



Minutes of the 11th meeting of the Working Group to develop a Guide to support implementation of ISPM 15 (2017-043) (VM11)

24 May 2022 at 14:00 – 16:00 (Central European Time)

1. Opening of the meeting

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

2. Meeting arrangements

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

3. Administrative matters

- [5] The list of meeting participants is presented in Appendix 2.

4. Status of draft Guide

- [6] One WG member expressed concern about one of the peer review comments suggesting that the guide sets too high a bar and may be difficult for all NPPOs to apply. However, other WG members pointed out that the guide is intended to support implementation of ISPM 15 and cannot be less stringent than the requirements specified in ISPM 15.
- [7] Another WG member described the challenge of providing common guidance when different NPPOs may need to do things differently because their industry is different or the workflows are different. Another WG member agreed, noting the challenge of providing an adequate amount of guidance without being too prescriptive. He suggested that the guide should focus on the agreed scope for the guide, which is to support implementation of ISPM 15 and to suggest the factors that an NPPO must consider and provide some examples of how different NPPOs have implemented different requirements.
- [8] The WG agreed to the suggestion by the SC representative that supplementary case studies and implementation materials could continue to be added to the ISPM 15 phytosanitary component page on the International Phytosanitary Portal (<https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/phytosanitary-system/ispm-15-implementation/>) after the guide has been published. The Secretariat reminded the WG that six case studies were submitted in response to the call that was sent to all NPPOs and RPPOs in July 2021.

- [9] The WG agreed that a brief scope section should be added to the guide to clarify what the guide contains and what it does not.
- [10] One WG member suggested that some language should be added regarding the environmental impacts related to ISPM 15 treatments. The Secretariat informed the WG that the draft fumigation treatment manual and chapter 4 of the guide include information about the Montreal Protocol and about the environmental risks associated with methyl bromide and sulphuryl fluoride and suggested that the WG members should review this to ensure it is adequate.
- [11] The lead author for chapter 1 thanked the other WG members for the discussion on how to approach the comments and indicated that he was confident that he could now finish revising this chapter.
- [12] The lead authors for chapters 2 and 7 also noted comments that show there is a lack of consistency in how different NPPOs apply ISPM 15 and what activities are considered to be manufacturing and which ones are not (e.g., assembling kits, knock-downs, or partially assembled packaging). Again, the WG discussed the importance of preparing a scope section for the guide and to be very clear when something is an example.
- [13] The word “recycled” has been defined in the draft guide to include: reused, repaired and remanufactured wood packaging material. One peer reviewer comment noted that in the UK the term “recycling” has a specific meaning. The WG discussed and concluded that as long as the term was clearly defined in the guide, no change should be needed.
- [14] One of the lead authors for chapter 2 explained that wood packaging material can be touched by many people, both certified and not certified, during its travels. When a recycling facility takes possession of a used WPM unit it needs to be inspected and the facility needs to make decisions about what they can do with it. At what point do they need to obliterate the original mark on the WPM and at what point, can they just reuse it allow it to reenter the supply chain, as is. What happens if the WPM needs to be repaired and when is the recycler obligated to retreat the entire unit. These are the questions that many of these facilities have and it's really quite difficult to give guidance. This is why the chapter was broken down to show the options for recycled WPM. The lead author indicated that he would like to prepare a flowchart or decision tree to map out the factors that should be considered.
- [15] The lead author for chapter 3 indicated that it was fairly straight forward to incorporate the peer reviewer’s comments into this chapter. One peer reviewer offered to provide additional photos to illustrate types of regulated and non-regulated materials and the WG agreed that this would be beneficial and that the Secretariat should follow-up on this.
- [16] The lead author for chapter 4 indicated that the peer reviewer comments for this chapter were fairly straight forward and most have been incorporated.
- [17] The WG agreed that an explanation of the DB mark that was used on prior to 2008 to indicate that wood was debarked should be added to chapter 5. The WG also agreed with the idea of adding

more photographic examples of compliant and non-compliant ISPM 15 marks with an explanation of what makes the mark non-compliant (similar to the training materials that were produced as part of the STDF project in Africa).

- [18] One of the authors for Chapter 6 explained that he made changes to use the terms “non-compliance” and “non-conformance” more consistently. Non-conformance should be used to refer to an activity that is inconsistent with a component of a quality system and non-compliance should be used to refer to inconsistency of WPM with ISPM 15 or with a country’s import requirements, which might require an NPPO to make regulatory decisions or take actions. He offered to meet with the other lead author to discuss the peer review comments in more detail. He suggested that some of the comments were out of scope and would add considerably to the length of the guide if they were incorporated.
- [19] There were a number of peer review comments related to the case study in Chapter 7. One WG member suggested that the case study should be introduced more clearly as an example. Add a sentence to clarify the scenario and the outcomes.
- [20] The lead author for chapter 8 indicated that he felt that some of the peer reviewer comments were out of scope and that some of these suggestions would add unnecessarily to the length of the guide. He had incorporated many of the editorial changes but would welcome the opinion of the other lead authors with respect to the comments that expressed concern about the ability of an inspector to judge the age of imported WPM. He agreed with the comments and deleted those aspects. After further discussion about the context of the comment the WG members agreed. One WG member suggested that be given guidance on looking at pallets that might have been repaired with untreated wood or situations where the mark should have been obliterated and the WPM retreated.
- [21] One peer reviewer suggested adding an appendix with an example inspection report based on the check list that was developed. Marcel DAWSON suggested that he could provide a sample CFIA inspection report to use as an example or create a mock form.
- [22] Chapters 8 and 9 are closely linked and it would be beneficial if they were reviewed by other experts from NPPOs. The Secretariat proposed asking Debora CRUZ to review chapters 8 and 9, as well.
- [23] The case studies in chapter 10 still need to be reviewed to ensure that they do not conflict with ISPM 15 or the content of the guide. The Secretariat asked that the lead authors read any case study associated with a chapter assigned to them. It is important to keep in mind that the case studies are submissions from different countries and were not included in the peer review and that each of the countries will be asked to approve the final version prior to publication.

