



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7)

Rome, Italy

15–19 May 2023

IPPC Secretariat

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, 2023



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 <https://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 (<https://www.fao.org/publications>) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: <https://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	4
2.	Meeting arrangements	4
2.1	Election of the chairperson.....	4
2.2	Election of the rapporteur.....	4
2.3	Adoption of the agenda	4
3.	Administrative matters	4
4.	Draft ISPMs for approval for second consultation	4
4.1	Draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) including deferred terms from 2021 amendments (1994-001), priority 1.....	4
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.....	8
5.	Draft ISPMs under development	12
5.1	ISPM 15 (<i>Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade</i>): Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010).....	12
6.	General review of the Standard Setting Procedure.....	16
7.	Review of the standard setting calendar	22
8.	Any other business.....	22
9.	Date and type of the next SC-7 meeting.....	23
10.	Evaluation of the meeting process	23
11.	Close of the meeting	23
	Appendix 1: Agenda.....	24
	Appendix 2: Documents list.....	26
	Appendix 3: Participants list	28
	Appendix 4: References	30
	Appendix 5: Draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 including deferred terms from 2021 amendments: Glossary of phytosanitary terms (1994-001), priority 1	31
	Appendix 6: Draft annex to ISPM 37: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (2018-011), priority 3.....	41

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”) welcomed all participants to the Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) meeting.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Election of the chairperson

- [2] The SC-7 elected Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ (Costa Rica) as chairperson.

2.2 Election of the rapporteur

- [3] The SC-7 elected Nader ELBADRY (Egypt) as rapporteur.

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

- [4] The SC-7 adopted the agenda (Appendix 1).

3. Administrative matters

- [5] The documents list (Appendix 2) and the participants list (Appendix 3) had been made available to the SC-7 before the meeting.

4. Draft ISPMs for approval for second consultation

4.1 Draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) including deferred terms from 2021 amendments (1994-001), priority 1

- [6] The Steward of the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG), Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile), introduced the draft amendments to ISPM 5.¹
- [7] “**general surveillance**” (2018-046) (addition). One SC-7 member questioned the need for definitions of “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance”, as ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*) provides more holistic definitions of both terms.
- [8] The member explained that the main concern was the word “official” in the definition of “general surveillance”, which in ISPM 6 is described as “a process whereby information on pests of concern in an area is gathered from various sources”. The inclusion of the word “official” therefore gives the perception that “general surveillance” was only the gathering of information from various sources by the national plant protection organization (NPPO).
- [9] It was therefore proposed that the word “official” be removed from the proposed definition, because if it remained it would then exclude several information sources (e.g. universities, general public, local government bodies), narrowing the definition. Moreover, as stated in the section 2.1.1 of ISPM 6, it is the NPPO that evaluates the reliability of the information, making the process official thereafter.
- [10] The secretariat pointed out the rationale provided by the TPG with regards to the addition of the word “official” to the proposed definition². The TPG had explained that, whereas the overall surveillance process is official (i.e. exclusively an NPPO responsibility), data may be collected from various sources, including non-official sources. Data resulting from general surveillance are not official until they have been endorsed by the NPPO; therefore, the process does not stop with the collection of data, as analysis and verification are key parts of the process when non-official data sources are being used.

¹ 1994-001; 04_SC7_2023_May.

² 1994- 001

- [11] An SC-7 member therefore proposed that the word “official” be retained to emphasize the role of the NPPO in validating the data coming from various information sources. Otherwise, it was suggested that some wording be added regarding the validation by the NPPO, for example by adding “to be validated from an NPPO” at the end of the proposed definition.
- [12] Another SC-7 member pointed that out that the proposed revision of the definition of “surveillance” stated that surveillance is an official process that includes general surveillance, specific surveillance, or a combination of both. The surveillance process refers to the verification and processing step, but the actual collection of data needs to remain non-official, otherwise all entities but NPPOs are excluded. The member reiterated that it is the NPPO that validates the data gathered.
- [13] An SC-7 member considered proposing, during consultation, an amendment to section 2.1.1 of ISPM 6 to replace “conducting” with “utilizing”, thus “When utilizing general surveillance ...”.
- [14] The SC-7 agreed to remove the term “official” from the proposed definition and approved it for third consultation as modified during this meeting.
- [15] **“specific surveillance” (2018-047) (addition).** The SC-7 agreed with the term and definition proposed by the TPG and did not make any changes to the version from second consultation. The SC-7 agreed the term “specific surveillance” (2018-047) to be recommended to the SC for approval for adoption by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM).
- [16] The SC-7 noted that, although the term “specific surveillance” would not be opened for a third round of consultation, it would provide additional information for the interconnected terms “general surveillance” and “surveillance”. They agreed, therefore, that the proposed definition of “specific surveillance” and the associated reasoning would be retained in the draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 but the text would be greyed out and contracting parties would be advised not to provide comments on it.
- [17] **“surveillance” (2020-009) (revision).** The SC-7 agreed with the term and definition proposed by the TPG and did not make any changes to the version from second consultation. The SC-7 approved it for third consultation, as the definition was interconnected with “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance”. The SC-7 felt that the modifications to the proposed definition of “general surveillance” discussed earlier in the meeting implicitly changed the proposed definition of “surveillance”.
- [18] **“phytosanitary action” (2020-006) (revision).** The SC-7 discussed the definitions of “phytosanitary procedure” and “phytosanitary action” together, which were being revised because it was extremely challenging to revise the definition of “phytosanitary measure”, as it is in the text of the convention (IPPC).
- [19] An SC-7 member questioned the need to define “phytosanitary procedure”, as there is already “phytosanitary measure” and “phytosanitary action”, and an NPPO can move from the former to the latter directly. Moreover, the proposed revision of the definition of “phytosanitary procedure” did not specify anymore that it was for implementing phytosanitary measures.
- [20] One SC-7 member proposed that “or to enable phytosanitary procedures” be added to the proposed revision of the definition “phytosanitary action”, to link both terms. The TPG steward replied that this addition might be redundant, because the definition of “phytosanitary measure” is any official procedure “having the purpose to prevent the introduction or spread of quarantine pests ...”, thus making it implicit that a phytosanitary action is undertaken to implement phytosanitary procedures. However, to clarify that every action needs a procedure and to avoid amending several ISPMs where the term “phytosanitary procedure” is used, the SC-7 agreed to add “with reference to a phytosanitary procedure” to the proposed definition of “phytosanitary action”.
- [21] Regarding the addition “or to enable phytosanitary certification” made by the TPG, an SC-7 member commented that, in their understanding, this was added because phytosanitary measures only relate to quarantine pests or regulated non-quarantine pests. The secretariat referred the SC-7 to the explanatory

point from the draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5,³ which explained that the phrase described the scenario from the perspective of the NPPO carrying out the operations: implicitly, this wording referred 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.

- [22] The SC-7 approved the draft definition of “phytosanitary action” (2020-006) for second consultation as modified during this meeting.
- [23] **“phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007) (revision).** The SC-7 reviewed this term alongside the term “phytosanitary action”. They agreed with the definition proposed by the TPG and did not make any changes. The SC-7 approved “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007) for second consultation.
- [24] **“release (of a consignment)” (2021-007) (revision).** The secretariat noted that no changes had been proposed by the TPG to the version that had been submitted to the Standards Committee (SC) meeting in November 2022.
- [25] One SC-7 member asked for the rationale behind the addition of “of a consignment” and the secretariat explained that the addition introduced by the TPG was in line with the ink amendment to “entry (of a consignment)” that had been approved by the SC in May 2023. This had been done to provide parallelism with the definition of “entry (of a pest)” and hence reduce potential confusion.
- [26] The SC-7 considered the proposal from the TPG to add the word “official” to the definition, which was based on a comment from the second consultation.
- [27] One SC-7 member supported the proposal and reported that there was a concern that, without the word “official”, importers could declare that customs officers had released their consignments and, therefore, there should not be the need for phytosanitary checks. The word “official” in the proposed definition linked the release of a consignment to the NPPO, as the term “clearance (of a consignment)” had been deleted from the glossary.
- [28] One SC-7 member proposed that “official” be replaced with “authorization established or performed by a national plant protection organization ...”. It was then proposed to simplify it by rewording the addition as “The NPPO authorization for entry ...” or “The NPPO approving the entry ...”.
- [29] Some SC-7 members then proposed that “authorization” be replaced with “approval”. In this way, the approval could come either from the NPPO or an authorized entity. The SC-7 discussed whether “authorization” may be more appropriate, as in some countries other boarder agencies, which are not the official NPPOs, perform NPPO functions (e.g. inspections, release of consignments). Therefore, the word “authorization” would best fit the definition, as it related better to other standards.
- [30] Another proposal was to begin the definition with “authorization” as in the current definition, because the completion of the compliance procedure relates back to an official process. In this case, regardless of whether it is an authorized entity or the NPPO, the word “authorization” may be sufficient to link the NPPO to the release of a consignment.
- [31] The SC-7 did not agree with the TPG proposal to add “official” and kept the definition starting with “authorization” as originally sent for second consultation. The SC-7 recommended the term “release (of a consignment)” (2021-007), unchanged from second consultation, to the SC for approval for adoption by the CPM.
- [32] **“inspection” (2017-005) (revision).** The SC-7 agreed with the term and definition proposed by the TPG, which was unchanged from the version that had been submitted to the SC meeting in November 2022.

³ 1994-001.

- [33] The SC-7 agreed that the term “inspection” (2017-005) be recommended to the SC for approval for adoption by the CPM.
- [34] **“test” (2021-005) (revision).** One SC-7 member proposed the deletion of the words “other than visual examination” because they added complexity and, by removing them but retaining the references to other processes (such as chemical, molecular, serological methods), the difference with the term “inspection” would be underlined.
- [35] Another SC-7 member suggested that “other than visual examination” be retained, as it needed to be clear that “test” is not a “visual examination”. The member explained that tests can be conducted in the laboratory as well as in the field (i.e. rapid testing) and therefore proposed that the definition should be linked to an examination carried out according to an official procedure for the identification of a regulated pest. However, the SC-7 agreed to remove “other than visual examination”.
- [36] An SC-7 member initially proposed that the list of non-exhaustive examples proposed by the TPG be amended by adding morphological assessment of a pest. Another SC-7 member proposed modifying this to “morphological characterization”. The amended text would read as “chemical, molecular, serological or morphological characterization”. The SC-7 agreed with this proposal and noted that one SC-7 member questioned how morphological characterization is assessed and pointed out that it still related to inspection because visual methods are used (e.g. comparing particular parts of the organisms).
- [37] An SC-7 member proposed that part of the definition be amended to read “to determine if regulated pests are present”, suggesting that the actual difference between the terms “test” and “inspection” might be the determination of the presence of regulated pests. In an inspection, some pests can be visually identified but morphological characterization may be required to identify other pests. Another SC-7 member proposed that the word “regulated” be added not to this definition but to the definition of “inspection” for consistency.
- [38] An SC-7 member recalled that inspection relates to compliance with phytosanitary regulations and the definition of “phytosanitary regulation” is a “rule to prevent the introduction or spread of quarantine pests or to limit the impact of regulated non-quarantine pests”. The member wondered whether the scope of “pest” in the definition of “inspection” was therefore already reduced to quarantine pests.
- [39] Another SC-7 member, looking at the proposed revised definition of “inspection”, commented that the phrase “verify conformity with phytosanitary requirements” related to the morphological characteristics of the pest.
- [40] The SC-7 chairperson reminded the SC-7 of the rationale behind the TPG’s proposal to replace “regulations” with “requirements”.⁴ The TPG had explained that phytosanitary regulations are at a higher conceptual level and refer to regulated pests. However, inspection can be carried out in scenarios other than at import, such as in a place of production or a production site or at export, and inspection in such scenarios may not always be related to regulated pests.
- [41] An SC-7 member commented that visual examination is also used for regulated pests or quarantine pests; adding the word “regulated” to “pests” in the definition of “inspection” would not therefore make the distinction between “inspection” and “visual examination” clear, given that inspection is supposed to be anything but visual. The SC-7 chairperson noted that, without “morphological characterization”, there would not be a clear difference between “inspection” and “test”. Another SC-7 member suggested that “morphological characterization” be retained in the definition because chemical, molecular or serological methods are used to identify several pests. Through an inspection, it is determined whether pests are present but not whether it is a quarantine pest or a regulated pest. Therefore, the SC-7 member proposed that the sentence be modified to read “to identify pests or to determine if regulated pests are present”.

