



REPORT

Expert Working Group on Field Inspection (2021-018) (Annex to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*))

Tokyo, Japan

16–20 October 2023

IPPC Secretariat

IPPC Secretariat. 2024. *Expert Working Group on Field Inspection (2021-018) (Annex to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection)), 16–20 October 2023, Tokyo, Japan*. Rome. FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2024



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
1.2 Presentation of the standard setting process and the role of participants	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. Review of the specification	4
4.1 Considerations for the development of the draft annex to ISPM 23 on field inspection	4
5. Review of discussion papers.....	5
5.1 Consistency issues with ISPM 23	5
6. Development of the text of the draft annex to ISPM 23.....	5
6.1 Brainstorming session to develop the outline of the draft annex	5
6.2 Elaboration of the text of the draft annex.....	9
7. Any other business.....	19
8. Close of the meeting	19
Appendix 1: Agenda.....	20
Appendix 2: Documents list	22
Appendix 3: Participants list	24
Appendix 4: References	26

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”) opened the meeting of the Expert Working Group (EWG) on Field Inspection (2021-018) (Annex to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*)), welcomed all participants, and thanked the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of Japan for hosting the meeting and for proposing the topic in the first place.
- [2] Masatoshi KOBAYASHI (Japan), the director of the NPPO’s international affairs office, delivered his welcome remarks, thanking phytosanitary experts and the secretariat and affirming the NPPO’s continued support for IPPC activities. The steward for the draft annex, Masahiro SAI (Japan), welcomed all participants and thanked them for offering to take part in the EWG.
- [3] The participants then all introduced themselves.

1.2 Presentation of the standard setting process and the role of participants

- [4] The secretariat delivered a presentation summarizing the standard setting process and outlined the roles of the EWG participants, explaining that the experts contribute as global experts rather than as national or regional representatives.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Election of the chairperson

- [5] The EWG elected Akosua Agyekumwaa ADOFO (Ghana) as chairperson.

2.2 Election of the rapporteur

- [6] The EWG elected Laura Jayne STEVENS (United Kingdom) as rapporteur.

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

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

3. Administrative matters

- [8] The secretariat introduced the documents list (Appendix 2) and the participants list (Appendix 3) and invited participants to notify the secretariat of any information that required updating in the participants list or was missing from it.
- [9] Subsequently, the secretariat briefed the EWG on the issuance of a call for papers on “field inspection”, informing the EWG that discussion papers from two NPPOs¹ had been received in response to the call.

4. Review of the specification

4.1 Considerations for the development of the draft annex to ISPM 23 on field inspection

- [10] The steward introduced Specification 74 (*Field inspection*)² and its tasks and outlined some considerations for the development of the draft annex.³ In particular, the steward pointed out two potential options for how to proceed with the drafting of the annex for consideration by the EWG: developing the text as an annex to ISPM 23 according to Specification 74 or developing it as a stand-alone standard and submitting a recommendation to this effect to the Standards Committee (SC).

¹ 13_EWG_FI_2023_Oct; 14_EWG_FI_2023_Oct.

² Specification 74: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91862/>

³ 05_EWG_FI_2023_Oct.

- [11] Regarding the former, the steward pointed out the linkages to ISPM 23 and other ISPMs the EWG should take into consideration for the drafting of the annex.

5. Review of discussion papers

- [12] The EWG considered all the discussion papers⁴ presented by its members, the papers submitted by two NPPOs⁵ through the call for papers and the paper “Consistency issues with ISPM 23”⁶ prepared by the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG).

5.1 Consistency issues with ISPM 23

- [13] The secretariat presented the paper “Consistency issues with ISPM 23”⁷ and explained that it was developed by the TPG to highlight inconsistencies throughout the standard.
- [14] The secretariat noted that, during the 2023 IPPC Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation, a proposal for the revision of ISPM 23 had been submitted and this submission would be considered by the Task Force on Topics and the SC. It was also pointed out that the primary objective and the task of this EWG was not to revise the standard but to provide proposals useful to its revision to be submitted to the SC as well as new definitions to be proposed to be added to the TPG’s work programme.

6. Development of the text of the draft annex to ISPM 23

- [15] The secretariat drew the attention of the EWG to the reference documents for drafting ISPMs: the *IPPC style guide* and annotated templates, ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) and the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*.⁸
- [16] The secretariat highlighted that, when drafting the annex, consistent ISPM terminology needed to be ensured. If a suitable term was available in ISPM 5, then that term should be used; particular attention should also be paid to the use of the words “should”, “shall”, “must”, “may” and “can”.

6.1 Brainstorming session to develop the outline of the draft annex

- [17] The EWG discussed the discussion papers and the tasks outlined in Specification 74.

Task 1 of Specification 74: Consider the requirements relating to field inspection described in existing standards (e.g. ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas), ISPM 10, ISPM 12, ISPM 20, ISPM 36, ISPM 38, ISPM 45 (Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions))

- [18] For the drafting of the text, the EWG considered the following ISPMs and relevant sections thereof:
- ISPM 10 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*) – section 3 (Documentation and review) and section 3.2 (Additional declaration on phytosanitary certificates);
 - ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) – section 6.2 (Considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for export in certain re-export cases);
 - ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) – section 4.6 (Legal authority for the NPPO), section 5.1.5 (Audit and compliance procedures), section 5.1.5.1

⁴ 06_EWG_FI_2023_Oct; 07_EWG_FI_2023_Oct; 08_EWG_FI_2023_Oct; 09_EWG_FI_2023_Oct; 10_EWG_FI_2023_Oct; 11_EWG_FI_2023_Oct; 12_EWG_FI_2023_Oct.

⁵ 13_EWG_FI_2023_Oct; 14_EWG_FI_2023_Oct.

⁶ 15_EWG_FI_2023_Oct.

⁷ 15_EWG_FI_2023_Oct.

⁸ *IPPC style guide*: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/132/>; ISPM 5: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/622/>; *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85024/>

(Audit of procedures in the exporting country), section 5.1.5.2 (Compliance procedure at import), section 6.2 (Records), section 8.1 (System review) and section 8.2 (Incident review);

- ISPM 31 (Methodologies for sampling of consignments);
- ISPM 36 (*Integrated measures for plants for planting*) – Background section and Annex 1;
- ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) – section 4.1.2 (Field inspection), section 4.2 (Sampling of lots) and section 4.3 (Testing);
- ISPM 45 (Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions); and
- ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*) – section 4.2 (Responsibilities of an NPPO auditing in its own territory) and section 4.3 (Responsibilities of an NPPO auditing in an exporting country).

