



# **REPORT**

## **Standards Committee Meeting**

**Rome, Italy  
13–17 November 2023**

**IPPC Secretariat**

FAO. 2023. *Report of the meeting of the Standards Committee, 13-14 November 2023*. Rome, Italy. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

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

## Contents

1.	Opening of the meeting .....	5
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat .....	5
2.	Meeting arrangements .....	5
2.1	Election of the rapporteur.....	5
2.2	Adoption of the agenda .....	5
2.3	Discussion of SC report format .....	5
2.4	Legal advice on SC decision-making.....	6
3.	Administrative matters .....	6
4.	Draft ISPMs for recommendation to Commission on Phytosanitary Measures for adoption (from second consultation) .....	7
4.1	Draft amendments to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ) (1994-001), priority 1 .....	7
4.2	Draft annex to ISPM 37 ( <i>Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies ((Tephritidae))</i> ): Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (2018-011), priority 3.....	8
5.	Issues raised on draft ISPMs from first consultation .....	9
6.	Draft specifications.....	13
6.1	SC-7 recommendations regarding the draft specification on the revision of ISPM 15 ( <i>Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade</i> ): Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010).....	13
7.	Topics .....	14
7.1	Task Force on Topics .....	14
7.2	List of topics.....	17
8.	Standards Committee.....	19
8.1	Follow-up actions from the SC-7 meeting in May 2023.....	19
8.2	Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) May 2023.....	19
8.3	Summary of polls and fora discussed on e-decision site.....	22
9.	Implementation and Capacity Development (IC) Committee and SC/IC Interactions.....	23
9.1	Update on IC activities.....	23
10.	Updates.....	23
10.1	CPM Bureau, October 2023 meeting .....	23
10.2	SC small group on systems approaches .....	24
10.3	Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations, 2023 .....	25
10.4	Briefings from IPPC Secretariat.....	25
11.	Ink amendments to adopted Arabic and Chinese versions of standards .....	26
12.	SC recommendations for CPM-18 (2024) decisions and discussions .....	26
13.	Agenda items deferred to future SC meetings.....	27
14.	Any other business.....	27
15.	Date and venue of the next SC meeting.....	27
16.	Evaluation of the meeting process.....	27

---

17. Review and adoption of the decisions .....	27
18. Close of the meeting .....	27
Appendix 1: Agenda.....	28
Appendix 2: Documents list .....	32
Appendix 3: Participants list .....	35
Appendix 4: References .....	40
Appendix 5: Draft 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ) (1994-001) ..	41
Appendix 6: Draft Annex to ISPM 37: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) (2018-011) .....	52
Appendix 7: Review and adjustments to the List of topics for IPPC standards .....	57
Appendix 8: Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) meeting provisional agenda .....	69
Appendix 9: Modifications proposed to the Standard Setting Procedure .....	71
Appendix 10: Summary on poll and forums discussed on e-decisions sites 2023 may - 2023 November .....	80
Appendix 11: Proposals for ink amendments to adopted Arabic and Chinese versions of standards, for consistency with Arabic and Chinese translations of ISPM 5 .....	86
Appendix 12: SC November 2023 Decision points and follow-up actions.....	87

## 1. Opening of the meeting

### 1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The IPPC Standing Setting Unit (SSU) lead, Avetik NERSISYAN, opened the Standards Committee (SC) meeting on behalf of the IPPC Secretary, Osama EL-LISSY, and welcomed all participants. A particular welcome was extended to those SC members present who were new to the committee: Stavroula IOANNIDOU (Greece), Eyad MOHAMMED (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mi Chi YEA (Republic of Korea). The SSU lead also acknowledged the contributions of Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom), Mohamed Lahbib BEN JAMÂAA (Tunisia) and Conticha RAKKRAI (Thailand), who were no longer members of the committee.
- [2] The SC noted the absence of Abdelmoneem Ismaeel ADRA ABDETAM (Sudan), Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ (Costa Rica) and Maryam Jalili MOGHADAM (Islamic Republic of Iran).

## 2. Meeting arrangements

### 2.1 Election of the rapporteur

- [3] The SC elected Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) as rapporteur, assisted by Matías GONZALEZ BUTTERA (Argentina).

### 2.2 Adoption of the agenda

- [4] The SC adopted the agenda (Appendix 1), modified to start consideration of agenda item 8.1 as agenda item 2.4 (to be continued under item 8.1) and to discuss some issues relating to the work of the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) under agenda item 14 (Any other business). They also agreed to adjust some of the start, break and finish times.

### 2.3 Discussion of SC report format

- [5] Recalling the issues experienced by the SC in adopting the report from SC May 2023 meeting, the SC Chairperson, Sophie PETERSON (Australia), explained that some contracting parties had expressed concern that the resulting delays had meant that they did not have all the information they needed in time for the IPPC regional workshops at which the draft standards were discussed.
- [6] The secretariat referred the SC to Rule 8 of the Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee,<sup>1</sup> which specified the requirements for SC reports. The SC noted the move of the FAO towards shorter, concise reports of governance meetings and discussed the level of detail that needed to be in the reports of SC meetings. They considered what was reasonably practicable and would comply with the rules of procedure without imposing on the SC's limited time for discussion in meetings. They considered possible options for adoption of the report and agreed to try a slight modification to the practice used for the last meeting (as detailed in the decisions below).
- [7] The secretariat confirmed that they could check whether it was possible to record SC meetings, for reference, but emphasized that a recording could only be made if everyone at the meeting agreed.
- [8] The SC:
- (1) *agreed* to review the decisions made each day at the start of the following day, adopt the decisions from this meeting under agenda item 17, and adopt the report as a whole after the meeting by e-decision;
  - (2) *requested* that the secretariat include a table of actions as an appendix to the meeting report; and

---

<sup>1</sup> In *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*: <https://www.ippc.int/en/about/core-activities/ippc-standard-setting-procedure-manual/>

- (3) *agreed* that, while still complying with Rule 8 of the Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee, SC reports should reflect the discussions held by the SC and focus on major issues.

## 2.4 Legal advice on SC decision-making

- [9] The SC chairperson presented the advice that the secretariat had received from the FAO Legal Office, at the request of the SC Working Group (SC-7), concerning the process for SC decision-making when consensus has not been achieved.<sup>2</sup> The legal advice had clarified that the current Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee allowed for sending ISPMs and specifications for consultation or adoption only by consensus, not by voting. However, the terms of reference and rules of procedure included no provisions regarding decision-making for issues other than the approval of ISPMs or specifications, so the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) rule on voting (two-thirds majority) could be applied in these cases. The FAO Legal Office had also advised that the SC's terms of reference and rules of procedures should contain general guidance, not the details of specific processes, and so the wording proposed by the SC-7 needed revision.
- [10] The SC considered that, although there was a voting procedure for CPM sessions, it was only really intended for issues other than the adoption of standards. The SC acknowledged the importance of the CPM reaching consensus when adopting standards, to ensure that the standards would be accepted in international trade. For a similar reason, therefore, they agreed that it was important for the SC to reach consensus when approving draft standards for adoption by the CPM.
- [11] The SC discussed the potential benefits and problems of sending draft standards for consultation without reaching consensus, if the rules were changed to allow this, but agreed that the SC should always use its best efforts to reach consensus. They noted that, where consensus cannot be reached, the SC should make the technical reason for this clear and that reason should be captured in the SC report.
- [12] The SC agreed to return to this matter under agenda item 8.1, when a representative of the FAO Legal Office would be present.

## 3. Administrative matters

- [13] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “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 latter or was missing from it.
- [14] The secretariat had provided a document on local information.<sup>3</sup>
- [15] In a response to a request from the SC, the secretariat provided a link to the 2010 version of the draft appendix on *Submission of new treatments for inclusion in ISPM 15 (2003-2013) to ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade)*, as this was the document to which the compiled 2010 consultation comments was related in agenda item 6.1.<sup>4</sup>
- [16] The SSU lead introduced the SSU staff and explained some changes in staffing.<sup>5</sup>
- [17] The SC:
- (4) *noted* that the SC chairperson had received a letter from the International Forest Quarantine Research Group, reaffirming their willingness to support the SC, and would forward this to SC members for information and the CPM Bureau for advice.

---

<sup>2</sup> 27\_SC\_2023\_Nov; SC-7 2023-05, agenda item 6.

<sup>3</sup> Local information for participants: <https://www.ippc.int/en/work-area-publications/91735/>

<sup>4</sup> Draft appendix on *Submission of new treatments for inclusion in ISPM 15*: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1017/>

<sup>5</sup> Standard Setting Unit staff (2023-09-06): [https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2023/09/StSetStaff\\_2023-09-06\\_1.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2023/09/StSetStaff_2023-09-06_1.pdf)

#### 4. Draft ISPMs for recommendation to Commission on Phytosanitary Measures for adoption (from second consultation)

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

- [18] The TPG Steward, Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile), introduced the draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*), the compiled comments from the 2023 consultation, and the steward's notes.<sup>6</sup> Approximately 90 comments had been received. For some terms, the 2023 consultation was the second consultation; for other terms, it was the third consultation.
- [19] The steward summarized the consultation comments received and the corresponding proposals from the TPG. The SC considered each of the draft definitions under consideration. The main points of discussion were as follows.
- [20] **“release (of a consignment)” (2021-007) (revision).** The SC noted that consignments in transit were covered by this draft definition, as it referred to “compliance procedure” and the ISPM 5 definition of “compliance procedure” referred to compliance with “phytosanitary requirements related to transit”. There was therefore no need to mention transit in the definition of “release (of a consignment)”.
- [21] **“inspection” (2017-005) (revision).** The SC agreed that morphological identification of a pest using a microscope would be considered as being inspection, because the draft definition of “inspection” referred to “visual examination” and the ISPM 5 definition of “visual examination” included examination with an optical microscope. They also agreed that, although samples for testing may be taken as a result of the inspection or because testing is required, that testing is not part of the inspection itself, even if it is the inspectors who take the samples.
- [22] **“test” (2021-005) (revision).** In response to consultation comments, the TPG had proposed two alternative definitions for consideration by the SC. The first was a modification to the draft definition sent for third consultation and made an explicit distinction between this term and the term “inspection”; the second was the same as had been sent for first consultation, reflecting the original intent of the revision, which was only to make a rather small, consequential editorial aimed at improving consistency.
- [23] The SC agreed that there was no value in approving the latter to go for adoption, as this definition had not proved to be acceptable at the first consultation stage. They discussed some possible alternatives to the first option, but they recognized that it resolved the distinction between the terms “inspection” and “test” and concluded that it was better to leave it unchanged.
- [24] The SC:
- (5) *approved* the draft definitions of “general surveillance” (018-046), “specific surveillance” (2018-047), “surveillance” (020-009), “phytosanitary action” (2020-006), “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007), “release (of a consignment)” (2021-007) and “inspection” (2017-005), proposed by the TPG following consultation;
  - (6) *approved* the first option proposed by the TPG for the draft definition of “test” (2021-005) (Solution A);
  - (7) *recommended* the draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001), with the draft definitions as approved at this meeting, for submission to CPM-18 (2024) for adoption (Appendix 5); and
  - (8) *thanked* the steward and the TPG for their efforts in developing the draft amendments to this standard.

---

<sup>6</sup> 1994-001; 12\_SC\_2023\_Nov; 13\_SC\_2023\_Nov; 2023-05 SC-7 meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/92470/>

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

- [25] The Steward, Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America), introduced the draft annex and her notes and responses to the comments received during the second consultation.<sup>7</sup> A total of 238 comments had been received. She also highlighted those comments that required specific discussion by the SC and the potential implementation issues raised during consultation.
- [26] The SC discussed the issues raised and reviewed the draft annex. They made numerous editorial changes to the text to improve its clarity and flow. The main technical issues discussed were as follows.
- [27] **“viability” vs “fertility”.** In response to a consultation comment, the steward had amended the draft annex to use the terms “fertile” or “reproductive status” rather than “viable” or “viability”. The SC noted that it was relevant to refer to fertility in ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) in the context of pest free areas, especially as the sterile insect technique may be a measure used to establish pest free areas. The SC acknowledged, however, that in the context of determining host status of fruit to fruit flies, the focus was on viability (i.e. development to mature adults that have an appearance and behaviour that is normal). Also, as this draft annex concerned the determination of host status from available information, rather than from experiments, it was more relevant to refer to viability than to fertility. The SC amended the text accordingly, although retained one reference to “reproductively mature”, as this was appropriate in the context.
- [28] **Referencing IPPC guides in ISPMs.** The SC recognized the valuable information provided in IPPC guides and considered whether it would be appropriate to cite them as a reference in ISPMs. The secretariat explained that, with rare exceptions, the custom-and-practice in adopted ISPMs other than diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments was to avoid citing material other than ISPMs or international agreements, but that if the SC chose to cite other material, they may wish to consider the level of obligation that was appropriate for such material and the language that could be used to make this level of obligation clear. The SC noted that advice on the legal status of IPPC implementation materials was still outstanding.
- [29] The SC noted that the draft wording of the annex could imply that the sources cited, which included two ISPMs and one IPPC guide, were equally binding on contracting parties. They therefore agreed to delete the citation to the IPPC guide.
- [30] The SC noted that, when there is an IPPC guide that directly corresponds to an ISPM, it may be useful to include a hyperlink to that guide from the web page for that ISPM on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP). However, the SC did not reach a view on what to do in cases where the IPPC guide in question did not directly correspond to the ISPM, such as was the case with the citation in this draft annex.
- [31] **Clearly described natural conditions.** The SC deleted the qualifying text “clearly described” in relation to natural conditions, as its precise meaning was not clear and for consistency with the references to semi-natural conditions, which did not have this qualifying text.
- [32] **Application of the host status of a fruit to a fruit fly in pest risk analysis.** The SC considered the final sentence of the penultimate paragraph of this section, which had been added in response to a consultation comment. The sentence referred to fruit ripeness and pre-and post-harvest activities, but the SC noted that the former was already mentioned earlier in the annex and the latter two should not affect the host status. They therefore deleted the whole sentence.
- [33] The steward also drew the attention of the SC to a consultation comment that had suggested that text be added to the final paragraph of this section to highlight the differences in pest risk for natural and

---

<sup>7</sup> 2018-11; 08\_SC\_2023\_Nov; 09\_SC\_2023\_Nov; 2023-05 SC-7 meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/92470/>



conditional hosts and to say that “the measures should provide the same level of protection as a treatment”. The steward had not added this text, because measures should be consistent with the level of risk and the intended meaning of “treatment” in this context was not clear. The SC agreed with the steward and did not add the suggested text.

### ***Potential implementation issues***

[34] The following issues and suggestions had been raised in consultation comments regarding potential implementation issues:

- **Inclusion of a table on “Classification of alternative terms describing host status of fruit to fruit fly to terms used by ISPM 37” as an appendix.** The steward explained that, although the expert working group (EWG) had attempted to compile such a table during the drafting process, this had not proved possible because of the lack of objective criteria for attributing the numerous existing literature terms to the main three host categories outlined in ISPM 37. The SC therefore agreed not to forward this as a potential implementation issue.
- **Development of implementation material, including case studies.** The steward suggested that this could be forwarded to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) for consideration, as it could be useful to have guidance on possible ways to evaluate evidence. The SC agreed.

[35] **Process for raising potential implementation issues.** The IC representative on the SC, Kyu-Ock YIM, and the secretariat explained the process by which potential implementation issues are forwarded by the SC for consideration by the IC. This involved the SSU forwarding the issues identified in the SC report to the Implementation and Facilitation Unit of the secretariat, who would then take the issues to the IC. The SC noted, however, that although contracting parties are invited to submit such issues as comments during the consultation process for draft ISPMs, the IC process for considering proposals for new topics requires a form to be completed. The IC representative on the SC acknowledged that there was probably a need for a closer and more direct relationship between the SC and IC and agreed to raise this with the IC.

[36] The SC:

- (9) *thanked* the stewards for their efforts in developing this draft annex;
- (10) *recommended* the 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)* as modified in this meeting for submission to CPM-18 (2024) for adoption (Appendix 6);
- (11) *requested* that the SC representative to the IC present the implementation issues identified for this draft annex (namely, the development of “worked” examples as case studies in implementation material) to the IC for consideration; and
- (12) *invited* the IC to consider how to improve the process by which suggestions on potential implementation issues raised during consultation on draft ISPMs are possibly incorporated in the work programme of the IC.