⁴ 1994-001.

- [42] An SC-7 member proposed that “determine” be replaced with “confirm”. The rationale was that, with a test, a pest can be identified up to subspecies level, thus confirming if the pest is regulated. However, another SC-7 member noted that it cannot be known beforehand whether the pest identified is a regulated pest or not; the SC-7 therefore decided to use “determine”.
- [43] It was also proposed that the examples be replaced with “... using diagnostic protocols”, because when a laboratory or a rapid test is done, an approved diagnostic protocol has to be used. Another SC-7 member pointed out that this change may exclude emerging pests that are not addressed by existing diagnostic protocols (e.g. those of the IPPC or the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization). The SC-7 member who had proposed this amendment commented that, in the absence of existing international or regional protocols, the references are peer-reviewed protocols. The SC-7 agreed not to implement this proposal.
- [44] An SC-7 member noted that some contracting parties may propose an alternative definition during the upcoming consultation period.
- [45] The SC-7 approved “test” (2021-005) for third consultation as modified during this meeting.
- [46] The SC-7:
- (1) *approved* the draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001) as modified at this meeting for submission to consultation (second consultation for the terms “phytosanitary action” (2020-006) and “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007), and third consultation for “general surveillance” (2018-046), “surveillance” (2020-009) and “test” (2021-005)) (Appendix 5); and
 - (2) *recommended* “specific surveillance” (2018-047), “release (of a consignment)” (2021-007) and “inspection” (2017-005) to the SC for approval for adoption by the CPM as part of the draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001).

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

- [47] The steward, Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America), introduced the draft annex to ISPM 37, which had been revised to take account of the comments received during consultation.⁵
- [48] The steward reported that the major general concern was the need to align the proposed definitions for “host”, “conditional host” and “non-host” with those in the core text of ISPM 37, as outlined in Specification 71 (*Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information*), to avoid redundancy and confusion.
- [49] The steward also shared the following potential implementation issues:
- a lack of existing capacity in NPPOs means that there is a requirement for training on interpretation of relevant information, including the quality of information (reliability and applicability); and
 - the need for implementation materials (i.e. training modules, guides) on assessing uncertainty.
- [50] The steward presented her response to some major comments. One of the major changes was the deletion of several paragraphs that elaborated on the definitions of the host status terms used in ISPM 37, as it was considered sufficient to refer to the core text of ISPM 37; another was the use of consistent language when referring to undamaged fruit.
- [51] The steward then listed some other consultation comments that needed to be discussed by the SC-7 as reported in the steward’s notes. She proposed that the SC-7 discuss whether “completeness” of information is a separate category when identifying the “quality of information” (i.e. completeness,

⁵ 2018-011; 05_SC7_2023_May; 06_SC7_2023_May; 07_SC7_2023_May.

reliability and applicability). She explained that there were different interpretations of the “reliability” of information, but that completeness often referred to information gaps, which in turn was associated with the uncertainty related to this information. Thus, it was considered to be a part of the reliability.

- [52] The SC-7 was also invited to discuss comments regarding “evidence and description of the presence of the target and other fruit fly species”. The SC-7 noted that it was not clear whether the comments were calling for an explanation of how “insect species...affect the target fruit fly species” or whether the issue was about competition for the same host or other resource or about natural enemies of the target fruit fly species.
- [53] **Title.** One SC-7 member proposed that “(Tephritidae)” be added to the title to be consistent with ISPM 37 and the SC-7 agreed.
- [54] **Alignment of terminology with that used in the core text of ISPM 37.** The SC-7 discussed the deletion of several paragraphs elaborating on the ISPM 37 definitions of host status categories, for the reason given earlier by the steward. One SC-7 member considered them supplementary information and proposed that they be retained in the draft annex. The steward noted that the summary of the three categories would come further in the annex, but another SC-7 member pointed out that the issue with this extra information was that it was inconsistent with the definitions outlined in the core text of ISPM 37 (e.g. the ISPM 37 definition of “natural host” does not refer to undamaged fruit) and proposed that this information be provided later in the document. An SC-7 member proposed the deletion of the paragraphs in question, as there are already definitions in ISPM 37, and the steward supported the proposal. Another SC-7 member, who supported the deletion, proposed that specific reference be made to the definitions in the core text of ISPM 37, as was done in other sections of the draft annex when referring to the general requirements of the standard. The SC-7 agreed and modified the wording to make it clear that NPPOs should reclassify, where possible, the various categories into one of the three host status categories outlined in ISPM 37. They then agreed to delete the paragraphs elaborating on the definitions.
- [55] **General criteria: completeness, reliability and quality of information.** One SC-7 member queried the inclusion of completeness of the available information in the list of general criteria.
- [56] One SC-7 member proposed that reference to the completeness and reliability of information be moved to after the reference to quality of information, while another SC-7 member replied that completeness is a very important criterion whereas quality is a general concept. The steward proposed that an explanation be given of what quality is by adding “i.e. completeness, reliability, and applicability”, and this was considered a better wording by SC-7 members. One SC-7 member commented, however, that applicability is not a quality measure and therefore it should be separate, but the steward replied that if the information is less applicable, then its quality is reduced. The SC-7 noted that applicability might be used to refer to a specific situation, so one SC-7 member proposed that “relevance” be used instead. The SC-7 agreed and amended the wording to refer to “quality (i.e. completeness, reliability, and relevance)”.
- [57] **General criteria: fruit-collection conditions.** The SC-7 discussed the fruit-collection conditions, and in particular whether the fruit has to be detached, fallen to the ground or collected after falling to the ground. One SC-7 member commented that “fallen to the ground” could exclude detached fruit. Another SC-7 member proposed that only “detached” be retained. One SC-7 member pointed out that the original wording “picked from the plant or collected from the ground” contained two actions – “picked from the plant” and “collected from the ground” – that are not mutually exclusive. Another SC-7 member replied that, in their opinion, there seemed to be no difference between “harvested from the plant” and “detached at the time of collection”.
- [58] The steward emphasized that the intention of this annex was not to provide guidance on how to do something, but to analyse the variable information to determine if a conclusion could be made (e.g. through pest risk analysis (PRA), it could be concluded that the status of a plant is a host, non-host or conditional host).

- [59] The steward explained that, in some fruit species, the fruit is not a host to fruit flies if the fruit is still attached to the stem; however, when the fruit drops, the biochemical changes in the fruit make it attractive to the female fruit fly for egg laying. This was the reason for referring to fruit-collection conditions in the draft annex.
- [60] One SC-7 member proposed that the text refer to “harvested from the plant or collected after falling to the ground”, and the SC-7 agreed.
- [61] **General criteria: evidence of the presence of fruit fly species.** The SC-7 member noted that, where the text referred to evidence and description of the target and other fruit fly species in the sampled area “before and during sampling”, this was referring to the time of the season in the field.
- [62] One SC-7 member proposed keeping the paragraph in question with no changes, as it could be useful in cases when the fruit fly species are present in the field for a period of time, and not only at the moment of sampling. The steward replied that she was unsure about the word “description” and considered the rest of the sentence to be sufficiently clear. The steward proposed that the word “identified” be added after “fruit fly species” and the SC-7 member commented that the identification would be implicit in the determination of presence of the target fruit fly. The SC-7 members agreed on the importance of the concept of presence of target fruit flies. The SC-7 agreed to delete the word “description”, not to refer to identification, and to keep reference to both the target fruit fly and other fruit fly species in the sampled area before and during sampling.
- [63] **Criteria for conditional host.** The steward proposed that a cross-reference to the core text of ISPM 37 be added to the text in this section and requested that the IPPC editor review the cross-references to the core text and the annex throughout the draft annex to ensure clarity.
- [64] The SC-7 agreed to delete the final paragraph of this section, regarding evidence of the presence of the target fruit fly species in fruit under semi-natural field conditions, as it was not necessary.
- [65] **Criteria for non-host.** One SC-7 member reported a general consultation comment regarding the implications of this section for the trade of plants that are initially considered a non-host but subsequently considered a host with no published evidence. The steward explained that NPPOs could have databases with information on host plants, use circular references and interception information, update listings based on outbreaks and potentially develop internal documents that could be used as a reference. The host list would be based on existing references, and it would be updated as new evidence come out. Another SC-7 member commented that the information reported in this section seemed to contradict evidence-based PRA principles, and provided the following example: if there is an existing trade, with no cases of interceptions, it cannot be proven that a given plant is a non-host; field trials are required, and results need to be published or a specific surveillance programme established. The SC-7 member concluded that it would be unusual to ask for evidence if there is no interception, report or data demonstrating that a given plant is a host. In response, the steward provided an example where a given plant was not considered a host following the PRA from the exporting country, but the NPPO of the importing country studied PRAs from other countries, one of which had reported that the plant was a host. The only evidence was interceptions in passenger baggage. The steward continued that, in such cases where there is no other evidence, Article 5.7 of the World Trade Organization’s Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures should be applied, which states that:
- In cases where relevant scientific evidence is insufficient, a Member may provisionally adopt sanitary or phytosanitary measures on the basis of available pertinent information, including that from the relevant international organizations as well as from sanitary or phytosanitary measures applied by other Members. In such circumstances, Members shall seek to obtain the additional information necessary for a more objective assessment of risk and review the sanitary or phytosanitary measure accordingly within a reasonable period of time.
- [66] Another SC-7 member commented that it was unlikely that this draft annex would affect countries requesting evidence to categorize pest hosts; the draft annex aimed to set the minimum information and requirements for trade in order to reduce the potential for requests being made that are not based on evidence.