[19] An EWG member proposed that the producers' responsibilities be included in the annex, but the EWG agreed that the draft ISPM should provide guidance to NPPOs on how to set requirements for producers. The secretariat used as an example the draft annex *Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood* (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*), which stated the responsibilities of NPPOs and participating entities.

[20] Another EWG member suggested that annexes to ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*) could have more details explaining how inspection should be carried out to better detect and identify specific pests.

[21] The Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) representative commented that a proposal for the development of a guide outlining the implementation of field inspections, including the process of conducting field inspections, could be submitted to the IC. The secretariat concurred, emphasizing that such information would be suitable for inclusion in implementation material, as ISPMs are developed to establish requirements.

Task 2 of Specification 74: Review examples of phytosanitary import requirements and guidance for field inspection from different NPPOs

[22] The chairperson highlighted that some examples had already been included in the discussion papers and would be considered during drafting.

[23] The IC representative pointed out that field inspections are not based only on the import requirements of an importing country but they can be carried out by an exporting country to facilitate the export. Consequently, it was essential to consider two distinct scenarios in this context.

Task 3 of Specification 74: Review guidance for visual examination of plants in the field developed by regional plant protection organizations and industry bodies

[24] One EWG member proposed that the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization standard on inspection of consignments (EPPO, 2009) be considered.

Task 4 of Specification 74: Identify any requirements in ISPM 23 that can be applied to field inspection

[25] The steward introduced a reference paper aimed at addressing this task, identifying the sections of ISPM 23 that could potentially be applied to field inspection. Additionally, the paper delved into task 8 on the amendments that should be made accordingly to ISPM 23.

[26] Given the assumption that the sections identified would apply to field inspection, the EWG considered the following:

- Scope;
- Outline of requirements;
- General requirements;

- Inspection objectives;
- Assumptions involved in the application of inspections;
- Responsibility for inspection;
- Requirements for inspectors;
- Other considerations for inspection;
- Inspection in relation to pest risk analysis;
- Specific requirements;
- Examination of documents associated with a consignment;
- Verification of consignment identity and integrity;
- Visual examination;
- Pests;
- Compliance with phytosanitary regulations;
- Inspection methods;
- Inspection outcome;
- Review of inspection systems; and
- Transparency.

[27] **Integrity.** Regarding the possibility of referring to the section of ISPM 23 on “Verification of consignment identity and integrity”, the steward explained that references to integrity in the main body of ISPM 23 related only to consignments and not field inspection. However, the content of this section had the capacity to cover both types of inspections.

[28] **Identity of the field.** The steward reminded the EWG that the term “identity (of a consignment)” is defined in ISPM 5; therefore, the group should reflect on a proposed definition of “identity of field”. The secretariat informed the EWG that there was no need to create a new definition of “identity of field” if it was used only in one standard but an explanation was provided. The IC representative felt that the word “identity” could also be used outside of the phytosanitary arena. The EWG agreed to explain “identity of the field” in the text of the annex during drafting.

Task 5 of Specification 74: Describe the concept, objectives and process of field inspection in the phytosanitary context, especially the difference between the concept and objectives of field inspection and those of specific surveillance (e.g. detection surveys)

[29] **Concept of field inspection.** The EWG discussed and agreed that the aim of field inspection is to inspect plants in fields as well as in nurseries, under protected cultivation and in controlled environments. The group also agreed that field inspection is applied to detect regulated pests or visible signs and symptoms of regulated pests and to verify conformity with phytosanitary requirements. Moreover, field inspection may be used as a phytosanitary requirement (both by importing and exporting countries) or as a post-entry quarantine measure.

[30] **Objectives.** The EWG analysed the inspection objectives set out in ISPM 23 and acknowledged that the objectives of inspection of consignments and field inspection are the same, with the major difference being in the application.

[31] **Difference between field inspection and surveillance.** The EWG agreed that inspection focuses on plants while surveillance focuses on an area. The development of this concept can be found in section 6.2 of this report (Elaboration of the text of the draft annex).

Task 6 of Specification 74: Consider the need, and suggest wording, for definitions of “field inspection” and “growing season inspection” if the latter term is needed in the annex, and

consider the necessity of replacing “growing season” with “growing period” as defined in ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)

[32] **Definition of field inspection.** The EWG discussed the existing definition of “field” in ISPM 5, and eventually agreed with the following definition of “field inspection”: “Field inspection is a phytosanitary measure to inspect field crops, seed crops, mother plants and other plants in fields as well as in nurseries, under protected cultivation and in controlled environments.”

[33] More details are provided in section 6.2 of this report.

[34] **Definition of growing season inspection.** Regarding the necessity to define “growing season inspection”, the EWG agreed there was no need for the definition because the term “growing season inspection” had been removed from ISPM 5 in 1999 upon adoption of ISPM 10, which provided more detail on pest free places of production, and because an explanation of the concept of field inspection was provided in this draft annex.

[35] **Definition of growing period.** The EWG agreed, for consistency, to use “growing period” instead of “growing season” throughout the draft annex as defined in ISPM 5:

Period when a **plant** species actively grows in an **area, place of production or production site**

Task 7 of Specification 74: Describe the requirements specific to field inspection, including ...

[36] The EWG addressed this task during the drafting of the annex (see section 6.2 of this report).

Task 8 of Specification 74: Identify potential consequential changes to the text of ISPM 23

[37] The secretariat emphasized the importance of aligning changes with the EWG’s objectives while drafting the annex. It was noted that proposed modifications would be subject to further review by a potential EWG tasked with the revision of ISPM 23, pending the outcome of the proposal for revision of ISPM 23 submitted in response to the 2023 Call for Topics (see section 5.1).

[38] At the suggestion of an EWG member, the EWG agreed that the standard should be more general in scope, covering both consignments and fields, with field inspection addressed in the annex. This decision took into consideration the insights shared by the steward in his reference paper submitted to the EWG.

[39] **Consequential changes to ISPM 23.** The major consequential changes applied to the text of ISPM 23 by the EWG were to:

- delete the reference to import and export in the text, especially in the sections on “Scope” and “Outline of requirements”, to make the ISPM more general;
- replace “consignment” with “plants, plant products and other regulated articles” throughout the text;
- include references to link to, or cover, field inspection (e.g. Article IV.2(a)); and
- replace the result of inspection in the “Outline of requirements” section with “[...] contributes to the decision to be made as to whether the plants, plant products and regulated articles meet phytosanitary requirements”.

[40] The EWG elaborated a paper detailing the proposed revisions that would be submitted to the SC.