## **5. Issues raised on draft ISPMs from first consultation**

[37] The SC considered some of the issues raised on draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation in 2023.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/member-consultation-draft-ispms/https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/member-consultation-draft-ispms/%23a>

***Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001), priority 1***

- [38] The Steward, Masahiro SAI (Japan), highlighted two issues for consideration by the SC.<sup>9</sup> He explained that over 1300 consultation comments had been received, but although contracting parties had been encouraged to focus on the new parts of the text, many comments had also been received on the parts that originated in ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*) or ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*). There had also been calls for a full revision of the reorganized pest risk analysis (PRA) standards. The first issue for the SC to consider, therefore, was whether to put the current topic on hold or proceed with the current specification until a new topic for a full revision is submitted. The steward recommended the latter approach. The second issue highlighted by the steward was whether to reintegrate text about environmental risks into the core text, rather than it being together in an annex. The steward recommended the former approach.
- [39] **Calls for a full revision.** The SC considered the best way forward. The SC acknowledged the need for a holistic revision of the PRA standards to bring the guidance up to date, perhaps include guidance pertaining to the impacts of climate change and possibly streamline it by moving some information into implementation material. They recognized that the CPM had already tasked the SC with developing the current standard under Specification 72 (*Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards*), but they acknowledged that there was a risk that the standard would not be adopted by the CPM if the concerns expressed during the first consultation were not adequately addressed. However, development of the guidance on pest risk management, which had started under a previous topic and had then been merged into this topic, had already been significantly delayed and a pause to the current work would result in a significant further delay.
- [40] To avoid undue delays, the SC therefore agreed to pursue a parallel approach. In this parallel approach, the steward would address the comments submitted during the 2023 consultation, so that the revised text, with the compiled comments and steward's notes, could be considered by the EWG. In the meantime, a recommendation would be submitted to CPM-18 (2024) for a new topic for a holistic revision of the PRA standards and a draft specification for a new topic would be prepared in readiness for the CPM's decision. The secretariat confirmed that the SC can recommend new topics to the CPM at any time, without having to wait for a call for topics, and that a draft specification does not need to be submitted with the proposal.
- [41] The SC agreed that the process for the current draft standard should continue until the steward had finished addressing the consultation comments, after which the revised draft should be reviewed by the SC (not the SC-7) and forwarded to the EWG for the new topic rather than being submitted for second consultation.
- [42] **Environmental risks.** The SC did not discuss this in detail, but deferred a decision to the new EWG (pending a decision by the CPM to add a new topic to the SC's work programme).

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

- [43] The Steward, Joanne WILSON (New Zealand), gave an update on the outcome of the first consultation. She explained that over 600 comments had been received. Suggestions for changes had included amendments to the set wording of the Scope section; inclusion of synonyms or preferred synonyms for pests; deletion of text that repeated statements from the core text of ISPM 46 (*Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures*); additional text to clarify what national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) need to do to use the standard; and changes to pests and measures, including some new treatments and two systems approaches but also the deletion of methyl bromide treatments. In general, comments were positive and supportive of the approach taken.

---

<sup>9</sup> 25\_SC\_2023\_Nov.

- [44] Members of the SC raised several issues about the draft annex, including the following:
- a suggestion to include the information source used to justify the inclusion of each pest on the list;
  - whether it was justified to omit pests simply because there was not a corresponding specific measure in the annex;
  - a suggestion to give further consideration to how to deal with information from pest interceptions;
  - a suggestion that guidance from the core text of ISPM 46 relating to the need for countries to conduct PRA be included in the template for commodity standards;
  - the importance of listing the main measures that are reliable and practical to use, especially those for which there are multiple sources of evidence;
  - the need for sources, cited in support of systems approaches, to specify the independent measures that comprise the systems approach; and
  - the need to emphasize the distinction between CPM-adopted treatments and other treatments.
- [45] The steward explained that the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) had decided not to cite the information sources for the pests, because the basic criterion for inclusion was that the pest was regulated by at least one country and the TPCS thought that it would not be appropriate to name the countries. They had also felt that it would not be helpful to cite pest PRAs, as these were published in a range of languages. The steward clarified that it was not the role of the TPCS to conduct PRA nor to question the technical justification of countries to regulate specific pests. She also highlighted the potential difficulties in achieving consensus over the sources, as whichever source was cited, there would probably be countries that would dispute it.
- [46] The steward explained that the decision of the TPCS to omit pests for which there was not a specific measure was a pragmatic one, as otherwise there would potentially be thousands of pests to list.
- [47] The steward acknowledged that citing sources for systems approaches had been a very difficult issue for the TPCS and she had tried to address the consultation comments on this issue. She had also addressed the comments about the distinction between CPM-adopted treatments and other treatments.

***Draft annex to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood): Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (2015-004), priority 3***

- [48] The Steward, Steve CÔTÉ (Canada), gave an update on the outcome of the first consultation. He explained that 159 pages of comments had been received, including some comments that had overlapped with each other. He highlighted the following issues:
- some contracting parties had felt that site suitability may not be appropriate for a systems approach for forestry products, given the long cycle for producing mature trees;
  - one region had identified an overlap between the annex and the core standard;
  - one region had commented that the annex felt more like a guide than a standard;
  - some concerns had been expressed over inclusion of measures that included pre-planting;
  - there were some comments about some measures not being practical;
  - a concern had been expressed that there may be difficulty, at times, in considering some of these measures in a forest situation (compared to horticultural crops); and
  - there were also some editorial and translation comments.
- [49] **Guidance vs requirements.** One SC member expressed the view that the annex provided guidance rather than requirements and mostly comprised examples. The steward explained that the tables had been developed to make it easier for the reader to understand the various measures, but he would do his best to make it a more requirements-based annex.
- [50] **Impact of treatments.** Another SC member asked whether the annex needed to explain the impact of the various treatments on different pests, as a measure may have an impact on only one phase of a pest's

life cycle or on only one pest species. The steward explained that the concept behind the annex was to provide an alternative to single treatments that are challenging to use because of limitations on certain chemicals or environmental conditions that prevent the use of certain treatments. In the systems approach, a combination of treatments would provide cumulative protection.

[51] The SC:

- (13) *agreed*, having considered the consultation comments, that there is a need to take a holistic approach to the revision of PRA standards;
- (14) *selected* Steve CÔTÉ (Canada), Nader ELBADRY (Egypt), Stavroula IOANNIDOU (Greece), David KAMANGIRA (Malawi), Masahiro SAI (Japan), André Felipe C. P. da SILVA (Brazil), Joanne WILSON (lead, New Zealand) and Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America) to form a small working group to develop a draft specification for this holistic revision for presentation at the SC meeting in May 2024;
- (15) *agreed* that one of the tasks of the EWG would be to decide where best to present guidance on environmental risks in the holistic standard;
- (16) *requested* that the steward of the topic *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001), Masahiro SAI (Japan):
  - review the 2023 consultation comments and prepare steward's notes highlighting the themes that have emerged from the comments (initially to feed into the development of the draft specification and subsequently to accompany the compiled responses to consultation comments and the revised draft ISPM for presentation to the EWG for the holistic standard), and
  - address the consultation comments by providing responses and revising the text of the draft ISPM;
- (17) *recommended* to CPM-18 (2024) that the topic *Holistic revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis standard* (2023-037) be added to the *List of topics for standards*;
- (18) *agreed* the following provisional timeline for work on the existing PRA topic (2020-001) and the new topic (2023-037) (if added to the work programme):
  - SC May 2024 – revised draft *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) provided to the SC for information,
  - July 2024 – draft specification for new topic submitted for consultation,
  - SC November 2024 – detailed review of revised draft *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) (after which it is forwarded to the EWG of the new topic) and review and approval of specification for new topic,
  - early 2025 (tentative) – call for experts for new topic, and
  - 2025 (tentative) – EWG meeting;
- (19) *invited* the TPCS to consider how to address the comments related to the addition of sources for the pests included in the list of pests in commodity standards; and
- (20) *thanked* the stewards for the *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001), the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit* (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*), and 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*) for their updates.

## 6. Draft specifications

### 6.1 SC-7 recommendations regarding the draft specification on the revision of ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*): Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010)

- [52] The Steward, Harry ARIJS (European Union), summarized the background to this topic.<sup>10</sup> He explained that a draft annex to ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) had been developed in 2009, outlining the process to be used when evaluating the performance of potential treatments for inclusion in ISPM 15. The draft annex had subsequently been put on hold, however, pending publication of a scientific paper. Following publication of the paper (Ormsby, 2022),<sup>11</sup> the SC-7 had considered the next steps and had requested the drafting of a new specification.
- [53] The SC was invited to decide whether the draft should be annexed to ISPM 15, ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) or to the IPPC *Guide to the regulation of wood packaging material*, and to review the draft specification and agree on the way forward.
- [54] **Need for the text.** The SC noted that treatments for wood packaging material were needed to replace methyl bromide.
- [55] **Where to publish.** The SC considered the relative merits of the different options, including not only annexing the text to ISPM 15 or ISPM 28, but also posting it on the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) page of the IPP, including it in the TPPT section of the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*, or even simply referring contracting parties to Ormsby (2022).
- [56] **Annexing to ISPM 28.** The SC noted that the treatments included in ISPM 15 are very specific to wood packaging material. No efficacy is given and the aim is to significantly reduce pest risk rather than eliminate pests. This is because wood packaging material can consist of multiple wood species, with many potential pests, and it would not be feasible to evaluate the performance of treatments to the same level as for annexes to ISPM 28. The aim was therefore to have treatments that were achievable, and this was the rationale for the model presented in Ormsby (2022), which was based on achieving a lower efficacy than annexes to ISPM 28. For this reason, the SC noted that the draft annex may not fit with ISPM 28, where all the annexes are of high efficacy and the efficacy is stated.
- [57] **Annexing to ISPM 15.** The SC noted that annexing the text to ISPM 15 would have the benefit of keeping the methodological guidance for wood-packaging-material treatments together and may serve to encourage further submissions of proposed treatments. However, annexing it to ISPM 15 or ISPM 28 would mean that it was a prescriptive part of a standard (it would be “binding”), which could result in a perception that the treatments that were already included in ISPM 15 were no longer valid, as they had not been developed according to the new process. The SC acknowledged that publishing the annex as guidance, instead of a standard, would avoid this problem. The SC noted that whereas some stakeholders may prefer the guidance to be binding, others may not.
- [58] **Publishing as guidance.** The secretariat confirmed that there was guidance currently available on the IPP regarding development of phytosanitary treatments (PTs): the “Overview of a good research protocol”, which was a subsection of the TPPT part of the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting* and had been developed by the TPPT; the Phytosanitary Measures Research Group’s research guidelines,<sup>12</sup> which were specific to treatment types; and the *TPPT research guidelines* (IPPC Secretariat, 2019),<sup>13</sup> which was available on the TPPT page of the IPP. The SC noted that, as the former

---

<sup>10</sup> 2006-010; 14\_SC\_2023\_Nov; 15\_SC\_2023\_Nov.

<sup>11</sup> See Appendix 4.

<sup>12</sup> Phytosanitary Measures Research Group: <https://www.ippc.int/en/partners/organizations-page-in-ipp/phytosanitarymeasuresresearchgroup/>

<sup>13</sup> See Appendix 4.

already included some information on how many insects are needed to determine efficacy, the draft annex text may fit well in the procedural manual.

- [59] The IC representative to the SC highlighted the two forthcoming treatment manuals that would be annexed to the IPPC guide on *Regulation of wood packaging material* (IPPC Secretariat, 2023).<sup>14</sup> She suggested that, if the SC thought it was more appropriate to publish the draft annex as guidance, then it could perhaps be forwarded to the IC for consideration as a third annex to this IPPC guide.
- [60] **Review of the draft annex.** Some SC members suggested that the draft annex be reviewed by experts, given that it was now quite old (with the exception of one table, which had been added from Ormsby, 2022). Some SC members also expressed the view that an annex to a standard should not be derived from only one source, and so would it be useful to have corroborating information on the process presented in Ormsby (2022), either in the form of other studies or validation by other experts.
- [61] **Which group to work on the draft annex.** The SC noted that, when the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine was disestablished, the SC had agreed that an EWG could be called if work on a relevant draft standard was needed. The TPPT steward commented that the draft annex could be passed to the TPPT for their opinion, and the SC recognized the expertise of the TPPT in advising on this matter.
- [62] **Binding or not binding.** Some SC members preferred that the draft annex should be binding (i.e. as an annex to an ISPM), citing the need for robust information. Others thought that it should be non-binding, because of the problem of how to address the treatments already in ISPM 15 and because an annex to an ISPM should not be based only on one study. As the SC did not reach consensus, they agreed to consult the TPPT for their advice.

Noting that the author of the Ormsby (2022) paper was a member of the TPPT, the SC expressed an expectation that every effort should be made to avoid conflict of interest.

- [63] The SC invited the TPPT to:
- (21) *advise* the SC on whether the process for testing new treatments for ISPM 15 should be included in the IPPC framework;
  - (22) *advise* the SC on the best location within the IPPC framework to place the description of the process for testing new treatments for ISPM 15, including the pros and cons of each option and the rationale for the preferred option;
  - (23) *assess* whether the model described in Ormsby (2022) and other relevant publications provide a sufficient basis for the development of treatment schedules for ISPM 15.

## 7. Topics

### 7.1 Task Force on Topics

- [64] Steve CÔTÉ (Canada), one of the SC representatives on the Task Force on Topics (TFT), briefed the SC on the outcome of the 2023 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation.<sup>15</sup> The secretariat had received 14 complete submissions for standards (other than diagnostic protocols (DPs)), 11 for DPs and three for implementation resources. The TFT had made recommendations to the SC on which topics for standards and DPs to include in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, and the SC was invited to review these and to recommend corresponding priorities.
- [65] The SC chairperson also drew the attention of the SC to the conference room papers from the TPCS and the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP), who had been asked by the SC to provide input to inform the SC's discussions.

---

<sup>14</sup> See Appendix 4.

<sup>15</sup> Call for topics: <https://www.ippc.int/en/calls/call-for-topics-standards-and-implementation/>; submissions received in 2023 call for topics: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/92580/>; Task Force on Topics report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/commission/cpm-focus-group-reports/task-force-on-topics/>; 21\_SC\_2023\_Nov.

### *Standards other than commodity standards and DPs*

- [66] The SC considered the three submissions recommended by the TFT and agreed to the inclusion of all three, with the following recommended priorities:
- **2023-031: Annex Remote audits to ISPM 47 (*Audits in a phytosanitary context*)** – priority 1, given how the COVID-19 pandemic had highlighted the value of remote activities;
  - **2023-020: Revision of ISPM 12 *Phytosanitary certificates*** – priority 1, because a second EWG could be accommodated in the same year as that for 2023-031, and the global impact of this revision would be greater than that of the revision of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*), particularly with the increasing use of electronic phytosanitary certification; and
  - **2023-014: Revision of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*)** – priority 2, although the SC welcomed the suggestion that the SC review the priority at their meeting in May 2024, when they review the draft annex to ISPM 23, as this would make it easier to understand the need for the proposed topic.

### *Commodity standards*

- [67] The Assistant TPCS Steward, Joanne WILSON (New Zealand), summarized the feedback from TPCS on the submissions for commodity standards.<sup>16</sup> She explained that the TPCS would prefer to reduce the number of priority 1 topics to two, as it would not be feasible to develop them all simultaneously. The TPCS had made some initial observations on the various submissions recommended by the TFT, which included the suggestion to work on one temperate commodity and one tropical commodity first. The TPCS had also discussed the criteria to use when considering priorities, but they had pointed out that they would only be able to fully assess the feasibility of topics after a call for information material.
- [68] **2023-021: Commodities of lower pest risk.** The assistant steward explained that the TPCS had not discussed this submission, as they did not have the full information package. The SC chairperson recalled that the full information package may not have been received by the TFT. The SC noted the suggestion from the TFT that the SC discuss a potential path forward for this proposed topic and whether it could be an annex or an appendix to ISPM 46, and the SC chairperson suggested that advice be sought from the TPCS, given that ISPM 46 allowed for the inclusion of commodity standards that did not fall within the scope of ISPM 32. One SC member supported inclusion of the topic, as the commodity standard could facilitate trade for developing countries. When discussing the various submissions in their entirety, however, the SC agreed to accept the TFT's recommendation to not include this topic at this time.
- [69] **Criteria.** The SC discussed possible criteria that could be used to prioritize topics more objectively, but acknowledged that it would not be feasible to agree on such criteria at this meeting. They agreed, however, that it would be helpful if the TPCS could provide advice on possible criteria, for consideration at a later SC meeting. Possible criteria discussed by the SC included the added value of the proposed standard in terms of increased trade and protection against pests, the global impact of the standard, the benefit to developing countries in terms of economic development, whether the commodity is subject to phytosanitary measures, and the availability of information. The SC noted that the volume of trade is only relevant if it affects the pest risk.
- [70] The SC recognized that the TPCS would not be able to advise on criteria yet, given the early stage of commodity-standard development, but agreed that it would be helpful to receive feedback from the TPCS in due course.
- [71] **Submissions recommended by the TFT.** There was general support among the SC for including both a temperate commodity and a tropical one. However, there was not a clear consensus on which two commodities should be prioritized. The SC therefore agreed to recommend four submissions as priority 1 topics, with a view to the TPCS providing further advice, following a call for information

---

<sup>16</sup> CRP\_02\_SC\_2023\_Nov.

material, on which two to work on first. The priority 1 topics and the corresponding rationale were as follows:

- **2023-008: Seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris*** – as a learning process on how to draft a commodity standard for a commodity other than fruit and because it may inform the development of the draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*);
- **2023-019: International movement of citrus fruit** – as a learning process on how to draft a commodity standard for a group of species and because of the global impact of the proposed standard (but noting that if this standard proved not to be feasible, the single-species standard (2023-027) would be developed);
- **2023-023: International movement of fresh taro (*Colocasia esculenta*) corm for consumption** – because the proposed standard would facilitate trade by developing countries and support work on the safe provision of food aid; and
- **2023-028: International movement of fresh banana (*Musa paradisiaca*) fruit** – because of the global impact of the proposed standard and because it would support the IPPC work on addressing the pest risk of *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* Tropical Race 4.

[72] The SC recommended that the other three submissions should be included as priority 2 topics.

[73] The SC noted the value in regions developing regional commodity standards, which could support the development of the annexes to ISPM 46.