- [67] The steward explained that ISPM 37 provided guidance on how to harmonize the review of available literature.
- [68] **Assessing the uncertainty of the host status determination: completeness of the information.** The SC-7 agreed to modify some text about assessing the completeness of information against criteria, to clarify that the criteria in question were those listed in the General requirements section of the core text of ISPM 37.
- [69] **Assessing the uncertainty of the host status determination: examples of uncertainty because of inadequate information.** The SC-7 considered the first situation listed, which related to new interception records that lacked relevant information. They noted that one of the examples provided of inadequate information, “not clear whether the fruit fly or larvae was found infesting the fruit”, was ambiguous. The SC-7 considered whether adult flies would infest the fruit or whether only larvae would infest. The steward commented that an adult fruit fly could be stuck in a box and could therefore still contaminate the fruit. However, the SC-7 recognized that the key issue here was the uncertain association of the fruit fly with the fruit, rather than whether it was an adult or a larva. They amended the text accordingly.
- [70] **Assessing the uncertainty of the host status determination: determination of the level and nature of the uncertainty.** The SC-7 considered a new sentence that had been added following the consultation, which stated that, if the level of uncertainty is too high, the NPPO should conclude that the available information does not allow the host status to be determined. The SC-7 discussed whether to move the phrase “the level of uncertainty is too high” later in the sentence, but noted that a high level of uncertainty is not a consequence of an NPPO not being able to determine host status. They therefore retained the original order of wording but modified it to clarify the meaning.
- [71] **Application of the host status of a fruit to a fruit fly in PRA.** The SC-7 discussed two issues that gave rise to confusion in the final paragraph of this section, which said that 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)*). One issue was that this indicated that, as well as declaring pest status (present or absent), an NPPO would also have to declare the host status of fruit; if so, the text needed to explain how host status is determined and on what it is based, as this would have a trade impact. The steward gave an example of a situation where an NPPO considers a particular plant a non-host and then a scientific paper is released stating that that plant is a host; in this situation, the NPPO would need to verify the paper, the methodology used and the results. The second issue was that the text did not explain in which cases host status could be used. The steward replied that host status could be used for the establishment of pest free areas if there is a possible host. In such a case, products could not be moved out of such area. When establishing a pest free area, the hosts of the specific fruit fly should be known, and these requirements are described in ISPM 26 and ISPM 4.
- [72] As the paragraph appeared to be confusing and the concept was already clarified in the introduction of the draft annex, where it referred to the ability of NPPOs to determine the implementation of PRA-related ISPMs, the SC-7 agreed to delete the paragraph altogether.
- [73] **Potential implementation issues.** The SC-7 noted the potential implementation issues and agreed that, rather than discussing the issues at this meeting, the steward would report the issues to the next SC meeting together with any with new ones submitted during the second consultation.
- [74] The SC-7:
- (3) *approved 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 (Tephritidae)) as modified during this meeting to be submitted for second consultation (Appendix 6);*

- (4) *noted* the potential implementation issues and *requested* that the steward report these to the next SC meeting in the steward's notes, together with any additional ones following the second consultation period.

5. Draft ISPMs under development

5.1 ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*): Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010)

- [75] The Assistant Steward, David KAMANGIRA (Malawi), introduced the discussion paper, the background to this topic and the pertinent issues, and invited the SC-7 to discuss the way forward for the topic.⁶
- [76] **Nomination of steward.** The SC-7 member for Europe proposed Harry ARIJS (European Commission) as steward for this draft ISPM, given the importance of this standard.
- [77] **Background to development of the draft annex.** One SC-7 member recalled the discussion that had taken place several years ago about treatments, their efficacy and the requirements of Probit 9. The member explained that the treatment applied in Baker (1939)⁷ is not applicable to all groups of organisms (e.g. bacteria, fungi). Moreover, some organisms require three to four years to develop, and the infestation level might not be high enough to be valid for Probit 9. For example, arthropods may take several years to develop while harboured in wood. There was therefore a need to use more appropriate methods of testing the efficacy of treatments other than Probit 9. The SC-7 member pointed out, however, that any potential model has to be validated before it can be presented as an amendment to an ISPM, in particular ISPM 15 as it is a widely implemented standard. This can be done by the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) or any other expert familiar with this topic.
- [78] The secretariat reminded the SC-7 that the aim of the draft annex, which had been developed by the (now disestablished) Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ), was to clarify the criteria used to add new treatments to ISPM 15.
- [79] **Next steps.** The secretariat suggested that the SC-7 consider the next steps for the draft annex. The options were that:
- the draft annex could be reviewed and approved for second consultation;
 - the draft annex could be sent to another expert working group (EWG);
 - the draft annex could be sent to the TPPT;
 - the draft annex could be sent to the SC to review the text; or
 - the SC-7 could propose to the SC that the topic be removed from the work programme.
- [80] An SC-7 member suggested that, as this annex to ISPM 15 dated from 2010, the SC should make a new call for experts or require the TPPT to review the draft and make recommendations to the SC.
- [81] The secretariat noted that, if the SC-7 recommended that a call for experts be issued, this would imply that the draft was not sufficient, in which case it would be beneficial for the SC-7 to specify what was insufficient or whether a new specification was needed. Moreover, the secretariat reminded the SC-7 that the former members of the TPFQ could be part of the new EWG.
- [82] An SC-7 member proposed that the steward and the assistant steward consider both the consultation comments and the IPPC *Guide to the regulation of wood packaging material* and report to the SC in November 2023.

⁶ 2006-010; 08_SC7_2023_May; 09_SC7_2023_May.

⁷ See Appendix 4.

- [83] As it is the SC that selects the steward, and this would be done either at the SC meeting in November 2023 or through e-decision, one SC-7 member felt that it would be beneficial to draft some tasks for a new specification to be presented to the SC in November 2023.
- [84] Another SC-7 member highlighted the importance of having clear guidance on the number of insects or pathogens that would be required for developing any treatment to control pests of wood. From the consultation comments received in 2010, and even during the TPFQ meeting in 2016, there had been suggestions to revise the draft.
- [85] The secretariat clarified that there is no requirement, explicit or implicit, to reach Probit 9 efficacy with phytosanitary treatments, but the efficacy reached is very close to it. Regarding the sample size, circa 30 000 insects have to be tested to be sure that the treatment is efficacious. However, the issue regarding wood treatments is that some pests are very slow to grow and very hard to grow in the laboratory and makes treatments too expensive to develop. This is the reason the TPFQ had worked on a minimum number that would be economically feasible while providing a high level of quarantine protection, and this was the main point of conflict regarding the draft annex. Moreover, the secretariat pointed out that ISPM 15 does not specify the efficacy required, but the efficacy has to be high enough to treat wood packaging material. Regarding the draft itself, the secretariat pointed out that inputs were needed to see whether the draft was sufficient from a regulatory point of view, and whether treatments would be accepted based on this document.
- [86] One SC-7 member asked whether the draft annex only related to ISPM 15 or whether it could also be related to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) or ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*). Another SC-7 member commented that the document was more appropriate for ISPM 15 because it was more related to wood packaging material.
- [87] The secretariat noted that the current version of the document was proposed to be an annex to ISPM 15 as recommended by the TPPT. However, ISPM 15 currently contained a section that referred to ISPM 28. Thus, it was not yet known whether the document would replace this section or be an annex. Most probably, the document would only apply to wood packaging material and treatments that fall under ISPM 15 that allow application of the ISPM 15 mark, rather than to generic round wood. If it was under ISPM 28, the treatments should be reviewed by the TPPT.
- [88] **Process to develop a new specification.** The SC-7 discussed whether to develop the tasks for a new specification, leave this for the steward to do once appointed, or recommend that it be done by a small group of SC members. Noting the relative timings of meetings and the value of allowing input from the TPPT, the SC-7 agreed that the most effective and efficient way to proceed would be to prepare a draft specification at this meeting and recommend the opening of an SC e-decision to nominate the steward. Input could then be sought from the TPPT at their October meeting, alongside asking the technical panel whether it would be more appropriate to annex the draft annex to ISPM 15 or to ISPM 28. The steward would then report to the SC in November 2023.
- [89] The SC-7 agreed that the TPPT should not draft the specification.

Drafting of a new specification

- [90] The SC-7 drafted a new specification for the annex to ISPM 15, outlining the tasks for the EWG.
- [91] **Position of the annex.** One SC-7 member raised again the question of whether the draft annex should be attached to ISPM 15 or to ISPM 28, as the draft annex was about how to develop treatments but was limited to wood packaging material.
- [92] Another SC-7 member suggested that one of the tasks for the EWG could be to consider whether the draft annex should still be annexed to ISPM 15 or somewhere more appropriate.
- [93] An SC-7 member proposed a further option for consideration: to add the annex to the recently published IPPC *Guide to the regulation of wood packaging material*, as this would be a quicker process and would also serve to improve the draft annex itself.

- [94] However, some SC-7 members thought that it would not be appropriate to say “attached to ISPM 28 or to the *Guide to the regulation of wood packaging material*”, as the draft annex concerned the development of experiments and attaching it to either ISPM 28 or the IPPC guide could create confusion. Moreover, it would need to follow a given template if annexed to ISPM 28 and it would not be an adopted text if annexed to the IPPC guide. Therefore, the SC-7 agreed to request that the SC take the decision.
- [95] An SC-7 member noted that the questions should be open and not provide options to the EWG, as EWGs were tasked not to decide but to advise on the best solution. Another SC-7 member supported the proposal to keep advice open but suggested that options could be included as examples and the SC-7 could provide guidance and advice as to where to find information.
- [96] **Reinfestation.** One SC-7 member commented that, as the draft annex was related only to wood packaging materials, it was important to take into account the scope of ISPM 15, which notes that the treatments considered are not designed to protect against reinfestation but only the infestation of raw (green) wood.
- [97] **Tasks for the EWG.** The SC-7 agreed that the draft annex developed by the TPFQ (2006-010) should form the basis of the EWG’s work. They noted that the draft annex was quite outdated and the EWG may decide that there are parts of the document that need updating.
- [98] **Task 1: scoping.** The SC-7 discussed whether the EWG should consider the scope and target pests described in the currently adopted ISPM 15, evaluating the completeness and accessibility of the information. They agreed, however, that the draft annex (2006-010) should be the focus of the EWG’s work and so the first task for the EWG should be to consider the scope of the draft annex and the target pests, and evaluate which parts of the recently published paper by Ormsby (2022)⁸ were relevant to be included.
- [99] **Task 2: position of the annex.** The SC-7 agreed that the EWG should advise on whether the resulting document should be annexed to ISPM 15 as originally proposed or whether it would more appropriately fit elsewhere (e.g. attached to ISPM 28 or to the *Guide to the regulation of wood packaging material*).
- [100] **Task 3: overview of the process for treatment testing.** The SC-7 agreed that the EWG should review the “Overview of the process for treatment testing” section of the draft annex and consider appropriate modifications for inclusion.
- [101] **Task 4: minimum numbers of insect individuals required for testing efficacy of treatments.** The SC-7 agreed that the EWG should assess whether the numbers of individuals specified in the draft annex as being the minimum required for testing treatments are adequate (noting that Probit 9 is neither the aim nor the benchmark to be used).
- [102] **Tasks 5 and 6: extrapolation of results.** The SC-7 discussed the EWG’s tasks in relation to extrapolation of the results from testing of treatments. They agreed that the EWG should determine how results may be extrapolated to other genera or species, as this is the first extrapolation done during treatment development (the second one focusing on the treatment application).
- [103] The secretariat explained that the TPPT extrapolates treatments based on the most resistant pest that can occur in a certain commodity. If confirmatory trials are conducted with the most resistant species, then it is assumed that the treatment is efficacious against all the pests in the commodity.
- [104] The secretariat also considered whether the point was how Ormsby (2022) had selected the pest groups specified in his paper and how research on those groups could be extrapolated to all tests of wood packaging material. An SC-7 member replied that the study focused on exemplar species only. The SC-7 therefore agreed that the EWG should determine how the development of treatment schedules

⁸ See Appendix 4.

(e.g. dosage, exposure time) may need to be modified if extrapolating outside exemplar species and life stages.

[105] **Task 7: other technical issues.** The SC-7 then agreed that the EWG should consider any other technical issues in the draft annex (2006-010) and in Ormsby (2022), as some pertinent technical issues and needs might not be covered by the other tasks and may need to be clarified.

[106] **Task 8: treatments for pathogens.** The SC-7 agreed that the EWG should evaluate the methodology proposed in Ormsby (2022) for developing treatments for pathogens in wood packaging material.

[107] **Expertise.** The SC-7 considered whether to request the TPPT's opinion on the draft specification or whether TPPT members could be included or invited to the EWG. They noted that it is the SC that directs the TPPT's work, so it may be possible for the SC to request one TPPT member to attend the EWG meeting. The SC-7 therefore agreed to include one TPPT member in the section on Expertise. Moreover, the SC-7 considered that it would be beneficial for a former TPFQ member to participate.