Task 9 of Specification 74: Formulate a recommendation as to whether this annex would be more appropriate as a stand-alone ISPM or annexed to an ISPM other than ISPM 23

[41] The EWG discussed whether this annex would be more appropriate as a stand-alone ISPM or annexed to an ISPM other than ISPM 23. The secretariat stressed the importance of agreeing on this point, as it would affect the work of the EWG.

[42] One EWG member suggested a stand-alone ISPM with specific annexes, such as one dedicated to seeds. Another member supported the idea of a stand-alone ISPM, citing the differences between the inspection

of consignments and field inspection. Most members, however, leaned towards drafting the text as an annex, recognizing the challenge of a single standard encompassing all variations of field inspection.

[43] Eventually, the EWG agreed to recommend that the text be annexed to ISPM 23 and that they would identify the consequential changes to ISPM 23 to make the annex fit the standard.

Task 10 of Specification 74: Consider implementation of the annex by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the Standards Committee

[44] The EWG discussed the potential implementation issues.

[45] Prompted by the IC representative's input, the EWG recognized that while field inspection is referenced in other ISPMs and frequently employed by contracting parties, there is a lack of comprehensive implementation guidance material to support contracting parties in the implementation of field inspection. Consequently, the EWG proposed the development of a guide, complete with detailed case studies and examples to assist contracting parties in effectively implementing field inspection.

[46] An EWG member pointed out that, in the case of a consignment, it is always the inspector who inspects it, while for field inspection there are cases where unauthorized personnel conduct the inspection as well. Another EWG member proposed that an accreditation programme be used and that authorization be described in the guide. However, the EWG recalled that requirements for authorization are already described in ISPM 45. One participant suggested that guidance also be included on how an importing country can verify the effectiveness of field inspection required as an import requirement.

[47] In addition, the group agreed to suggest inclusion of more information on pests' signs and symptoms in diagnostic protocols (DPs).

[48] Eventually, with inputs from the EWG, the IC representative drafted the following subjects that could be included in the potential guide:

- how to assess the pest selected for field inspection;
- how to select and approve fields for field inspection and the procedure to be used;
- inspection patterns often used in field inspection;
- how to select plants for close examination;
- how to select samples for testing;
- what data should be collected and maintained by producers, authorized entities and NPPOs;
- the producers' responsibilities;
- what are the requirements other than the pest to be included in the field inspection;
- audit points for producers and for entities authorized by the NPPO;
- if actual inspection is conducted by producers or companies who are not authorized entities, how to manage and recognize it; and
- how importing countries effectively monitor the implementation of field inspection required as an import requirement.

[49] In addition, it was proposed that an appendix be created to list pests and hosts for which field inspection is often required.

6.2 Elaboration of the text of the draft annex

[50] The EWG drafted an outline for the structure of the annex and then elaborated the content, modifying the structure as appropriate as the draft text was developed.

- [51] **Concept of field inspection.** One EWG member proposed a definition of field inspection based on the current definition of “inspection” given in ISPM 5,⁹ “to determine if pests are present or to determine the compliance with phytosanitary regulations”, while another EWG member pointed out the definition of “field inspection” from the 1996 version of ISPM 5, which read as follows:

Inspection of plants in a field during the growing season

- [52] An EWG member stated that, at the time, it had been proposed that the term “growing season inspection” entirely replace “field inspection” to avoid certain ambiguities about the word “field” and the French and Spanish terms then had to be changed. For this reason, the EWG questioned whether the term “field” should be used in the draft annex as described in ISPM 5 or whether the text should be drafted to avoid it. However, the EWG concluded that the latter option would be confusing.

- [53] **Definition of plants.** Referring to the scope of ISPM 23, one EWG member stated that field inspection is conducted on plants, not on plant products or regulated articles, leading the EWG to define what “plants” are. After discussion, the EWG agreed to use the definition of “plants” as described in ISPM 5:

Living plants and parts thereof, including **seeds** and germplasm

- [54] One EWG member proposed that reference be made to the paragraph from the section on “Reason for the annex to the standard” in Specification 74:

Field inspection is a phytosanitary measure to inspect field crops, seed crops, mother plants and other plants in fields (including plants in open fields, in nurseries, under protected cultivation and in controlled environments)

- [55] However, some EWG members raised concerns that the examples in the brackets conflicted with the definition of “field” in ISPM 5, which reads as:

Plot of land with defined boundaries within a **place of production** on which a **commodity** is grown

- [56] As the definition referred to defined boundaries, narrowing down the scope of field inspection, the EWG considered several alternatives to the term “field”, such as “collection in field”, “production site” and “place of production”. Eventually, the EWG agreed to broaden the definition: “Field inspection is a phytosanitary measure to inspect field crops, seed crops, mother plants and other plants in fields as well as in nurseries, under protected cultivation and in controlled environments.”

- [57] Based on the specification and upon a proposal by the IC representative that clarification be included about field inspection always being required by the NPPO of the exporting country, the EWG agreed that “field inspection may be required by importing countries as a phytosanitary import requirement or by the NPPO of an exporting country, aimed at reducing, directly or indirectly, the pest risk associated with the international movement of plants”. This clarification addressed the dual perspective that even though it is an import requirement, some NPPOs require field inspection to maintain the quality of their exports. This would also clarify that field inspection can be applied both by importing and exporting countries.

- [58] **Definition of pest.** The EWG discussed the term “pest”. One EWG member raised a query regarding whether the focus of field inspection is all-encompassing or specifically aimed at regulated pests only. Observing that inspectors note everything during field inspection, another EWG member proposed that the term “pests” be used, as it covered a broad spectrum and so was comprehensive. However, another EWG member replied that, during the inspection, the inspector usually looks for pests related to a given consignment or destination rather than examining everything, which may be part of surveillance. Another member proposed that the phrase “pests of concern” be used, taking into account the possibility of identifying new pests during the pest risk analysis (PRA). Considering that the definition of

⁹ **Official visual examination of plants, plant products or other regulated articles** to determine if **pests** are present or to determine compliance with **phytosanitary regulations**.

“inspection” in ISPM 5¹⁰ referred to “pests”, the EWG agreed to use the definition of “pest”¹¹ as defined in the same standard.

