



REPORT

Standards Committee

Virtual focused meeting

27–28 April 2022

IPPC Secretariat

IPPC Secretariat. 2022. *Report of the virtual focused meeting of the Standards Committee, 27–28 April 2022*. 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	4
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat and SC chairperson.....	4
2.	Meeting arrangements	4
2.1	Election of the rapporteur.....	4
2.2	Adoption of the agenda	4
3.	Administrative matters	4
4.	Draft specifications for review and approval for consultation.....	4
4.1	Annex to ISPM 46 (<i>Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures</i>): International movement of mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i>) fruit (2021-011), priority 1 ...	4
4.2	Annex to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>): Field inspection (including growing- season inspection) (2021-018), priority 2	7
4.3	Revision of ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>) (2021-010), priority 3.....	9
5.	Review of <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i>	9
6.	Updates and enhancing synergies.....	9
7.	Any other business.....	10
7.1	Outcomes of the selection process from the call for experts.....	10
7.2	Call for a virologist as a member of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols ..	10
7.3	International Plant Health Conference	10
8.	Dates and types of next SC meetings	10
9.	Recommendations to CPM Bureau, Strategic Planning Group or CPM-17 (2023)	10
10.	Close of the meeting.....	10
	Appendix 1: Agenda.....	11
	Appendix 2: Documents list.....	13
	Appendix 3: Participants list	14
	Appendix 4: Draft specification on the annex <i>International movement of mango (Mangifera indica)</i> <i>fruit to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures) (2021-011)</i>	19
	Appendix 5: Draft specification on the annex <i>Field inspection (including growing season inspection)</i> <i>to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection) (2021-018).....</i>	22

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat and SC chairperson

- [1] The Chairperson of the Standards Committee (SC), Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), and the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred as “the secretariat”) welcomed all participants to this focused meeting of the SC, the main objective of which was to review, and consider for approval, the draft specifications for the topics added to the SC’s work programme by CPM-16 (2022).
- [2] The following SC members were absent: Prudence Tonator ATTIPOE (Ghana), Imad (M.E) Jrouh Al-AWAD (Jordan), David KAMANGIRA (Malawi), Gerald Glenn F. PANGANIBAN (the Philippines), Chonticha RAKKRAI (Thailand) and David Boas TENAKANAI (Papua New Guinea).

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Election of the rapporteur

- [3] The SC elected Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) as rapporteur.

2.2 Adoption of the agenda

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

3. Administrative matters

- [5] The secretariat introduced the documents list (Appendix 2) and the participants list (Appendix 3). The secretariat invited participants to notify the secretariat of any information that required updating in the participants list or was missing from it.

4. Draft specifications for review and approval for consultation

- [6] The SC was invited to review the draft specifications for the topics added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by CPM-16 (2022).

4.1 Annex to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures*): International movement of mango (*Mangifera indica*) fruit (2021-011), priority 1

- [7] Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) introduced the draft specification.¹ She explained the background to the topic submission and summarized the scope of the topic (fresh mango fruit for consumption or processing only) and the tasks for the expert working group (EWG).
- [8] The SC chairperson thanked Ms WILSON and invited the SC to comment.
- [9] A few SC members raised questions about the process for developing the annex, given that the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) had not yet convened. One SC member suggested that it might be better to wait until the process is established before progressing the specification, but another commented that it might be helpful to the TPCS to have a specification that they can start work on, rather than delaying work on the specification. The SC chairperson speculated that information from contracting parties could be solicited in the same way that discussion papers are submitted for consideration by EWGs or there could be a specific call for such information. Some SC members supported the idea of such a call and the SC agreed to proceed with the draft specification as planned.
- [10] The SC considered the text of the draft specification, noting in doing so that the draft needed to be aligned with ISPM 46.
- [11] **Title.** The SC considered whether to remove “international movement” from the title of the proposed annex and simply use “Commodity standard for mango (*Mangifera indica*) fruit”. They noted that ISPM 46 did not say anything about international movement, but also recognized the benefits of being

¹ 04_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr; 2021-011.

specific about the scope in the title (by including “international movement”) rather than leaving it open. The SC discussed whether all annexes to ISPM 46 needed to follow the same format for their title (e.g. “Phytosanitary measures for [commodity]” or simply the name of the commodity), but also noted that it is possible for the titles of annexes to differ. Noting these various possibilities, the SC therefore agreed to keep the title unchanged for the time being and review the matter again after the consultation.

