC) approved Specification 71 (<i>Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information</i>). 2022-01 Expert working group met virtually and drafted the annex. 2022-05 SC revised and approved for first consultation.
Steward history	2019-05 Marina ZLOTINA (US, Lead Steward) 2019-05 Mariangela CIAMPITTI (IT, Assistant Steward) 2019-05 Sophie PETERSON (AU, Assistant Steward)
Notes	This section will remain on the drafts going for consultation but deleted before adoption. 2022-02 Edited 2022-05 SC changed title to <i>Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies</i> 2022-05 Edited

This annex was adopted by the [XXX] Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in [XXX 20XX].

This annex is a prescriptive part of the standard.

ANNEX 1: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies

1. Introduction

- [1] National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use a variety of published information relating to fruit fly host status when they implement adopted ISPMs related to pest risk analysis (PRA), pest free areas, the design of import and export programmes, eradication, surveillance, pest records, and more. There is considerable inconsistency, however, in the interpretation of published information, and terms used in the literature to describe hosts do not always align with those defined in this standard. This can lead to disputes between NPPOs. This annex promotes harmonization to prevent future trade challenges. It outlines the criteria that should be used when evaluating evidence to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) based on information that already exists, and provides guidance on assessing the uncertainty of the resulting host status determination. It also provides guidance to NPPOs on applying host status determinations in activities such as PRA.

2. Host terminology in available literature and alignment with the host status categories used in this standard

- [2] In addition to the terms for hosts defined in this standard, many other terms are used in published literature, including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host” and “alternative host”. When the host status of a plant species or cultivar is given using a term other than those defined in this standard, the host status should be reclassified into one of the three host status categories in this standard.
- [3] A natural host is a plant species or cultivar:

- in which the target fruit fly develops completely from egg to viable adult, starting in attached fruit that is free from any mechanical or natural damage, under natural conditions.

[4] A conditional host is a plant species or cultivar:

- that shows evidence of infestation under semi-natural or certain, clearly described natural conditions (including field trials); and
- in which the target fruit fly develops completely from egg to viable adult, starting in attached fruit that is free from any mechanical or natural damage, under clearly described conditions.

[5] A non-host is a plant species or cultivar:

- in which the target fruit fly does not develop at all in attached fruit that is free from any mechanical or natural damage under natural conditions, or starts to develop in such fruit under natural conditions but does not complete its development to viable adult; or
- in which the target fruit fly does not develop from egg to viable adult in field trials, in trials conducted under semi-natural conditions as set out in this standard or in laboratory experiments.

3. Criteria for determining host status

3.1 General evaluation criteria

[6] When determining host status based on available information, NPPOs should assess the completeness, reliability and applicability of the information to establish whether it provides the following:

- an accurate identification of the plant species (scientific name and authority) or cultivar, with supporting evidence (e.g. references used for plant (including cultivar) identification, verification of plant material by a specialist taxonomist, molecular identification, voucher specimens);
- a description of the sampled area (e.g. management practices if in a commercial orchard, presence of other natural or conditional hosts in the area), details of location (e.g. geographic coordinates, climate, growing region, elevation) and details of collection dates (e.g. early or late season, multiple years);
- details of the fruit-collection conditions (e.g. commercial or non-commercial environment; picked from the plant or collected from the ground);
- a description of the fruit-sampling method (e.g. the number and distribution of plants and the number of fruits sampled per plant);
- details of the condition of the fruit, including the stage of its maturity (or other indicators of ripeness, such as dry matter content, colour, sugar content, ripeness scale) and the condition of its skin or rind (whether it is damaged or is free from any mechanical or natural damage);
- evidence of the presence of the target fruit fly species in the sampled area before and during sampling (e.g. trap records);
- a description of the fruit-dissection method (e.g. peeling and fruit cutting for detection of eggs or larvae) for determination of infestation and, where there is infestation, the fruit fly rearing method (e.g. fruit-holding conditions, including temperature, humidity, daylength, substrate for pupation including soil moisture) for development to adults (taking in consideration that eggs and larvae should not have been transferred from infested fruit to artificial diet for rearing); and
- a clear presentation of fruit fly rearing results, indicating absence of infestation (e.g. no eggs or larvae, no pupation), a lack of viable fruit fly adults reared from the plant species or cultivar under suitable conditions, or
- an accurate identification of the fruit fly species reared from the fruit together with supporting evidence (e.g. published keys used for fruit fly species identification, verification of fruit fly species by a specialist taxonomist, photographs, molecular identification, voucher specimens).

- [7] In addition to these general evaluation criteria, which are applicable to all three host status categories, NPPOs should also establish whether the information provides the specific information applicable to the host status category under consideration as described in sections 3.2 to 3.4.