[108] In addition, the SC-7 agreed that the EWG should consist of at least one expert in developing treatment schedules for wood and wood packaging material, at least one expert in forest pathology, at least one expert in forest entomology, at least one expert in forest nematology, and one expert in experimental modelling. The secretariat asked whether the latter area of expertise would also include expertise in statistics and some SC-7 members agreed that it should.

[109] **Purpose.** The SC-7 agreed that the purpose of the draft annex was to provide guidance on the treatment testing process for NPPOs, regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs), treatment developers or researchers, in order to harmonize work on the development of effective and feasible phytosanitary treatments for ISPM 15. They recognized that, in the past, the efficacy of treatments had to reach Probit 9 for the treatment to be approved; this was no longer the case, although Probit 9 must still be specified. The SC-7 therefore agreed to make it clear in the draft specification that an efficacy of Probit 9 is not the benchmark.

[110] One SC-7 member noted that whereas the draft annex said that "new phytosanitary treatments for inclusion in ISPM 15 are submitted by NPPOs or RPPOs for evaluation against the requirements outlined in ISPM 28", ISPM 15 said that "ISPM 28 provides guidance on the IPPC's process for approval of treatments". The SC-7 agreed that the wording in the draft annex might be misleading.

[111] The SC-7 asked whether the TPPT allowed historical treatments and the secretariat confirmed that they did. However, the TPPT had still not concluded how to evaluate such treatments and assign an efficacy, which is a requirement of ISPM 28. One SC-7 member recalled that the original treatments in ISPM 15 did not have any efficacy and for this reason they had not been annexed to ISPM 28.

[112] **Reason for the annex.** The SC-7 drafted a section on the reason for the annex, drawing upon some text from the existing draft annex.

[113] **Scope.** The SC-7 drafted a section on the scope of the annex, using wording from the Purpose section. They agreed to use the word "document" rather than "annex", as it was still not known what type of document this was going to be.

[114] The draft specification was finalized by the SC-7.

[115] **Next steps.** The SC-7 chairperson summarized the next steps for this draft annex: the SC, by e-decision, would select a steward; the SC would then review both the draft specification prepared by the SC-7 at this meeting and the draft annex, and decide either to assign the work to the steward or to an SC small group; the draft specification would then be presented to the SC in May 2024 for approval for consultation. The chairperson explained that the steward may seek feedback from the TPPT.

[116] The SC-7:

- (5) *asked* the secretariat to open an SC e-decision to confirm the selection of Harry ARJIS (European Commission) as the steward for the draft annex *Criteria for treatments for wood packaging*

material in international trade (2006-010) to ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*);

- (6) *requested* that the steward develop further the specification drafted by the SC-7 and submit it to the SC in November 2023; and
- (7) *requested* that the SC decide whether the draft annex should be annexed to ISPM 15, ISPM 28 or to the IPPC *Guide to the regulation of wood packaging material*.

6. General review of the Standard Setting Procedure

[117] The secretariat introduced the paper,⁹ explaining that, following several requests, the SC had tasked the SC-7¹⁰ with reviewing the Standard Setting Procedure (SSP),¹¹ starting from the version reviewed by the SC in November 2022 and considering the decisions taken by the SC in May 2023. The SC-7 members had therefore been invited to provide comments and suggestions for revision before this meeting. The secretariat explained that the revised version from the SC-7 would be reported to the SC in November 2023.

[118] During the course of this agenda item, the SC-7 also discussed other consequential changes to the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*.

[119] **Number and mode of participation of observers at SC meetings.** The first comment was a proposal to increase the number of observers at SC meetings, especially if silent, for educational purposes.

[120] One SC-7 member supported the proposal but expressed concern regarding hybrid and virtual meetings, where verbal contributions from observers could significantly reduce the amount of translation time available for SC members to contribute, impacting on the discussions of the SC members. Some SC-7 members therefore proposed that observers should be silent but that the number of observers should also be increased to allow up to two observers per contracting party or RPPO.

[121] The secretariat confirmed that, in the case of many requests for observers to attend, the number invited would depend on the maximum capacity of the room booked.

[122] The secretariat reminded the SC-7 of the rights of observers as specified in Rule 7 of the rules of procedure for the Standards Committee:¹²

Such observers may i) participate in the discussions, subject to the approval of the Chairperson and without the right to vote; ii) receive the documents other than those of a restricted nature, and, iii) submit written statements on particular items of the agenda.

[123] As the SC meetings need to be face-to-face, an SC-7 member proposed that there be up to two observers to attend the meeting and follow it through a webcast. The secretariat pointed out that although CPM sessions can be webcast, this is not possible for SC sessions as they are closed meetings. The alternative would be a hybrid or virtual meeting where the secretariat could check the attendees; if silent observers wanted to provide a paper or intervene, they would need to be approved for attendance or an SC member could present a paper on their behalf.

[124] The SC-7 therefore agreed that the number of observers should be increased to a maximum of two for face-to-face SC meetings but without specifying in the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting* all the various cases (i.e. virtual and hybrid modalities and conditions), as they would be an exception (e.g. during events such as the COVID-19 pandemic). The SC-7 drafted an amendment to Rule 7 accordingly.

⁹ 10_SC7_2023_May.

¹⁰ 21_SC_Tel_2022_Nov.

¹¹ Section 2 of the IPPC procedure manual for standard setting: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/ippc-standard-setting-procedure-manual/>

¹² Section 5.2 of the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*.

- [125] The SC-7 further agreed that Rule 7 should be amended to replace the phrase “right to vote” (in relation to observers) with “right to participate in the decision-making process”. The rationale for this was that, as observers are not members, they should be excluded from any participation in the decision-making process, not just from voting.
- [126] **Process when consensus is not reached.** The SC-7 considered a comment regarding the procedure to follow when a consensus cannot be reached during an SC meeting because an SC member does not agree with the proposed decision. Drawing upon the “Friends of the Chair” model used at CPM sessions to resolve issues, the SC-7 proposed that, if no consensus was possible, the SC would form a small group of SC members to work on the identified issue and report to the SC. If the identified issue was still not addressed, the remaining concerns would be submitted in writing with proposed solutions. If, after this effort, the issue was still not addressed or remained unresolved, it would be referred to the CPM Bureau or an SC member could request a vote. The question put to the vote would need to be suitable for answering with “yes” or “no”. To allow for the difference in numbers of SC members from each region, contracting parties within each region would first be required to seek a regional agreement and then the representative or representatives of that region would vote. The vote would be decided if five regions voted one way, with a requirement that each region was represented by at least one SC member. If the issue was conceptual, a paper would be drafted and submitted to the CPM Bureau for guidance.
- [127] The SC-7 drafted some proposed text on the above approach to add to the end of Rule 6 of the SC’s rules of procedure. They also requested that the secretariat seek advice from the FAO Legal Office on the parts related to voting and report to the SC for its consideration.
- [128] **Call for submissions for phytosanitary treatments.** The SC-7 discussed proposals regarding Step 1 of the SSP (Call for topics) that referred to a separate call for submissions for phytosanitary treatments (PTs).
- [129] One SC-7 member pointed out that, although it is the CPM that adds topics to the SC’s work programme, subjects are added to the technical panels’ work programmes by the SC. To align the process for all four technical panels, the member therefore proposed that it would be better to refer to a call for subjects being always open, rather than a call for submissions for PTs. However, the member also expressed concern regarding the capacity for the secretariat to manage all the proposals.
- [130] The secretariat explained that all proposals for subjects, except PTs, are submitted through the biennial Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation, while proposals for PTs are submitted through a separate call, which was currently a continuous call. The secretariat also clarified that the call for submissions for PTs is not about treatment data but about proposals for treatments. Twice per year, during the SC’s review of the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, the technical panels can also propose to the SC the addition of subjects to their work programme (i.e. glossary terms, diagnostic protocols (DPs) and PTs).
- [131] One SC-7 member pointed out that if all technical panels were to be aligned with the approach used for the TPPT, the scope of the call for topics would need to be adjusted, as subjects could be added at any time. Another SC-7 member commented that the ability to close the call would also need to be considered, pending the availability of resources and with reference being made to the priorities assigned to subjects on the work programme.
- [132] One SC-7 member suggested that, for an ISPM revision or a CPM recommendation, a call every two years would be sufficient, as a specification is needed and contracting parties are consulted to make sure that the topic proposed is relevant. However, this might not be the case for subjects. The SC-7 member commented that, for subjects, it might be better that calls are kept open to avoid delays when new subjects are needed to address emerging pests.
- [133] The secretariat confirmed that having open calls for submissions would not present a problem. The SC would need to approve the corresponding changes to the SSP and if CPM agrees to this change, the SC would approve the subjects, which would then be added to the workplans of the respective technical panels, and the CPM would then note the new subjects.

- [134] Based on their discussions, the SC-7 agreed that, instead of referring to a “separate call for submissions for phytosanitary treatments”, the SSP should be amended to open this up to other subjects (i.e. “a separate call for submissions for subjects for technical panels’ work programmes”).
- [135] For technical panels that require specific supporting documentation, the SC-7 considered whether to require submissions to be made through NPPOs or RPPOs. However, they noted that subjects for glossary terms do not require a specification and that the TPG’s terms of reference allow the TPG to propose new subjects to the SC. The SC-7 agreed, however, that when contracting parties and RPPOs submit proposals for subjects, they should follow the relevant submission documentation requirements.
- [136] As a consequence of opening the call for PTs to all subjects, the SC-7 considered the footnote that explained that the “call for topics” is a call for “technical area”, “topic”, “diagnostic protocol (DP)”, noting that there would no longer be a need to refer to the hierarchy of terms for standards, as all proposals for subjects would be submitted through the same call. The secretariat suggested that the footnote should not refer to CPM recommendations, as they are not standards, and suggested some wording used on the Call for topics webpage, which referred only to ISPMs (including annexes not covered by a technical panel) and revisions of ISPMs. However, one SC-7 member recalled that the call for topics is open to proposals for CPM recommendations as well as standards and therefore proposed that the footnote refer to CPM recommendations.
- [137] Returning to the text describing the call for submissions for subjects, the SC-7 considered whether to refer to the call as being “ongoing”, but decided against this to allow the SC the flexibility to open or close the call as needed.
- [138] The SC-7 then drafted some adjustments to the Step 1 text about the call for topics to make a clear distinction between the Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation and the call for submissions for the work programmes of the technical panels.
- [139] **Length of calls for experts.** The SC-7 considered a comment suggesting that a call for experts should be open for at least 45 days to give sufficient time for the best candidates to be identified. The secretariat pointed out that, if the length of a call were to be defined, it would make the process more rigid, and that previous experience had shown that there was usually a request for the call to be extended even if a long timeframe had been given. The SC-7 agreed that the issue raised did not necessarily need to be addressed in the SSP itself but could instead be considered internally by the secretariat in terms of their standard operating procedures. The secretariat agreed to consider timelines internally.
- [140] **SC members as EWG members.** The SC-7 considered a comment asking what procedure would be followed if an SC member was nominated to be an EWG member and how neutrality would be ensured in the selection process.
- [141] One SC-7 member shared their experience of one country’s approach, which involved a blind ranking process: after candidates had completed the subject expertise form, all names were removed and then the panel making the selection ranked the candidates against each other. However, the member commented that sometimes some of the information that is relevant for the selection can reveal the candidate’s identity. This process would also be more difficult to apply for the SC, as regional representation is sought.
- [142] To resolve the latter difficulty, it was proposed that the secretariat could remove the names but include the regions to ensure regional representation; the country of the candidate could be either requested in the form or retrieved from the application itself.
- [143] The SC-7 agreed to request that the secretariat consider the feasibility of implementing the blind ranking procedure to select experts for EWGs in order that the SC does not know when an IC or SC member has applied.