- [59] The EWG then agreed that this section of the draft annex should state that field inspection is applied to detect regulated pests or visible signs and symptoms of regulated pests and to verify conformity with phytosanitary requirements, in line with the revision of the ISPM 5 term “inspection” (2017-005) being considered by the SC for potential adoption by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures.
- [60] Following a proposal by one EWG member, the EWG agreed to incorporate into the “Scope” section the provision that field inspection may also be used as a post-entry quarantine measure.
- [61] **Field inspection during dormant stage.** One EWG member suggested that the EWG consider the scenario of field inspection during the dormant stage, for example in winter, or in nurseries featuring large plants. The IC representative acknowledged that field inspection is sometimes conducted during the dormant stage but felt there was no need to specify it in the “Scope”; it could, however, be included elsewhere in the text of the annex. The EWG agreed to include the statement “for the purpose of this annex the field inspection means inspection of plants during growing season or dormant stage” with the addition of “to ensure conformity with phytosanitary requirements”.
- [62] In relation to another section, on “Concept of field inspection”, the EWG concurred with the steward that text be included to stipulate that field inspection should be required only if technically justified, based on PRA.
- [63] **Objectives.** The EWG analysed the inspection objectives outlined in ISPM 23 and acknowledged that the objectives of inspection of a consignment and field inspection are essentially identical.
- [64] **Scope.** The EWG analysed the inspection objectives set out in the specification:

The annex should apply to inspections in the field in relation to plants destined for international trade. It should provide the general and specific requirements for field inspection that will apply if a national plant protection organization (NPPO) uses field inspection as a stand-alone phytosanitary measure or as one component of a systems approach. The annex should define a standardized concept, objectives and process by which the NPPO in the exporting country may conduct field inspection and use it as the basis for phytosanitary certification.

- [65] **Regulated pests.** The EWG agreed to refer to regulated pests.
- [66] After the discussion, the EWG concluded that the scope of the annex was to describe inspections of plants in the field for international trade and it aimed to provide the necessary requirements for field inspection that an NPPO could use as a stand-alone phytosanitary measure or as one component of a systems approach. An EWG member suggested that the phrase “in combination with other measures to verify conformity with phytosanitary requirements” be added, which would cover the use of field inspection as part of the measures to maintain pest free production sites. The EWG then stated that the annex outlined the assumptions integral to field inspection.
- [67] Then the EWG focused on how field inspection is conducted. One EWG member stated that field inspection is not feasible when symptoms are not visible; testing is therefore needed in such situations. Another EWG member proposed the inclusion of a statement in the “Scope” section indicating that field inspection is not an appropriate method when pests do not result in symptoms (when plants do not display visible symptoms or pests are not visually detectable). Ultimately, the EWG decided to not include this in the “Scope” but acknowledged circumstances where measures other than field inspection should be considered.

¹⁰ Official visual examination of plants, plant products or other regulated articles to determine if pests are present or to determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations.

¹¹ Any species, strain or biotype of **plant**, animal or **pathogenic** agent injurious to **plants** or **plant products**.

- [68] One EWG member underscored the importance of differentiating between inspection and surveillance: the latter focused on an area while the former focused on inspection of plants. The EWG discussed in what part of the draft annex this should be clarified. Another EWG member emphasized the need to consider cultivated and uncultivated plants as well as the different process for phytosanitary certification following field inspection.
- [69] **Conformity or compliance.** The EWG, considering the pending revision of the definition of “inspection” in ISPM 5 that included the phrase “to verify conformity with phytosanitary requirements”, agreed to use “conformity” rather than “compliance” and apply it throughout the draft annex.
- [70] **Difference between inspection and surveillance.** As outlined in Specification 74, the EWG agreed to state that field inspection and surveillance are both phytosanitary actions and, although they may be conducted using similar procedures and methods, their concept and objectives differ.
- [71] Then, the EWG proceeded to clarify that field inspection is employed to detect regulated pests or visible signs and symptoms of regulated pests and to verify conformity with phytosanitary requirements. This decision was taken following a proposal by an EWG member that “to determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations” be replaced with “to verify conformity with phytosanitary requirements” for consistency and substitute “regulations” with “requirements” in line with the ongoing revision of the term “inspection” in ISPM 5.
- [72] Eventually, an EWG member stressed the importance of highlighting that inspection focuses on plants while surveillance focuses on an area and the EWG agreed to the proposal to explicitly repeat the statement that surveillance of an area is an official process to determine the presence or absence of pests in an area (detection survey), to establish the boundaries of an area considered to be infested by or free from a pest (delimiting survey), or to verify the characteristics of a pest population in an area (monitoring survey).
- [73] **Assumptions involved in the application of field inspection.** The EWG agreed that this section should build upon section 1.2 of ISPM 23. They therefore outlined the assumptions underpinning the use of field inspection, which is used to detect the presence of pests or to determine or verify pest incidence in a field.
- [74] One EWG member suggested the addition of text to say that field inspection is not applicable in cases when plants do not display visual symptoms or pests are not visually detectable. This clarification would explain when laboratory testing would be needed and when other measures should be considered.
- [75] One EWG member presented a scenario wherein regulated pests may be latent and potentially transmitted without visible signs. Another member pointed out that, even if the pests are latent, symptoms might still be detectable and the latent stage could be managed by timing. However, another EWG member suggested that this scenario not be included as an assumption, as it contrasted with the assumption on pests of concern (see next paragraph). The EWG reached a consensus to omit this assumption.
- [76] Another assumption that was proposed was as follows: “pests of concern are present in or on the plants, and the pests are visually detectable with their presence, symptoms, or signs at the appropriate time”. However, one EWG member pointed out that the wording assumed that pests are present while they might not be, leading the EWG to agree to revise the statement accordingly.
- [77] Another assumption proposed was that field inspection is operationally more practical and effective than inspection of consignments (e.g. mother plants, rootstocks). The EWG agreed with the addition of this proposed text.
- [78] One EWG member proposed the inclusion of the assumption that, if the plant is healthy, it is therefore assumed that the other parts of the plant are healthy or free of pests. Another EWG member replied that if the symptoms are not visible, it cannot be assumed that the plant is healthy and there was no need to specify this in the annex. The EWG agreed to omit this assumption. Consequently, the EWG considered

the assumption that, if the pest is detected on the plants, it is likely that the commodity for international trade may be infested.

[79] **Other considerations for field inspection.** The EWG agreed that some factors contained in section 1.5 of ISPM 23 were applicable to field inspection and to list additional factors that may be considered.

[80] There was a proposal to add “growing period” or “growing season” to the list of factors, but it was noted that the term “growing period” is defined in ISPM 5 while “growing season” is not. Consequently, the EWG agreed to omit both terms from the list and instead use “phenological stage of plants” as the designated factor.