- [12] **Reason for the annex.** The SC agreed to omit any reference to the IPPC Strategic Framework when explaining the reason for the annex, because it was not a technical reason for the annex and would, at some point, become out of date.
- [13] The SC considered a bulleted list outlining the potential objectives and outcomes of the proposed annex, but concluded that the purpose and content of commodity standards was adequately described in ISPM 46 and there was no need to include such information in this annex unless it was specific to mango. As it was not specific to mango, the SC agreed to delete the whole of this bulleted list.
- [14] **Scope of the annex.** Noting that commodity standards should be narrow in scope, the SC agreed that the scope of the annex should be limited to *fresh* mango fruit. They therefore agreed to insert “fresh” before “mango” throughout the draft specification where appropriate. In the Scope section, the SC considered whether to expand the text to give the intended use of the fruit (i.e. fresh mango fruit for consumption or processing only), but decided against this. The intended use of the fruit was already specified in the Purpose section.
- [15] The SC considered whether the annex would relate to all varieties of mango fruit and whether this was something that could be included in the specification or needed to be set as a task for the EWG to consider. The SC agreed to leave this issue for the TPCS to consider, but noted that the default for commodity standards would probably be that they relate to all varieties unless the title of the annex specifies otherwise.
- [16] The SC considered a short paragraph that pointed out the variation in pest risk between countries and the need to use pest risk analysis to identify quarantine pests and provide the technical justification for phytosanitary import requirements. Although they recognized that this text helped to set the scene, the SC also acknowledged that it was only repeating guidance that is in other ISPMs and did not provide information pertinent to the scope of the annex. The SC therefore deleted this paragraph.
- [17] **Tasks.** The SC considered whether the tasks should be directed to an expert drafting group (i.e. either an expert working group or a technical panel) or the TPCS. The SC recalled that Specification TP 6 (*Technical Panel on Commodity Standards*) did allow the TPCS, in exceptional circumstances, to recommend to the SC that calls be made for expert drafting groups for specific commodity standards. To allow for this eventuality, while recognizing that it was unlikely, the SC agreed that the TPCS should *ensure* that the various tasks were undertaken, but did not necessarily need to undertake the tasks itself. The SC rephrased the introductory stem of the tasks accordingly.
- [18] **List of pests.** When referring to the list of pests that would be compiled by the EWG for inclusion in the annex, the SC agreed to refer to pests and pest groups but not to “major pests”, noting that there is no reference to “major pests” in ISPM 46, which refers to “a list of pests or groups of pests that are known to be associated with the commodity” and to regulated pests (“a criterion for inclusion of a pest is that it is regulated by at least one contracting party”).
- [19] **Measures.** When referring to the measures that would be identified and evaluated by the EWG for possible inclusion in the annex, the SC agreed to use the phrase “options for phytosanitary measures” for consistency with the terminology used in ISPM 46 and because the purpose of ISPM 46 and its annexes is to help national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) develop phytosanitary import requirements, not to identify phytosanitary import requirements.
- [20] **Production and post-harvest practices.** The SC considered a proposed task regarding the development of guidance on mango production and post-harvest practices to minimize pest risk. The discussion revolved around whether such practices were within the scope of the annex.