#### *Diagnostic protocols*

[74] The SC referred to the feedback from the TPDP on the submissions for DPs.<sup>17</sup>

[75] **Review of submissions.** The SC noted that, although the TFT had recommended that all 11 submissions received be included in the work programme, the TPDP had agreed to recommend eight. The reasons for not recommending three of the submissions were related to their feasibility. The SC agreed with the TPDP's conclusion not to recommend these three topics.

[76] The SC agreed to the recommendations of the TPDP regarding the other eight submissions. For the submission on *Bactrocera* species, they noted that the TPDP had recommended priority 2 for the DP for *Bactrocera correcta* (2023-015), so that it would be the same priority as the DP for *Bactrocera zonata* (2021-013). This was to allow the scope of the DP for *B. zonata* to be expanded to include *B. correcta* if that proved feasible and desirable. However, the TPDP's view after their initial discussions was that it would not be possible to also incorporate the other two *Bactrocera* species: *B. tsuneonis* and *B. minax*.

[77] **Call for new TPDP member.** The SC accepted the recommendation from the TPDP that a call be opened for a new TPDP member for entomology, because of the increased number of subjects on the work programme related to insects.

[78] The SC:

(24) *recommended* that the following topics be added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*:

- 2023-014: Revision of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*), priority 2,
- 2023-020: Revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*), priority 1,
- 2023-031: Annex *Remote audits* to ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*), priority 1,
- 2023-008: ISPM 46 Annex: Seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris*, priority 1,
- 2023-018: ISPM 46 Annex: International movement of *Vitis vinifera* fruit, priority 2,
- 2023-019: ISPM 46 Annex: International movement of citrus fruit, priority 1,

<sup>17</sup> CRP\_01\_SC\_2023\_Nov.



- 2023-023: ISPM 46 Annex: International movement of fresh taro (*Colocasia esculenta*) corm for consumption, priority 1,
  - 2023-024: ISPM 46 Annex: International movement of *Malus domestica* fruit for consumption, priority 2,
  - 2023-027: ISPM 46 Annex: International movement of fresh orange (*Citrus sinensis*) fruit, priority 2, and
  - 2023-028: ISPM 46 Annex: International movement of fresh banana (*Musa paradisiaca*) fruit, priority 1;
- (25) *thanked* the TPCS for their observations on the commodity-standard proposals from the 2023 IPPC Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation;
- (26) *noted* that the TPCS would consider the topic proposals in more detail at a future meeting, with a view to providing further advice to the SC about which of the priority 1 commodity standards to develop first once the CPM has decided which topics to include on the work programme;
- (27) *invited* the TPCS to consider, as they are developing the commodity standards, what criteria may be useful to the SC when considering priorities in future;
- (28) *thanked* the TPDP for their assessment and recommendations on the DP proposals from the 2023 IPPC Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation;
- (29) *added* the following diagnostic protocols to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*:
- 2023-003: ISPM 27 Annex: *Oryctes rhinoceros*, priority 2,
  - 2023-009: ISPM 27 Annex: High-throughput sequencing identification of pure culture of phytopathogenic regulated bacteria isolated from plants, priority 2,
  - 2023-010: ISPM 27 Annex: *Alopecurus myosuroides*, priority 3,
  - 2023-012: ISPM 27 Annex: Detection and identification of *Halyomorpha halys*, priority 1,
  - 2023-015: ISPM 27 Annex: *Bactrocera correcta*, priority 2,
  - 2023-016: ISPM 27 Annex: *Bactrocera tsuneonis* and *Bactrocera minax*, priority 2,
  - 2023-026: ISPM 27 Annex: Avocado sun blotch viroid, priority 1, and
  - 2023-029: ISPM 27 Annex: *Thaumatotibia leucotreta*, priority 1;
- (30) *agreed* with the TPDP's recommendation not to add the following subjects to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*:
- 2023-011: Diagnostic protocol for detection and identification of *Xylella* vectors,
  - 2023-017: DP *Colletotrichum kahawae* J.M. Waller & Bridge, and
  - 2023-025: DNA barcoding as an identification tool for regulated pests;
- (31) *noted* that the TPDP would further reassess the priorities for DPs, considering the existing DPs in the work programme; and
- (32) *requested* that the secretariat open a call for a new TPDP member for entomology.

## 7.2 List of topics

### *Review and adjustments to the List of topics for IPPC standards*

- [79] The SC reviewed the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, which had been updated to take account of decisions taken by the SC meeting in May 2023.<sup>18</sup> The SC chairperson drew the attention of the SC to the vacancies for stewards and assistant stewards.

<sup>18</sup> 24\_SC\_2023\_Nov; *List of topics for IPPC standards*: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards/list>

- [80] **Criteria for recommending topics be removed.** The SC noted the need, at a future meeting, to check the SC paper prepared previously that gave guidance on the length of time that a topic should remain on the list if it had not progressed.
- [81] **Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (2004-002) and Technical Panel for the Glossary (2006-013).** The steward for these panels, Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile), explained that he would no longer be an SC member after the SC-7 in 2024, as he would have completed three terms. The SC therefore recognized the need to find a new steward for each of these panels, as well as an SC representative to the IC, which was Mr SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE's other role on the SC.
- [82] **Guidelines for phytosanitary [measures] of international mail items (2018-014), and Requirement for phytosanitary certificate on cross-border online-shopping plants, plant products and other regulated articles (2018-021).** The SC noted that there was no specification for either of these topics, but relevant IPPC implementation material had been published since these topics were added to the list. The SC therefore agreed to recommend their removal. In doing so, the SC also noted that these topics could be added at a later date following a new, hopefully more detailed, proposal from a contracting party.
- [83] **Removal of subjects.** The SC noted that, following the adoption by CPM-17 (2023) of the 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5, the new terms that had been adopted had been removed from the list of topics. The SC also noted that they had previously agreed to remove some DP subjects and the list had been updated accordingly.
- [84] **Priorities for new PTs.** The SC reviewed the priorities recommended by the TPPT for the PT subjects that had been added by the SC to the list of topics by e-decision. The SC agreed with the TPPT's recommendations.
- [85] The SC:
- (33) *assigned* the following stewards and assistant stewards:
- *Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols* (2004-002) – Prudence Tonator ATTIPOE (Ghana), assistant steward,
  - *Technical Panel on Commodity Standards* (2019-009) – Joanne WILSON (New Zealand), steward, with Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy) and Eyad MOHAMMED (Syrian Arab Republic) as assistant stewards,
  - *Minimizing pest movement by sea containers* (2008-001) – Steve CÔTÉ (Canada), steward, with Gerald Glen F. PANGANIBAN (Philippines) as assistant steward, and
  - *Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts* (2008-002) – Steve CÔTÉ (Canada), steward, with Gerald Glen F. PANGANIBAN (Philippines) as assistant steward;
- (34) *noted* that they would need to select a new steward for the Technical Panel for the Glossary (2006-013) at their meeting in May 2024;
- (35) *recommended* to CPM-18 (2024) that the following topics be removed from the *List of IPPC standards*:
- *Guidelines for phytosanitary [measures] of international mail items* (2018-014), and
  - *Requirement for phytosanitary certificate on cross-border online-shopping plants, plant products and other regulated articles* (2018-021);
- (36) *noted* that the secretariat had updated the *List of topics for IPPC standards* according to the decisions of the SC at its meeting in May 2023 and following the adoption by CPM-17 (2023) of the 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5;
- (37) *agreed* the following priorities for the phytosanitary treatments that had been added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by e-decision (2023\_eSC\_Nov\_14):
- Cold treatment of *Citrus sinensis* for *Zeugodacus tau* (2023-004), priority 1,

- Methyl iodide fumigation of *Carposina sasakii* on *Malus × domestica* (2023-006), priority 3,
  - Combination of modified atmosphere and irradiation treatment for *Trogoderma granarium* (2023-032), priority 1,
  - Irradiation treatment for *Pseudococcus baliteus* (2023-033), priority 1,
  - Irradiation treatment for *Paracoccus marginatus* (2023-034), priority 1, and
  - Irradiation treatment for *Planococcus lilacinus* (2023-035), priority 1;
- (38) *requested* that the secretariat update the *List of topics for IPPC standards* to include the subjects for diagnostic protocols added to the work programme under agenda item 7.1 of this meeting, for noting by CPM-18 (2024); and
- (39) *noted* the modified *List of topics for IPPC standards* (Appendix 7).

## 8. Standards Committee

### 8.1 Follow-up actions from the SC-7 meeting in May 2023

- [86] A representative of the FAO Legal Office was present for this agenda item, which continued the discussion started under agenda item 2.4 about the options for the SC when consensus cannot be reached.
- [87] In answer to questions from the SC, the legal representative advised against changing Rule 6 of the Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee, which specified that “approvals relating to specifications or draft standards are sought by consensus”. She explained that the aim of the rule was to avoid having a lack of consensus at the CPM session and that, even for approvals for first consultation, it would be better to leave the rule unchanged unless the issue occurred often, as this would provide a greater flexibility of approach. To maintain flexibility, she also advised against specifying, in a rule, the steps that would constitute “all efforts to reach consensus”. In terms of escalating an unresolved issue, she advised that it would be better for the SC to seek the views of the CPM Bureau before the CPM.
- [88] In the course of the discussion, some SC members emphasized the importance of reaching consensus at all stages of the development of a standard and commented that the problem was not new, as there had been previous draft standards on which development had stopped because of a lack of consensus. One SC member emphasized the importance of SC members providing a technical justification and a solution when not supporting the approval of a draft standard, in the same way as is required of contracting parties when objecting to the adoption of standards. Another member expressed the view that all steps had not yet been exhausted with the draft standard in question (see agenda item 10.2).
- [89] The SC thanked the legal representative for her counsel.
- [90] The SC:
- (40) *noted* the legal advice given regarding the Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee; and
- (41) *agreed* not to propose a change to Rule 6 of the Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee.

### 8.2 Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) May 2023

#### *Update from the 2023 SC-7 meeting*

- [91] The SC-7 representative from the Near East, Nader ELBADRY (Egypt), gave an update from the SC-7 meeting held in May 2023.<sup>19</sup>
- [92] There were no comments from SC members.

<sup>19</sup> SC-7 2023-05 report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/92470/>

### ***Agenda of the 2024 SC-7 meeting***

[93] The SC reviewed the draft agenda.<sup>20</sup> They agreed the duration of the meeting and the secretariat confirmed that it would be possible for stewards of draft ISPMs being considered by the SC-7 to participate virtually. The secretariat emphasized, however, that it was important for SC-7 members to participate in person.

### ***Selection or reconfirmation of SC-7 members***

[94] The SC reviewed the SC-7 membership list<sup>21</sup> and agreed some changes (as detailed in the decisions below).

### ***Modifications proposed to the Standard Setting Procedure***

[95] The SC considered some proposed modifications to the Standard Setting Procedure, as well as other sections in the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*.<sup>22</sup> These included modifications proposed by the SC-7 at their meeting in May 2023,<sup>23</sup> as requested by the SC in the agenda of the SC-7, together with some changes suggested by the secretariat.

[96] **Standard Setting Procedure: call for topics.** The secretariat clarified that calls for subjects for the work programmes of technical panels were not formally “ongoing”, as the call may need to be closed, for instance if the work programme was too full. The SC therefore agreed to refer to such calls as “separate” to the Call for Topics: Standard and Implementation” as per the current wording.

[97] **Standard Setting Procedure: drafting of an ISPM.** The SC noted that the wording of the first paragraph of this section could be improved to make it explicit that expert consultations applied only to draft DPs and to clarify who solicited this input, as expert consultation was now undertaken as a routine part of the development of DPs but the text implied that the SC made specific requests for such consultations. The SC agreed, however, to leave this for a future revision, if needed.

[98] **Standard Setting Procedure: consultation and review.** The SC agreed to the proposed changes, to allow for more than two consultation periods for draft ISPMs (other than draft DPs and PTs).

[99] **Standard Setting Procedure: adoption.** The SC noted that although the SC-7 had proposed that the deadline for objections be brought forward, to allow time for the SC to resolve the issue raised, the proposed deadline was the same as the deadline for posting the draft ISPMs on the IPP: six weeks before the CPM session. The SC recognized that the deadline set for objections needed to balance, on the one hand, the need for contracting parties to have sufficient time to consider the draft ISPMs and formulate an objection, and on the other hand, the need for other contracting parties to be able to consider that objection and for solutions to the objection to be found. The secretariat explained that the deadline for posting the draft ISPMs could not be brought forward, because of the time required for translation. The secretariat confirmed that it was not possible to post the English version of draft ISPMs before the other language versions, as this would discriminate against contracting parties who relied on the versions in other FAO languages. The SC therefore agreed to keep the deadline for objections unchanged (i.e. three weeks) but to add a footnote to highlight the fact that draft ISPMs approved by the SC for adoption by the CPM are available in English as appendices of the SC November meeting report.

[100] The secretariat confirmed that objections can be submitted in any FAO language.

---

<sup>20</sup> 11\_SC\_2023\_Nov.

<sup>21</sup> SC and SC-7 membership list: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1109/>

<sup>22</sup> 20\_SC\_2023\_Nov.

<sup>23</sup> SC-7 2023-05, agenda item 6.

- [101] **The standing setting process explained: hierarchy of terms of standards.** The SC agreed to the proposal by the SC-7 to include reference to commodity standards as “subjects”, pending approval by the CPM to the corresponding recommendation by the SC in May 2023.<sup>24</sup>
- [102] **Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee: Rule 6, approval.** The SC agreed not to incorporate the change to this rule proposed by the SC-7 (see agenda item 8.1).
- [103] **Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee: Rule 7, observers.** The SC recognized how useful it can be for NPPOs or regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) to be able to send an observer to an SC meeting, to gain experience or to support an SC member whose first language is not one of the official FAO languages. The SC therefore agreed to the SC-7’s proposal that the maximum number of observers at SC meetings be increased to two observers per NPPO or RPPO. However, they agreed that this should apply equally to face-to-face and virtual meetings and be limited to NPPO or RPPO personnel, and that the decisions about attendance should rest with the SC chairperson. They also agreed that observers should not be allowed access to documents of a sensitive nature.
- [104] **SC procedures for conducting e-decisions.** The SC agreed with the SC-7’s proposal to add text to allow the SC to add subjects to their work programme via e-decisions.
- [105] **Expert working groups.** The SC made some modifications to the text proposed by the SC-7 and the secretariat. They agreed to refer to the experts nominated for an EWG as “members” rather than “participants”, to distinguish them from observers and invited experts. They recognized that the option to invite observers from the host country can be useful for host countries in leveraging funding for EWG meetings. The SC therefore agreed to leave the number of observers open, to be agreed in advance by the secretariat and the steward for the topic. Regarding the role of invited experts, the SC agreed that the EWG chairperson may restrict the participation of the invited experts in the discussion.
- [106] **Technical Panel on Commodity Standards.** The SC noted that the new text about the TPCS needed improving and agreed that it would be better to consider it at the SC meeting in May 2024, following review by the TPCS and stewards.

*Secretariat proposal for operating a blind ranking procedure for the selection of experts for EWGs as per SC-7 request*

- [107] The secretariat presented a paper outlining the outcome of an assessment they had conducted, at the request of the SC-7, into the feasibility of implementing a blind ranking procedure for the selection of experts for EWGs.<sup>25</sup> The primary objective was to examine whether the selection could be made in such a way that the SC remained unaware of whether an IC or SC member had been nominated as an EWG member. Based on their assessment of feasibility, the secretariat recommended that the SC apply a partially blind ranking procedure rather than a fully blind one, considering the challenges and constraints associated with maintaining anonymity.
- [108] The SC discussed the relative merits of the procedure outlined by the secretariat. Noting that it was likely that the identity of an SC member could be guessed from the information about a nominee’s professional background, they agreed that it would be easier to simply preclude SC members from being nominated for selection to an EWG. They noted that this would still allow the steward to be a member, as the steward is automatically a member and so is not nominated for selection.

*Update on the movement of the online submission form for nominations into the restricted work area of the International Phytosanitary Portal*

- [109] The secretariat confirmed that they had moved the link to the online submission form for nominations of experts into the restricted work area of the IPP to which IPPC official contact points have access.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> SC 2023-05, agenda item 6.4.

<sup>25</sup> 16\_SC\_2023\_Nov.

<sup>26</sup> 04\_SC\_2023\_Nov.

This move had been requested by the SC-7 to avoid individual experts nominating themselves without prior approval from their NPPO.<sup>27</sup>

[110] The secretariat confirmed that submissions could still be submitted by email, but the form was now only available to those with access to the restricted work area.

[111] The secretariat confirmed that one of the responsibilities of official IPPC contact points was to submit nominations. The SC noted that, if an official IPPC contact point fails to discharge their responsibilities, this is an internal matter for that country but regions may sometimes be able to help resolve such issues. The SC chairperson confirmed that regions may also submit nominations.

[112] The secretariat confirmed that, for transparency, they present to the SC all the nominations received. However, a submission is not complete unless it is accompanied by a signed statement of commitment from the nominee's supervisor. Where a nominee is neither supported financially by their organization nor eligible for financial support from the secretariat, the secretariat highlight this fact in the notes that accompany the list of nominees. The SC agreed that there was no need to change the process in this regard, but they noted that if the nomination of unfunded experts became a frequent occurrence, the SC may need to seek advice from the secretariat or the CPM on how to address that.

[113] The secretariat confirmed that this nomination process applied only to the SC, not the IC.