[81] The EWG agreed to add the following as factors:

- pest status;
- pest prevalence;
- pest biology;
- phenological stage of plants;
- timing and frequency of inspections;
- field size and configuration;
- difficulty of pest detection on a specific plant;
- biotic versus abiotic factors; and
- objective of field inspection.

[82] One EWG member proposed the addition of “difficulty of pest detection on a specific commodity plant” to the list, this being based on a factor included in section 1.5 of ISPM 23, and to keep the reference to “commodity” because a plant is a commodity. Another EWG member pointed out that the plant only becomes a commodity when it is being moved for trade and eventually the EWG agreed to omit reference to “commodity” and refer only to “difficulty of pest detection on a specific plant”.

[83] One EWG member suggested that text be added to state that some plants may not show symptoms. The EWG acknowledged that some varieties of plants may or may not show symptoms but agreed that these cases would be included in the factor relating to difficulty of pest detection.

[84] Regarding the factor on phenological stage, the EWG initially considered also referring to the growing or cultivation period of plants. They noted that “cultivation period” may be “considered the entire length that plants are at a site, whether they are actively growing or dormant”, but they ultimately decided to omit “growing or cultivation period of plants” because this was already covered by “phenological stage of plants”.

[85] The EWG agreed to the proposal of an EWG member to include “biotic versus abiotic factors” in the list of factors. The EWG also discussed the inclusion of the need for inspectors to obtain access to the facility, but it was agreed to either include it as a requirement for inspectors or in the assumptions.

[86] In response to proposals from EWG members, the EWG agreed to add “pest prevalence” as well as “objective of field inspection” to the list.

[87] **Specific requirements for field inspection.** The EWG agreed on the following three specific requirements for field inspection:

- examination of relevant documents;
- verification of identity of field and plants; and
- visual examination for pests and other phytosanitary requirements.

[88] Initially, the EWG agreed to include “Documentation and reporting” as a fourth specific requirement, because following field inspection a report is issued for future use. However, an EWG member pointed out that documentation and reporting are not inspection but just the recording of the findings of

inspection. Therefore, the EWG agreed to create a separate section specifically for documentation and reporting.

[89] An EWG member proposed the inclusion of a fifth technical requirement on the examination of documents related to the field (e.g. use of fertilizers). The EWG agreed that this case would fall into the subsection on documentation.

[90] The EWG included the following sentence: “Certain aspects of inspection may differ depending on the purpose such as detection of the pest or incidence level.”

[91] **Examination of relevant documents.** The EWG discussed the examples contained in section 2.1 of ISPM 23 and considered several of those relevant for field inspection (e.g. treatment documents or certificates, certificate of origin, import permit and laboratory reports). The secretariat emphasized the benefit of not limiting the discussion to these examples, highlighting the utility of annexes when the core text of the standard does not provide enough guidance.

[92] The EWG deemed the following requirements for the documents as mandatory: complete, consistent, accurate, valid, and not fraudulent.

[93] Then, the EWG compiled a list of the examples of documents that may be associated with field inspection. The steward sought clarification from the EWG on whether the annex should indicate when these documents are examined. Some EWG members replied that documents may be examined before, during or even after field inspection and concluded that the examination of documents is part of the field inspection. Therefore, the EWG agreed to apply a general approach. The EWG then considered and listed examples of these documents:

- “certification programme documents” (e.g. seed potato certification programmes, pest free area documentation) and “commercial invoices” for identity checks and cross reference, which would certify the origin of propagation material and confirm exactly what was bought;
- “traceability reports”, either electronic or in paper format, which are compulsory for some kind of propagation materials;
- “field maps and site plans”, subsequently expanded to “field maps, site plans, field identity document” to make it clear that this included document giving the location, not just the boundaries;
- “registration of field”;
- “previous inspection reports”, as field inspection may take place several times in a year;
- “previous test reports” (rather than “laboratory reports”) to be in line with ISPM 5 and because field inspection may take place several times in a year; and
- producers’ records.

[94] **Verification of identity of field and plants.** The EWG initially considered “Verification of identity and integrity” as the heading for this section but recognized that the term “integrity” referred to consignments and so agreed to omit this term throughout the draft annex. An EWG member stated that, even if it applied to the field, identity is part of integrity. The secretariat proposed that the EWG consider moving the attention away from identity and integrity, as those terms related to consignments in ISPM 5, and explained that the EWG might refer to the verification of documents during field inspection. Therefore, the EWG explored alternatives, with the IC representative proposing the title “Verification of information about field and plants” and another EWG member suggesting “Verification of conditions of field and plants”. The steward proposed “Verification of conditions about field and plants according to phytosanitary import requirements” with the aim of referring to the verification of either the phytosanitary import requirements or the documents submitted. Eventually, the EWG agreed that verification related to documents rather than conditions of plants and settled on “Verification of identity of field and plants”.

[95] **Identity of field.** Regarding “identity of field”, the steward reminded the EWG that “identity (of a consignment)” is defined in ISPM 5, therefore the group should reflect on a proposed definition of

“identity of field”. The secretariat informed the EWG that there was no need to create a new definition of “identity of field” if it was used only in this draft annex but an explanation could be provided in the text.

[96] **Officially acceptable documents.** One EWG member proposed “the verification of documents associated with field inspection is necessary to design and implement field inspections appropriately”, but other members noted that the purpose of the verification of documents was not correctly reflected in this statement. Consequently, the EWG revised the statement as follows: “The verification of identity of the field and plants is necessary to ensure that the field and plants subject to field inspection are in accordance with documents in the terms of species, varieties, type of material, phenological stage, age, category, location and production conditions.” The steward proposed that the text clarify that documents need to be officially acceptable, as the NPPO looks only at the documents that it deems necessary, and the EWG agreed. The revised paragraph read as follows: “The verification of identity of the field and plants is necessary to ensure that the field and plants subject to field inspection are in accordance with officially acceptable documents (e.g. species, varieties, phenological stage, location).”

[97] The secretariat then suggested that the EWG clarify in this section the meaning of “identity of field and plants” and the EWG stated that, for the purpose of the annex, “identity of the field and plants” meant plants in fields as well as in nurseries, under protected cultivation and in controlled environments and plants as defined in ISPM 5.

[98] **Visual examination for pests and other phytosanitary requirements.** The EWG agreed to have two subsections:

- Detection of pests; and
- Verification of conformity with phytosanitary requirements.

[99] **Detection of pests.** The EWG considered the section on pests in ISPM 23 and repeated that the “objective of field inspection is the detection of pest to meet phytosanitary requirements”. They also noted that the ability of an inspection to detect the pest with the desired confidence level depended on practical and statistical considerations such as the intensity of inspection.