- [21] On the one hand, the SC recognized that practices such as washing of mango fruit can be effective in reducing pest risk, and this in turn may influence the technical justification of phytosanitary import requirements. As such, information on such practices would be useful for NPPOs. The secretariat recalled that Task 2 of Specification TP 6 tasked the TPCS with considering production practices that may inform the development of the standard. The SC also noted that ISPM 46, when describing the content of commodity standards, says that individual measures or combinations of measures may be provided and may relate to any point of production or handling of the commodity before import.
- [22] On the other hand, the SC recalled that the scope of ISPM 46 annexes was limited to options for phytosanitary measures, but production and post-harvest practices may not all be applicable as phytosanitary measures and so may be outside the scope of the annex. They noted that although production and post-harvest practices could form part of a systems approach, not all combinations of practices would be considered a systems approach as systems approaches include at least two independent measures and have a measured efficacy. Where a systems approach was possible, this would, in itself, be an option for a phytosanitary measure and so would already be covered by the preceding task on identifying options for phytosanitary measures. Where a combination of practices did not comprise a systems approach, it would simply be considered to be a set of integrated measures, which may or may not be phytosanitary measures.
- [23] In the light of their discussions, the SC considered whether to reverse the order of tasks in this draft specification, so that the EWG first considered practices and then identified options for phytosanitary measures from among them, or to delete the task on production and post-harvest practices completely and amend the preceding task (on identifying options for phytosanitary measures) to include combinations of measures. They opted for the latter.
- [24] **Evaluation of options for phytosanitary measures.** The SC agreed that, when considering which options for phytosanitary measures to include in the annex, the critical aspect for the TPCS to consider was the effectiveness of the measures.
- [25] **Methods for the detection of pests.** The SC considered whether to include a task for the EWG to consider and indicate available methods that could be used for the detection of pests that may be associated with fresh mango fruit at export. They noted, however, that although useful information is already provided in ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies*) and ISPM 31 (*Methodologies for sampling of consignments*), this task would ensure that diagnostic protocols were considered in the drafting of the annex and not just methods related to inspection. The SC therefore agreed to include the task, with editorial adjustment.
- [26] **Liaison with other technical panels.** The SC agreed that, when describing the necessary liaison between the TPCS and other technical panels, there was no need to specify that these panels were “under the SC” as all technical panels were under the oversight of the SC.
- [27] **Review of information.** The SC considered the mechanism by which information would be provided for use by the TPCS when drafting the annex, and how best to incorporate this into the draft specification. They considered whether to refer to information provided by NPPOs, regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) and other relevant organizations in some of the tasks, but noted that one of the tasks in the draft specification already focused specifically on the consideration of existing standards and guidelines for managing pest risk. Recognizing, however, that there could be phytosanitary measures or lists of pests that are not in such standards and guidelines, they considered whether to include a generic statement that there would be a general call for information. The secretariat advised that the SC could decide, at the appropriate time, to open a call for case studies, papers, and so on, and there was no need for this to be in the specification. The SC therefore agreed to omit it from the draft specification.
- [28] **Biodiversity and the environment.** The SC considered the standard task on biodiversity and the environment that is included in the template for all draft specifications and is set as a task for the TPCS in Specification TP 6. They noted, however, that where an ISPM already includes a statement on the

impact of the ISPM on the protection of biodiversity and the environment, it may not be necessary to also have such a statement in annexes to that ISPM. As ISPM 46 already included such a statement, the SC therefore agreed that there was no need for this annex to also include a statement on biodiversity and the environment and so they deleted this task from the draft specification.

- [29] The SC recalled that they had agreed at an earlier SC meeting to have a specific discussion on the inclusion of the section on biodiversity and the environment at some point.²
- [30] **Participants.** The SC deleted the Participants section, because the Expertise section already made it clear that the participants would be the members of the TPCS and other experts if deemed necessary.
- [31] **Discussion papers.** The SC considered whether to refer to case studies in the section on Discussion papers, but were unsure whether case studies would apply to the selection of pests and options for phytosanitary measures and so decided against this.
- [32] The SC considered whether the draft specification should be more specific as to who was being encouraged to submit discussion papers, to include reference to contracting parties and RPPOs as well as participants and other interested parties. They agreed, however, that the standard wording of “participants and interested parties” would suffice, as it already allowed any party to contribute papers.
- [33] **Development of the annex after final approval of the specification.** In response to a query from the SC, the secretariat confirmed that if the TPCS decided that it needed additional experts to help draft the annex, then the TPCS could invite such experts but only with prior agreement by the SC.
- [34] The SC recalled the concerns raised at CPM-16 (2022) regarding the need for transparency in the criteria used by the TPCS to evaluate potential options for phytosanitary measures for inclusion in commodity standards.³ With this in mind, the SC noted that the TPCS would not be able to proceed with the drafting of the annex until the full criteria for evaluating options for phytosanitary measures have been developed and potentially submitted to consultation. However, the SC did not discuss these matters any further at this meeting.
- [35] The SC:
- (1) *approved* the draft specification on the annex *International movement of mango (Mangifera indica) fruit* to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) (2021-011), as modified in this meeting, for consultation (Appendix 4).

4.2 Annex to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*): Field inspection (including growing-season inspection) (2021-018), priority 2

- [36] Masahiro SAI (Japan) introduced the draft specification.⁴ He explained that as some ISPMs use the terms “field inspection” and “growing-season inspection” apparently interchangeably, the title of the draft specification included both terms. In his understanding, “growing-season inspection” was a field inspection that was conducted during the growing season. Mr SAI explained the background and rationale for the new annex, the aim of which was to provide specific information on field inspection to supplement the guidance in ISPM 23 and help resolve confusion between field inspection and surveillance. He then drew the attention of the SC to the nine tasks set for the EWG.
- [37] The SC chairperson thanked Mr SAI and invited the SC to comment.
- [38] **Review of the text**
- [39] **Title of the annex.** The SC recalled that ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) included the term “growing period” but that “growing season” was no longer included in it. They therefore considered

² SC 2019-11, agenda item 8.2.