[114] The SC:

- (42) *noted* the update from the 2023 SC-7 meeting;
- (43) *agreed* to the draft agenda for the 2024 SC-7 meeting, pending the outcome of CPM-18 (2024), and agreed that the duration of the meeting would be three days (Appendix 8);
- (44) *requested* that the secretariat make arrangements for stewards of draft ISPMs being considered by the SC-7 for second consultation to join the meeting virtually for the relevant agenda item;
- (45) *agreed* that David KAMANGIRA, Masahiro SAI, David OPATOWSKI, André Felipe C.P. da SILVA, Nader ELBADRY, Marina ZLOTINA and Sophie PETERSON would be the SC representatives on the SC-7 for Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and Caribbean, the Near East, North America and the Southwest Pacific, respectively;
- (46) *recommended* the proposed revisions to the Standard Setting Procedure and the Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee, as modified at this meeting, to CPM-18 (2024) for adoption (Appendix 9);
- (47) *agreed* the other proposed revisions to the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*, as modified at this meeting, and *agreed* that those parts that require adoption, approval or noting by the CPM are presented to CPM-18 (2024), except for section 7.4 on the TPCS (Appendix 9);
- (48) *invited* the TPCS and the TPCS stewards to review the proposed text for section 7.4 of the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*, for presentation to the SC meeting in May 2024;
- (49) *thanked* the secretariat for exploring the possibilities for the operation of a blind ranking procedure for the selection of experts for EWGs, but *agreed* not to adopt this procedure;
- (50) *agreed* that SC members should not be nominated for selection as members of EWGs; and
- (51) *noted* the update on the movement of the online submission form for nominations of experts into the restricted work area of the IPP and *thanked* the secretariat for facilitating this.

### 8.3 Summary of polls and fora discussed on e-decision site

[115] The secretariat presented a paper listing the e-decision polls and fora conducted from May 2023 to November 2023.<sup>28</sup> The secretariat also informed the SC that they would provide details of forthcoming e-decisions.

---

<sup>27</sup> SC-7 2023-05, agenda item 6.

<sup>28</sup> 28\_SC\_2023\_Nov.

[116] The SC noted that there would be an e-forum for SC members to express their preferences for the selection of an additional entomology expert for the TPDP (see agenda item 7.1).

[117] The SC:

- (52) *agreed* that the “Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions between 2023 May–November” accurately reflects the outcome of the SC e-decisions (Appendix 10); and
- (53) *agreed* that the final decision on selection and appointment of a new TPDP member for entomology would be made at the SC meeting in May 2024.

## 9. Implementation and Capacity Development (IC) Committee and SC/IC Interactions

### 9.1 Update on IC activities

[118] Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile), the SC representative on the IC, and Kyu-Ock YIM (Republic of Korea), the IC representative on the SC, gave an update on IC activities.<sup>29</sup>

[119] The main issues discussed by the SC were as follows.

[120] **Status of the IC representative to the SC.** The IC representative on the SC referred to the recommendation from the IC that the SC consider changing the status of the IC representative on the SC from observer to SC member, to provide parity with the status of the SC representative on the IC. She informed the SC, however, that she would be taking further considerations on this matter to the IC at their next meeting. The SC therefore did not discuss this further, other than to note the workload involved with being a full member of either the SC or the IC: the SC representative on the IC, for example, had two roles on the IC in addition to serving as a conduit between the SC and the IC.

[121] **Revision of ISPM 18 (*Requirements for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) (2014-007).** The SC representative on the IC explained that the IC had recommended that the guide on irradiation published by the International Atomic Energy Agency be submitted as a contributed resource and had invited the secretariat to promote the guide. In response to questions from the SC, the SC representative on the IC and the IC representative on the SC confirmed that the guide did refer to the issue of live insects in treated consignments. At their meeting in May 2024, the IC would be considering whether to organize a joint webinar on irradiation with the International Atomic Energy Agency.

[122] **Development of implementation materials.** One SC member asked whether the work of the IC could feed back to the SC, so that the SC could develop more responsive standards in the future. The IC representative on the SC and the SC representative on the IC explained that, currently, the process works the other way round but is a continuum: the SC identifies potential implementation issues during the development of a standard and these are forwarded to the IC, who then consider the development of corresponding implementation material.

[123] The SC:

- (54) *noted* the update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee; and
- (55) *noted* the IC discussions and recommendations on the implementation issues identified by the SC.

## 10. Updates

### 10.1 CPM Bureau, October 2023 meeting

[124] The secretariat presented an update on the CPM Bureau’s discussions about the draft term “emerging pest” (2018-003).<sup>30</sup> The secretariat explained that, further to the SC’s recommendation to the CPM

---

<sup>29</sup> 26\_SC\_2023\_Nov; IC meeting reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/commission/capacity-development-committee/>

<sup>30</sup> 17\_SC\_2023\_Nov; CPM Bureau reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/commission/bureau/>

Bureau,<sup>31</sup> the CPM Bureau had agreed with the SC proposal that there was no need for an adopted definition of “emerging pest” and that a simple working definition, developed by the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Steering Group for its purposes, would suffice. The CPM Bureau had therefore supported the removal of the term from the TPG’s work programme.

[125] The SC noted that, in the absence of an ISPM 5 definition of the term, the draft definition proposed by the TPG would still be useful for the steering group. The SC representative on the steering group pointed out that the term “emerging pest” was present in some IPPC documents, such as the IPPC *Surveillance guide* and the paper on the concept of emergency pests and emergency issues discussed at CPM-14 (2019),<sup>32</sup> and therefore, even in the absence of an ISPM 5 definition, she was hopeful that a common understanding of this term within the IPPC community would be achieved in the future.

[126] The SC:

(56) *agreed* to remove the subject “emerging pest” (2018-003) from the work programme of the TPG.

## 10.2 SC small group on systems approaches

[127] Harry ARIJS (European Union) presented an update from the small group of SC members who had been tasked with preparing a paper for the Strategic Planning Group on systems approaches.<sup>33</sup> He explained that, despite the best efforts of the small group and the contributions from SC members in an e-forum, a consensus had not been reached on how to resolve the obstacles to the development of the draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38. The group had concluded that it was better, therefore, to bring the matter back to the SC rather than submit a paper to the Strategic Planning Group or the CPM Bureau. The paper listed some possible options for the way forward:

- redrafting of the draft annex by experts, with an increased focus on the role and responsibilities of NPPOs throughout the text consistent with the provisions of ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*);
- organization of a new EWG for redrafting the text based on Specification 70 (*Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds*), possibly including two or three experts from the former EWG;
- revision of Specification 70 by the SC, with the formation of a new EWG;
- drafting of a new specification;
- putting the draft annex on hold and addressing the needs in separate commodity standards for different seed groups (which may list components of systems approaches);
- in parallel to the above, organization of an exchange of views on the implementation of ISPM 14 (e.g. during a side event at CPM-18 (2024)), resulting in, for example, guidelines to clarify the preferred format and contents of systems approaches or in a request for a revision of ISPM 14; or
- submitting the draft annex as drafted to consultation in conjunction with one or more draft seed-specific commodity standards (if proposals for seed commodity standards are submitted during the 2023 call for topics).

[128] Members of the SC shared their views on the possible options presented, with some expressing a preference for the first option, one preferring the development of the material as a commodity standard, and one favouring the last option. Other suggestions were for the steward to amend the draft annex for further review by the small group of SC members and then the SC, and for the publication of the material as non-binding guidance (e.g. as an appendix to ISPM 38 or as implementation material).

[129] One SC member commented that the main problem with the draft annex appeared to relate to implementation and emphasized that it was the sovereign right of countries to determine their own

---

<sup>31</sup> SC 2023-05, agenda item 4.3.

<sup>32</sup> Surveillance guide: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/90618/>; CPM paper: CPM 2019/15.

<sup>33</sup> 22\_SC\_2023\_Nov; SC 2023-05, agenda item 4.4.



phytosanitary import requirements. The SC noted that the draft annex already referred to the voluntary nature of the systems approaches described, but this could be made even more explicit. The SC recalled how the draft title of ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*) had been changed, and the draft text substantially redrafted, to address similar concerns about obligation.

[130] One SC member pointed out that the difficulties with the draft annex ran the whole way through, so it was not simply a matter of changing particular sentences. The member suggested that, to avoid further delay, the SC either needed to adjust the existing specification or draft a completely new one.

[131] The SC:

(57) *selected* Harry ARIJS (European Union, lead), Matías GONZALEZ BUTTERA (Argentina), Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) and Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America) to form a small group of SC members to redraft Specification 70 (*Design and use of systems approaches for the phytosanitary certification of seeds*) for consideration at the SC meeting in May 2024.

### 10.3 Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations, 2023

[132] An update from the Thirty-Fifth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations, which had been held in Bogota, Colombia, on 24–27 October 2023, had been circulated before the meeting.<sup>34</sup>

[133] The SC:

(58) *noted* the update from the Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations; and

(59) *noted* that a detailed report would be posted on the IPP.

### 10.4 Briefings from IPPC Secretariat

[134] **Implementation and Facilitation Unit.** The SC received an update from the secretariat's Implementation and Facilitation Unit,<sup>35</sup> and selected a representative to sit on the IC Team on E-Commerce (see decisions below).

[135] **Integration and Support Team.** The SC received a report from the secretariat's Integration and Support Team.<sup>36</sup>

[136] **IPPC regional workshops.** The SC received an update on the 2023 IPPC regional workshops.<sup>37</sup>

[137] **Standard Setting Unit.** The SSU lead presented an update on the activities of the SSU during 2023,<sup>38</sup> and explained that an online space had been created to brainstorm ideas about how to improve SSU operations.<sup>39</sup> He also presented the tentative workplan for the SSU for 2024.<sup>40</sup>

[138] The secretariat confirmed that the dates for SC meetings had now been confirmed for the next two years; for reasons of room availability, they could not be changed. They also confirmed that the consultation period for draft DPs in January was in addition to the consultation period in July.

---

<sup>34</sup> 07\_SC\_2023\_Nov; TC-RPOs meeting reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/ippc-community/regional-plant-protection-organizationstechnical-consultation-among-rppos/>

<sup>35</sup> 10\_SC\_2023\_Nov.

<sup>36</sup> 06\_SC\_2023\_Nov.

<sup>37</sup> 05\_SC\_2023\_Nov.

<sup>38</sup> 23\_SC\_2023\_Nov.

<sup>39</sup> SSU brainstorming page: <https://forms.office.com/e/WqDTBeZYz7>

<sup>40</sup> 19\_SC\_2023\_Nov; IPP calendar: <https://www.ippc.int/en/year/calendar/>

[139] The secretariat agreed to circulate the presentation to the SC, once it had been updated according to the decisions made at this meeting.

[140] The SC:

- (60) *noted* the update from the Implementation Facilitation Unit;
- (61) *selected* Prudence Tonator ATTIPOE (Ghana) to be the SC representative on the IC Team on E-Commerce;
- (62) *noted* that SC members may be invited to peer-review the draft *Guide to participating in meetings of the International Plant Protection Convention Commission on Phytosanitary Measures* in the first quarter of 2024;
- (63) *noted* that SC members may be invited to peer-review the draft *IPPC regional workshop guidelines*;
- (64) *noted* the update from the Integration and Support Team;
- (65) *noted* the update from the IPPC regional workshops; and
- (66) *noted* the update from the Standard Setting Unit.

## 11. Ink amendments to adopted Arabic and Chinese versions of standards

[141] The secretariat presented proposals for translation consistency changes to be made to the Arabic and Chinese versions of some standards, to align the terminology with the corresponding language versions of ISPM 5.<sup>41</sup> The secretariat explained that these changes had been suggested by the respective Language Review Coordinators for Arabic and Chinese, and the TPG had agreed with the suggestions.

[142] The SC members who spoke Arabic or Chinese confirmed the accuracy of the proposed changes.

[143] The SC:

- (67) *approved* the proposed translation consistency changes to the adopted Arabic and Chinese versions of standards, aligning them to the ISPM 5 translation in their respective languages; and
- (68) *agreed* that these translation consistency changes would be applied as ink amendments (Appendix 11), to be submitted to CPM-18 (2024) for noting.

## 12. SC recommendations for CPM-18 (2024) decisions and discussions

[144] The SC noted that the following would be recommended to CPM-18 (2024):

- draft ISPMs for adoption: 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001), 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), and (if approved by the SC by e-decision) draft PT Cold treatment for *Thaumatotibia leucotreta* on *Citrus sinensis* (2017-029);
- *List of topics for IPPC standards* (to note the updates, including the addition of subjects; to add the topic *Holistic revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis standard* (2023-037); and to remove the topics *Guidelines for phytosanitary [measures] of international mail items* (2018-014) and *Requirement for phytosanitary certificate on cross-border online-shopping plants, plant products and other regulated articles* (2018-021));
- proposed revisions to the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*, including the Standard Setting Procedure and the Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee (see agenda item 8.2).

[145] The SC noted that the following issues would be forwarded to CPM-18 (2024):

- ink amendments to Arabic and Chinese versions of standards for noting (see agenda item 11).

---

<sup>41</sup> 18\_SC\_2023\_Nov.

[146] These items are in addition to those identified by the SC at their meeting in May 2023.<sup>42</sup>

### **13. Agenda items deferred to future SC meetings**

[147] The following item was deferred to the May 2024 meeting of the SC:

- discussion on the work of the TPG (agenda item 14 of this meeting).

### **14. Any other business**

[148] **Work of the TPG.** This item had been requested by one SC member, who had suggested that the SC discuss the work of the TPG, taking into consideration the complex terms that had been submitted for second and third consultation in 2023. The SC deferred discussion about this.

[149] **Compiled consultation comments.** One SC member requested a return to the former presentation of compiled consultation comments, where the comments were listed in order of the comment number, with all the comments for one paragraph listed sequentially. The secretariat confirmed that they would endeavour to ensure that this happened.

[150] **Adopted decisions.** The SC agreed that the adopted decisions from this meeting could be circulated to SC members but not outside of the SC. The decisions would be in the public domain once the SC report was published, as usual.

### **15. Date and venue of the next SC meeting**

[151] The next SC meeting is scheduled for 6–10 May 2024 in Rome, Italy.

### **16. Evaluation of the meeting process**

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

### **17. Review and adoption of the decisions**

[153] The SC reviewed and adopted the decisions from this meeting.

[154] For ease of reference, a list of action points arising from the meeting is attached as Appendix 12.

[155] The SC:

- (69) *requested* that the secretariat open an e-decision to approve the report from this meeting, following approval of the text by the rapporteurs.

### **18. Close of the meeting**

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

---

<sup>42</sup> SC 2023-05, agenda item 11.

**Appendix 1: Agenda**

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER/ SECRETARIAT SUPPORT
<b>1.</b>	<b>Opening of the Meeting</b>		
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	---	EL-LISSY NERSISYAN
<b>2.</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>		
2.1	Election of the Rapporteur	---	Chairperson (PETERSON)
2.2	Adoption of the Agenda	01_SC_2023_Nov	Chairperson
2.3	Discussion of SC report format		Chairperson / NERSISYAN
2.4	Follow-up on actions from the SC May 2023 (1) Legal advice on SC decision making Link to SC May 2023 report	27_SC_2023_Nov	Chairperson /KISS / NERSISYAN
<b>3.</b>	<b>Administrative Matters</b>		
3.1	Documents List	02_SC_2023_Nov	KRAH
3.2	Participants List	03_SC_2023_Nov <a href="#">SC membership list</a>	KRAH
3.3	Local Information	<a href="#">Link to local information</a>	KRAH
3.4	Standard Setting Unit staff	<a href="#">Link to standard setting staff</a>	NERSISYAN / KRAH
<b>4</b>	<b>Draft ISPMs for recommendation to Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) for adoption (from second consultation)</b>		
4.1	<b>Draft 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001), Priority 1</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Steward: Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE</li> <li>❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response)</li> <li>❖ Steward's notes</li> <li>❖ SC-7 2023 meeting report</li> </ul>	1994-001  12_SC_2023_Nov 13_SC_2023_Nov <a href="#">Link SC-7 2023 meeting report</a>	<b>SEPÚLVEDA / SHAMILOV</b>

	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER/ SECRETARIAT SUPPORT
4.2	<p><b>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)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Steward: Marina ZLOTINA</li> <li>- Assistant stewards: Mariangela CIAMPITTI; Sophie PETERSON</li> <li>❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response) (2018-011)</li> <li>❖ Steward's notes and potential implementation issues (2018-011)</li> <li>❖ SC-7 2023 meeting report</li> </ul>	<p>2018-011</p> <p>08_SC_2023_Nov</p> <p>09_SC_2023_Nov</p> <p><a href="#">Link SC-7 2023 meeting report</a></p>	<p>ZLOTINA / KISS</p>
5	<b>Issues raised from the first consultation period</b>		
5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001), Priority 1</li> <li>❖ Draft annex to ISPM 46 (Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures): International movement of <i>Mangifera indica</i> fruit (2021-011), Priority 1</li> <li>❖ Draft annex to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood): Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (2015-004), Priority 3</li> </ul>	<p>25_SC_2023_Nov</p> <p><a href="#">First consultation period</a></p>	<p>Chairperson / Stewards</p>
6	<b>Draft Specifications</b>		
6.1	<p><b>SC-7 recommendations regarding the Draft Specification for the Revision of ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade): Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Steward: Harry ARJIS</li> <li>❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response) (from 2010 consultation)</li> <li>❖ Steward's notes</li> </ul>	<p>2006-010</p> <p>14_SC_2023_Nov</p> <p>15_SC_2023_Nov</p>	<p>ARJIS / KISS</p>
7.	<b>Topics</b>		
7.1	<b>Task Force on Topics (TFT)</b>		