3.2 Criteria for natural host

- [8] The information used to determine natural host status should contain evidence of infestation under clearly described conditions and evidence of development to viable adults.
- [9] When assessing the completeness, reliability and applicability of the information being used to determine host status, NPPOs should establish whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1, the information available also provides the following:
- a description of any phytosanitary treatments applied; and
 - details of the viability of emergent adults in terms of their size, flight ability, longevity and fecundity.

3.3 Criteria for conditional host

- [10] The information used to determine conditional host status should contain both evidence of infestation under clearly described conditions and evidence of development to viable adults from either field trials or from trials under semi-natural conditions as set out in this standard, with published methodological details and results.
- [11] When assessing the completeness, reliability and applicability of the information being used to determine host status, NPPOs should establish whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1, the information available also provides the following:
- details of the viability of emergent adults in terms of their size, flight ability, longevity and fecundity; and
 - evidence of the presence of the target fruit fly species in fruit under semi-natural or certain, clearly described environmental conditions (e.g. under certain conditions of population pressure from conspecific fruit flies, presence of other fruit fly and insect species, fruit fly management measures, absence of other natural or conditional hosts in the area, temperature, humidity or rainfall).

3.4 Criteria for non-host

- [12] The information used to determine non-host status should contain evidence of the absence of infestation, or of the incomplete development to viable adults, derived from field surveillance by fruit sampling, field trials, or trials conducted under semi-natural conditions as set out in this standard, with published methodological details and results. If this information is not available, data from laboratory experiments may be used.
- [13] If the information on non-host status is derived from field surveillance by fruit sampling, NPPOs should establish whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1, the information available also provides the following:
- evidence of the presence of reproductively mature adults of the target fruit fly species in the sampled area before and during sampling (e.g. from trap records); and
 - a description of the fruit-handling procedures (e.g. harvesting procedures, post-harvest processing and treatment, and transportation procedures).
- [14] If the information on non-host status is derived from field trials, there are no further criteria for evaluation of the information other than the general evaluation criteria listed in section 3.1.

[15] If the information on non-host status is derived from laboratory experiments, NPPOs should establish whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1, the information available also provides the following:

- details of the colony's origin (e.g. date of collection and location of natural host for the parental line, number of generations reared by the start of the experiment (preferably not more than five generations), substrate used for egg collection (preferably fruit substrate);
- a description of the fruit fly rearing method used for maintenance of the colony (e.g. proven artificial diet used for larvae; conditions of the rearing room, such as temperature, humidity, light);
- details of the quality of the fruit fly colony used in the experiment (e.g. developmental rates and survival, mating period, oviposition period, fecundity);
- details of the physiological condition of the fruit fly females used (e.g. mating status, age; the fruit fly adult females used should be mated and should be at the peak of their reproductive potential);
- confirmation that the plant material used was free from pesticides and other products that could have negatively affected the oviposition behaviour of the fruit fly females used;
- details of the natural infestation rate of the plant species or cultivar used in the experiment (the fruit fly species reared and the number of fruit fly adults emerged per fruit or per weight of fruit, as determined by incubating a sample of the fruit used in each replicate of the experiment without exposing it to the target fruit fly); and
- a description of the method used in the laboratory experiment (e.g. cages used, exposure period, presence of food and water in cages, number of females used per cage, presence of males in cages, use of a natural host as a control in separate cages to demonstrate normal oviposition behaviour, time of conduct of experiment, conditions during experiment, number of replicates using different cohorts).

4. Assessing the uncertainty of the host status determination

[16] Available information relating to the host status of plant species or cultivars to fruit flies has varying levels of quality, completeness, reliability and applicability, and these will, in turn, influence the level of uncertainty associated with the host status determination.

[17] The quality of the information should be assessed based on the design of the method used to determine the type of host, the sample size, the extent of replication, the presentation of results and the expertise of the contributors.

[18] The completeness of the information should be assessed against the criteria listed in this standard for the determination of host status in relation to the plant species or cultivar and the fruit fly species being evaluated. Of these criteria, NPPOs should consider the key elements for the determination of natural host status and non-host status to be the identification of the plant species or cultivar and the fruit fly species by a taxonomist or trained specialist, the deposition of voucher specimens, and the details provided of the fruit origin and condition.

[19] The quality, completeness, reliability and applicability of the information sources used will dictate the level of uncertainty associated with the resulting host status determination: the greater these are, the lower the uncertainty. A host status determination based on multiple reports from independent sources, particularly those of higher reliability, has a low level of uncertainty. Using less reliable sources can increase the level of uncertainty.