³ CPM-16 (2022), agenda item 9.2.

⁴ 05_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr; 2021-018.

whether the title should refer to “growing period” or “growing season”. Noting that ISPM 10 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*) and ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) both referred to “growing season” but not to “growing period”, the SC agreed to use the former.

- [40] As field inspection includes growing-season inspection, the SC considered whether there was a need to refer to “growing-season inspection” in the title of the annex, as a definition of field inspection could be given in the text of the annex instead. However, they agreed to keep it in the title to help make it clear that field inspection was different from surveillance and that field inspection also included inspection in controlled environments, not just in open fields (see “Reason for annex” below).
- [41] **Reason for annex.** Recognizing that certain crop types can be grown in controlled environments such as a greenhouse, the SC agreed that the annex should cover these environments as well as open fields. They referred to the Glossary definition of “field” and noted that “a plot of land with defined boundaries” (the phrasing used in the definition) could refer equally to environments such as greenhouses and not just open fields, and so the same would apply also to the term “field inspection”.
- [42] The SC considered whether to include a definition of “field inspection”, which would also avoid the need to keep repeating the words “including growing-season inspection” in parentheses after “field inspection”, but concluded that field inspection was already adequately described in the draft specification and that it was still necessary to include “growing-season inspection” in the title for greater clarity.
- [43] The SC agreed to omit any reference to the IPPC Strategic Framework when explaining the reason for the annex, for the same reason as in the draft specification reviewed under agenda item 4.1. They considered whether to retain the associated text that highlighted the links between field inspection and commodity standards and between field inspection and the draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) (2018-009), but agreed to delete this too, as although these were valid points to make in the proposal for the specification, they were not necessary for the actual specification.
- [44] **Scope of the annex.** The SC agreed that, when describing the scope of the annex as including plants and plant parts moving in international trade, it was not necessary to give the purpose of this international movement. They also agreed that field inspection may be used as a standalone phytosanitary measure or as one component of a systems approach, but decided against referring to integrated measures as the only type of integrated measures relevant to this annex would be a systems approach.
- [45] **Consideration of requirements in existing standards.** The SC reviewed the list of examples of standards to which the EWG should refer when considering existing requirements. They discussed the relevance of ISPM 10 in this context and agreed to retain it in the list, because ISPM 10 refers to growing-season inspections as one of the options that may be used to achieve pest freedom. The SC chairperson also clarified that “requirements” in this context referred to the obligations set out in ISPMs, “requirements” being the term used in ISPMs for these obligations.
- [46] **Review of examples of phytosanitary requirements and industry guidance.** The SC reviewed two tasks, one relating to a review of examples of phytosanitary requirements from different countries and the other relating to a review of guidance from industry, if available. They noted that, as inspection was an official activity, the only bodies that could conduct inspection and have requirements for it were NPPOs, but that RPPOs may also produce guidance. The SC also noted that the plant industry does examine plants as part of quality systems and so there could be guidance from industry that is relevant to the annex. The SC therefore amended the text to task the EWG with considering examples of information from NPPOs, RPPOs and industry.
- [47] **General requirements for field inspection.** The SC reviewed a task concerning the development of general requirements for field inspection. Although the original draft text described these requirements as ensuring technical justification of phytosanitary measures, the SC noted that technical justification cannot be ensured by the content of an ISPM. Instead, technical justification relates to the setting of

phytosanitary import requirements by individual countries, with importing NPPOs having to ensure that the phytosanitary measures they set as requirements are technically justified. The SC therefore amended the text to task the EWG with defining general requirements for field inspection, including the circumstances under which field inspection may be technically justified.

[48] **Specific requirements for field inspection.** The SC reviewed a task concerning the development of specific requirements for field inspection. They simplified it by merging some of the examples listed and by incorporating the examples into the main sentence rather than presenting them as secondary bullet points. They also made some editorial changes to improve clarity.

[49] **Amendments to the core text of ISPM 23.** The SC acknowledged that some changes may need to be applied as ink amendments to the core text of ISPM 23 as a consequence of the annex on field inspection, and that it would also be useful for the core text to include a description of field inspection. Recognizing that the implementation of such changes would be outside the scope of the EWG, the SC agreed that the EWG should, nevertheless, identify what the proposed changes would be.