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER/ SECRETARIAT SUPPORT
	Briefing from the TFT October 2023 virtual meeting	2023 Call for Topics <a href="#">web page</a> and <a href="#">submissions</a>  TFT virtual meetings report	CÔTÉ / SHAMILOV
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ TFT recommendations to the SC for submissions for 2023 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation</li> <li>❖ TPDP feedback</li> <li>❖ TPCS feedback</li> </ul>	21_SC_2023_Nov	
7.2	<b>List of Topics</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Review and adjustments to the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i></li> <li>❖ Re-distribution of workload of SC members.</li> <li>❖ Adjustment / assignment of stewards</li> </ul>	24_SC_2023_Nov  <a href="#">Link to List of Topics for IPPC standards</a>	Chairperson / KRAH
<b>8.</b>	<b>Standards Committee</b>		
8.1	(70)		
8.2	Standards Committee working group (SC-7) May 2023 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Update from the 2023 SC-7 meeting</li> <li>❖ Agenda of the 2024 SC-7 meeting</li> <li>❖ Selection or reconfirmation of SC-7 members</li> <li>❖ Modifications proposed to the Standard Setting Procedure</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Link SC-7 2023 meeting report</a>  11_SC_2023_Nov  <a href="#">Link to SC membership list</a>  20_SC_2023_Nov	MORERA / SHAMILOV  PETERSON / SHAMILOV
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Secretariat proposal for operating a blind ranking procedure for the selection of experts for EWGs as per SC-7 request</li> </ul>	16_SC_2023_Nov	SHAMILOV
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Update from the secretariat to move the online submission form for nominations into the restricted work area of the International Phytosanitary Portal</li> </ul>	04_SC_2023_Nov	SHAMILOV / KRAH
8.3	Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (from May 2023 to November 2023)	28_SC_2023_Nov	KISS
<b>9.</b>	<b>Implementation and Capacity Development (IC) Committee and SC/IC Interactions</b>		
9.1	Update on IC activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Potential implementation issues on ISPMs</li> <li>❖ IC update to SC</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Link to IC meeting reports</a>  26_SC_2023_Nov	YIM / SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE
<b>10.</b>	<b>Updates</b>		

	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER/ SECRETARIAT SUPPORT
10.1	CPM Bureau: Update October 2023 meeting ❖ Emerging pest	<a href="#">Link to Bureau meeting reports</a> 17_SC_2023_Nov	NERSISYAN / SHAMILOV
10.2	SC small group: ❖ System Approaches	22_SC_2023_Nov	ARIJS / SHAMILOV
10.3	Technical-consultation among Regional Plant Protection organizations (TC-RPPOs) 2023 update	<a href="#">Link to the 2023 webpage – TC RPPOs</a> 07_SC_2023_Nov_Rev1	GILMORE
10.4	Briefings from IPPC Secretariat ❖ Update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Unit (IFU) ❖ Update from the Integration and Support Team (IST) ❖ Update on the IPPC Regional Workshops ❖ Update from the Standard Setting Unit (SSU) ○ <b>Work plan and calendar</b>	10_SC_2023_Nov 06_SC_2023_Nov 05_SC_2023_Nov 23_SC_2023_Nov 19_SC_2023_Nov <a href="#">Link to the IPP calendar</a>	BRUNEL / KOUMBA DENG GILMORE NERSISYAN
11.	<b>Ink amendments to adopted Arabic and Chinese standards' versions (for consistency with ISPM 5 Ar and Zh translations)</b>	18_SC_2023_Nov	NERSISYAN / DELGRECO
12	<b>SC recommendations for CPM-18 (2024) decisions and discussions</b> (including proposals for discussions on concepts and implementation issues related to draft or adopted standards, special topics session and side-event)		Chairperson
13.	<b>Agenda items deferred to future SC Meetings</b>		Chairperson
14.	<b>Any other business</b> • <b>Draft ISPMs for approval for the first consultation – draft ISPMs to be discussed in detail in May 2024</b> • <b>Activities on TPGTPG work and activities</b>		Chairperson
15.	<b>Date and venue of the next SC Meeting</b>	06 to 10 May 2024 (FAO HQ, Rome)	Chairperson
16.	<b>Evaluation of the meeting process</b>	<a href="#">Link to survey</a>	Chairperson
17.	<b>Review and Adoption of the decisions</b>		Chairperson
18.	<b>Close of the meeting</b>		Chairperson

**Appendix 2: Documents list**

<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TITLE</b>	<b>DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED</b>
<b>Draft ISPMs</b>			
2018-011	4.2	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)	2023-10-27
2006-010	6.1	Draft Specification for the Revision of ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade): Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade	2023-10-30
1994-001	4.1	Draft 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)	2023-10-31
<b>Other Documents</b>			
01_SC_2023_Nov	2.2	Provisional Agenda	2023-09-07 2023-09-13 2023-09-18 2023-10-04 2023-10-06 2023-11-03 2023-11-08 2023-11-09
02_SC_2023_Nov	3.1	Documents List	2023-11-06 2023-11-09
03_SC_2023_Nov	3.2	Participants List	2023-10-27
04_SC_2023_Nov	8.2	Update from the secretariat to move the online submission form for nominations into the restricted work area of the International Phytosanitary Portal	2023-09-26
05_SC_2023_Nov	10.4	Update on the IPPC Regional Workshops	2023-10-04
06_SC_2023_Nov	10.4	Update from the Integration and Support Team (IST	2023-10-06
07_SC_2023_Nov_Rev1	10.3	Update on the 35th TC-RPPO meeting	2023-10-18 2023-11-03
08_SC_2023_Nov	4.2	Steward's response to comments from 2023 Consultation: Draft Annex: to ISPM 37 (Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) (2018-011))	2023-10-27
09_SC_2023_Nov	4.2	Steward's notes and potential implementation issues: Draft Annex: to ISPM 37 (Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) (2018-011))	2023-10-27
10_SC_2023_Nov	10.4	Update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Unit (IFU)	2023-10-23
11_SC_2023_Nov	8.2	Agenda of the 2024 SC-7 meeting	2023-10-26



DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
12_SC_2023_Nov	4.1	Steward's response to comments from 2023 Consultation: Draft 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)	2023-10-27
13_SC_2023_Nov	4.1	Steward's notes: Draft 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)	2023-10-27
14_SC_2023_Nov	6.1	Steward's response to comments from 2010 Consultation: ISPM 15	2023-10-27
15_SC_2023_Nov	6.1	Stewards' notes to Draft Criteria for treatments for WPM in international trade	2023-10-27
16_SC_2023_Nov	8.2	Blind selection of EWG members	2023-10-30
17_SC_2023_Nov	10.1	Update on the progress of the term "Emerging pest"	2023-10-30
18_SC_2023_Nov	11	Proposals for ink amendments to adopted Arabic and Chinese versions of standards, for consistency with Arabic and Chinese translations of ISPM 5.	2023-10-30
19_SC_2023_Nov	10.4	Standard Setting Unit (SSU) 2024 tentative work plan	2023-10-31
20_SC_2023_Nov	8.2	Modifications proposed to the Standard Setting Procedure	2023-10-31
21_SC_2023_Nov	7.1	TFT recommendations to the SC for submissions for 2023 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation	2023-11-02
22_SC_2023_Nov	10.2	Note to SC on Draft Annex to ISPM 38: Design and use of systems approaches for the phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009) and suggestions from the SC small group on the way forward	2023-11-02
23_SC_2023_Nov	10.4	Update from the Standard Setting Unit (SSU)	2023-11-02
24_SC_2023_Nov	7.2	Review and adjustments to the List of topics for IPPC standards	2023-11-02
25_SC_2023_Nov	5.0	Steward's notes: Draft reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards: Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests	2023-11-02
26_SC_2023_Nov	9.1	Update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee	2023-11-03
27_SC_2023_Nov	8.1	Legal advice on SC decision making	2023-11-09
28_SC_2023_Nov	8.3	Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (from May 2023 to November 2023)	2023-11-09
CRP_01_SC_2023_Nov	7.1	TPDP feedback on Call for Topics	2023-11-10
CRP_02_SC_2023_Nov	7.1	TPCS feedback on Call for Topics	2023-11-11

IPP LINKS:	Agenda item
<a href="#">SC membership list</a>	3.2
<a href="#">Link to local information</a>	3.3
<a href="#">Link to standard setting staff</a>	3.4
<a href="#">First consultation period</a>	5.1
<a href="#">Link to Technical Panels</a>	6
<a href="#">Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation</a>	7.1
<a href="#">Task Force on Topics (TFT)</a>	7.1
<a href="#">Link to List of Topics for IPPC standards</a>	7.2
<a href="#">SC May 2023 Report</a>	8.1
<a href="#">SC-7 May 2023 Report</a>	8.2
<a href="#">Link to SC membership list</a>	8.2
<a href="#">Link to IC meeting reports</a>	9.1
<a href="#">Link to Bureau meeting reports</a>	10.1
<a href="#">Link to the 2023 webpage – TC RPPOs</a>	10.3
<a href="#">Link to the IPP calendar</a>	10.4
<a href="#">Link to survey</a>	16

**Appendix 3: Participants list**

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Africa Member	<b>Ms Alphonsine LOUHOUARI TOKOZABA</b> Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Élevage, 24, rue KiéléTenard, Mfilou, Brazzaville, <b>REPUBLIC OF CONGO</b> Tel: +242 01 046 53 61 Tel: +242 04 005 57 05	<a href="mailto:louhouari@yahoo.fr">louhouari@yahoo.fr</a> <a href="mailto:A.louhouaritoko@gmail.com">A.louhouaritoko@gmail.com</a>	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021)  2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Africa Member  SC-7	<b>Mr David KAMANGIRA</b> Senior Deputy Director and IPPC Focal Point Department of Agricultural Research Services Headquarters, P.O. Box 30779, Lilongwe 3 <b>MALAWI</b> Tel: +265 888 342 712 Tel: +265 999 122 199	<a href="mailto:davidkamangira1@gmail.com">davidkamangira1@gmail.com</a>	CPM-11 (2016) CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022)  3 <sup>rd</sup> term / 3 years	2025
✓	Africa Member	<b>Mr Theophilus Mwendwa MUTUI</b> Managing Director, Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) P.O. BOX 49592, 00100 Nairobi <b>KENYA</b> Tel: +254 725 294445	<a href="mailto:tmutui@kephis.org">tmutui@kephis.org</a> ; <a href="mailto:director@kephis.org">director@kephis.org</a> ;	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Africa Member	<b>Mr Prudence Tonator ATTIPOE</b> Deputy Director, Head Plant Quarantine Division. Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate (PPRSD), Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA) P.O. Box M37, Accra <b>GHANA</b> Tel: 0209793292, 0262235397	<a href="mailto:tonattipoe@yahoo.co.uk">tonattipoe@yahoo.co.uk</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Asia Member	<b>Ms Mi Chi YEA,</b> Department of Plant Quarantine, Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency 177, Hyeoksin 8-ro Gimcheon- si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, <b>REP. OF KOREA</b> Tel: 82-54-912-0627 Fax: 82-54-912-0635, Mobile: 82-10-8405-9278	<a href="mailto:kittymc@korea.kr">kittymc@korea.kr</a>	Replacement for Ms Chonticha RAKKRAI  CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022)  2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years  (0)	2025

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Asia Member	<b>Mr. Gerald Glenn F. PANGANIBAN</b> Assistant Director for Operations and Administration, Bureau of Plant Industry, 692 San Andres Street, Malate, Manila, <b>PHILIPPINES</b> Tel: +639153141568	<a href="mailto:glenn.panganiban@da.gov.ph">glenn.panganiban@da.gov.ph</a> <a href="mailto:gfpanganiban@gmail.com">gfpanganiban@gmail.com</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Asia Member  SC-7	<b>Mr Masahiro SAI</b> Head Pest Risk Analysis Division. Plant Protection Station, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) <b>JAPAN</b> Tel: +81-45-211-0375	<a href="mailto:masahiro_sai670@maff.go.jp">masahiro_sai670@maff.go.jp</a>	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021)  2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Asia Member	<b>Mr Xiaodong FENG</b> Deputy Director of the Division of Plant Quarantine, NATESC Ministry of Agriculture No. 20, Maizidian Street, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100125 <b>CHINA</b> Tel: (8610)59194524	<a href="mailto:fengxdong@agri.gov.cn">fengxdong@agri.gov.cn</a>	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021)  2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years  (0)	2024
✓	Europe Member	<b>Mr Harry AIRJS</b> European Commission, DG Sante G-1, Plant Health Rue Froissart 101, 6/60 1040 Brussels <b>BELGIUM</b> Tel: +3222987645	<a href="mailto:Harry.ARIJS@ec.europa.eu">Harry.ARIJS@ec.europa.eu</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Europe Member	<b>Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI</b> Servizio Fitosanitario DG Agricoltura Regione Lombardia Piazza Città di Lombardia 1 20124 Milano <b>ITALY</b> Tel: (+39) 3666603272	<a href="mailto:mariangela_ciampitti@regione.lombardia.it">mariangela_ciampitti@regione.lombardia.it</a>	CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022)  2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years	2025
✓	Europe Member	<b>Ms Stavroula IOANNIDOU</b> National Regulatory Expert on Plant Health <b>GREECE</b> Phone: +30 210 9287133	<a href="mailto:stioannidou@minagric.gr">stioannidou@minagric.gr</a>	Replacement for Mr Sam Bishop CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021)  2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years	2024

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Europe Member  SC-7	<b>Mr David OPATOWSKI</b> Head, Plant Biosecurity, Plant Protection and Inspection Services (PPIS), P.O. Box 78, Bet Dagan, 50250 <b>ISRAEL</b> Tel: 972-(0)3-9681518 Mob: 972-(0)506-241885 Fax: 972-(0)3-9681571	<a href="mailto:dopatowski@yahoo.com">dopatowski@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:davido@moag.gov.il">davido@moag.gov.il</a>	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) CPM-12 (2017) CPM-15 (2021)  4 <sup>th</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member  SC-7	<b>Mr André Felipe C. P. da SILVA</b> Federal Inspector Quarantine Division Ministry of Agriculture, Live Stock and Food Supply <b>BRAZIL</b> Tel: (61) 3218-2925	<a href="mailto:andre.peralta@agricultura.gov.br">andre.peralta@agricultura.gov.br</a>	CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022)  2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years	2025
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	<b>Mr Matías GONZALEZ BUTTERA</b> Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA Andonaegui 2021, ciudad de Buenos Aires <b>ARGENTINA</b> Tel/Fax: (+54 9 11) 36661284	<a href="mailto:mbuttera@senasa.gob.ar">mbuttera@senasa.gob.ar</a>	CPM-16 (2022)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2025
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	<b>Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE</b> Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal Av. Presidente Bulnes 140, 4 <sup>th</sup> floor, Santiago, <b>CHILE</b> Tel: + 56-2 234 5120	<a href="mailto:alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl">alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl</a>	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021)  3 <sup>rd</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Near East Member  SC-7	<b>Mr Nader ELBADRY</b> Phytosanitary Specialist, Central Administration of Plant Quarantine, 6 Michel Bakhoum St., Dokki, Giza, <b>EGYPT</b> Tel: +201096799493	<a href="mailto:nader.badry@gmail.com">nader.badry@gmail.com</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Near East Member	<b>Mr Eyad MOHAMMED</b> Ministry of Agriculture and Agrarian reform Al Abed street Sabeh Bahrat Area, Damascus <b>SYRIA</b> Tel:+963933492111- 00963112220187	<a href="mailto:ppdsyr@gmail.com">ppdsyr@gmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:Eyadm2009@gmail.com">Eyadm2009@gmail.com</a>	Replacement for  Mr Mohamed Habib Ben Jamâa (TUNISIA)  CPM-15 (2021)  1st term /  3 years	2024

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	North America Member  SC-7	<b>Ms Marina ZLOTINA</b> IPPC Technical Director USDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) 4700 River Rd, 5c-03.37 Riverdale, MD 20737 <b>USA</b> Tel: 1-301-851-2200 Cell: 1 -301-832-0611	<a href="mailto:Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov">Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov</a>	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021)  3 <sup>rd</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	North America Member	<b>Mr Steve CÔTE</b> National Manager, International Phytosanitary Standards Plant Export Division 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa, Ontario <b>K1A 0Y9</b> <b>CANADA</b> Tel: (+1) 343-543-1432 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7576	<a href="mailto:Steve.Cote@inspection.gc.ca">Steve.Cote@inspection.gc.ca</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024
✓	Southwest Pacific Member	<b>Ms Joanne WILSON</b> Principal Adviser Animal and Plant Health Directorate Biosecurity New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries. <b>NEW ZEALAND</b> Tel: +64 489 40528 Mob: +64 2989 40528	<a href="mailto:joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz">joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz</a>	CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022)  2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years	2025
✓	Southwest Pacific Member  SC-7  SC Chairperson	<b>Ms Sophie PETERSON</b> Director, Pacific Engagement and International Plant Health Plant Protection and Environmental Biosecurity Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry <b>AUSTRALIA</b> Tel: +61 2 6272 3769 Mob: +61 466 867 519	<a href="mailto:sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au">sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au</a>	CPM-15 (2021)  1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024