[20] The following cases are examples of situations where there can be particular uncertainty associated with the host status determination because of inadequate information:

- A new plant species or cultivar is introduced into an area where a fruit fly species is present, or where a fruit fly establishes in a new area and encounters new plant species.

- One or both parent species of a newly developed hybrid or cultivar are known natural or conditional hosts (in which case the host status of the hybrid should be considered for its potential as a natural or conditional host until its host status can be confirmed otherwise).
- There is a taxonomic change in a plant or fruit fly species.
- A new interception record lacks relevant information or contains unconfirmed information (e.g. life stage not mentioned, not clear whether the fruit fly or larvae was found infesting the fruit, quality of fruit not mentioned).

[21] If there is a taxonomic change that splits a fruit fly species into two or more species, the host range of each component species is likely to be different. Similarly, if two or more fruit fly species that were thought to be different are synonymized, the species as it is now understood is likely to have a different host range. Particular attention should be paid to taxonomic changes when evaluating host records.

[22] The result of an analysis of host status should be accompanied by a determination of the level and nature of the associated uncertainty.

5. Application of the host status of a fruit to a fruit fly

[23] When conducting a PRA for a fruit commodity, the following requirements apply:

- The host status of a fruit to a fruit fly should be considered in the initiation stage of PRA; in the evaluation of the probability of introduction and spread and in the assessment of impacts; in the evaluation and selection of pest risk management options to mitigate the pest risk (e.g. pre-inspection, inspection, phytosanitary treatment); and in risk communication (e.g. consultation and sharing of information).
- Even if plant species or cultivars are categorized as natural hosts, they may not all pose the same pest risk. Therefore, when conducting a PRA for import of fruit from a plant species or cultivar categorized as a natural host for a particular fruit fly species, the evidence that led to the decision of natural host status should be analysed in detail so that phytosanitary measures can be selected that are appropriate for the level of pest risk posed.
- When a PRA is conducted for import of fruit from a plant species or cultivar categorized as a non-host for a particular fruit fly species, that fruit fly species should be eliminated from further consideration at the initiation or pest categorization stages.
- When a PRA is conducted for import of fruit from a plant species or cultivar categorized as a conditional host, the pest risk of the conditional host should be considered as being lower than that of a natural host (when infested by the same species of fruit fly). Phytosanitary measures should be appropriate for the pest risk posed by the conditional host.

[24] The use of the host status of a fruit to a fruit fly in the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas should be in accordance with ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) and ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*).

Appendix 5: Draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001)

DRAFT 2022 AMENDMENTS TO ISPM 5: *GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS* (1994-001)

Publication history

(This is not an official part of the standard)

Date of this document	2022-05-20
Document category	Draft 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) (1994-001)
Current document stage	To first consultation
Major stages	<p>CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms</p> <p>2006-05 Standards Committee (SC) approved specification TP5</p> <p>2012-10 Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) revised specification</p> <p>2012-11 SC revised and approved revised specification, revoking Specification 1</p> <p>2021-12 TPG proposed 2022 amendments below</p> <p>2022-05 SC revised the 2022 amendments via the Online Comment System and approved the 2022 amendments for the first consultation at the virtual meeting.</p>
Notes	Note to Secretariat formatting this paper: formatting in definitions and explanations (strikethrough, bold, italics) needs to remain.

Introduction

- [1] The IPPC Official Contact Points are asked to consider the following proposals for revising terms and definitions to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms*). A brief explanation is given for each proposal. For revision of terms and definitions, only the proposed changes are open for comments. For full details on the discussions related to the specific terms, please refer to [the TPG meeting reports on the IPP](#).

1. REVISION

[2] The following introduction refers to both proposals for the revision of the terms “phytosanitary action” (2020-006) and “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007):