[50] **Biodiversity and the environment.** The SC considered whether to include the standard task on biodiversity that is included in all ISPMs. They noted that there was no biodiversity statement in the core text of ISPM 26 and that the impact of the standard on biodiversity should not be considered only in the context of this annex. The steward of the draft annex *Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information* (2018-011) to ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies*) recalled that the EWG for that annex had faced the same situation and had resolved it by omitting the biodiversity statement from the annex while also drafting a statement for the SC to consider including in the core text of ISPM 37 at a future revision. The SC therefore agreed to delete the biodiversity task from this draft specification.

[51] **Expertise.** The SC agreed that the EWG should include experts with a wide knowledge and experience in field inspection, pest risk assessment and pest risk management. They discussed whether the latter two needed to be mentioned specifically, rather than referring to pest risk analysis (which includes both of these), but agreed that specific expertise on pest risk assessment would be needed to draft requirements on technical justification as this was based on risk. The SC noted that the balance of expertise on the EWG could be considered when selecting the experts for the EWG, to ensure that experts in field inspection – which was the subject of the annex – were adequately represented.

[52] The SC:

(2) *approved* the draft specification on the annex *Field inspection (including growing season inspection)* to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) (2021-018), as modified in this meeting, for consultation (Appendix 5).

4.3 Revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010), priority 3

[53] This item was deferred to the next meeting of the SC.

5. Review of *List of topics for IPPC standards*

[54] This item was deferred to the next meeting of the SC.

6. Updates and enhancing synergies

[55] This item was deferred to the next meeting of the SC.

7. Any other business

7.1 Outcomes of the selection process from the call for experts

[56] The secretariat presented the outcomes of the e-fora on the selection of experts for:

- the EWG on the Use of Systems Approaches in Managing the Pest Risks Associated with the Movement of Wood (2015-004); and
- a member for the Chinese language for the Technical Panel for the Glossary.

[57] With regard to the first of these, the secretariat confirmed that the EWG was scheduled to meet in person in Canada in June 2022. One SC member pointed out that not all EWG members may be able to attend in person, because of COVID-19 travel restrictions. The secretariat suggested that if this were to be the case, a similar approach could be taken to that adopted at a previous EWG meeting where a few members had had to cancel their attendance at the last minute: the members concerned had been invited to contribute working papers and to participate virtually to present their papers.

[58] Based on the outcome of the forum discussion, the SC selected seven experts to form the EWG.

[59] The SC:

- (3) *selected* the following experts to be members of the Expert Working Group on the Use of Systems Approaches in Managing the Pest Risks Associated with the Movement of Wood (2015-004):
 - Ian James BROWNLEE (GB),
 - Christopher Garry HOWARD (AU),
 - John Tyrone JONES, II (US),
 - Meghan Keely NOSEWORTHY (CA),
 - Etsuko SHODA-KAGAYA (JP),
 - Emmanuel YAMOAHA (NZ),
 - Guang YANG (CN); and
- (4) *deferred* the selection of a member for the Chinese language for the Technical Panel for the Glossary to a future meeting of the SC.

7.2 Call for a virologist as a member of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols

[60] This item was deferred to a future meeting of the SC.

7.3 International Plant Health Conference

[61] This item was deferred to a future meeting of the SC.

8. Dates and types of next SC meetings

[62] The next SC meeting is scheduled for 9–11 and 13 May 2022, to be held in virtual mode.

9. Recommendations to CPM Bureau, Strategic Planning Group or CPM-17 (2023)

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

10. Close of the meeting

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

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 	–	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_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	Chairperson
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1.	Documents list	02_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	MUSHEGIAN
3.2.	Participants list	03_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr SC membership list	MUSHEGIAN
4.	Draft specifications for review and approval for consultation		
4.1.	Annex International movement of mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i>) fruit to ISPM 46 (<i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i>) (2021-011), Priority 1	04_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	WILSON / MOREIRA
	Draft Specification for approval for consultation	2021-011	
4.2.	Field inspection (including growing season inspection) (Annex to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>)) (2021-018), Priority 2	05_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	SAI / SHAMILOV
	Draft Specification for approval for consultation	2021-018	
4.3.	Revision of ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>) (2021-010), Priority 2	06_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	WILSON / KISS
	Draft Specification for approval for consultation	2021-010	
5.	Review of the List of Topics for IPPC standards (LOT)		
5.1.	Review of: topics, subjects, and priorities stewards and assistant stewards	07_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr Link to List of Topics for IPPC standards	MUSHEGIAN
6.	Updates and enhancing synergies		
6.1.	CPM-16 (2022) outcomes, relevant to the SC	CPM-16 (2022) (draft) report (20 April 2022) 11_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	FERRO / MUSHEGIAN
6.2.	Updates from the IST	10_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	MUSHEGIAN / DENG
6.3.	Updates from the IFU	08_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	MUSHEGIAN / KOU MBA