Role	Name	Email address
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Avetik NERSISYAN</b> Standard Setting Unit Lead	<a href="mailto:Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org">Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Adriana MOREIRA</b> Standard Setting Officer	<a href="mailto:Adriana.Moreira@fao.org">Adriana.Moreira@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Artur SHAMILOV</b> Standard Setting Officer	<a href="mailto:Artur.Shamilov@fao.org">Artur.Shamilov@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Janka KISS</b> Standard Setting Associate	<a href="mailto:Janka.Kiss@fao.org">Janka.Kiss@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr. Emmanuel Plarhar KraH</b> Standard Setting Support Specialist	<a href="mailto:Emmanuel.krah@fao.org">Emmanuel.krah@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Daniel Torella</b> Standard Setting Support Specialist	<a href="mailto:daniel.torella@fao.org">daniel.torella@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Lorenzo Monterosa</b> Standard Setting Intern	<a href="mailto:lorenzo.monterosa@fao.org">lorenzo.monterosa@fao.org</a>

---

<b>Role</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Email address</b>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Karen ROUEN</b> Report writer	<a href="mailto:karen@karenrouen.com">karen@karenrouen.com</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Colleen Stirling</b> Standard Setting Specialist	<a href="mailto:colleen.stirling@fao.org">colleen.stirling@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Gaviano, Giulia</b> Office Assistant	<a href="mailto:giulia.gaviano@fao.org">giulia.gaviano@fao.org</a>

**Appendix 4: References**

- IPPC Secretariat.** 2019. *Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) research guidelines*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. 10 pp.
- IPPC Secretariat.** 2023. *Regulation of wood packaging material – Understanding the phytosanitary requirements for the movement of wood packaging material in international trade*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. ix + 78 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 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001)

### [1] DRAFT 2022 AMENDMENTS TO ISPM 5 (*GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS*) (1994-001)

[2]

[3] **Publication history**[4] *(This is not an official part of the standard)*

[5] <b>Date of this document</b>	[6] 2023-10-30
[7] <b>Document category</b>	[8] Draft 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> ) (1994-001)
[9] <b>Current document stage</b>	[10] To SC November 2023 meeting, for terms/definitions to be considered for submission to CPM 2024 for adoption
[11] <b>Major stages</b>	<p>[12] CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms</p> <p>[13] 2006-05 Standards Committee (SC) approved specification TP5</p> <p>[14] 2012-10 Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) revised specification</p> <p>[15] 2012-11 SC revised and approved revised specification, revoking Specification 1</p> <p>[16] 2021-12 TPG proposed 2022 amendments below</p> <p>[17] 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>[18] 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>[19] 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>[20] 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>[21] 2022-12 TPG reviewed the terms and drafted recommendations to SC-7</p> <p>[22] 2023-03 TPG finalized the review of the terms and the recommendations to SC-7</p> <p>2023-05 SC-7 approved the 2022 amendments for 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> consultation, and recommended to the SC to submit for adoption the terms “specific surveillance” (2018-047), and “inspection” (2017-005) 2023-10 TPG Steward and Assistant Steward reviewed 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> consultation comments and provided recommendations to SC</p>
[23] <b>Notes</b>	<p>[24] Note to Secretariat formatting this paper: formatting in definitions and explanations (strikethrough, bold, italics) needs to remain.</p> <p>[25] Comments were only sought on the terms and definitions, not on the associated explanatory text.</p> <p>[26] 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 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation).</p>

**[28] Introduction to the SC**

[29] This document, following the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> July- September 2023 consultation, is a (simplified) update provided by the TPG Steward and Assistant Steward for consideration at the SC 2023 November meeting, with a view to submission of terms and definition to CPM 2024 for adoption.

**Table 1: Status of the terms provided in draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5**

*(This is not an official part of the standard)*

Term	Status	Next step
“phytosanitary action” (2020-006)	From 2 <sup>nd</sup> consultation	For SC approval for adoption by CPM-18
“phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007)	From 2 <sup>nd</sup> consultation	For SC approval for adoption by CPM-18
“specific surveillance” (2018-047)	From 2 <sup>nd</sup> consultation (2022)	For SC approval for adoption by CPM-18
“inspection” (2017-005)	From 2 <sup>nd</sup> consultation (2022)	For SC approval for adoption by CPM-18
“release (of a consignment)” (2021-007)	From 2 <sup>nd</sup> consultation (2022)	For SC approval for adoption by CPM-18
“surveillance” (2020-009)	From 3 <sup>rd</sup> consultation	For SC approval for adoption by CPM-18
“test” (2021-005)	From 3 <sup>rd</sup> consultation	For SC approval for adoption by CPM-18
“general surveillance” (2018-046)	From 3 <sup>rd</sup> consultation	For SC approval for adoption by CPM-18

## 1. [32] ADDITION

### [33] 1.1 “general surveillance” (2018-046)

[34] The SC 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.

[36] In January 2021, the TPG 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 an amended definition proposal was sent for second consultation. Following a review by the TPG stewards, 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.

[37] The SC-7 in May 2023 sent for third consultation a modified proposed definition.

Having considered the third consultation comments received, the TPG stewards recommend the below definition be submitted to CPM for adoption.

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

- (71) [39] *It is useful to add the term and definition in the Glossary to clarify its meaning in ISPMs without having to read ISPM 6.*
- (72) [41] *Whereas the overall surveillance process is official (i.e. exclusively an NPPO responsibility), the sources of information for general surveillance can be non-official or official, as explained in ISPM 6.*
- (73) [43] *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).*

#### *For comparison: definition as had been proposed for first consultation*

<b>general surveillance</b>	An <b>official</b> process whereby data on <b>pests</b> in an <b>area</b> are collected from various sources other than <b>surveys</b> , analyzed and verified
-----------------------------	--

#### *For comparison: definition as had been proposed for second consultation*

<b>general surveillance</b>	An <b>official</b> process whereby data on <b>pests</b> in an <b>area</b> , collected from various sources other than <b>surveys</b> , are analyzed and verified
-----------------------------	--

#### *For comparison: definition as had been proposed for third consultation*

[44]

[45] <b>general surveillance</b> [46]	[47] A process whereby information on <b>pests</b> in an <b>area</b> is obtained through various sources other than <b>surveys</b> .
--	--

#### *Proposed addition*

<b>general surveillance</b>	An <b>official</b> process whereby information on <b>pests</b> in an <b>area</b> is obtained through various non-official or <b>official</b> sources other than <b>surveys</b> .
-----------------------------	--

### [49]1.2 “specific surveillance” (2018-047)

[50]The SC 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.

[51]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.

[52]The SC-7 sent the proposed definition to SC, unchanged compared to the version sent for the first and second consultations.

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

- (1) [54]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) [55]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) [56]Specific surveillance is achieved through surveys.
- (4) [57]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) [58]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”.

### [59]Proposed addition

[60]specific surveillance [61]	[62]An <b>official</b> process whereby information on <b>pests</b> in an <b>area</b> is obtained through <b>surveys</b> .
-----------------------------------	---

## 2. [63]REVISION

### [64]2.1 “surveillance” (2020-009)

[66]The SC in November 2020 added “*surveillance*” to the TPG work programme. The TPG in January 2021 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 an amended proposal was sent for second consultation. Following a review by the TPG stewards, 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.

[67]The SC-7 sent for third consultation the proposed revised definition unchanged compared to the version sent for second consultation.

Having considered the third consultation comments received, the TPG stewards recommend the below definition be submitted to CPM for adoption.

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

- (1) [69] Whilst the current definition of “*surveillance*” indistinctly mixes various methods from the two surveillance types (at that time undefined), and unnecessarily restricts the surveillance objective to only ‘presence or absence of pests’, the proposed definitions of the new Glossary terms “*general surveillance*” (section 1.1) and “*specific surveillance*” (section 1.2) provides the essential distinction between those two disjunctive surveillance types.
- (2) [70] 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*”.

**[71] Current definition**

[72] <b>Surveillance</b>	[73] An <b>official</b> process which collects and records data on <b>pest</b> presence or absence by <b>survey, monitoring</b> or other procedures [CEPM, 1996; revised CPM, 2015]
--------------------------	---

**For comparison: definition as had been proposed for first consultation**

<b>Surveillance</b>	<b>General surveillance, specific surveillance</b> or a combination of both <del>An official process which collects and records data on pest presence or absence by survey, monitoring or other procedures</del>
---------------------	--

**For comparison: definition as had been proposed for second and third consultation**

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

**[74] Proposed revision (note: identical to version proposed for second and third consultation)**

[75] <b>Surveillance</b> [76]	[77] An <b>official</b> process <u>whereby information on pests in an area is obtained through general surveillance, specific surveillance or a combination of both</u> <del>which collects and records data on pest presence or absence by survey, monitoring or other procedures</del>
----------------------------------	--

[78]

**[79] 2.2 “phytosanitary action” (2020-006) and “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007)**

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

[81] 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 all efforts should be made to use the most accurate terminology according to the concept provided in a standard.

[82] In the suit of SC’s discussions, it had 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.

[83]Consequently, the TPG recommended that it would be pertinent that the definitions of “*phytosanitary action*” and “*phytosanitary procedure*” be amended to explicitly reflect such broader scope. The SC in November 2020 agreed and added the terms “phytosanitary action” (2020-006) and “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007) to the TPG work programme.

[84]The TPG 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*. “*Phytosanitary action*” and “*phytosanitary procedure*” both refer to “*phytosanitary measures*” and are strongly interconnected.

[93]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.

### [97]2.2.1 “phytosanitary action” (2020-006)

[98]The SC-7 May 2023 had sent for second consultation a slightly extended version, as compared to the version as sent for first consultation.

Having considered the second consultation comments received, the TPG stewards recommend the below definition, identical with the proposal sent for first consultation, be submitted to CPM for adoption.

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

- (1) [100]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) [101]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) [102]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.

#### [103]Current definition

[104]phytosanitary action	[105]An <b>official</b> operation, such as <b>inspection, testing, surveillance</b> or <b>treatment</b> , undertaken to implement <b>phytosanitary measures</b> [ICPM, 2001; revised ICPM, 2005]
---------------------------	--

#### For comparison: definition as had been proposed for first consultation

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

#### For comparison: definition as had been proposed for second consultation

[107] <b>phytosanitary action</b>	[108] An <b>official</b> operation, such as <b>inspection, testing, surveillance</b> or <b>treatment</b> , undertaken <u>with reference to a phytosanitary procedure</u> , to implement <b>phytosanitary measures</b> or to enable <b>phytosanitary certification</b>
-----------------------------------	---

**Proposed revision (note: identical to version proposed for first consultation)**

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

**[110] 2.2.2 “phytosanitary procedure” (2020-007)**

[111] Accepting a range of suggestions from first consultation of simplifying the definition of “*phytosanitary procedure*” by linking it to “*phytosanitary action*”, the SC-7 May 2023 for the second consultation had proposed a modification to that effect.

No comments have been received on the proposal, and the TPG stewards recommend the below definition, identical with the proposal sent for second consultation, be submitted to CPM for adoption.

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

- (1) [113] 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) [114] 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) [115] 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) [116] 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 and should therefore be deleted.
- (5) [117] ‘*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) [118] With the linkage to “*phytosanitary action*”, the listed examples are redundant and therefore deleted.
- (7) [119] 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.

**[120] Current definition**

[121] <b>phytosanitary procedure</b>	[122] Any <b>official</b> method for implementing <b>phytosanitary measures</b> including the performance of <b>inspections, tests, surveillance</b> or <b>treatments</b> in connection with <b>regulated pests</b> [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; CEPM, 1999; ICPM, 2001; ICPM, 2005]
--------------------------------------	--

**For comparison: definition as had been proposed for first consultation**

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

**For comparison: definition as had been proposed for second consultation**

[124] <b>phytosanitary procedure</b>	[125]Any <b>official</b> method <u>on how to perform a <b>phytosanitary action</b></u> <del>for implementing <b>phytosanitary measures</b> including the performance of <b>inspections, tests, surveillance</b> or <b>treatments</b> in connection with <b>regulated pests</b></del>
--------------------------------------	--

**Proposed revision (note: identical to version proposed for second consultation)**

<b>phytosanitary procedure</b>	Any <b>official</b> method <u>on how to perform a <b>phytosanitary action</b></u> <del>for implementing <b>phytosanitary measures</b> including the performance of <b>inspections, tests, surveillance</b> or <b>treatments</b> in connection with <b>regulated pests</b></del>
--------------------------------	---

[127]2.3 “release (of a consignment)” (2021-007)

[128]In January 2021, the TPG recommended the consequential revision of the definition of ‘release (of a consignment)’. The SC reviewed the proposal 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 an amended proposal was sent for second consultation.

[129]Following a review by TPG stewards, 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 recommended to the SC that the definition be revised with one modification as compared to the version presented to the SC in November 2022 and recommended by the TPG. The SC-7 proposes not to include the term ‘official’ in the beginning of the definition.

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

- (1) [131]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) [132]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) [133]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) [134]The revised definition of *release (of a consignment)* does not conflict with the current uses of the term in adopted ISPMs.

[135]Current definition

[136]release (of a consignment)	[137]Authorization for <b>entry</b> after <b>clearance</b> [FAO, 1995]
---------------------------------	--

[138]Proposed revision

[139] release (of a consignment)	[140]Authorization for <b>entry of a consignment</b> after <u>completion of the <b>compliance procedure</b></u> <b>clearance</b>
----------------------------------	--



[141]

## [142]2.4 “inspection” (2017-005)

[143] In 2017, the SC added the term ‘*inspection*’ to the List of topics for IPPC standards for a possible revision and 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*’, 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.

[144] The SC therefore deferred 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.

[145] In its continued discussions, the TPG reconfirmed that the distinction between ‘visual’ versus ‘other than visual’ examination in *inspection* and *test*, respectively, remains to be most important.

[146] 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. The TPG concluded and the SC agreed that it would be appropriate to:

- [150] retain the current, narrow definition of ‘*inspection*’; and
- [151] 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.

[152] Following that approach, the proposed revision of ‘*inspection*’ only aims at improving the wording and consistency with other definitions. The SC reviewed the proposal 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 revised definition was sent unchanged for the second consultation.

[153] Following second consultation comments, the SC agreed to change “check” to “verify” in consistency with wording in similar definitions such as test. The SC-7 May 2023 confirmed its support for the proposed revision and submitted the proposal to SC approval for adoption by CPM-18.

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

- (1) [155] 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) [156] The word ‘*determine*’ (compliance) is substituted by ‘*verify*’ (conformity) in consistency with the wording used in similar definitions.
- (3) [157] 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) [158] 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.

## [159] Current definition

[160] <b>Inspection</b>	[161] <b>Official visual examination of plants, plant products or other regulated articles</b> to determine if <b>pests</b> are present or to determine compliance with <b>phytosanitary regulations</b> [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; formerly “inspect”]
-------------------------	---

[162] **Proposed revision**

[163] <b>Inspection</b>	[164] <b>Official visual examination of plants, plant products or other regulated articles</b> to determine if <b>pests</b> are present or to <del>determine compliance</del> <u>verify conformity</u> with phytosanitary <u>requirements</u> <b>regulations</b>
-------------------------	--

[165]

[166] **2.5 “test” (2021-005)**

[167] *In January 2021, when concluding the proposed revision of ‘inspection’, the TPG recommended a slight, consequential consistency revision of the definition of ‘test’. The SC reviewed the proposal 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 an editorially amended proposal for second consultation.*

[168] Following second consultation, the SC did not reach consensus on “test”, the main point of contention being whether the concepts of “inspection” and “test” could be distinguished based on the one being visual (“inspection”) and the other (“test”) not being visual.

[169] During the TPG November 2022 meeting, “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 proposed revision for third consultation a revised definition considerably different from former consultation versions.

Having considered the second consultation comments received, the TPG stewards recommend that one of the two below definitions be submitted to CPM for adoption.

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

*For Solution A*

- (1) To uphold the distinction between ‘test’ and ‘inspection’ as two disjunctive concepts, ‘*other than inspection*’ is inserted and replacing ‘*other than visual*’
- (2) “*using for example chemical, molecular or serological characterization,*” has been added at the end as some examples of types of methods that could be used for tests and to illustrate the distinction between “test” and “inspection”, which is particularly necessary when ‘*other than inspection*’ replaces the former, more illustrative ‘*other than visual*’.
- (3) 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*’.
- (4) The word ‘*determine*’ in relation to “compliance” is substituted by ‘*verify*’ in consistency with wording in similar definitions.

*For Solution B*

- (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 *test* has a broader scope than only consignments, the term ‘*compliance*’ is therefore substituted by ‘*conformity*’.

- (2) The word ‘*determine*’ in relation to “compliance” is substituted by ‘*verify*’ in consistency with wording in similar definitions.

#### [174]Current definition

[175]Test	[176]Official examination of <b>plants, plant products</b> or other <b>regulated articles</b> , other than visual, to determine if <b>pests</b> are present, identify <b>pests</b> or determine compliance with specific phytosanitary requirements [FAO, 1990; revised CPM, 2018]
-----------	--

#### For comparison: definition as had been proposed for first consultation

Test	Official examination of <b>plants, plant products</b> or other <b>regulated articles</b> , other than visual, to determine if <b>pests</b> are present, identify <b>pests</b> or <del>determine compliance</del> <u>verify conformity</u> with specific phytosanitary requirements
------	--

#### For comparison: definition as had been proposed for second consultation

Test	Official <u>non-visual</u> examination of <b>plants, plant products</b> or other <b>regulated articles</b> , <del>other than visual</del> , to determine if <b>pests</b> are present, identify <b>pests</b> or <del>determine compliance</del> <u>verify conformity</u> with specific phytosanitary requirements
------	--

#### For comparison: definition as had been proposed for *third* consultation

[178]Test	[179]Official examination, <u>using for example chemical, molecular, serological or morphological characterization</u> , of <b>plants, plant products</b> or other <b>regulated articles</b> , <del>other than visual</del> , to <u>identify pests</u> or determine if <b>regulated pests</b> are present, <del>identify pests</del> or <del>determine compliance</del> <u>verify conformity</u> with specific phytosanitary requirements
-----------	---

#### Steward’s proposed revisions

##### Solution A

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

#### [181]Potential implementation issues

[182]This section is not part of the standard. The Standards Committee in May 2016 requested the Secretariat to gather information on any potential implementation issues related to this draft. Please provide details and proposals on how to address these potential implementation issues.