- In the context of discussing the term and definition of “emergency action” (2018-044), the TPG in November 2019 discussed the current definitions of “phytosanitary action” and “phytosanitary procedure” and concluded that these definitions might need a major overhaul through analyzing their inter-relations and current use in ISPMs. The Standards Committee (SC) in November 2020 agreed to the TPG conclusion and added the terms “phytosanitary action” (2020-006) and “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007) to the TPG work programme in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.
- The TPG in December 2021 recalled that a phytosanitary action is an official *operation*, and a phytosanitary procedure is an official *method* (i.e., a documented process or a methodology) for implementing phytosanitary measures (or taking phytosanitary action). The relationship between the three concepts may be illustrated as: a phytosanitary measure is *what to do*, a *phytosanitary procedure* is *how to do it*, and a phytosanitary action is actually *doing it*.
- The terms “phytosanitary action” and “phytosanitary procedure” both refer to “phytosanitary measures” in their respective definitions and are strongly interconnected. TPG discussions on the two definitions were therefore also intertwined and followed similar lines of argumentation.
- Phytosanitary measures have the purpose of preventing the introduction or spread of quarantine pests or limiting the economic impact of regulated non-quarantine pests (RNQPs). Thus, phytosanitary measures are established exclusively in relation to regulated pests, i.e., quarantine pests and RNQPs.
- A national plant protection organization (NPPO) can apply phytosanitary actions and phytosanitary procedures against pests regulated in the country itself. Furthermore, to fulfill all prerequisites for performing phytosanitary certification in export situations, the NPPO may similarly apply *phytosanitary actions* and *phytosanitary procedures* against pests regulated in other (importing) countries in order to meet the phytosanitary import requirements of those countries. Thus, the qualifier “phytosanitary” can be used, and has been widely used, in ISPMs in relation to scenarios where the NPPO of an exporting country is *applying* procedures or actions to meet phytosanitary import requirements of an importing country as established to prevent the spread of pests regulated in that importing country, but not necessarily regulated in the country of export where such application is taking place.
- Examples of such inclusive use of the concepts and terms ‘phytosanitary procedure’ and ‘phytosanitary action’ are provided below:
 - Inspection, testing, surveillance, treatment, etc., may also be conducted to support phytosanitary certification prior to export, and in such cases, the pests of concern may not be regulated pests of the country where these activities are carried out.
 - Phytosanitary actions may be applied in relation to changes in the status of an Area of Low Pest Prevalence (ALPP), and phytosanitary procedures may be followed in relation to the establishment and maintenance of a pest free area (PFA) or an ALPP. PFA and ALPP may be used in a country to exclude or control pests regulated in that country, or to exclude or control pests regulated in another country in order to enable phytosanitary certification and thereby facilitate exports to that country.
 - In ISPM 31 (*Methodologies for sampling of consignments*), the application of various phytosanitary actions may be determined by the outcome of sampling, and sampling of consignments may be performed prior to phytosanitary certification or at import.
 - According to ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*), NPPOs may authorize entities to perform phytosanitary actions on their behalf, and these phytosanitary actions can be undertaken in support of import or domestic activities (against pests regulated in the actual country) or export activities (against pests regulated in another, importing country).

- Phytosanitary procedures are followed in relation to export certification as described in ISPMs 7 (*Phytosanitary certification system*) and 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*).
- To explicitly express the full scope of ‘phytosanitary action’ and phytosanitary procedure’, including the aspect of pests regulated in another, importing country, the proposed additional wording is “...or to enable phytosanitary certification”, and “...or for enabling phytosanitary certification” (in the definitions of “phytosanitary action” and “phytosanitary procedure”, respectively). This additional wording provides conceptual focus on the scenario as seen from the perspective of the NPPO *applying* the procedures and actions.

a. “phytosanitary action” (2020-006)

[3] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal:

- An NPPO may apply phytosanitary actions against pests regulated in the country itself. Furthermore, to fulfill all prerequisites for performing phytosanitary certification in export situations, the NPPO may similarly apply *phytosanitary actions* against pests regulated in other (importing) countries in order to meet the phytosanitary import requirements of those countries.
- The proposed additional wording is “...or to enable phytosanitary certification” which describes the scenario from the perspective of the NPPO carrying out the operations. Implicitly, this wording refers to the objective of ‘meeting another country’s phytosanitary import requirements’, because phytosanitary certification (as per definition) can only be carried out once the exporting country is able to declare that phytosanitary import requirements have been met.
- The proposed revised definition reflects the actual use of the term ‘phytosanitary action’ in ISPMs. It does not conflict with and therefore does not necessitate amendments to ISPM texts.

Current definition

phytosanitary action	An official operation, such as inspection, testing, surveillance or treatment , undertaken to implement phytosanitary measures [ICPM, 2001; revised ICPM, 2005]
-----------------------------	--

Proposed revision

phytosanitary action	An official operation, such as inspection, testing, surveillance or treatment , undertaken to implement phytosanitary measures <u>or to enable phytosanitary certification</u>
-----------------------------	---

b. “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007)

[4] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal:

- An NPPO may apply phytosanitary procedures against pests regulated in the country itself. Furthermore, to fulfill all prerequisites for performing phytosanitary certification in export situations, the NPPO may similarly apply *phytosanitary procedures* against pests regulated in other (importing) countries in order to meet the phytosanitary import requirements of those countries.
- The proposed additional wording is “...or for enabling phytosanitary certification” which describes the scenario from the perspective of the NPPO carrying out the operations. Implicitly, this wording refers to the objective of ‘meeting another country’s phytosanitary import requirements’, because phytosanitary certification (as per definition) can only be carried out once the exporting country is able to declare that phytosanitary import requirements have been met.
- Given the inclusion of ‘phytosanitary’ in the term itself and within both elements of the definition as ‘phytosanitary measures’ and ‘phytosanitary certification’, the current phrasing ‘in connection with regulated pests’ is redundant and potentially confusing, as it does not provide the immediate understanding that, with the export scenario, although the pest in question is regulated in the

importing country, it may not be regulated in the exporting country where the procedure is being followed. The phrasing therefore should be deleted from the definition.