6.4.	Updates on IC Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) activities	09_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	KOUMBA / KISS
7.	Any other business		
7.1.	Outcomes of the selection process from the Call for experts for: EWG on the use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood for the Chinese language for the TPG	–	SHAMILOV
7.2.	Call for TPDP member: virologist	–	MOREIRA
7.3.	International Plant Health Conference	–	BISHOP / SHAMILOV
8.	Next meetings dates and types		Secretariat / Chairperson
	- 9-11 and 13 May 2022: Standards Committee meeting		
9.	Recommendations to CPM Bureau, SPG, or CPM-17 (if any)		Chairperson
10.	Close of the meeting		Chairperson

Appendix 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGE NDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / UPDATED
Draft specifications			
2021-011	4.1	Annex International movement of mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i>) fruit to ISPM 46 (<i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i>) (2021-011), Priority 1	2022-03-22 2022-04-20
2021-018	4.2	Field inspection (including growing season inspection) (Annex to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>)) (2021-018), Priority 2	2022-03-22 2022-04-20
2021-010	4.3	Revision of ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>) (2021-010), Priority 2	2022-03-22 2022-04-20
Meeting documents			
01_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	2.2	Provisional agenda	2022-03-22 2022-04-20 2022-04-25 2022-04-26
02_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	3.1	Documents list	2022-03-22 2022-04-20 2022-04-25 2022-04-26
03_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	3.2	Participants list	2022-03-22 2022-04-20 2022-04-26
04_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	4.1	Annex International movement of mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i>) fruit to ISPM 46 (<i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i>) (2021-011), Priority 1	2022-03-22 2022-04-20
05_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	4.2	Field inspection (including growing season inspection) (Annex to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>)) (2021-018), Priority 2	2022-03-22 2022-04-20
06_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	4.3	Revision of ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>) (2021-010), Priority 2	2022-03-22 2022-04-20
07_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	5.1	Review of the List of Topics for IPPC standards (LOT)	2022-04-20
08_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	6.3	Updates from the IFU	2022-04-20
09_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	6.4	Updates on IC Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) activities	2022-04-20
10_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	6.2	Updates from the IST	2022-04-25
10_SC_FM_Tel_2022_Apr	6.1	CPM-16 outcomes – key issues	2022-04-26

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

Links	Agenda item	Document link
SC membership list	3.2	SC membership list
Review of List of Topics for IPPC standards (LOT)	5.1	Link to List of Topics for IPPC standards
CPM-16 (2022) (draft) report (20 April 2022)	6.1	CPM-16 (2022) (draft) report
Next meetings dates and types	8	9-13 May 2022: Standards Committee meeting

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.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.gob.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 JAMAA 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
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 Janka KISS Standard Setting Associate	Janka.Kiss@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Edgar MUSHEGIAN Standard Setting Associate	Edgar.Mushegian@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Aoife CASSIN Standard Setting Associate	Aoife.Cassin@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 specification on the annex *International movement of mango (Mangifera indica) fruit to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures) (2021-011)*

DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ISPM: Annex *International movement of mango (Mangifera indica) fruit (2021-011) to ISPM 46*

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	2022-05-09
Document category	Draft specification for an annex to an ISPM
Current document stage	To first consultation
Major stages	2022-04 CPM-16 added topic Annex <i>International movement of mango (Mangifera indica) fruit (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures)</i> , priority 1. 2022-04 Standards Committee revised and approved for first consultation.
Steward history	2022-05 SC Joanne WILSON (NZ, Lead Steward) 2022-05 SC Hernando MORERA-GONZÁLEZ (CR, Assistant Steward)
Notes	This is a draft document 2022-05 Edited

Title

- [1] Annex *International movement of mango (Mangifera indica) fruit (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures)*.

Reason for the annex to the standard

- [2] Mango fruit, which has the potential to host pests such as fruit flies, fruit-boring moths and beetles, scale insects and mealybugs, is widely traded internationally.
- [3] Several contracting parties have established and accepted phytosanitary measures to effectively manage pests associated with the traded commodity. This makes mango fruit a suitable commodity for an annex to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*).
- [4] The Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures on the movement of fresh mango fruit (APPPC, 2019) provides a good basis for the development of this commodity-specific standard.