## Appendix 6: Draft Annex to ISPM 37: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) (2018-011)

### [1] DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 37: CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF AVAILABLE INFORMATION FOR DETERMINING HOST STATUS OF FRUIT TO FRUIT FLIES (TEPHRITIDAE) (2018-011)

#### [2] Status box

[3] This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
[4] Date of this document	[5] 2023-05-25
[6] Document category	[7] Draft annex to ISPM 37
[8] Current document stage	[9] To adoption
[10] Major stages	[11] 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. [12] 2020-11 Standards Committee (SC) approved Specification 71 ( <i>Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information</i> ). [13] 2022-01 Expert working group met virtually and drafted the annex. [14] 2022-05 SC revised and approved for first consultation. [15] 2022-07 First consultation. [16] 2023-05 SC-7 revised and approved for second consultation 2023-07 Second consultation 2023-11 SC revised and approved for adoption.
[17] Steward history	[18] 2019-05 Marina ZLOTINA (US, Lead Steward) [19] 2019-05 Mariangela CIAMPITTI (IT, Assistant Steward) [20] 2019-05 Sophie PETERSON (AU, Assistant Steward)
[21] Notes	[22] This section will remain on the drafts going for consultation but deleted before adoption. [23] 2022-02 Edited [24] 2022-05 SC changed title to <i>Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies</i> [25] 2022-05 Edited [26] 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> [27] 2022-05 Edited

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

[29] This annex is a prescriptive part of the standard.

### [30] ANNEX 1: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)

#### [31] 1. Introduction

[32] 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.

While 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”), NPPOs should only use the host status categories described in the Definitions section of this standard: natural host, conditional host and non-host.

There is a lack of consistency, 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 consistency by outlining the criteria that should be used when evaluating available information to determine the host status of fruit to fruit

flies (Tephritidae). It also provides guidance to NPPOs on assessing the uncertainty of the resulting host status determination and on applying host status determinations in activities such as PRA.

[157] [new para] This annex provides guidance only in relation to undamaged fruit.

[33]

## [35] 2. Criteria for evaluating available information

### [36] 2.1 General criteria

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

- [38]an accurate identification of the plant species (scientific name and authority) as well as the name of the cultivar or variety, when available, with supporting evidence (e.g. published keys and taxonomic publications used for plant species (including cultivar) identification, verification of plant material by a specialist taxonomist, molecular identification, voucher specimens);
- [39]a description of the sampled area (e.g. any pest-control measures or phytosanitary measures applied in the area, presence of other natural or conditional hosts), details of location (e.g. geographic coordinates, growing region elevation, climate), and details of collection dates (e.g. early or late season, multiple years);
- [40]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);
- [41]details of the fruit-sampling conditions (e.g. commercial or non-commercial environment, harvested from the plant or collected after falling to the ground);
- [42]a description of the fruit-handling procedures (e.g. harvesting procedures, post-harvest processing and treatment, transportation procedures);
- [43]a description of the fruit-sampling method (e.g. number and distribution of plants sampled and number of fruits sampled per plant or sample weight);
- [44]details of the characteristics of the skin or rind (e.g. thickness);
- [45]details of whether the fruit is damaged or not;
- [46]details of the stage of fruit maturity (or other indicators of ripeness, e.g., dry matter content, colour, sugar content, standardized ripeness scale);
- [47]if used, a description of the fruit-dissection method (e.g. peeling and fruit cutting for detection of eggs or larvae);
- [48]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;
- [49]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);
- [50]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 of fruit in the fruit sample or the weight of the fruit sample under suitable conditions;
- [51] 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
- [52]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 fruit under suitable conditions).

[53]In addition to these general evaluation criteria, further information is required for each host status category as described in sections 2.2 to 2.4 of this annex.

#### [54]**2.2 Natural host**

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

[56]National plant protection organizations should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 2.1 of this annex, the information available also provides sufficient details of the viability of emergent adults in terms of their size, flight ability, longevity and fecundity.

#### [57]**2.3 Conditional host**

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

[59]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.

#### [60]**2.4 Non-host**

[61]The information used to determine non-host status should contain evidence of the absence of infestation, or of the incomplete development to viable adults under natural conditions or derived from field 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.

[62]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 2.1 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).

[63]If the information on non-host status is derived from field trials conducted under semi-natural conditions, there are no further criteria for evaluation of the information in addition to the general evaluation criteria listed in section 2.1 of this annex.

[64]If the information on non-host status is derived from laboratory experiments, NPPOs should consider whether, in addition to the items listed in section 2.1 of this annex, the information available also provides some of the following:

- [65]details of the fruit fly colony's origin (e.g. date of sampling 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);
- [66]a description of the fruit fly rearing method used for maintenance of the colony (e.g. natural or artificial diet used for larvae; conditions of the rearing room, such as temperature, humidity, photoperiod);
- [67]details of the quality of the fruit fly colony used in the experiment, including physiological conditions (i.e., details of developmental and survival rates, mating period, oviposition period, female fecundity, mating status, age); information on the fruit fly adult females used (i.e., females should be mated and be at the peak of their reproductive potential);
- [69]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;
-

- [71]a description of the method used in the laboratory infestation (e.g. cages used, exposure period, presence of food and water in cages, number and age of females and males used per cage, use of a natural host as a control in separate cages to demonstrate normal oviposition behaviour, lab conditions during experiment, number of replicates in the experiment using different cohorts of flies).

### [72] 3. Assessing the uncertainty of the host status determination

[73]The quality of the available information related to the host status of plant species or cultivars to fruit flies is variable (i.e. completeness, reliability and relevance) and this will, in turn, influence the level of uncertainty associated with the host status determination. Further guidance on the quality of information can be found in ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*), ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*).

[74]The quality of the information should be assessed based on the trial design for the method used to determine the host status category (e.g. sample size, number of replicates), the robustness and presentation of results and the expertise of the contributors.

[75]The completeness of the information should be assessed against the criteria listed in the General requirements section of 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.

[76]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.

[77]The following cases are some examples of situations where there can be particular uncertainty associated with the host status determination because of incomplete or lower quality information:

- [78]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).
- [79]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.
- [80]One or both parental 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 as a potential natural or conditional host until it can be confirmed otherwise).
- [81]There is a taxonomic change in a plant or fruit fly species. If taxonomic changes in a fruit fly species split it into two or more species, the host range of each valid species could potentially be different. If two or more fruit fly species 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.

[82]The result of a determination of host status should be accompanied by the evaluation 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 conducted under semi-natural conditions should be used to determine host status (see step C in the section on General requirements in this standard).

### [83]4. Application of the host status of a fruit to a fruit fly in pest risk analysis

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

- [85]The host status of a fruit to a fruit fly species (including the level and nature of the associated uncertainty) should be considered:

- [86]in the initiation stage;
  - [87]in the evaluation of the probability of introduction and spread and in the assessment of impacts;
  - [88]in the evaluation and selection of pest risk management options (e.g. inspection, phytosanitary treatment); and
  - [89]in pest risk communication (e.g. consultation and sharing of information).
- [90]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.
  - [91]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 consistent with the pest risk. The measures should specify features of the conditional host to differentiate it from a natural host. .
  - [92]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.

## [93]5. References

[94]

### [95]Potential implementation issues

[96]This section is not part of the standard. The Standards Committee in May 2016 requested the secretariat to gather information on any potential implementation issues related to this draft. Please provide details and proposals on how to address these potential implementation issues.



## Appendix 7: Review and adjustments to the List of topics for IPPC standards

(Prepared by the IPPC Secretariat)

- [1] The IPPC Secretariat presented an updated [List of Topics \(LOT\) for IPPC Standards](#) that incorporated the changes made by [CPM-17 \(2023\)](#) to the IPPC Standards Committee (SC) at its May 2023 meeting.

### 1. Subject adjustments:

#### ISPM 5:

- [2] Following the adoption by CPM-17 of 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5, the following terms were removed from LOT and TPG's work programme:

- “identity (of a consignment)” (2011-001);
- “integrity (of a consignment)” (consequential) (2021-008);
- “phytosanitary security (of a consignment)” (2013-008);
- “emergency measure” (2020-004);
- “provisional measure” (2020-008);
- “compliance procedure (for a consignment)” (2021-006);
- “clearance (of a consignment)” (2018-045); and
- “germplasm” (2020-005).

- [3] The SC agreed to remove the term “visual examination (2022-001)” from the TPG's work programme and update the LOT.

### 2. Diagnostic Protocols (DPs)

- [4] The SC in May 2023 agreed to remove the subjects *Begomoviruses* transmitted by *Bemisia tabaci* DP (2006-23) and *Puccinia graminis* f. sp. UG 99 (2019-004) from the TPDP work program.

- [5] The SC also removed from “pending status” and agreed to the “new scope adjustment” to subject Tephritidae: Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques (2006-028). Moreover, the SC putted on “pending status” the Revision of DP 5 (*Phyllosticta citricarpa* (McAlpine) Aa) (2019-011).

### 3. Phytosanitary treatments

- [6] The SC agreed through e-decision to add the following PTs to the work programme of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) and the LOT database:

- Cold treatment of *Citrus sinensis* for *Zeugodacus tau* (2023-004), priority 1
- Methyl iodide fumigation of *Carposina sasakii* on *Malus × domestica* (2023-006), priority 3
- Combination of Modified Atmosphere and Irradiation Treatment for *Trogoderma granarium* (2023-032), priority 1
- Irradiation treatment for *Pseudococcus baliteus* (2023-033), priority 1
- Irradiation treatment for *Paracoccus marginatus* (2023-034), priority 1
- Irradiation treatment for *Planococcus lilacinus* (2023-035), priority 1

- [7] Normally subjects are added to the work programme only at SC meetings, however these submissions were presented via e-decision to allow the TPPT to review them at their meeting in October 2023. The

TPPT also recommended the priorities of these topics at their October meeting as indicated above. The SC is invited to agree to these priorities.

#### **4. Recommendations to the SC**

The SC is invited to:

- (1) *note* the modified *List of topics for IPPC standards* (table in track changes in Appendix 1);
- (2) *consider* the assignment of stewards or assistant stewards for topics and also the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards, and make changes as appropriate;
- (3) *consider* the discussions under agenda item 7.1 – see document 21\_SC\_2023\_Nov (Call for topics: standards and implementation) and request the IPPC secretariat to incorporate any decisions for subjects into the LOT to be presented to the CPM-18 (2025).

**Annex 1 - List of Topics for IPPC Standards** (Notes: presented in track changes to the SC November 2021)

[Table 1: Technical panels and topics for the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols \(TPDP\), the Technical Panel for the Glossary \(TPG\) and the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments \(TPPT\)](#)

[Table 2: Topics for the Expert Working Groups \(EWGs\), Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments \(TPPT\) and Technical Panel on Commodity Standards \(TPCS\)](#)

[Table 3: Subjects for the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols \(TPDP\)](#)

[Table 4: Subjects for the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments \(TPPT\)](#)

[Table 5: Subjects for the Technical Panel for the Glossary \(TPG\)](#)

**IPPC Strategic Objectives**

**A:** Food Security

**B:** Environmental Protection

**C:** Trade Facilitation

**D:** Capacity Development

**Priority**

Priority 1 to 4 (with 1 being of high priority and 4 being of low priority)

**Notes:** Country names and dates are in ISO format (respectively: ISO 3166-1-alpha-2 code and YYYY-MM).

The *List of topics* is presented in order of priority, as requested by CPM-7 (2012).

Table 1: Technical panels and topics for TPDP, TPG TPPT and TPCS								
Topic N.	Current Title	Drafting Body	Topic under technical area (if applicable)	Added to the list	Lead Steward / TP Lead (Country, Meeting assigned)	Assistant Stewards (Country, Meeting assigned)	Spec No	
2004-002	Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols	TPDP	Panel	ICPM 06 (2004)	Alvaro SEPULVEDA LUQUE (CL, 2020-11)	Prudence Tonator ATTIPOE	TP1	
2004-005	Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments	TPPT	Panel	ICPM 06 (2004)	David OPATOWSKI (IL, 2017-05)		TP3	
2006-005	Bacteria	TPDP	Topic	CPM 01 (2006)	Robert TAYLOR (NZ, 2011-05)		-	
2006-006	Fungi and fungus-like organisms	TPDP	Topic	CPM 01 (2006)	Julie PATTEMORE (AU, 2020-11) Yazmin RIVERA (US, 2020-11)		-	
2006-007	Insects and mites	TPDP	Topic	CPM 01 (2006)	Norman BARR (US, 2012-07) Juliet GOLDSMITH (JM, 2014-11)		-	
2006-008	Nematodes	TPDP	Topic	CPM 01 (2006)	Géraldine ANTHOINE (FR, 2009-04)		-	
2006-009	Viruses and phytoplasmas	TPDP	Topic	CPM 01 (2006)	Vessela Assenova MAVRODIEVA (US, 2022-05)		-	
2006-013	Technical Panel for the Glossary	TPG	Panel	CPM 01 (2006)	Alvaro SEPULVEDA LUQUE (CL, 2022-05)	Ebbe NORDBO (DK, 2012-11)	TP5	
2007-001	Plants	TPDP	Topic	CPM 02 (2007)			-	
2019-009	Technical Panel on Commodity Standards	TPCS	Panel		Joanne Wilson (NZ, 2023-11)	Mariangela CIAMPITTI (IT 2023-11) Eyad MOHAMED (SY 2023-11)	TP6	

Table 2: Topics for EWGs, TPPT and TPCS										
Topic N.	Current Title	Priority	Strategic objective	Drafting Body	Added to the list	to	Lead Steward / TP Lead (Country, Meeting assigned)	Assistant Stewards (Country, Meeting assigned)	Spec No	Status
2006-010	Revision of ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade): Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade	2	B	EWG			Harry ARIJS (EU, 2023-08)	Mr. David KAMANGIRA (MW, 2022-05)	31	04. Draft ISPM under development
2008-001	Minimizing pest movement by sea containers	1	B	EWG	CPM (2008)	03	Mr. Steve CÔTÉ (CA, 2023-11)	Gerald Glenn F. PANGANIBAN	51	00. Pending
2008-002	Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts	3	B	EWG	CPM (2008)	03	Mr. Steve CÔTÉ (CA, 2022-11)	Gerald Glenn F. PANGANIBAN	52	00. Pending
2009-002	Revision of ISPM 4 Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas)	4	C	EWG	CPM (2008)	03	Marina ZLOTINA (US, 2015-11)	David KAMANGIRA (MW, 2019-05)	58	08. Draft ISPM recommended for adoption
2014-001	Pest risk management for quarantine pests	2	A C	EWG	CPM (2014)	09	Joanne WILSON (NZ, 2019-05)	Marina ZLOTINA (US, 2019-05)	63	04. Draft ISPM under development
2014-003	Requirements for the use of chemical treatments as a phytosanitary measure	3	A B C	TPPT	CPM (2014)	09	David OPATOWSKI (IL, 2017-11)	Michael ORMSBY (NZ, 2016-11)	62	04. Draft ISPM under development
2015-004	Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (Annex to ISPM 39: International movement of wood)	3	B C	EWG	CPM (2017)	12	Steve CÔTÉ (CA, 2022-05)	Harry ARIJS (BE, 2022-05)		06. Draft ISPM to first consultation

Table 2: Topics for EWGs and TPPT										
Topic N.	Current Title	Priority	Strategic objective	Drafting Body	Added to the list		Lead Steward / TP Lead (Country, Meeting assigned)	Assistant Stewards (Country, Meeting assigned)	Spec No	Status
2018-009	Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification	1		EWG	CPM (2019)	14	Marina ZLOTINA (US, 2019-05)	Hernando MORERA-GONZÁLEZ (CR, 2019-05)		04. Draft ISPM under development

	of seeds (Annex to ISPM 38 International movement of seeds)								
2018-011	Criteria for the determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information (Annex to ISPM 37)	3		EWG	CPM 14 (2019)	Marina ZLOTINA (US, 2019-05)	Mariangela CIAMPITTI (IT, 2019-05) Sophie PETERSON (AU, 2019-05)		07. Draft ISPM to second or subsequent consultation
2018-014		4		EWG	CPM 14 (2019)				01. Topic added to the List of topics
2018-021		4		EWG	CPM 14 (2019)				01. Topic added to the List of topics
2020-001	Reorganization of Pest Risk Analysis standards	1		EWG		Masahiro SAI (JP, 2020-09)	Hernando MORERA-GONZÁLEZ (CR, 2020-09) Joanne WILSON (NZ, 2020-09)		06. Draft ISPM to first consultation
2021-010	Revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae))	2	A	EWG	2022-05	Joanne WILSON (NZ, 2022-05)	Prudence ATTIPOE (GH, 2022-05)	-	04. Draft ISPM under development
2021-011	Annex International movement of mango (Mangifera indica) fruit to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures)	1	A C	TPCS	2022-04	Joanne WILSON (NZ, 2022-04)	Hernando MORERA-GONZÁLEZ (CR, 2022-05)	-	06. Draft ISPM to first consultation
2021-018	Field inspection (including growing season inspection) (Annex to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection))	2	A C D	EWG	2022-04	Masahiro SAI (JP, 2022-04)	Mariangela CIAMPITTI (IT, 2022-05)	-	04. Draft ISPM under development