- [144] The secretariat noted that, according to the “Guidelines for the composition and organization of expert working groups”,¹³ one CPM Bureau member could attend EWGs and members of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) could attend as invited experts or as an IC representative. However, the secretariat noted that if an IC member attended as an observer, the IPPC criteria for travel assistance would not apply (as it did not apply to observers), which may affect their ability to fulfil the role.
- [145] The secretariat noted, for future consideration, that funding would be considered to ensure that the experts required are able to attend and can fulfil the role. This proposal would be presented to the SC and, if approved, would be sent to the CPM Bureau for financial consideration.
- [146] The secretariat commented that it would be beneficial to make clear the role of IC and CPM Bureau members in EWGs.
- [147] Regarding the attendance of IC, SC and CPM Bureau members at EWG meetings, the SC-7 agreed that the “Guidelines for the composition and organization of expert working groups” should be amended to refer to the possible attendance by “IC representatives” rather than by “IC members as invited experts or IC representatives”.
- [148] **Participation of industry representatives in EWGs.** The SC-7 discussed a suggestion that the role of industry representatives invited to EWG meetings be clarified. To address this, they proposed that the “Guidelines for the composition and organization of expert working groups” be amended to make it clear that not only are industry representatives and other invited experts not permitted to participate as members but they are not permitted to participate in the decision-making process.
- [149] The SC-7 agreed that the role and tasks of industry representatives, and the rules governing their participation, should be specified in the “Guidelines for the operation of expert working groups”.¹⁴ The secretariat confirmed that they would draft this new subsection. Moreover, to differentiate experts of the EWG from the invited experts, the SC-7 agreed that the former should be described as “members” in the “Guidelines for the operation of expert working groups” (with the section on the roles of experts therefore starting with “The members of an EWG should:”).
- [150] **Observers at EWGs.** The SC-7 agreed that the criteria for the composition of an EWG (the first subsection of the “Guidelines for the composition and organization of expert working groups”) should be amended to remove reference to a participant from the host country being allowed to participate and to change the criterion on observers to make it clear that observers are only from collaborators (i.e. the host country).
- [151] The SC-7 agreed that the role and tasks of observers, and the rules governing their participation, should be specified in the “Guidelines for the operation of expert working group”, and the secretariat confirmed that they would draft this new subsection.
- [152] **Closure of PT subjects when insufficient data are available.** The SC-7 considered a comment regarding the closure of treatment subjects when there are not enough data available. The comment pointed out that there was no opportunity for the submitter to provide further information and suggested that, in such instances, the submitter be given 30 minutes to explain their position at a TPPT meeting.
- [153] The secretariat noted that technical panels do not allow observers, but there is a possibility for papers to be submitted. Moreover, meetings of technical panels are an objective forum and having the submitters at the meeting could make the discussion more difficult. The secretariat explained that the reason the TPPT does not inform the submitter that their treatment has been rejected is because the TPPT and SC reports are publicly available and contain a detailed reasoning.

¹³ Section 6.1 of the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*.

¹⁴ Section 6.2 of the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*.

- [154] The SC-7 suggested that submitters might join the meeting just for the time necessary to explain the data and then the technical panel could decide how to proceed. However, the secretariat explained that the submitter is not always the conductor of the research (e.g. the submitter could be an NPPO that collected several studies), making it difficult if there are questions from the technical panel members.
- [155] One SC-7 member proposed that the submitter should be informed of the outcome, for example if the treatment has been removed from the work programme. The secretariat noted the proposal.
- [156] The secretariat pointed that every submission must identify a technical lead responsible for the content of the draft. This contact person could be the first person for the TPPT to invite, and this could be an alternative option to the submitter providing a written explanation of the data.
- [157] The SC-7 then discussed who was responsible for informing the submitter if a treatment was removed from the work programme and noted that SC members were responsible for informing submitters from their respective regions.
- [158] **Communications regarding selection of EWGs.** Following on from their discussion about who should inform submitters of treatments, the SC-7 also agreed that it was the responsibility of SC members to inform unsuccessful EWG applicants in their respective regions that they had not been selected. One SC-7 member proposed that a note, reminding SC members to inform applicants of the outcome, could be included with the notification that selections are closed. The SC-7 agreed.
- [159] **Role of the IPPC official contact point.** The SC-7 considered a comment proposing that proposals for experts and topics should be submitted through the IPPC official contact point, and hence the NPPO, as had been the case historically.
- [160] One SC-7 member supported this proposal, noting that the online submission form lacked a mechanism to avoid an individual expert nominating him- or herself without prior approval from their NPPO (even if they use an official NPPO email address). The NPPO would be notified of that application only once the submission was received by the secretariat, but as the NPPO may not endorse the candidate, the SC-7 member preferred the submission to be submitted by email through the official contact point in the first instance, as this would give more control to the NPPO.
- [161] The SC-7 noted that another approach would be for the notification provided to the NPPO once the form is filled and inviting NPPO to endorse the nominee, making the submission official.
- [162] The SC-7 agreed that the secretariat would address this issue by setting restricted access for the submission form during calls for experts, moving it into the restricted work area of the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) to which official contact points have access.
- [163] **Calls for DP authors.** Regarding calls for DP authors, where self-nominations are accepted, the secretariat confirmed that they endeavour to inform the respective NPPOs of the nominees' countries of origin. Noting that NPPOs must be informed, the SC-7 requested that the wording on the Calls for DP authors page of the IPP be amended as follows:
- Some NPPOs require nominations for DP authors be submitted through the NPPO. Please consult your contracting party contact point before submitting. Contact points reserve the right to withdraw nominations not submitted by the contact point.
- [164] **Selection of experts according to expertise and regional representation.** The SC-7 was reminded that the SC had already agreed that selection of experts should be based on expertise as the first priority, with regional representation considered if the expertise was nearly identical. The SC had also agreed that it would be beneficial to have the processes documented.
- [165] The secretariat proposed that, as most experts are selected by the SC through e-decision, a note could be added during e-decisions.

- [166] The SC-7 noted the difference between the selection of experts for EWGs and technical panels, as the former are selected only once while for the latter the composition of the whole panel has to be taken into account.
- [167] The secretariat recalled the procedure for selecting experts for EWGs that had been agreed by the SC in November 2022,¹⁵ which had been incorporated into the draft revision of the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*. This described how the SC used a ranking process to select experts, with a poll being used if the selection of the last position was inconclusive, and the decision being returned to the SC if there was still no consensus.
- [168] The secretariat also reminded the SC-7 that the SC, at its May 2023 meeting, had agreed some wording to be included in the “Procedures for conducting discussions and making decisions by electronic means” regarding the selection of experts for technical panels.¹⁶ The SC-7 agreed that this text should be modified to specify that selection is based on expertise and regional representation, and to clarify that the ultimate decision should be taken at a face-to-face meeting.
- [169] **Adding subjects to the work programme by e-decision.** The secretariat recalled that, at its meeting in May 2023, the SC had not had the time to discuss the possibility of adding subjects to the work programmes of technical panels via SC e-decision. The secretariat explained that using e-decisions in this way would allow subjects to be submitted at any time and the SC could review subjects whenever they are submitted, thus facilitating the work of technical panels as they could start working on subjects without waiting for the SC meeting in November.
- [170] The SC-7 agreed that the approval of subjects to be included in the work programme of technical panels should be added to the list of types of discussions and decisions that may be made through the use of electronic communication (in section 5.8, “Types of discussion and decisions that the SC can make by electronic means”, in the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*).
- [171] The SC-7 agreed to refer to “subject matter experts” rather than “scientists” from around the world.
- [172] **Number of consultation periods.** Regarding Stage 3 of the SSP (Consultation and review), one SC-7 member suggested that the text be adjusted to accommodate *at least* two consultation periods, as some draft ISPMs had been approved for third consultation.
- [173] **Hierarchy of terms for standards.** Further to the decision of the SC in May 2023 to recommend to the CPM-18 that commodity standards be “subjects” instead of “topics”,¹⁷ the SC-7 noted that, with the exception of glossary terms (which are amendments to ISPM 5), subjects have a submission form rather than a specification and only specifications are sent for consultation. The SC-7 agreed that section 3.2.4 of the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting* (Hierarchy of terms for standards) should therefore be amended to include The Technical Panel on Commodity Standards in the list of technical panels allowed to work on “subjects” and to mention that subjects do not have a specification.
- [174] **Objections to draft ISPMs.** The SC-7 reviewed a proposal to consider a more specific process to address objections to a draft ISPM at the adoption stage, as the current SSP only said that the objection would be added to the CPM agenda and the CPM would decide the way forward. The SC-7 agreed that, if an objection is received, a potential virtual SC meeting (without interpretation) should be held at least two weeks after the closure of the objection period to develop advice to support the CPM Bureau and the CPM in their consideration of the objection. For this meeting, no quorum would have to be met but the SC members attending would have to agree how the information would be presented to the CPM Bureau or the CPM and a list of the SC members attending this virtual meeting would be provided. The CPM Bureau would consider the suggestions from the SC and, if the CPM Bureau agreed, the suggestions would be forwarded to the CPM for decision. If the SC was not able to present suggestions

¹⁵ SC 2022-11, agenda item 8.1.

¹⁶ SC 2023-05, agenda item 8.2.

¹⁷ SC 2023-05, agenda item 6.4.

on how to solve the issue, the CPM Bureau would report to the CPM with its own recommendation and seek CPM guidance.

[175] In addition, the SC-7 drafted an amendment to the text of the SSP following the SC's suggestion¹⁸ to change the deadline for objections from three weeks to six weeks before the CPM session.

[176] The secretariat confirmed that they would provide a "save the date" notification, reminding contracting parties of the deadline for objections, once the draft ISPMs are uploaded to the IPP for CPM adoption.

[177] **First consultation.** In the section on Step 5 of the SPP, the SC-7 agreed that draft commodity standards and glossary terms should be added to the list of items revised by technical panels following first consultation.

[178] The secretariat explained that it was still not decided whether commodity standards would follow the regular procedure for ISPMs or the one followed for PTs and DPs (i.e. usually one round of consultation). Currently, the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit* (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) was following the regular procedure, with review by the SC-7 after the first consultation, whereas consultation comments on DPs, PTs and glossary terms were addressed by the respective technical panel in lieu of the steward.

[179] The SC-7 recommended to the SC that the TPCS be invited to report how it would prefer to operate.

[180] The secretariat confirmed that they would approach the panel and would present the revised SSP to the SC in November 2023 for review.

[181] The SC-7:

- (8) *invited* the SC to consider the draft revision of the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting* as modified during this meeting, with a view to submitting it to CPM-18 (2024) for approval (in the case of changes to CPM-approved procedures, such as the SSP) or noting (in the case of other changes);
- (9) *requested* that the secretariat consider the feasibility of operating a blind ranking procedure for the selection of experts for EWGs;
- (10) *requested* that, for calls for experts, the secretariat move the online submission form for nominations into the restricted work area of the International Phytosanitary Portal to which official contact points have access;
- (11) *requested* that the secretariat update the wording on the Calls for DP authors page of the IPP as discussed at this meeting; and
- (12) *recommended* to the SC that the TPCS be invited to report whether it would prefer that commodity standards follow the regular procedure for ISPMs or the procedure followed by PTs and DPs.

7. Review of the standard setting calendar

[182] The secretariat introduced the standard setting calendar, which listed the major events in the upcoming months, and highlighted the IPPC regional workshops that would be held in August and September in the FAO regions, the EWGs, the IPPC Workshop on the Call for Topics, and the SC meeting in May 2024.