- ‘An’ as the introductory article of the definition is consistent with far the most Glossary definitions and is more precise than the original ‘Any’.
- ‘including’ is changed to ‘such as’, consistent with wording used in the definition of “phytosanitary action” and to clarify that the examples mentioned are not exhaustive.
- The proposed revised definition reflects the actual use of the term ‘phytosanitary procedure’ in ISPMs. It does not conflict with and therefore does not necessitate amendments to ISPM texts.

Current definition

phytosanitary procedure	Any official method for implementing phytosanitary measures including the performance of inspections, tests, surveillance or treatments in connection with regulated pests [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; CEPM, 1999; ICPM, 2001; ICPM, 2005]
--------------------------------	--

Proposed revision

phytosanitary procedure	Any official method for implementing phytosanitary measures <u>or for enabling phytosanitary certification</u> , such as the performance of inspections, tests, surveillance or treatments in connection with regulated pests
--------------------------------	---

Appendix 6: Draft specification on Revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010)

DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ISPM: Revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010)

Status box

This is not an official part of the specification and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after approval	
Date of this document	2022-05-10
Document category	Draft specification for revision of an ISPM
Current document stage	To first consultation
Major stages	2022-04 CPM-16 added topic <i>Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae))</i> , priority 2. 2022-05 Standards Committee (SC) revised and approved for first consultation.
Steward history	2022-05 SC [Joanne WILSON (NZ, Lead Steward)]
Notes	This is a draft document 2022-05 Edited

Title

- [1] Revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010).

Reason for the revision of the standard

ISPM 26 should be revised for the following reasons:

- While the purpose of an ISPM is to provide guidance that allows a harmonized approach to international trade, the requirements set out in ISPM 26 are too open and broad and leave too much for interpretation by countries.
- Some key parts of ISPM 26 (e.g. section 2.4) lack sufficient clarity to ensure adequate harmonization and hence need expanding.
- Some aspects of the standard are open to interpretation, particularly by countries that would normally be free from fruit flies. The standard therefore needs further linkages to ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) and ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) to reduce ambiguity.

Scope

- [2] The revised ISPM 26 should provide guidance for the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (*Tephritidae*) of economic importance, including requirements that accommodate the needs of both countries with indigenous fruit flies and countries that are free from fruit flies.

Purpose

- [3] The purpose of the revision of ISPM 26 is to:
- ensure consistency between the requirements in ISPM 26 and those in ISPM 4 and ISPM 8;
 - provide appropriate criteria for determining whether a pest population constitutes an incursion or an outbreak;
 - provide a better description of the criteria for suspension and reinstatement of pest free areas (sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 of ISPM 26), considering varying geographical scales and host densities to ensure a more harmonized approach; and
 - determine whether the appendices and annexes should remain as part of the ISPM or be removed to implementation material.

Tasks

[4] The expert working group (EWG) should undertake the following tasks:

- (1) Revise the current text of ISPM 26 to reduce ambiguity in interpretation by countries that would normally be free from fruit flies.
- (2) Revise the current text of ISPM 26 so that it is more explicitly linked to ISPM 4 and ISPM 8 to ensure that it provides an effective, cohesive approach to the establishment of pest free areas for tephritid fruit flies. In addition, update the text as appropriate to reflect recent developments in the management of such pest free areas.
- (3) Review the current text of ISPM 26, annexes and appendices and propose which sections or parts should remain as part of the ISPM and which, if any, should be moved to implementation material.
- (4) Propose what implementation material needs to be developed in a form that could be more easily updated with new information as it becomes available.
- (5) Define the criteria for determining whether a pest population constitutes an incursion or an outbreak. In developing these criteria, consider the biology of species, the number of detections, the life stages detected, indicators of population size, and the impacts of time frame, distance between detections, climate, season, generation, surveillance trapping grid, and so on, when appropriate. Take into account current knowledge, modelling, and existing arrangements, contingency protocols or export plans used internationally or agreed bilaterally.
- (6) Consider whether the ISPM could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft ISPM.
- (7) Consider implementation of the ISPM by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the Standards Committee.
- (8) Review all references to ISPM 26 in other ISPMs to ensure that they are still relevant and propose consequential changes if necessary. Review all references to other ISPMs in the revised ISPM and amend as necessary.