Scope

- [5] The annex should provide guidance for national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) on options for phytosanitary measures for the import and export of fresh mango fruit. This includes information on pest risk assessment (ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*) and ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*)), pest risk management options and treatments (ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) and ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*)), packing, inspection (ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*)) and phytosanitary certification (ISPM 7 (*Phytosanitary certification*) and ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*)) of fresh mango fruit. The annex should identify common and significant pests or pest groups that are known to be associated with fresh mango fruit at export and describe selected options for phytosanitary measures that may be applied to reduce pest risk before export.
- [6] This annex should not apply to processed mango (dried, frozen or canned), mango seed or vegetative plant parts.

Purpose

- [7] This ISPM annex will provide guidance for NPPOs who currently, or intend to, import or export fresh mango fruit for consumption or processing.

Tasks

- [8] Following the requirements in ISPM 46, the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) should ensure that the following tasks are completed:
- (1) Identify and provide a list of pests or pest groups associated with fresh mango fruit at export.
 - (2) Identify options for effective phytosanitary measures, or effective combinations of phytosanitary measures, against these pests or pest groups.
 - (3) Evaluate potential options for phytosanitary measures for inclusion in the annex and consider whether there is sufficient information on their effectiveness to support their inclusion.
 - (4) Consider and list available methods that may be used for the detection of pests or pest groups that are known to be associated with fresh mango fruit at export.
 - (5) Consider existing standards and guidelines, developed under the auspices of the IPPC Secretariat or by regional plant protection organizations and other international organizations, for managing the pest risk associated with the international movement of fresh mango fruit.
 - (6) Liaise as needed with the other technical panels (Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols, Technical Panel for the Glossary, Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments) and with the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee.
 - (7) Consider implementation of the annex by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the Standards Committee.

Provision of resources

- [9] 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

- [10] To be determined.

Steward

- [11] 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

- [12] The TPCS and other experts if deemed necessary.

References

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

APPPC (Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission). 2021. *International movement of fresh mango (Mangifera indica) fruit*. Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RPSM) 11. Bangkok, APPPC, FAO. 12 pp. www.fao.org/3/cb5357en/cb5357en.pdf

- ISPM 2.** 2019. *Framework for pest risk analysis*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/592
- ISPM 7.** 2016. *Phytosanitary certification*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/613
- ISPM 11.** 2019. *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/639
- ISPM 12.** 2022. *Phytosanitary certificates*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/609
- ISPM 18.** 2019. *Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/604
- ISPM 23.** 2019. *Guidelines for inspection*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/598
- ISPM 28.** 2016. *Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/591
- ISPM 46.** 2022. *Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/91184

Discussion papers

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

Appendix 5: Draft specification on the annex *Field inspection (including growing season inspection)* to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) (2021-018)

DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ISPM: Annex *Field inspection (including growing-season inspection)* (2021-018) to ISPM 23

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	2022-05-09
Document category	Draft specification for an annex to an ISPM
Current document stage	To first consultation
Major stages	2022-04 CPM-16 added topic <i>Field inspection (including growing season inspection)</i> (<i>Annex to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection)</i>), priority 2. 2022-04 Standards Committee revised and approved for first consultation.
Steward history	2022-05 SC [Masahiro SAI (JP, Lead Steward)] 2022-05 SC [Mariangela CIAMPITTI (IT, Assistant Steward)]
Notes	This is a draft document 2022-05 Edited

Title

- [1] Annex *Field inspection (including growing-season inspection)* (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*).

Reason for the annex to the standard

- [2] Field inspection (including growing-season inspection) is an effective phytosanitary measure that is set by many countries as a phytosanitary import requirement. By requiring exporting countries to inspect field crops, seed crops and mother plants in open fields and controlled environments, the importing country can, directly or indirectly, reduce the pest risk associated with the international movement of plants and plant parts. However, although some ISPMs (ISPM 10 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*), ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*), ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*), ISPM 36 (*Integrated measures for plants for planting*) and ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*)) describe field inspection (or “growing-season inspection” as a synonym), they do not provide any guidance focusing specifically on field inspection, resulting in unharmonized implementation of field inspections by countries.
- [3] This has led to confusion between the concepts of field inspection and specific surveillance. Field inspection is a phytosanitary measure to detect regulated pests that produce visible signs or symptoms on host plants during their growing period. Specific surveillance, on the other hand, is conducted to determine if pests are present or absent in an area (detection survey), to establish the boundaries of an area considered to be infested by or free from a pest (delimiting survey), or to verify the characteristics of a pest population in an area (monitoring survey). Although field inspection and specific surveillance may be conducted using similar procedures and methods and are both official processes, the concept and objectives differ between the two.
- [4] For field inspection to be interpreted and applied appropriately by countries, it is therefore necessary to describe the concept and objectives of field inspection in the form of an annex to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*).