5. Update on ISPM 15 Treatment Manuals

- [24] The Secretariat provided a brief summary of the progress on the two ISPM 15 treatment manuals, noting that the SG had prepared the draft ISPM 15 fumigation manual and that Brad GETHING and Scot GEFFROS had prepared the draft ISPM 15 heat treatment manual. She informed that

the WG that both manuals were ready for review by WG and SG members and that the Secretariat planned to open the consultation following the WG meeting. She suggested that the IPPC On-line comment system (OCS) would be used because several people were having difficulties accessing files using MS Teams.

6. Discussion of next steps

- [25] The lead authors agreed to finish revising the chapters assigned to them, considering the comments from the peer reviewers and tracking their changes in the relevant Word documents on MS Teams. In addition, they agreed to provide a response to any substantive and technical comments associated with their chapters in the Excel table, indicating whether the comment was incorporated, considered but not incorporated, modified, or requiring further consideration by the WG. The WG members agreed to complete this work prior to the next WG meeting.
- [26] Brad GETHING offered to read through chapter 1 after the lead author had completed their work on it.
- [27] Marcel DAWSON offered to have another look at chapters 2 and 7. The SC representative suggested also checking section 4.3 of ISPM 15 to ensure that the guidance is aligned.
- [28] The Secretariat reminded the WG members to contact them if they are having difficulties accessing the files on MS Teams, so any issues may be resolved promptly.
- [29] The WG agreed to meet again on 07 June to continue reviewing the comments that require further discussion by WG members. The WG also agreed that another WG meeting should be planned for 28 June. The WG suggested that both meetings should be scheduled for three hours in order to provide more time for discussion.
- [30] The WG members noted that the draft ISPM 15 treatment manuals are also ready for review and that these would be posted on OCS by the end of the week and that all WG and SG members would be invited to review the manuals. The review period would close on June 10. After the comments on the treatment manuals have been addressed the manuals would be circulated for peer review.
- [31] The Secretariat emphasized the importance of finalizing the guide and the treatment manuals by early July, noting that the treatment manuals still need to be peer reviewed. The final versions of the guide and treatment manuals still need to be edited and sent for graphic design and publication. The plan is to have a webinar to launch the new guide before the end of the year.

7. Any other business

- [32] There was no other business.

8. Close of the meeting

- [33] The chairperson and the Secretariat thanked all the experts for their participation and the meeting was closed.

Appendix 1

Working Group Meeting to develop an IPPC Guide to support the implementation of ISPM 15 (VM-11)

24 May 2022 at 14:00 - 16:00 (CET)

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

	AGENDA ITEM	Duration (minutes)	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1	Opening of the Meeting	5		Barbara PETERSON
2	Meeting Arrangements	5		Barbara PETERSON
2.1	Selection of the chairperson		--	Barbara PETERSON
2.2	Selection of the rapporteur		--	Barbara PETERSON
2.3	Adoption of the Agenda		VM11_01_ISPM15_Guide	Chairperson
3	Administrative matters	5		Barbara PETERSON
3.1	Participants		VM11_02_ISPM15_Guide	Barbara PETERSON
3.2	Adopt minutes from previous WG meeting		VM11_03_ISPM15_Guide	Chairperson
3.2	Working papers		MS Teams	Barbara PETERSON
4	Review comments from peer review	60	--	Chairperson
5	Discussion of next steps	30	--	Chairperson / IPPC Secretariat
6	Update on work of ISPM 15 Treatment Manuals	5	--	Chairperson / IPPC Secretariat
7	Any Other Business	5	--	Chairperson / IPPC Secretariat
8	Close of the Meeting	5	--	Chairperson / IPPC Secretariat

Appendix 2

Working Group Meeting: Guide to support the implementation of ISPM 15

Participants List (VM-11)

Role	Name	Email address
WG Member	Corrado CREMONINI	corrado.cremonini@unito.it
WG Member	Marcel DAWSON	marcel.dawson17@gmail.com
WG Member	Scott GEFFROS	scott.geffros@canadianpallets.com
WG Member	Brad GETHING	bgetting@palletcentral.com
WG Member	Christopher HOWARD	chris.howard@agriculture.gov.au
WG Member	Mohamed MAGDY	mm.fao.ispm15@gmail.com
WG Member	Vinod PANDIT	v.pandit@CABI.org
ISPM 15 Steward	Marina ZLOTINA	marina.a.zlotina@usda.gov
IPPC Secretariat Lead	Barbara PETERSON	barbara.peterson@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Natsumi YAMADA	natsumi.yamada@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Janka KISS	janka.kiss@fao.org