Provision of resources

[5] Funding for the meeting may be provided from sources other than the regular programme of the IPPC (FAO). As recommended by ICPM-2 (1999), whenever possible, those participating in standard setting activities voluntarily fund their travel and subsistence to attend meetings. Participants may request financial assistance, with the understanding that resources are limited and the priority for financial assistance is given to developing country participants. Please refer to the *Criteria used for prioritizing participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat* posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) (see www.ippc.int/en/core-activities).

Collaborator

[6] To be determined.

Steward

[7] Please refer to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* posted on the IPP (see www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards).

Expertise

[8] Experts with a wide knowledge and experience in the development or maintenance of pest free areas, including:

- at least one person knowledgeable in the biology of tephritid fruit flies;
- at least one person knowledgeable in risk management in trade; and
- at least one expert from a national plant protection organization (NPPO) of a country that is free from tephritid fruit flies (either because such pests have never been recorded or through

establishment of PFAs), to ensure that the interests and interpretation of such NPPOs are represented.

[9] The participation of a member of the EWG for the revision of ISPM 4 (2009-002) would also be advantageous to ensure alignment with the revised ISPM 4.

[10] In addition, a member of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee should be invited to participate as an invited expert.

Participants

[11] Seven to nine experts and one invited expert.

References

[12] The IPPC, relevant ISPMs and other national, regional and international standards and agreements as may be applicable to the tasks, and discussion papers submitted in relation to this work.

Clarke, A.R., Powell, K.S., Weldon, C.W. & Taylor, P.W. 2011. The ecology of *Bactrocera tryoni* (Diptera: Tephritidae): what do we know to assist pest management? *Annals of Applied Biology*, 158: 26–54.

Dominiak, B.C. & Fanson, B.G. 2014. Revised quarantine distances for domestic and international trading. Presentation to the Ninth International Symposium on Fruit Flies of Economic Importance, 12–16 May 2014, Bangkok, Thailand.

Dominiak, B.C. & Fanson, B.G. 2020. Current quarantine and suspension distances are excessive for incipient populations of Queensland fruit fly (*Bactrocera tryoni* (Froggatt)) (Diptera: Tephritidae) in southern New South Wales, Australia. *Crop Protection*, 138: 105341.

ISPM 4. *Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/614

ISPM 8. *Determination of pest status in an area*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/612

Kean, J. 2015. The effective sampling area of traps: estimation and application. In: R.M. Beresford, K.J. Froud, J.M. Kean & S.P. Worner, eds. *The plant protection data toolbox*. Proceedings of a symposium held on 11 August 2014, Taupo, New Zealand. Auckland, New Zealand, New Zealand Plant Protection Society. 176 pp.

Meats, A. & Edgerton, J.E. 2008. Short- and long-range dispersal of the Queensland fruit fly, *Bactrocera tryoni* and its relevance to invasive potential, sterile insect technique and surveillance trapping. *Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture*, 48: 1237–1245.

NAPPO (North American Plant Protection Organization). 2010. *Guidelines for the establishment, maintenance and verification of fruit fly pest free areas in North America*. Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) 17. Ottawa, The Secretariat of the North American Plant Protection Organization. 13 pp.

Ormsby, M.D. 2021. Establishing criteria for the management of tephritid fruit fly outbreaks. *CABI Agriculture & Bioscience*, 2: 23. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43170-021-00043-w>

Qin, Y., Paini, D.R., Wang, C., Fang, Y. & Li, Z. 2015. Global establishment risk of economically important fruit fly species (Tephritidae). *PLoS ONE*, 10(1): e0116424. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0116424>

Suckling, D.M., Kean, J.M., Stringer, L.D., Cáceres-Barrios, C., Hendrichs, J., Reyes-Flores, J. & Dominiak, B.C. 2016. Eradication of tephritid fruit fly pest populations: outcomes and prospects. *Pest Management Science*, 72: 456–465.

Discussion papers

[13] Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) for consideration by the EWG.

Appendix 7: Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions between 2021 November and 2022 May

SUMMARY OF STANDARDS COMMITTEE E-DECISIONS 2021 NOVEMBER – 2022 MAY

(Prepared by the IPPC Secretariat)

Background

- [1] This paper provides a summary of the outcomes of the e-decision forums and polls that the Standards Committee (SC) has conducted between 2021 November and 2022 May.
- [2] To review the concluded e-decision forums please see this page: <https://www.ippc.int/en/forum/category/sc-forum-november-2021-may-2022/>. The background documents and other documents (e.g. drafts, complied comments) are posted in the forum.
- [3] Visit the following page to review the forum and poll summaries (<http://www.ippc.int/en/work-area-pages/background-e-decisions/>).