8. Any other business

[183] The SC-7 did not consider any other business.

¹⁸ 21_SC_Tel_2022_Nov.

9. Date and type of the next SC-7 meeting

[184] The next SC-7 meeting is scheduled to take place after the SC May 2024 meeting, tentatively from 13 to 17 May 2024.

10. Evaluation of the meeting process

[185] The SC-7 chairperson encouraged all SC members to complete the evaluation of the meeting via the link provided on the agenda for this meeting.

11. Close of the meeting

[186] The SC-7 chairperson thanked all participants for their contributions and closed the meeting.

[187] On behalf of the secretariat, Avetik NERSISYAN, Standard Setting Unit lead, thanked the participants for their commitment and work.

Appendix 1: Agenda

1.	Opening of the Meeting	Document number / link	Presenter / IPPC Secretariat support
1.1.	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat		NERSISYAN
2.	Meeting Arrangements		
2.1.	Election of the Chairperson	–	Secretariat
2.2.	Election of the Rapporteur	–	Chairperson
2.3.	Adoption of the Agenda	01_SC7_2023_May	Chairperson
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1.	Documents list	02_SC7_2023_May	TORELLA
3.2.	Participants list	03_SC7_2023_May SC membership list	TORELLA
4.	Draft ISPMs for approval for the second consultation		
4.1.	<p>Draft 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 including deferred terms from 2021 Amendments: Glossary of phytosanitary terms (1994-001), Priority 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE - Assistant steward: Ebbe NORDBO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o TPG responses to comments from 2022 Consultation (1994-001) 	<p>1994-001 (with TPG recommendations on deferred terms)</p> <p>04_SC7_2023_May</p>	SEPÚLVEDA / SHAMILOV
4.2.	<p>Draft Annex: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies to ISPM 37 Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) (2018-011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Marina ZLOTINA - Assistant stewards: Mariangela CIAMPITTI; Sophie PETERSON <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Steward's responses to Comments from 2022 Consultation (2018-011) o TPG response on comments on terminology and consistency (2018-011) o Steward's notes and potential implementation issues (2018-011) 	<p>2018-011</p> <p>05_SC7_2023_May 06_SC7_2023_May 07_SC7_2023_May</p>	ZLOTINA / KISS
5.	Draft ISPM under development		

5.1.	<p>ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade): Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: vacant - Assistant steward: David KAMANGIRA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Discussion paper - Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010) o Steward's responses to Comments from 2010 Consultation (2006-010) 	<p>2006-010 08_SC7_2023_May 09_SC7_2023_May</p>	<p>KAMANGIRA / KISS</p>
6.	General review of SSP	10_SC7_2023_May (Rev1)	SHAMILOV
7.	Review of the standard setting calendar	Link to the IPP calendar	TORELLA
8.	Any other business		Chairperson
9.	Date and type of the next SC-7 Meeting		Chairperson
10.	Evaluation of the meeting process	Link to the survey	Chairperson
11.	Close of the meeting		Chairperson

Appendix 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / UPDATED
Draft ISPMs for approval for the second consultation			
1994-001	4.1.	2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 including deferred terms from 2021 Amendments (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) (1994-001), Priority 1	2023-04-17
2018-011	4.2.	Draft Annex: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies to ISPM 37 (<i>Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>) (2018-011)	2023-04-17
Draft ISPM under development			
2006-010	5.1.	ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade): Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010)	2023-04-17
Meeting documents			
01_SC7_2023_May	2.3.	Provisional agenda	2023-04-18
02_SC7_2023_May	3.1.	Documents list	2023-04-18
03_SC7_2023_May	3.2.	Participants list	2023-04-17
04_SC7_2023_May	4.1.	TPG responses to comments from 2022 Consultation (1994-001)	2023-04-17
05_SC7_2023_May	4.2.	Steward's responses to Comments from 2022 Consultation (2018-011)	2023-04-17
06_SC7_2023_May	4.2.	TPG response on comments on terminology and consistency (2018-011)	2023-04-17
07_SC7_2023_May	4.2.	Steward's notes and potential implementation issues (2018-011)	2023-04-17
08_SC7_2023_May	5.1.	Discussion paper - Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010)	2023-04-17
09_SC7_2023_May	5.1.	Steward's responses to Comments from 2010 Consultation (2006-010)	2023-04-17

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / UPDATED
10_SC7_2023_May (Rev1)	6.	General review of SSP	2023-04-20

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 the standard setting calendar	7.	Link to the IPP calendar
Evaluation of the meeting process	10.	Link to survey

Appendix 3: Participants list

SC-7 members					
✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	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
✓	Asia Member SC-7	Mr Masahiro SAI Head Pest Risk Analysis Division Plant Protection Station, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) JAPAN Tel: +81-45-211-0375	masahiro_sai670@maff.go.jp	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 2 nd term / 3 years	2024
	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
✓	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
✓	Near East Member SC-7	Mr Nader ELBADRY Phytosanitary Specialist, Central Administration of Plant Quarantine, 6 Michel Bakhoum St., Dokki, Giza, EGYPT Tel: +201096799493	nader.badry@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

SC-7 members					
✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	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

Others			
*	Name, mailing address, telephone	Role	Email address
✓	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	TPG Steward	alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl
✓	Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI Servizio Fitosanitario DG Agricoltura Regione Lombardia Piazza Città di Lombardia 1 20124 Milano ITALY Tel: (+39) 3666603272	Europe Member	mariangela_ciampitti@regione.lombardia.it

IPPC Secretariat	
Mr Avetik NERSISYAN Standard Setting Unit Lead	Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org
Ms Adriana MOREIRA Standard Setting Officer	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org
Mr Artur SHAMILOV Standard Setting Officer	Artur.Shamilov@fao.org
Ms Janka KISS Standard Setting Associate	Janka.Kiss@fao.org
Mr Daniel Lorenzo TORELLA Standard Setting Unit Intern	Daniel.torella@fao.org
Mr Emmanuel KRAH Standard Setting Unit Intern	Emmanuel.krah@fao.org
Mr Lorenzo MONTEROSA Standard Setting Unit Intern	Lorenzo.monterosa@fao.org
Ms Colleen STIRLING Standard Setting Unit Specialist	Colleen.stirling@fao.org

Appendix 4: References

- Baker, A.C.** 1939. The basis for treatment of products where fruitflies are involved as a condition for entry into the United States. Circular No. 551. Washington, DC, United States Department of Agriculture. 8 pp.
- Ormsby, M.D.** 2022. Elucidating the efficacy of phytosanitary measures for invasive alien species moving in wood packaging material. *Journal of Plant Diseases and Protection*, 129: 339–348. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41348-022-00571-1>

Appendix 5: Draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 including deferred terms from 2021 amendments: Glossary of phytosanitary terms (1994-001), priority 1

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	2023-06-09
Document category	Draft 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) (1994-001)
Current document stage	To second or third consultation, depending on the terms
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> <p>2022-11 SC revised the 2021 amendments and referred “general surveillance” (2018-046), “specific surveillance” (2018-047), “surveillance” (2020-009), “inspection” (2017-005) and “test” (2021-005) for further consideration</p> <p>2022-11 SC invited the TPG to review “test”, “inspection” and “visual examination” and forward their recommendations to the SC-7 in May 2023</p> <p>2022-11 SC requested the terms “general surveillance” (2018-046), “specific surveillance” (2018-047), “surveillance” (2020-009) and “release (of a consignment)” (2021-007) to be reviewed by the SC-7 in May 2023</p> <p>2022-12 TPG reviewed the terms and drafted recommendations to SC-7</p> <p>2023-03 TPG finalized the review of the terms and the recommendations to SC-7</p>
Notes	<p>Note to Secretariat formatting this paper: formatting in definitions and explanations (strikethrough, bold, italics) needs to remain.</p> <p>Comments were only sought on the terms and definitions, not on the associated explanatory text.</p> <p>The SC-7 recommended the terms “release (of a consignment)” (2021-007), “inspection” (2017-005), and “specific surveillance” (2018-047) to the SC for approval for adoption by the CPM (no changes from 2nd consultation).</p>

Introduction

IPPC Official Contact Points are asked to consider the following proposals for addition and revision of 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. In addition, comments are only sought on the terms and definitions, not on the associated explanatory text. For full details on the discussions related to the specific terms, please refer to the [TPG meeting reports on the IPP](#).

1. ADDITION

1.1 “general surveillance” (2018-046)

In 2018, the TPG had noted that the revised ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*) had resulted in a slight change in the meaning of general surveillance and specific surveillance, with the previous version of ISPM 6 referring to “specific surveys” for what is now called “specific surveillance”. The SC meeting in May 2019 added the terms “*general surveillance*” and “*specific surveillance*” to the TPG work programme for inclusion in the Glossary, to provide clarity without having to read ISPM 6.

During their November 2019 meeting, the TPG discussed various options for definitions of “*general surveillance*” and “*specific surveillance*” together with an analysis of the use of these terms in adopted ISPMs.

In January 2021, the TPG had submitted a definition proposal, reviewed by the SC in May 2021, and sent for first consultation. The TPG in December 2021 and the SC-7 in May 2022 considered the first-consultation comments received, and the SC sent an amended definition proposal for second consultation. The SC in November 2022 considered the second-consultation comments received and deferred the terms and definitions of “*general surveillance*”, “*specific surveillance*” and “*surveillance*” to be reviewed by SC-7 in May 2023.

The SC-7 is now sending for third consultation a proposed definition, modified and in particular simplified as compared to the version sent for second consultation.

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

- (1) It is useful to add the term and definition in the Glossary to clarify its meaning in ISPMs without having to read ISPM 6.
- (2) The proposed definition refers to “*various sources*” rather than “*procedures*” to allow for sources of information that are not procedures.
- (3) Whereas the overall surveillance process is official (i.e. exclusively an NPPO responsibility), those various sources of information can be official or unofficial, as explained in ISPM 6.
- (4) “*Pests*” is used rather than “*pest presence or absence*” to allow for surveillance of other characteristics of pests.
- (5) As described in ISPM 6, general surveillance and specific surveillance are disjunctive concepts. They may be used in combination, as provided for in the revised definition of “*surveillance*” (Section 2.1).

Proposed addition

general surveillance	A process whereby information on pests in an area is obtained through various sources other than surveys .
-----------------------------	---

1.2 “specific surveillance” (2018-047)

In 2018, the TPG had noted that the revised ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*) had resulted in a slight change in the meaning of general surveillance and specific surveillance, with the previous version of ISPM 6 referring to “specific surveys” for what is now called “specific surveillance”. The SC meeting in May 2019 added the terms “*general surveillance*” and “*specific surveillance*” to the TPG work programme for inclusion in the Glossary, to provide clarity without having to read ISPM 6.

The TPG in January 2021 had submitted a definition proposal, reviewed by the SC in May 2021, and sent for first consultation. The TPG in December 2021 and the SC-7 in May 2022 considered the first-consultation comments received, and the SC sent the definition proposal unchanged for second consultation. The SC in November 2022 considered the second-consultation comments received and

deferred the terms and definitions of “*general surveillance*”, “*specific surveillance*” and “*surveillance*” to be reviewed by SC-7 in May 2023.

The SC-7 kept unchanged the definition compared to the version sent for the second consultation. The SC-7 recommended the term “specific surveillance” (2018-047) to the SC for approval for adoption by the CPM. The proposed definition of “specific surveillance” and the related reasoning were kept in order to provide additional information to the other two terms, “general surveillance” and “surveillance”.