[100] At the suggestion of the IC representative, the EWG agreed to include the phrase “to determine if a pest is present, or if it exceeds a specified tolerance level specific inspection pattern is selected”. One EWG member proposed the deletion of “specific”, as it was unclear by whom the inspection pattern was approved or agreed, and suggested that “inspection pattern” be replaced with “appropriate inspection method”, and the EWG agreed. The revised paragraph read as follows: “to determine if a pest is present, or if it exceeds a specified tolerance level an appropriate inspection method is selected”.

[101] An EWG member then proposed that the following paragraph be included from one of the discussion papers:

Field inspection methods should take into account objective of the field inspection, characteristic of the pest biology, size, symptoms, pest distribution patterns in field and suitable conditions for detection and in some cases the recommendation of the diagnostic protocols (ISPM 27).

[102] This would incorporate a reference to DPs, as countries might use their own national DPs. The EWG agreed.

[103] Finally, the EWG agreed that the field-inspection method should be based on transparent technical and operational criteria and should be consistently applied as described in ISPM 23.

[104] **Verification of conformity with phytosanitary requirements.** One EWG member proposed that “growing medium and substrate requirements” be included in the phytosanitary requirements listed in this section, referring to the cases where growing medium was used instead of soil, and the EWG agreed.

[105] Based on section 2.3.2 of ISPM 23, the EWG agreed to include “required growth stage” in the list of phytosanitary requirements.

- [106] The EWG also agreed to add “requirements for vicinity of the field”, referring to the areas in proximity to the production site, within which additional elements could be found during a field inspection.
- [107] **Field-inspection process.** Clarifying that ISPM 23 referred to inspection methods, the EWG outlined the structure of the field-inspection process according to Specification 74, with the following two subsections:
- Field-inspection circumstances; and
 - Consideration of field-inspection methods.
- [108] **Field-inspection circumstances.** Based on the proposals of the steward, the EWG agreed to list the circumstances under which a phytosanitary import requirement for field inspection may be technically justified.
- [109] One of the circumstances deemed crucial by the steward for carrying out field inspection was that the presence, symptoms, or signs of pests on plants are expressed at the appropriate time. The EWG agreed.
- [110] Upon the suggestion of the steward, the EWG agreed to say that field inspection could be “conducted in the vicinity around the field based on the pest distribution and capacity to spread”.
- [111] The third circumstance proposed by the steward was when field inspection is “combined with testing if pest freedom or a specific tolerance level is required for asymptomatic or unreliably symptomatic regulated pests”. One EWG member proposed that “asymptomatic” be replaced with “suspected presence of pest” to clarify that, if the presence of a pest is suspected, the inspector sends samples to the laboratory for confirmation. Another EWG member proposed that the circumstance be split to differentiate between field inspection combined with testing when pest freedom or a specific tolerance level is required and field inspection combined with testing to detect suspected presence of pests and unreliably symptomatic regulated pests. The EWG agreed.
- [112] The EWG also agreed to include in the list of circumstances the case when NPPOs of importing countries select field inspection as an appropriate option based on PRA.
- [113] The EWG agreed that field inspection could also be carried out to manage the risk of regulated pests that were difficult to detect during consignment inspections.
- [114] One EWG member proposed the inclusion of “high-value plants or plant products (e.g. seeds or propagation material) for which taking samples of consignments or lots for pest detection represents a high cost itself, added to the fact that in many cases, laboratory test destructive techniques are used”. Another EWG member proposed that the sentence be amended, because in the case of seed consignments, for example, an inspector might not see the spots on the seed but may see the disease on the plant, and field inspection would be more effective. Therefore, the EWG agreed to include as a circumstance the case when field inspection is “more effective than inspection of consignment (e.g. high value plant such as seed or plants for planting)”.
- [115] Recognizing that field inspection can be part of a systems approach or used to maintain a pest free place of production, the EWG agreed to include this circumstance, referring to ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) and ISPM 10.
- [116] **More suitable equivalent measures.** In accordance with Specification 74, the EWG drafted a section on situations where equivalent measures such as laboratory tests may be more suitable in order to provide assurance of freedom from targeted pests or when visual examination of plants may not be sufficient.
- [117] The EWG agreed to list some such situations:
- the pest is known to exhibit latency;
 - the phenological stage of plants is not appropriate for pest detection (e.g. young plants);
 - asymptomatic plants; and

- suspicious symptoms or deformations cannot be immediately identified.

[118] **Considerations for inspection methods according to the characteristics of pests and the best time and frequency for inspection.** The steward suggested some factors for consideration by the EWG.

[119] The first factor proposed was that “field inspections are generally undertaken during the pre-harvesting stage (or the growing period) and the timing and frequency depend on the pest, but at least once a year”. The EWG agreed to include it with the removal of “at least once a year”.

[120] Another proposal was to say that “plants or plant material with an unknown history or a history of significant pest occurrence may be inspected more than once”. The EWG questioned what “unknown history” referred to and brought up, as examples, wild forests and plants and plant material that could be traced but were collected in another country. The EWG also agreed that field inspection could be carried out more than once. The EWG therefore revised the proposal to read “field inspection may occur several times for plants with a history of significant pest occurrence” and agreed to include it.

[121] The steward suggested that “the timing of inspection varies with the pest species, depending on the optimum time for expression of symptoms if a specific pest is being targeted for detection”. One EWG member proposed that the text also refer to plants and the EWG revised the suggestion as follows: “the timing and frequency of inspection varies with the pest and plant species, depending on the optimum time for showing symptoms”.

[122] The EWG discussed those situations where it is difficult to detect a pest because the host has only just started showing symptoms. One EWG member stated that, in the case of insects, the inspector would then look for larvae or adults. The EWG therefore agreed to include “pest life stage is suitable for detection” in the list of situations where field inspection may be carried out.

[123] **Considerations of methods.** Based on ISPM 23, the EWG agreed that the “field inspection method should be designed either to detect the specified regulated pests or to be used for a general inspection for organisms for which the pest risk has not yet been determined”. Then, an EWG member proposed that, in the selection of field-inspection methods, the draft annex’s section on “Other considerations for field inspection” and the importing country’s requirements should also be taken into account. Another EWG member stressed the importance of technical review and suggested that methods be reviewed taking into consideration the experience gained and new technical developments. The EWG agreed to the proposals.

[124] The EWG discussed the factors that may be included during the selection of the methods.

[125] The steward proposed the following text: “A general look over the relevant unit of inspection should be carried out first, and then any noticeable poorer growing areas or those with more obvious symptoms (e.g. paler or with types of ‘patches’) should be examined. If none are apparent, then a representative number of plants should be thoroughly examined.”