Recommendations to the SC

- [4] The SC is invited to:
 - (9) *agree* that the “Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions between 2021 November – 2022 May” accurately reflects the outcome of the SC e-decisions (Annex 1).

Annex: Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions between 2021 May - November**Table 1: SC e-decisions presented between May and November 2021**

E-decision number	SC decision	SC members commenting in the forum	Polls (yes/no)
2022_eSC_MAY_01	Approval for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for Tortricidae on fruits (2017-011)	16	no
2022_eSC_MAY_02	Approval for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera zonata</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i> (2017-013)	16	no
2022_eSC_MAY_03	Approval for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for <i>Zeugodacus tau</i> (2017-025)	16	no
2022_eSC_MAY_04	Approval for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for <i>Sternochetus frigidus</i> (2017-036)	16	no
2022_eSC_MAY_05	Approval for adoption: 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)	16	no
2022_eSC_MAY_06	Approval for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 27: 'Candidatus Liberibacter' spp. on Citrus spp. (2004-010)	11	no
2022_eSC_MAY_07	Selection of experts for the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT)	20	Yes/4
2022_eSC_MAY_08	Selection of experts for the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)	21	Yes/5
2022_eSC_MAY_09	Decision on restructuring draft annex to ISPM 38 for further discussion at SC May 2022	13	no
2022_eSC_MAY_10	Selection of experts for the expert working group on the use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood	19	no
2022_eSC_MAY_11	Selection of experts for the Chinese language for the Technical Panel for the Glossary	20	no

2022_eSC_May_01: Approval for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for Tortricidae on fruits (2017-011)

[6] During the SC e-decision (2022_eSC_May_01), the SC was invited to approve the responses to the comments and the following draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for Tortricidae on fruits (2017-011).

[7] The SC e-forum was open 20 November – 4 December 2021, and 16 members provided their comments.

SC e-decision

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

2022_eSC_May_02: Approval for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Cold treatment for *Bactrocera zonata* on *Citrus sinensis* (2017-013)

[9] During the SC e-decision (2022_eSC_May_02), the SC was invited to approve the responses to the comments and the following draft PT for adoption: Cold treatment for *Bactrocera zonata* on *Citrus sinensis* (2017-013).

[10] The SC e-forum was open 20 November – 4 December 2021, and 16 members provided their comments.

SC e-decision

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

2022_eSC_May_03: Approval for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for *Zeugodacus tau* (2017-025)

[12] During the SC e-decision (2022_eSC_May_03), the SC was invited to approve the responses to the comments and the following draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for *Zeugodacus tau* (2017-025).

[13] The SC e-forum was open 20 November – 4 December 2021 and 16 members provided their comments.

SC e-decision

[14] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the comments and the following draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for *Zeugodacus tau* (2017-025)

2022_eSC_May_04: Approval for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 28: Irradiation treatment for *Sternochetus frigidus* (2017-036)

[15] During the SC e-decision (2022_eSC_May_04), the SC was invited to approve the responses to the comments and the following draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for *Sternochetus frigidus* (2017-036).

[16] The SC e-forum was open 20 November – 4 December 2021, and 16 members provided their comments.

SC e-decision

[17] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the responses to the comments and the following draft PT for adoption: Irradiation treatment for *Sternochetus frigidus* (2017-036).

2022_eSC_May_05: Approval for adoption: Vapour heat–modified atmosphere treatment for *Cydia pomonella* and *Grapholita molesta* on *Malus pumila* and *Prunus persica* (2017-037 and 2017-038)

[18] During the SC e-decision (2022_eSC_May_05), the SC was invited to approve the responses to the comments and the following draft PT for adoption: Vapour heat–modified atmosphere treatment for *Cydia pomonella* and *Grapholita molesta* on *Malus pumila* and *Prunus persica* (2017-037 and 2017-038).

[19] The SC e-forum was open 20 November - 10 December 2021, and 16 members provided their comments.

[20] Some members requested clarification regarding the heat up time and how the fruit size influences the treatment schedule, and it was agreed to add to the “Other relevant information” section, the heating rate of the study that the schedule was based on.

[21] Another member remarked on the implementation of the treatment and how further guidance would still be useful, however it was agreed that the PTs usually don't contain details of implementation or address product quality issues.

[22] One member also requested an adjustment to the responses to the consultation comment,

SC e-decision

[23] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the comments and the following draft PT for adoption as modified during the forum: Vapour heat-modified atmosphere treatment for *Cydia pomonella* and *Grapholita molesta* on *Malus pumila* and *Prunus persica* (2017-037 and 2017-038).