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

- (1) It is useful to add the term and definition in the Glossary to clarify its meaning in ISPMs without having to read ISPM 6.
- (2) The essential distinction between general and specific surveillance is the source of the information, as both types of surveillance can be directed to specific pests;
- (3) Specific surveillance is achieved through surveys.
- (4) Therefore, in the case of specific surveillance, not only the overall surveillance process but also the source of information is official, as according to its Glossary definition a “*survey (of pests)*” is an official procedure.
- (5) Reference to “*presence or absence*” of a pest in the definition would be too restrictive as it would exclude seeking information on other characteristics of a pest population, such as pest biology or distribution, as allowed by the Glossary definitions of “*survey (of pests)*” and “*monitoring survey*”.

Proposed addition

specific surveillance	An official process whereby information on pests in an area is obtained through surveys .
------------------------------	---

2. REVISION

2.1 “surveillance” (2020-009)

In 2018, the TPG had noted that the revised ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*) had resulted in a slight change in the meaning of general surveillance and specific surveillance, with the previous version of ISPM 6 referring to “specific surveys” for what is now called “specific surveillance”. The SC meeting in May 2019 added the terms “*general surveillance*” and “*specific surveillance*” to the TPG work programme for inclusion in the Glossary, to provide clarity without having to read ISPM 6.

In 2019, the TPG also discussed the definition of “*surveillance*” and, upon TPG’s recommendation, the SC in November 2020 added the term to the TPG work programme. The TPG in January 2021 had submitted a revised definition proposal, reviewed by the SC in May 2021, and sent for first consultation. The TPG in December 2021 and the SC-7 in May 2022 considered the first-consultation comments received, and the SC sent an amended proposal for the revised definition for second consultation. The SC in November 2022 considered the second-consultation comments received and deferred the terms and definitions of “*general surveillance*”, “*specific surveillance*” and “*surveillance*” to be reviewed by SC-7 in May 2023.

The SC-7 is now sending for third consultation the proposed revised definition unchanged compared to the version sent for second consultation.

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

- (1) Whilst the current definition of “*surveillance*” rather indistinctly mixes various methods from the two surveillance types, and unnecessarily restricts the surveillance objective to only ‘presence or absence of pests’, the proposed definitions of the new Glossary terms “*general surveillance*” (cf.

section 1.2) and “*specific surveillance*” (cf. section 1.3) provides the essential distinction between those two disjunctive surveillance types.

- (2) Subsequently, the generic characteristics of “*surveillance*” remain as “*an official process whereby information on pests in an area is obtained...*” (as outlined with the first part of the definition). The possible surveillance methodologies and the conceptual relationship between the terms are then outlined in the second part of the definition as “*...through general surveillance, specific surveillance or a combination of both*”.

Current definition

Surveillance	An official process which collects and records data on pest presence or absence by survey, monitoring or other procedures [CEPM, 1996; revised CPM, 2015]
---------------------	--

Proposed revision

Surveillance	An official process <u>whereby information on pests in an area is obtained through general surveillance, specific surveillance or a combination of both</u> which collects and records data on pest presence or absence by survey, monitoring or other procedures
---------------------	--

2.2 “phytosanitary action” (2020-006) and “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007)

The following introduction refers to both proposals for revising the definitions of “*phytosanitary action*” (2020-006) and “*phytosanitary procedure*” (2020-007):

In 2014, the SC had established a subgroup to consider the various arguments (including reference to SPS text) on whether ‘*phytosanitary measure*’ should be understood in a narrow sense (covering only regulated pests in the country itself) or in a broad sense (covering also pests regulated in another, (importing) country). The SC in 2015 could not agree on one common understanding but agreed that in ISPMs all efforts should be made to use the most accurate terminology according to the concept provided in a standard.

In the suit of SC’s discussions, it had also been broadly accepted that “*phytosanitary*” could be used, and has been used, in ISPMs as a qualifier in relation to scenarios where the NPPO of an exporting country is *applying* official measures, through phytosanitary procedures and phytosanitary actions, to meet phytosanitary import requirements of an importing country in preventing the spread of pests that are regulated in that importing country, but not regulated in the country of export where such application is taking place.

Consequently, the TPG recommended that it would be pertinent that the definitions of “*phytosanitary action*” and “*phytosanitary procedure*” be amended to explicitly reflect that their respective scope also covers such official actions and procedures used in an export scenario against pests that are regulated in an importing country but not regulated in the exporting country. The SC in November 2020 agreed and added the terms “phytosanitary action” (2020-006) and “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007) to the TPG work programme.

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*” in their current definitions both refer to “*phytosanitary measures*” 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 requirements 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, 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, additional wording “...or to enable *phytosanitary certification*”, and “...or for enabling *phytosanitary certification*” (in the two respective definitions) had been proposed for the first consultation and had been almost unanimously accepted. This additional wording provides conceptual focus on the scenario as seen from the perspective of the NPPO *applying* the procedures and actions.

Accepting a range of suggestions from first consultation of simplifying the definition of “*phytosanitary procedure*” by linking it to “*phytosanitary action*”, the SC-7 is now proposing the revised definition of “*phytosanitary procedure*” be modified to that effect.

In conclusion, revising the definitions of “*phytosanitary action*” and “*phytosanitary procedure*” solves consistency issues by aligning the actual (broader) use of those two terms without violating the narrow interpretation of the definition of “*phytosanitary measure*”.

It is noted that, while endorsing the revision of the two terms, some first-consultation comments suggested that it would have been more efficient to change the definition of “*phytosanitary measure*” to refer to “*phytosanitary certification*”. However, as the term “*phytosanitary measure*” had been defined in the Convention text, revising it could only take the form of a so-called “agreed interpretation” by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures. Such interpretations of Convention definitions have

only been proposed and agreed in two cases, in 2002 for “*phytosanitary measure*” to include the concept of RNQPs, and in 2007 for “*pest risk analysis*” to include the concept of evaluating whether an organism is a pest.

2.2.1 “phytosanitary action” (2020-006)

The SC-7 proposes the definition be revised with a modification as compared to the version as sent for first consultation. The SC-7 proposes the insertion of “with reference to a phytosanitary procedure”, to highlight that every action needs a procedure.

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

- (1) An NPPO may apply phytosanitary actions against pests regulated in the country itself. Furthermore, to fulfill all requirements 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.
- (2) The proposed additional wording “...or to enable *phytosanitary certification*” 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.
- (3) 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 <u>with reference to a phytosanitary procedure</u> , to implement phytosanitary measures <u>or to enable phytosanitary certification</u>
-----------------------------	---

2.2.2 “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007)

Meeting a range of suggestions from first consultation, the SC-7 proposes the definition be revised with some modifications as compared to the version as sent for first consultation.

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

- (1) The conceptual linkage between “*phytosanitary procedure*” and “*phytosanitary action*” is that a phytosanitary procedure is a method on how to perform a phytosanitary action.
- (2) For simplification and to avoid redundancy, the conceptual linkage between “*phytosanitary procedure*” and “*phytosanitary measure*” is no longer explicit, but implicitly remains intact through the linkage to “*phytosanitary action*”, defined as ‘*an official operation... undertaken to implement phytosanitary measures or to enable phytosanitary certification*’.
- (3) In effect, an NPPO may apply phytosanitary procedures against pests regulated in the country itself. Furthermore, to fulfill all requirements 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.

- (4) Given the inclusion of ‘*phytosanitary*’ in the term itself and of ‘*phytosanitary action*’ in its definition, 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.
- (5) ‘*An*’ as the introductory article of the definition is consistent with far the most Glossary definitions and is more precise than the current ‘*Any*’.
- (6) With the linkage to “*phytosanitary action*”, the listed examples are redundant and therefore deleted.
- (7) 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 <u>on how to perform a phytosanitary action for implementing phytosanitary measures including the performance of inspections, tests, surveillance or treatments in connection with regulated pests</u>
--------------------------------	--

2.3 “release (of a consignment)” (2021-007)

In January 2021, when discussing the proposed deletion of ‘*clearance (of a consignment)*’, the TPG recommended the consequential revision of the definition of ‘*release (of a consignment)*’. The SC reviewed the proposal at its meeting in May 2021 and sent it for first consultation. The TPG in December 2021 and the SC-7 in May 2022 considered the first-consultation comments received, and the SC sent an amended proposal for the revised definition for second consultation.

Subsequently, the SC in November 2022 considered the second-consultation comments received and deferred the draft revised definition to be further considered by the SC-7 in May 2023. The SC-7 revised the definition by deleting word “official” as compared to the version presented by the TPG to the SC in November 2022. Hence, the SC-7 kept unchanged the definition compared to the version sent for the second consultation and recommended it to the SC for approval for adoption by the CPM.

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

- (1) The revision does not change the substance of the definition but merely links *release* to *compliance procedure* rather than to *clearance* (as deleted by CPM-17 in 2023).
- (2) Being linked to a *consignment* (in its defined IPPC meaning), and being an action subsequent to the completion of a *compliance procedure* (being an *official* action), the Glossary term *release (of a consignment)* has a meaning specific to the IPPC domain and distinct from other possible uses.
- (3) Strictly speaking, the proposed insertion of ‘*of a consignment*’ is redundant, given the qualifier of the term (‘*of a consignment*’). However, the insertion makes the wording as a stand-alone definition clearer in contrast to the term and definition of ‘*release (into the environment)*’.
- (4) The revised definition of *release (of a consignment)* does not conflict with the current uses of the term in adopted ISPMs.

Current definition

release (of a consignment)	Authorization for entry after clearance [FAO, 1995]
---	---

Proposed revision

release (of a consignment)	Authorization for entry <u>of a consignment</u> after <u>completion of the compliance procedure</u> clearance
---	---

2.4 “inspection” (2017-005)

The TPG in 2015 recognized that the definition of ‘*inspection*’ might be considered partly outdated due to technological advances. In 2017, the SC, therefore, added the term ‘*inspection*’ to the List of topics for IPPC standards for a possible revision. Subsequently, the TPG presented a revised definition to the SC in 2018. While confirming the need for retaining the distinction between the definitions of ‘*inspection*’ and ‘*test*’ (as often distinguished in ISPMs and phytosanitary legislation), the SC queried the need and feasibility of including other tools than ‘*visual examination*’ into ‘*inspection*’. Furthermore, the SC noted two different uses of ‘*inspection*’ in ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*): in some parts ‘*inspection*’ is used congruent to its current definition, in other parts explicitly stating that inspection also includes the processes of examination of documents and verification of identity and integrity of the consignment.

The SC referred the term ‘*inspection*’ back to the TPG, to particularly evaluate the term in relation to ‘*test*’, the uses of ‘*inspection*’ in ISPM 23 and the possible future revision of that standard.

The TPG continued its discussion in its 2018, 2019 and 2021 meetings, also awaiting the parallel considerations of the consignment-related terms ‘*identity (of a consignment)*’, ‘*integrity (of a consignment)*’ and ‘*phytosanitary security (of a consignment)*’. In this process, the TPG reconfirmed that the distinction between ‘visual’ versus ‘other than visual’ examination in *inspection* and *test*, respectively, remains to be most important.

The TPG considered various ways to overcome the discrepancy between the current definition of ‘*inspection*’ and the broader use of the term in certain parts of ISPM 23. Given that:

- ‘*inspection*’ in its current narrow sense, i.e., referring only to the official visual examination of plants etc., is being used widely in many ISPMs, including in far the most of the cases within ISPM 23; and
- the Glossary term ‘*compliance procedure (for a consignment)*’, already covering the verification of compliance with phytosanitary import requirements, would fit as the overarching term to be used in the particular parts of ISPM 23,

the TPG concluded and the SC agreed that it would be appropriate to:

- retain the current, narrow definition of ‘*inspection*’; and
- adjust the very limited number of cases in ISPM 23 where ‘*inspection*’ had been used beyond its current definition by referring instead to ‘*compliance procedure (for a consignment)*’, as revised by CPM in 2023.