[126] An EWG member proposed that the suggested text be reviewed and referred to an extract from EPPO (2017):

Phytopathological inspection should start with an overall examination of the place of production in order to check the physical condition of the plants. If there is an abnormal die-off in a place or lot, or there are other anomalies within the crop (e.g. abnormal growth, differences in colour, spots on leaves), these lots/places should be checked with specific attention.

[127] The EWG merged the proposals to read: “a general visual assessment of the relevant unit of a field to check the physical condition of the plants, if there are anomalies within the crops, and then any noticeable poor growing areas or those with more obvious symptoms (e.g. abnormal growth, differences in colour, paler, or with types of ‘patches’). If none are apparent, then a representative number of plants should be examined.”

[128] Upon a proposal from the steward, the EWG considered that, depending on the phytosanitary importing requirements, field inspection may be required for the entire field and land in its vicinity or for the field

only. An EWG member pointed out that inspection can be requested for the entire field, its vicinity or a portion of the field, depending on the phytosanitary import requirements. The IC representative stated that inspection of the entire field is rare but it can be requested and agreed to include mention of vicinity. As the EWG felt the need to include the use of patterns, the following wording was proposed: “inspection of the entire field, entire field and its vicinity or portion of the field depending on phytosanitary import requirements, using an appropriate pattern”.

- [129] The EWG then clarified the function of the pattern in an additional factor: “a pattern that ensures that all parts of the field are adequately and proportionally represented in the plants inspected within the field”. An EWG member questioned whether this factor would include the inspection of the boundaries of the field as well and to reflect this the text was revised to read: “a pattern that ensures that relevant parts of the field are adequately and proportionally represented in the plants inspected within the field”.
- [130] The EWG also agreed to include in the text “inspection of individual plants or plant parts that may show symptoms and signs, and any other parts, if necessary”.
- [131] The EWG considered including sampling for pest identification and confirmatory testing as one of the factors to consider during the selection of methods. The chairperson suggested the inclusion of pest detection and an EWG member suggested the removal of confirmatory testing as it would be included in pest detection. One participant pointed out that an importing country may not allow the sampling of plants and the EWG revised the text to read: “sampling of selected plants for pest detection and identification as necessary”. However, recalling that ISPM 23 said that “pests or signs of pests that have been detected may require identification or a specialized analysis in a laboratory or by a specialist”, the EWG agreed to expand the text as follows: “sampling of selected plants for pest detection and identification as appropriate as in some cases, pests or signs of pests that have been detected may require identification or analysis in a laboratory or by a specialist”.
- [132] **Field inspection outcome.** The EWG deliberated on the section on “Inspection outcome” in ISPM 23 and agreed that the “result of the inspection contributes to the decision to be made as to whether the plants meet phytosanitary requirements”, acknowledging that field inspection is not the only measure taken into account.
- [133] Then, the EWG considered situations where pests are detected or conformity with phytosanitary requirements is not verified, and consequently further actions should be taken. The EWG clarified that actions may be determined by the nature of the findings, considering the pest or other objectives, and the circumstances as reported in ISPM 23.
- [134] Conversely, the EWG also discussed situations where the pest is not detected or is within the tolerance level, and the plants meet other phytosanitary requirements. The EWG agreed that further actions should not be taken in such situations and clarified that, following field inspection, the plants may be subject to inspection of the consignment in accordance with ISPM 23, which may lead to the issuance of a phytosanitary certificate.
- [135] **Documentation.** At the suggestion of the steward, the EWG agreed that “NPPOs should develop official documentation for undertaking field inspections and managing or accessing inspection records and outcomes”. Recognizing that “documentation is essential for promoting consistency, improving interpretation and reliability of results, and facilitating audit and verification of field inspection activities”, the EWG emphasized the need for NPPOs or authorized entities to retain all records related to field inspection.
- [136] Subsequently, the EWG agreed with the proposal of one participant to include the possibility of the NPPO of the importing country monitoring the compliance of consignments, in order to check whether field inspection was being conducted appropriately, and making available the records.
- [137] **Responsibilities of NPPOs.** The EWG agreed that NPPOs should be responsible for the revision of field-inspection processes and for:

- the training of personnel;
- ensuring that inspectors fulfil the requirements described in section 1.4 of ISPM 23; and
- ensuring that inspectors have the right of access and the practical possibility of carrying out inspections in a field and its vicinity.

[138] The EWG agreed to assign to NPPOs the responsibility to determine the roles and responsibilities of producers (referring to ISPM 36) and to authorize entities to perform field inspections in accordance with ISPM 45

7. Any other business

[139] The secretariat explained the next steps in the drafting process, informing the EWG that the draft annex would be edited by the IPPC editor in consultation with the steward and submitted to the SC for review. In addition, the secretariat pointed out that the finalized meeting report would be made available when ready.

8. Close of the meeting

[140] The chairperson and the secretariat thanked all the participants for their valuable contributions. The steward also expressed his gratitude, acknowledging how difficult it can be to draft a standard.

[141] The secretariat invited all EWG members and observers to complete the evaluation of the meeting.

[142] The chairperson closed the meeting.

Appendix 1: Agenda

Agenda Item		Document No.	Presenter
1.	Opening of the Meeting		
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat Welcome by the host: - NPPO of Japan Introductions	–	SHAMILOV KOBAYASHI Participants
1.2	Presentation of the standard setting process Roles of the Participants	Presentation	TORELLA
2.	Meeting Arrangements	–	
2.1	Selection of the Chairperson	–	SHAMILOV
2.2	Selection of the Rapporteur	–	Chairperson
2.3	Adoption of the Agenda	01_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	Chairperson
3.	Administrative Matters	–	
3.1	Documents list	02_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	TORELLA
3.2	Participants list	03_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	TORELLA
3.3	Local information	04_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	YAMAMOTO
4.	Review of Specification		SAI (Steward)
4.1	Review of Specification 74 - Annex <i>Field inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>)	Specification 74 - Annex Field inspection (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection)	SAI
4.2	Steward's considerations	05_EWG_FI_2023_Oct_Rev1	SAI
5.	Review of discussion papers	–	Chairperson
5.1	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) - Székely	06_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	SZÉKELY
5.2	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) - Bahig	07_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	BAHIG
5.3	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) - Stevens	08_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	STEVENS
5.4	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) – Larrea	09_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	LARREA
5.5	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) - Bruns	10_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	BRUNS
5.6	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) - Nguyen	11_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	NGUYEN
5.7	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) - Adofo	12_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	ADOFO
5.8	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) - NPPO of Japan	13_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	YAMAMOTO

	Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
5.9	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) - NPPO of Bangladesh	14_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	SHAMILOV
5.10	Consistency issues with ISPM 23	15_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	SHAMILOV
6.	Development of text for the draft annex to ISPM 23 <i>Reference documents:</i>		Chairperson
	- <i>IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates (particularly Part 1, sections 2, 3 and 5)</i>	Link to the IPPC Style Guide	
	- <i>ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)</i>	Link to ISPM 5	
	- <i>Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology (Section 3.3.2 of the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting)</i>	Link to the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting (2021-2022)	
6.1	Brainstorming session to draft the Annex Field inspection (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>)	–	Chairperson/All
6.2	Elaboration of the text of the draft Annex <i>Field inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>)	Link to the Annotated template for draft ISPMs	All
7.	Any Other Business	–	Chairperson
8.	Survey	Survey link	All
9.	Close of the Meeting	–	Chairperson

Appendix 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
01_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	2.3	Provisional agenda	2023-10-16
02_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	3.1	Documents list	2023-10-06
03_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	3.2	Participants list	2023-10-16
04_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	3.3	Local information document: Tokyo, Japan	2023-09-15
05_EWG_FI_2023_Oct_Rev1	4.2	Steward's considerations	2023-09-21
06_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	5.1	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) - Székely	2023-09-15
07_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	5.2	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) - Bahig	2023-09-15
08_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	5.3	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) - Stevens	2023-09-15
09_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	5.4	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) – Larrea	2023-09-15
10_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	5.5	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) - Bruns	2023-09-15
11_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	5.6	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) - Nguyen	2023-09-15
12_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	5.7	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) - Adofo	2023-09-15
13_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	5.8	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) - NPPO of Japan	2023-09-15
14_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	5.9	Discussion paper on annex <i>Field Inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) - NPPO of Bangladesh	2023-09-15
15_EWG_FI_2023_Oct	5.10	Consistency issues with ISPM 23	2023-09-15
Other documents / links			
Specification 74 - Annex Field inspection to ISPM 23	4.1	Specification 74 - Annex Field inspection to ISPM 23	
Link to the IPPC Style Guide	6	IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates (particularly Part 1, sections 2, 3 and 5)	
Link to ISPM 5	6	ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	
Link to the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting (2021-2022)	6	Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology (Section 3.3.2 of the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting)	

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
Link to the Annotated template for draft ISPMs	6.2	Elaboration of the text of the draft annex Field Inspection to ISPM 23	

Appendix 3: Participants list

	Participant role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
✓	Steward	<p>Mr Masahiro SAI Head Pest Risk Analysis Division. Plant Protection Station, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) JAPAN Tel: +81-45-211-0375</p>	masahiro_sai670@maff.go.jp
	Assistant Steward	<p>Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI Servizio Fitosanitario DG Agricoltura Regione Lombardia Piazza Città di Lombardia 1 20124 Milano ITALY Tel: (+39) 3666603272</p>	mariangela_ciampitti@regione.lombardia.it
✓	Member	<p>Ms Tracy BRUNS Commodity Specialist for Seeds United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Plant Protection and Quarantine USA Tel: +1 (515) 443-0894</p>	tracy.bruns@usda.gov
✓	Member	<p>Ms Natalia LARREA Inspector National Service for Agri-food Health and Quality (SENASA) - Regional Plant Protection Coordination Northern Buenos Aires – San Pedro Office ARGENTINA Tel: +54 93329 513430</p>	nlarrea@senasa.gob.ar
✓	Member	<p>Ms Laura Jayne STEVENS Plant Health Risk Manager DEFRA, Sand Hutton, York, YO41 1LZ, United Kingdom UNITED KINGDOM Tel: +447920379191</p>	laura.stevens@defra.gov.uk
✓	Member	<p>Mr Saleh Abdelsattar BAHIG Plant Quarantine Inspector Central Administration of Egyptian Plant Quarantine – Cairo EGYPT Tel: +201001082918</p>	Salehbaheeg8@gmail.com
✓	Member	<p>Ms Akosua Agyekumwaa ADOFO Senior Agricultural Officer/ Phytosanitary Inspector Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate Ministry of Food and Agriculture, P. O. Box M37, Accra GHANA Tel: +233241819619</p>	adofo.akosua@gmail.com
✓	Member	<p>Mr Anh Tuan NGUYEN Civil Servant of Plant Quarantine Division Plant Protection Department, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development VIETNAM Tel: +84913312929</p>	tuananh16ppd@gmail.com

	Participant role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
✓	Member	Mr Tamás Lajos SZÉKELY External auditor European Commission DG SANTE Directorate F IRELAND Tel: +353873408832	Tamas.Szekely@ec.europa.eu
	Member	Ms Hongxia JIANG Deputy master Gansu Plant Protection and Quarantine Station, Department of Agriculture and Rural Affairs of Gansu Province, P.R. China CHINA Tel: +8618189665755	jianghx1913@163.com
✓	Invited expert, representing the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)	Ms Kyu-Ock YIM Senior Researcher Export Management Division. Dept. of Plant Quarantine Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs REPUBLIC OF KOREA Tel: 82-31-420-7665	koyim2022@gmail.com
✓	Host representative	Ms Masumi YAMAMOTO Deputy Director International Affairs Office Plant Protection Division, Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8950, JAPAN Tel: +81 03 3502 5978	masumi_yamamoto440@maff.go.jp
✓	Host representative	Mr Hiroki FUJITA Chief, International Affairs Office Plant Protection Division, Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8950 JAPAN Tel: +81 3 6744 7168	hiroki_fujita450@maff.go.jp
✓	Host representative	Ms Natsumi YAMADA International Affairs Office Plant Protection Division Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) Address: 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, JAPAN Tel: +81-3-3502-5978	natsumi_yamada770@maff.go.jp

IPPC Secretariat

	Role	Name	Email address
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Artur SHAMILOV Agricultural Setting Officer	artur.shamilov@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Daniel TORELLA Standard Setting Support Specialist	daniel.torella@fao.org

Appendix 4: References

- EPPO (European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization)**. 2009. Elements common to inspection of places of production, area-wide surveillance, inspection of consignments and lot identification. PM 3/72(2). *EPPO Bulletin*, 39: 260–262. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2338.2009.02305.x>
- EPPO**. 2017. *Fragaria* plants for planting – inspection of places of production. PM 3/83(1). *EPPO Bulletin*, 47: 349–365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/epp.12408>