Scope

- [5] The proposed annex should be applicable to plants (e.g. seedlings, cuttings) and plant parts (e.g. seeds, grafts, bulbs, fruits) moving in international trade. It should provide the general and specific requirements for field inspection (including growing-season inspection) that will apply if a national plant protection organization (NPPO) uses field inspection as a stand-alone phytosanitary measure or as one

component of a systems approach. The annex should define a standardized concept, objectives and process by which NPPOs may recognize conformity with field-inspection requirements. This recognition by NPPOs could form the basis for phytosanitary certification based on field-inspection results.

Purpose

- [6] Field inspection (including growing-season inspection) as a phytosanitary measure can help contracting parties achieve the overall purpose of the IPPC as described in Article I.1 of the IPPC: securing common and effective action to prevent the spread and introduction of pests of plants and plant products, and to promote appropriate measures for their control. Field inspection is a type of inspection that many countries have adopted to inspect field crops, seed crops and mother plants. The private sector (e.g. the seed and nursery industries) has also adopted field inspections to ensure the health or quality of seeds, seedlings and crops.
- [7] Field inspection is an effective method of visually examining apparent signs or symptoms on plants caused by pests in a field during the growing period. It may, for example, be applied during the pre-harvest period to detect pests that produce visible signs or symptoms on host plants and to detect harmful plants (weeds, parasitic plants) growing among crops in fields. Field inspection may be applied either as a stand-alone measure or as one component of a systems approach for some commodities and pests (i.e. as an option during the pre-harvest period). In either case, it can directly or indirectly reduce the pest risk posed by the international movement of plants and plant parts and hence contribute to the safe international trade of plants and plant products.
- [8] The proposed annex will complement the information in ISPM 23 by providing specific information on field inspection to promote a shared understanding of the concept and objectives of this type of inspection among countries. This will facilitate the harmonization of field inspection as a phytosanitary measure and help countries apply it appropriately.

Tasks

- [9] The expert drafting group (EWG) should undertake the following tasks:
- (1) Consider the requirements relating to field inspection (including growing-season inspection) (hereafter referred to as “field inspection”) described in existing standards (e.g. ISPM 10, ISPM 12, ISPM 20, ISPM 36, ISPM 38).
 - (2) Review examples of phytosanitary import requirements and guidance for field inspection from different NPPOs, regional plant protection organizations and industry bodies.
 - (3) Describe the purpose and scope of field inspection in the phytosanitary context, especially the difference between the concept and objectives of field inspection and those of specific surveillance (e.g. detection survey).
 - (4) Define the general requirements for a field inspection, including the circumstances under which field inspection may be technically justified.
 - (5) Describe the specific requirements for field inspection, such as the requirements for inspection methods related to the characteristics of pests and the requirements for inspectors’ expertise.
 - (6) Propose a description of field inspection to be considered for inclusion in a future focused revision of ISPM 23 (section 1.1) and any other consequential changes to the text of ISPM 23 that may need to be applied as ink amendments.
 - (7) Consider implementation of the annex by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the Standards Committee.

Provision of resources

- [10] 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

- [11] To be determined.

Steward

- [12] 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

- [13] Experts with a wide knowledge and experience in field inspection for field crops, seed crops and plants for planting, pest risk assessment and pest risk management.

Participants

Five to seven experts

References

- [14] 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.

IPPC Secretariat. 1997. *International Plant Protection Convention*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/convention-text

ISPM 4. 2017. *Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/614

ISPM 5. *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/622

ISPM 6. 2018. *Surveillance*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/615

ISPM 10. 2016. *Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/610

ISPM 12. 2022. *Phytosanitary certificates*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/609

ISPM 20. 2019. *Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/602

ISPM 23. 2019. *Guidelines for inspection*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/598

ISPM 36. 2019. *Integrated measures for plants for planting*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/636

ISPM 38. 2018. *International movement of seeds*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. www.ippc.int/en/publications/84340

Discussion papers

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