Following that approach, the proposed revision of ‘*inspection*’ only aims at improving the wording and consistency with other definitions. The SC reviewed the proposal at its meeting in May 2021 and sent it for first consultation. The TPG in December 2021 and the SC-7 in May 2022 considered the consultation comments received and the SC sent the revised definition unchanged for the second consultation.

Following second consultation comments, the SC agreed to change “check” to “verify” as it was indicated that “check” was too informal, and also in consistency with wording in similar definitions such

as test. The SC-7 May 2023 confirmed its support for the proposed revision and is now submitting the proposal to SC approval for adoption by CPM-18.

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

- (1) Through Article VII.2f of the Convention and the definition of ‘*compliance procedure (for a consignment)*’, the terms ‘*compliance*’ and ‘*non-compliance*’ are linked with consignments, and the ‘General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs’ stipulates ‘*conformity*’ be used in other cases. As *inspection* has a broader scope than only consignments, ‘*compliance*’ is therefore substituted by ‘*conformity*’.
- (2) The word ‘*determine*’ (compliance) is substituted by ‘*verify*’ (conformity) in consistency with the wording used in similar definitions.
- (3) The term ‘*regulations*’ is substituted by ‘*requirements*’, as phytosanitary regulations are at a higher conceptual level and refer to regulated pests. However, inspection can be carried out in scenarios other than at import, like at place of production or production site or at export, and inspection in such scenarios may not always be related to regulated pests.
- (4) While the term ‘*inspection*’ needs substitution by ‘*compliance procedure*’ in a few cases in ISPM 23 (irrespective of the proposed revision), the use of the revised definition of ‘*inspection*’ does not conflict with the current uses of the term in adopted ISPMs.

Current definition

Inspection	Official visual examination of plants, plant products or other regulated articles to determine if pests are present or to determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; formerly “inspect”]
-------------------	---

Proposed revision

Inspection	Official visual examination of plants, plant products or other regulated articles to determine if pests are present or to determine compliance <u>verify conformity</u> with phytosanitary <u>requirements</u> regulations
-------------------	--

2.5 “test” (2021-005)

In January 2021, when concluding the proposed revision of ‘*inspection*’, the TPG recommended the consequential consistency revision of the definition of the related term ‘*test*’. The SC reviewed the proposal at its meeting in May 2021 and sent it for first consultation. The TPG in December 2021 and the SC-7 in May 2022 considered the consultation comments received. The SC sent the amended proposal for the revised definition for second consultation.

Following second consultation, the SC did not reach consensus on “test”, as the main point of contention had been whether the concepts of “inspection” and “test” could be distinguished based on one being visual (“inspection”) and the other (“test”) not being visual, given that some tests include visual observations.

During the TPG November 2022 meeting, the term “test” was further discussed and changes were proposed to the definition to further clarify the concept and address the concerns raised within the SC. The SC-7 in May 2023 reviewed the proposed revision and is now proposing for third consultation a revised definition considerably different from former consultation versions.

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

- (1) “using for example chemical, molecular, serological, or morphological characterization,” has been added as some examples of types of methods that could be used for tests and to illustrate the distinction between “test” and “inspection”.

- (2) Through Article VII.2f of the Convention and the definition of *compliance procedure (for a consignment)*, the terms ‘*compliance*’ and ‘*non-compliance*’ are linked with consignments, and the ‘General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs’ stipulates ‘*conformity*’ be used in other cases. As *test* has a broader scope than only consignments, the term ‘*compliance*’ is therefore substituted by ‘*conformity*’.
- (3) The word ‘*determine*’ in relation to “compliance” is substituted by ‘*verify*’ in consistency with wording in similar definitions.

Current definition

Test	Official examination of plants, plant products or other regulated articles , other than visual, to determine if pests are present, identify pests or determine compliance with specific phytosanitary requirements [FAO, 1990; revised CPM, 2018]
-------------	--

Proposed revision

Test	Official examination, <u>using for example chemical, molecular, serological, or morphological characterization,</u> of plants, plant products or other regulated articles , other than visual, to identify pests or determine if regulated pests are present, or determine compliance <u>verify conformity</u> with specific phytosanitary requirements
-------------	--

Appendix 6: Draft annex to ISPM 37: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (2018-011), priority 3

DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 37: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (*Tephritidae*) (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	2023-05-25
Document category	Draft annex to ISPM 37
Current document stage	To second 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 Standards 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. 2022-07 First consultation. 2023-05 SC-7 revised and approved for second 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 2022-05 SC-7 changed title to <i>Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)</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 (*Tephritidae*)

1. Introduction

National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) use a variety of available information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO reports, pest records) related to the host status of fruit to fruit flies 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 available information, and the terms used in such information to describe hosts do not always align with those defined in the core text of this standard, which can lead to trade disruption. This annex promotes harmonization by outlining the criteria that should be used when evaluating available information to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies (*Tephritidae*) 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. The annex provides guidance on interpretation of available information only in relation to undamaged fruit, based on the definitions and requirements set out in the core text of this standard.

2. Terms for the host status categories used in this standard

Many terms are used in published literature to describe the host status of fruit-to-fruit flies including “potential host”, “artificial host”, “conditional non-host”, “preferred host”, “general host”, “wild host”

and “alternative host”. National plant protection organizations should, however, use one of the three host status categories described in the Definitions section of this standard: natural host, conditional host, and non-host.

3. Criteria for evaluating available information

3.1 General criteria

When determining host status based on available information, NPPOs should assess the quality (i.e. completeness, reliability and relevance) of the information by considering whether it provides the following:

- an accurate identification of the plant species (scientific name and authority) or cultivar, with supporting evidence (e.g. published keys and taxonomic publications 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. any pest-control measures applied in the area, any phytosanitary measures applied in the area, 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);
- evidence of the presence of the target fruit fly, or other fruit fly species, or both, in the sampled area before and during sampling (e.g. trap records);
- details of the fruit-collection conditions (e.g. commercial or non-commercial environment, harvested from the plant or collected after falling to the ground);
- a description of the fruit-handling procedures (e.g. harvesting procedures, post-harvest processing and treatment, transportation procedures);
- a description of the fruit-sampling method (e.g. number and distribution of plants sampled and number of fruits sampled per plant);
- details of the condition of the skin or rind (e.g. rind thickness);
- details of whether the fruit is damaged or not, the cause of any damage (e.g. mechanical or natural damage), and the extent of the damage;
- details of the stage of fruit maturity (or other indicators of ripeness, such as dry matter content, colour, sugar content, standardized or objective ripeness scale);
- if used, a description of the fruit-dissection method (e.g. peeling and fruit cutting for detection of eggs or larvae);
- if used, a description of the fruit-holding method (e.g. maturity of fruits, temperature, humidity, day length, substrate for pupation including soil moisture) for determination of infestation;
- where there is infestation, a description of the fruit fly rearing method for development to adults (taking into consideration that eggs and larvae should not have been transferred from infested fruit to artificial diet for rearing);
- where there is infestation, a clear presentation of fruit fly rearing results, indicating the number of fruit fly adults reared per fruit or per weight of fruit and the total number and weight of the fruit sample under suitable conditions;
- an accurate identification of the fruit fly species (scientific name and authority) reared from the fruit together with supporting evidence (e.g. published keys and taxonomic publications used for fruit fly species identification, verification of fruit fly species by a specialist taxonomist, photographs, molecular identification, voucher specimens); and
- in the absence of infestation, a clear presentation of fruit fly rearing results (e.g. no eggs or larvae, no pupation, no viable fruit fly adults reared from the plant species or cultivar under suitable conditions).

In addition to these general evaluation criteria, further information is required for each host status category as described in sections 3.2 to 3.4 of this annex.

3.2 Natural host

The information used to determine natural host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults under clearly described natural conditions and evidence of development to viable adults.

National plant protection organizations should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1 of this annex, the information available also provides details of the viability of emergent adults in terms of their size, flight ability, longevity and fecundity.

3.3 Conditional host

The information used to determine conditional host status should contain evidence of both infestation and development to viable adults from trials under semi-natural field conditions as set out in section 2 of this standard, with published methodological details and results.

National plant protection organizations should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1 of this annex, the information available also provides details of the viability of emergent adults in terms of their size, flight ability, longevity and fecundity.

3.4 Non-host

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 trials or trials conducted under semi-natural conditions as set out in section 2 of this standard, with published methodological details and results. If this information is not available, data from laboratory experiments may be used.

If the information on non-host status is derived from field surveillance by fruit sampling, NPPOs should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1 of this annex, the information available also provides 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).

If the information on non-host status is derived from field trials or from trials conducted under semi-natural conditions, there are no further criteria for evaluation of the information other than the general evaluation criteria listed in section 3.1 of this annex.

If the information on non-host status is derived from laboratory experiments, NPPOs should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 3.1 of this annex, the information available also provides the following:

- details of the fruit fly 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, unless wild types are added during the maintenance of the colony), substrate used for egg collection (preferably fruit substrate));
- a description of the fruit fly rearing method used for maintenance of the colony (e.g. 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 (fruit fly species identified and 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

The available information related to the host status of plant species or cultivars to fruit flies has varying levels of quality (i.e. completeness, reliability and relevance) and this will, in turn, influence the level of uncertainty associated with the host status determination. As a general rule, the reliability of a host record diminishes with the age of the publication. Further guidance on the quality of information can be found in ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*), ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) and IPPC Secretariat (2021).

The quality of the information should be assessed based on the design of the method used to determine the type of host (e.g. sample size, number of replicates), the presentation of results and the expertise of the contributors.

The completeness of the information should be assessed against the criteria listed in the section on General requirements in this standard and the evaluation criteria listed in section 3 of this annex. National plant protection organizations should consider the key elements for the determination of host status to be the identification of the plant species or cultivar and the fruit fly species by a specialist taxonomist, the deposition of voucher specimens of plant and fruit fly species, and the details provided of the fruit origin and condition.

The quality of the information sources will dictate the level of uncertainty associated with the resulting host status determination: the greater the quality of information, 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.

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

- A new interception record lacks relevant information or contains unconfirmed information (e.g. life stage not mentioned, the fruit fly association with the fruit is unclear, quality of fruit not mentioned).
- A new plant species or cultivar is introduced into an area where a fruit fly species is present, or 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 or cultivar should be considered for its potential as a natural or conditional host until it can be confirmed otherwise).
- here is a taxonomic change in a plant or fruit fly species. If there is a taxonomic change that splits a fruit fly species into two or more species, the host range of each valid species could potentially be different. Similarly, if two or more fruit fly species that were thought to be different are now synonymized, the singular new species is likely to have a broader host range. Therefore, particular attention should be paid to taxonomic changes when evaluating host records.

The result of an analysis of host status should be accompanied by a determination of the level and nature of the associated uncertainty. If the level of uncertainty is too high, and the NPPO cannot determine host status, appropriate field surveillance by fruit sampling or field trials should be used to determine host status (see step C in the section on General requirements in this standard).

5. Application of the host status of a fruit to a fruit fly in pest risk analysis

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

- The host status of a fruit to a fruit fly species (including the level and nature of the associated uncertainty) should be considered:
 - in the initiation stage;
 - 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. inspection, phytosanitary treatment); and
 - in risk communication (e.g. consultation and sharing of information).
- 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.
- 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 described in detail so that phytosanitary measures can be selected that are appropriate for the level of pest risk posed.

6. References

IPPC Secretariat. 2021. *Pest status guide – Understanding the principal requirements for pest status determination*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. xv + 77 pp. www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb6103en