2022_eSC_May_06: Approval for adoption: ‘*Candidatus Liberibacter*’ spp. on *Citrus* spp. (2004-010)

[24] During the SC e-decision (2022_eSC_May_06), the SC was invited to approve the responses to the comments and the following draft DP for Notification Period: ‘*Candidatus Liberibacter*’ spp. on *Citrus* spp.

[25] The SC e-forum was open 14-28 December 2021, and 12 members provided their comments.

[26] One member suggested some editorial amendments.

SC e-decision

[27] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved responses to the comments and to submit the draft DP for ‘*Candidatus Liberibacter*’ spp. on *Citrus* spp. (2004-010) to the DP Notification Period, starting 5 January 2022.

2022_eSC_May_07: Selection of experts for the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT)

[28] During the SC e-decision (2022_eSC_May_07), the SC was invited to consider the nominations and select up to three member(s) for the TPPT for a 5-year term starting 2022.

[29] The SC e-forum was open 17 February - 2 March 2021, and 20 members provided their comments. According to the assessment of the comments, most preferred were the following 3 nominees for the TPPT.

- Mr Zhan (China)
- Mr Kawai (Japan)
- Ms Noseworthy (Canada)

[30] As the SC makes decisions by consensus, a poll was opened in order to establish that all SC members agreed to select these members.

[31] The poll was open until the 11 March 2022 and 4 members participated.

SC e-decision

[32] Based on the forum discussions and the poll, the SC selected the following three members for the TPPT for a 5-year term starting 2022: Mr Zhan (China), Mr Kawai (Japan) and Mr Noseworthy (Canada)

2022_eSC_May_08: Selection of experts for the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)

[33] During the SC e-decision (2022_eSC_May_08), the SC was invited to consider the nominations and select member(s) for the TPCS for a 5-year term starting 2022.

[34] The SC e-forum was open 17 February - 2 March 2021, and 21 members provided their comments. According to the assessment of the comments, most preferred were the following 10 nominees for the TPCS.

- Adriana Ceriani Camdessus (Argentina)
- Martin Damus (Canada)
- Sun Shuangyan (China)
- Alfayo Ombuya (Kenya)
- Lihong Zhu (New Zealand)
- Douglas Kerruish (Australia)
- Donam Kim (Rep. of Korea)
- Tiago Rodrigo Lohmann (Brazil)
- Hideki Taniguchi (Japan)
- Moshe Vaknin (Israel)

[35] As the SC makes decisions by consensus, a poll was opened in order to establish that all SC members agreed to select these members.

[36] The poll was open until the 11 March 2022 and 5 members participated.

SC e-decision

[37] Based on the forum discussions and the poll, the SC selected the above listed 10 members for the TPCS for a 5-year term starting 2022.

2022_eSC_May_09: Decision on restructuring draft annex to ISPM 38 for further discussion at SC May 2022

[38] During the SC e-decision (2022_eSC_May_09), the SC was invited to review both versions of the draft annex to the ISPM 38 and decide on whether version A or version B to discuss in detail via the OCS and further at SC May 2022 meeting.

[39] The SC e-forum was open 21 March – 03 April 2022, and 13 members provided their comments.

SC e-decision

[40] Based on the forum discussions, the SC agreed to discuss version B of the draft annex to the ISPM 38.

2022_eSC_May_10: Selection of experts for the expert working group on the use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood

[41] During the SC e-decision (2022_eSC_May_10), the SC was invited to review the nominations and select seven to nine experts for the EWG on the use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood.

[42] The SC e-forum was open 11-25 April 2022, and 19 members provided their comments. According to the assessment of the comments, most preferred were the following nominees for the EWG on the use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood.

- John Tyrone Jones, II (United States of America)
- Meghan Keely Noseworthy (Canada)
- Guang Yang (China)
- Christopher Garry Howard (Australia)
- Emmanuel Yamoah (New Zealand)
- Etsuko Shoda-Kagaya (Japan)

- Ian James Brownlee (United Kingdom / EPPO)

[43] As the SC makes decisions by consensus, and some members had different preferences, the SC deferred the decisions on the selection to their April 2022 focused meeting.

SC e-decision

[44] Based on the forum discussions, the SC deferred the decision to their next meeting (SC focused meeting April 2022).

2022_eSC_May_11: Selection of experts for the Chinese language for the Technical Panel for the Glossary

[45] During the SC e-decision (2022_eSC_May_10), the SC was invited to review the nominations and select an expert for the Chinese language for the Technical Panel for the Glossary.

[46] The SC e-forum was open 11-25 April 2022, and 20 members provided their comments.

[47] SC members had diverging opinions on which candidate to select. As the SC makes decisions by consensus, the SC deferred the decisions on the selection to their next meeting.

SC e-decision

[48] Based on the forum discussions, the SC deferred the decision to their next meeting.