Table 3: Subjects for TPDP								
Topic N.	Current Title	Priority	Strategic objective	Topic under technical area (if applicable)	Added to the list	Discipline Lead (Country)	Referee	Status
2006-028	Tephritidae: Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques	1	B C	Insects and mites	CPM 02 (2007) 2006-11 SC	Juliet GOLDSMITH (JM,	Norman BARR (US)	new scope adjustment
2018-015	<i>Cronartium comandrae</i> Peck	4	B C	Fungi and fungus-like organisms	2018-11 SC	Yazmin RIVERA (US, 2020-11)	Géraldine ANTHOINE (FR, 2019-08) Julie PATTEMORE (AU, 2020-11)	04. Draft ISPM under development
2018-019	<i>Meloidogyne mali</i>	3	B C	Nematodes	2018-11 SC	Géraldine ANTHOINE (FR, 2019-08)	Norman BARR (US, 2019-08)	04. Draft ISPM under development
2018-025	Citrus leprosis virus	1	B C	Viruses and phytoplasmas	2018-11 SC	Vessela Assenova MAVRODIEVA (US, 2022-04)	Norman BARR (US, 2019-08)	04. Draft ISPM under development
2018-030	Psyllid vectors of <i>Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum</i>	1	B C	Insects and mites	2018-11 SC	Norman BARR (US, 2019-08)	Juliet GOLDSMITH (JM, 2019-08)	04. Draft ISPM under development
2018-031	Pospiviroid species (except Potato spindle tuber viroid (DP 7))	2	B C	Viruses and phytoplasmas	2018-11 SC	Vessela Assenova MAVRODIEVA (US, 2020-11)		04. Draft ISPM under development
2018-032	<i>Acidovorax avenae</i> subsp. Citrulli	2	B C	Bacteria	2018-11 SC	Robert TAYLOR (NZ, 2019-08)	Géraldine ANTHOINE (FR, 2019-08)	04. Draft ISPM under development
2019-003	<i>Microcyclus ulei</i>	1	B C	Fungi and fungus-like organisms	2019-05 SC	Julie PATTEMORE (AU, 2020-11)	Géraldine ANTHOINE (FR, 2019-08) Yazmin RIVERA (US, 2020-11)	01. Topic added to the List of topics

Table 3: Subjects for TPDP (sorted by priority, topic under, then status)										
Topic N.	Current Title	Priority	Strategic objective	Topic under technical area (if applicable)	Added to the list	to	Discipline (Country)	Lead	Referee	Status

2019-005	<i>Moniliophthora roreri</i>	3	B C	Fungi and fungus-like organisms	2019-05 SC	Julie PATTEMORE (AU, 2020-11)	Juliet GOLDSMITH (JM, 2019-08) Yazmin RIVERA (US, 2020-11)	01. Topic added to the List of topics
2019-006	<i>Amaranthus palmeri</i>	2	B C	Plants	2019-05 SC	Colette C. JACONO (US, 2020-12) Liping Yin (CN, 2019- 08)	Juliet GOLDSMITH (JM, 2019-08)	04. Draft ISPM under development
2019-007	<i>Solanum rostratum</i>	2	B C	Plants	2019-05 SC	Colette C. JACONO (US, 2020-12) Liping Yin (CN, 2019- 08)	Géraldine ANTHOINE (FR, 2019-08)	04. Draft ISPM under development
2019-010	<i>Pyricularia oryzae</i> (syn. <i>Magnaporthe oryzae</i> ) on Triticum spp.	1	A B C	Fungi and fungus-like organisms	2019-05 SC	Julie PATTEMORE (AU, 2020-04)	Yazmin RIVERA (US, 2020-11)	04. Draft ISPM under development
2019-011	Revision of DP 5 ( <i>Phyllosticta citricarpa</i> (McAlpine)) Aa	1	A B C	Fungi and fungus-like organisms	2019-11 SC	Yazmin RIVERA (US, 2020-11)	Robert TAYLOR (NZ, 2020-11) Julie PATTEMORE (AU, 2020-11)	00. Pending
2021-001	Revision of DP 03: <i>Trogoderma granarium</i> Everts	1	A B C	Insects and mites	2021-02 SC	Norman BARR (US, 2021-04)	Juliet GOLDSMITH (JM, 2021-04)	04. Draft ISPM under development
2021-002	Revision of DP 09 Genus <i>Anastrepha</i>	2	A B C	Insects and mites	2021-02 SC	Norman BARR (US, 2021-04)	Juliet GOLDSMITH (JM, 2021-04)	04. Draft ISPM to first consultation
2021-003	Revision of DP 25 <i>Xylella</i> <i>fastidiosa</i>	2	A B C	Bacteria	2021-02 SC	Robert TAYLOR (NZ, 2021-04)		04. Draft ISPM to first consultation
2021-004	Revision of DP 27 <i>Ips</i> spp.	1	B C	Insects and mites	2021-02 SC	Norman BARR (US, 2021-04)	Juliet GOLDSMITH (JM, 2021-04)	05. Draft ISPM to first consultation
2021-013	<i>Bactrocera zonata</i> (Saunders, 1842)	2	A B C	Insects and mites	2021-11 SC	Norman BARR (US, 2022-04)	Juliet GOLDSMITH (JM, 2022-04)	04. Draft ISPM under development
2021-014	<i>Dickeya</i> spp. on potato	2	A B C	Bacteria	2021-11 SC	Robert TAYLOR (NZ, 2022-04)	Géraldine ANTHOINE (FR, 2022-04)	04. Draft ISPM under development
2021-015	<i>Heterobasidion annosum</i>	3	A	Fungi and fungus-like organisms	2021-11 SC	Yazmin RIVERA (US, 2022-04)	Robert TAYLOR (NZ, 2022-04)	04. Draft ISPM under development
2021-016	<i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> (Fall Armyworm)	1	A B C	Insects and mites	2021-11 SC	Juliet GOLDSMITH (JM, 2022-04)	Norman BARR (US, 2022- 04)	04. Draft ISPM under development
2021-017	<i>Drosophila suzukii</i> (Diptera: Drosophilidae)	1	A B	Insects and mites	2021-11 SC	Norman BARR (US, 2022-04)	Juliet GOLDSMITH (JM, 2022-04)	



			C					04. Draft ISPM under development
2021-025	Tomato brown rugose fruit virus	1	A C	Viruses and phytoplasmas	2021-11 SC	Vessela Assenova MAVRODIEVA (US, 2022-04)	Géraldine ANTHOINE (FR, 2022-04)	04. Draft ISPM under development
Table 4: Subjects for TPPT								
Topic N.	Current Title	Priority	Strategic objective	Topic under technical area (if applicable)	Added to the list	Treatment Lead (Country, Meeting assigned)	Assistant Lead (Country, Meeting assigned)	Status
2007-114	Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating	1	B C		2011-11 SC	Michael ORMSBY (NZ, 2006-12)		00. Pending
2017-012	Irradiation treatment for all stages of the family Pseudococcidae (generic)	1	A C		2018-05 SC	Daojian YU (CN, 2017-07)		01. Topic added to the List of topics
2017-018	Irradiation treatment for Epiphyas postvittana	2	A C		2018-05 SC	Daojian YU (CN, 2017-10)		04. Draft ISPM under development
2017-019	Irradiation treatment for Frankliniella occidentalis on all fresh commodities	3	A C		2018-05 SC	Toshiyuki DOHINO (JP, 2018-03)		01. Topic added to the List of topics
2017-028	Sulfuryl fluoride fumigation treatment for Chlorophorus annularis on bamboo articles	2	B C		2018-05 SC	Eduardo WILLINK (AR, 2017-07)		04. Draft ISPM under development
2017-029	Cold treatment Thaumotobia leucotreta on Citrus sinensis	2	A C		2018-05 SC	Peter LEACH (AU, 2019-07)		07. Draft ISPM to second or subsequent consultation
2017-030	Generic irradiation treatment against all insects except Lepidoptera larvae and pupae	2	A C		2018-05 SC	Scott W. MYERS (US, 2018-06)		01. Topic added to the List of topics
2017-037	CATTS (Controlled Atmosphere/Temperature Treatment System) treatments against codling moth (Cydia pomonella) and western cherry fruit fly (Rhagoletis indifferens) in cherry	3	A C		2018-11 SC	Michael ORMSBY (NZ, 2018-06)		06. Draft ISPM to first consultation
2018-001	Phytosanitary irradiation treatment of fresh commodities against Liriomyza sativa, L. trifolii and L. huidobrensis	2	A C		2018-05 SC	Enkerlin WALTHER (AT, 2019-07)		01. Topic added to the List of topics

Table 4: Subjects for TPPT								
Topic N.	Current Title	Priority	Strategic objective	Topic under technical area (if applicable)	Added to the list	Treatment Lead (Country, Meeting assigned)	Assistant Lead (Country, Meeting assigned)	Status
2021-027	Cold treatment of <i>Drosophila suzukii</i> on <i>Vitis vinifera</i>	1	A C		2022-05 SC	Eduardo WILLINK (AR, 2022-05)		01. Topic added to the List of topics
2021-028	Vapor heat treatment of <i>Planococcus lilacinus</i> on <i>Selenicereus undatus</i>	1	A C		2022-05 SC	Michael ORMSBY (NZ, 2022-05)		06. Draft ISPM to first consultation
2021-029	Irradiation treatment for all stages <i>Aspidiotis destructor</i>	1	A C		2022-05 SC	Guoping ZHAN (CN, 2022-10)		01. Topic added to the List of topics
2023-004	Cold treatment for <i>Zeugodacus tau</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i>	1	A C		2023 -11 SC	Toshiyuki DOHINO (JP, 2023-08)		04. Draft ISPM under development
2023-006	Methyl iodide fumigation of <i>Carposina sasakii</i> on <i>Malus x domestica</i>	3	A C		2023 -11 SC	Scott W. MYERS (US, 2023-08)		04. Draft ISPM under development
2023-032	Combination of Modified Atmosphere and Irradiation Treatment for <i>Trogoderma granarium</i>	1	A C		2023 -11 SC	Scott W. MYERS (US, 2023-08)		04. Draft ISPM under development
2023-033	Irradiation treatment for <i>Pseudococcus balteus</i>	1	A C		2023 -11 SC	Michael ORMSBY (NZ, 2023-08)		04. Draft ISPM under development
2023-034	Irradiation treatment for <i>Paracoccus marginatus</i>	1	A C		2023 -11 SC	Meghan NOSEWORTHY (CA, 2023-08)		04. Draft ISPM under development
2023-035	Irradiation treatment for <i>Planococcus lilacinus</i>	1	A C		2023 -11 SC	Takashi KAWAII (JE, 2023-08)		04. Draft ISPM under development

Table 5: Subjects for TPG					
Topic N.	Current Title	Drafting Body	Topic under technical area (if applicable)	Added to the list	Status
1994-001	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	None		08. Draft ISPM recommended for adoption
2010- 030	Review of the use of and/or in adopted ISPMs	TPG	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	2010-04 SC	04. Draft ISPM under development
2017-005	inspection	TPG	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	2017-05 SC	08. Draft ISPM recommended for adoption
2018-003	emerging pest	TPG	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	2018-05 SC	04. Draft ISPM under development
2018-046	general surveillance	TPG	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	2019-05 SC	08. Draft ISPM recommended for adoption
2018-047	specific surveillance	TPG	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	2019-05 SC	08. Draft ISPM recommended for adoption
2020-006	phytosanitary action	TPG	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	2020-11 SC	08. Draft ISPM recommended for adoption
2020-007	phytosanitary procedure	TPG	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	2020-11 SC	08. Draft ISPM recommended for adoption
2020-009	surveillance	TPG	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	2020-11 SC	08. Draft ISPM recommended for adoption
2021-005	Test	TPG	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	2021-05 SC	08. Draft ISPM recommended for adoption

Table 5: Subjects for TPG (sorted in English alphabetical order)

Topic N.	Current Title	Drafting Body	Topic under technical area (if applicable)	Added to the list	Status
2021-007	release (of a consignment)	TPG	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	2021-05 SC	07. Draft ISPM to second or subsequent consultation

**Appendix 8: Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) meeting provisional agenda****COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES  
STANDARDS COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP (SC-7) MEETING****13-17 May 2024****India Room (A-327), FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy****Start:** 13 May at 10:00 (coffee at 09:30) Rome time**End:** 17 May at 17:00 Rome time**Schedule**

Monday - Friday 10:00-12:30 and 14:30-17:00 coffee breaks 09:30 and 15:30 Rome time

<b>1.</b>	<b>Opening of the Meeting</b>	<b>Document number / link</b>	<b>Presenter / IPPC Secretariat support</b>
1.1.	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat		NERSISYAN
<b>2.</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>		
2.1.	Election of the Chairperson	–	<b>Secretariat</b>
2.2.	Election of the Rapporteur	–	<b>Chairperson</b>
2.3.	Adoption of the Agenda	01_SC7_2024_May	<b>Chairperson</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Administrative Matters</b>		
3.1.	Documents list	02_SC7_2024_May	TORELLA
3.2.	Participants list	03_SC7_2024_May <a href="#">SC membership list</a>	TORELLA
<b>4.</b>	<b>Draft ISPMs for approval for the second consultation</b>		
4.1.	○		
4.2.	<p><b>Draft Annex International Movement of Mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i>) Fruit to ISPM 46 (Commodity- specific standards for phytosanitary measures (2021-011), Priority 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Steward: Ms Joanne WILSON <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Steward's responses to Comments from 2023 Consultation (2021-011)</li> <li>○ TPG proposals to the Stewards terminology and consistency comments (2021-011)</li> <li>○ Steward's notes and potential implementation issues (2021-011)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>2021-011 XX_SC7_2024_May XX_SC7_2024_May XX_SC7_2024_May</p>	<b>WILSON/MOREIRA</b>

4.3.	<p><b>Draft Annex Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood) (2015-004), Priority 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Steward: Mr Steve CÔTÉ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Steward's responses to Comments from 2023 Consultation (2015-004)</li> <li>o TPG proposals to the Stewards terminology and consistency comments (2015-004)</li> <li>o Steward's notes and potential implementation issues (2015-004)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>2015-004  XX_SC7_2024_May  XX_SC7_2024_May  XX_SC7_2024_May</p>	CÔTÉ/SHAMILOV
5.	<b>Items arising from the SC May 2024</b>		
6.	<b>Review of the standard setting calendar</b>	<a href="#">Link to the IPP calendar</a>	TORELLA
7.	<b>Any other business</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>
8.	<b>Date and type of the next SC-7 Meeting</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>
9.	<b>Evaluation of the meeting process</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>
10.	<b>Close of the meeting</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>

## **Appendix 9: Modifications proposed to the Standard Setting Procedure**

### **MODIFICATIONS PROPOSED TO THE STANDARD SETTING PROCEDURE**

*(Prepared by the IPPC Secretariat based on SC-7 2023 proposals)*

#### **Color code/legend**

~~Strikethrough:~~ proposed deletion

Underlined: proposed addition

## Contents

<u>Modifications proposed to the Standard Setting Procedure</u> .....	71
<u>Background</u> .....	73
<u>SC-7 and IPPC Secretariat proposals to Standard Setting Procedure</u> .....	73
<u>2. IPPC Standard Setting Procedure</u> .....	73
<b><u>Stage 1: Developing the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i></u></b> .....	73
<u>Step 1: Call for topics</u> .....	73
<u>Stage 2: Drafting</u> .....	74
<u>Step 4: Preparation of a draft ISPM</u> .....	74
<b><u>Stage 3: Consultation and review</u></b> .....	74
<b><u>Stage 4: Adoption and publication</u></b> .....	74
<b><u>Step 7: Adoption</u></b> .....	74
<b><u>3. THE IPPC STANDARD SETTING PROCESS EXPLAINED</u></b> .....	75
<b><u>3.2 Topics</u></b> .....	75
<b><u>3.2.1 Submission of topics</u></b> .....	75
<b><u>3.2.4 Hierarchy of terms for standards</u></b> .....	75
<u>SC-7 proposals to the Rules of procedure for the Standards Committee</u> .....	75
<u>5. Standards Committee</u> .....	75
<u>5.2 Rules of procedure for the Standards Committee</u> .....	75
<b><u>Rule 6. Approval</u></b> .....	75
<b><u>Rule 7. Observers</u></b> .....	75
<b><u>5.8 E-decisions: IPPC SC procedures for conducting discussions and making decisions by electronic means</u></b> .....	76
<b><u>6. EXPERT WORKING GROUPS</u></b> .....	78
<b><u>6.1 Guidelines for the composition and organization of expert working groups</u></b> .....	78
<b><u>6.2 Guidelines for the operation of expert working groups</u></b> .....	78



## - Background

This paper contains the amendments proposed by the SC-7 during its meeting in May 2023 and change proposals by the secretariat (requests by the SC-7, consequential changes and proposals) to the IPPC Standard Setting Procedure. Therefore, this document does not include editorial changes and changes to unofficial sections of the SSP (existing blue font).

The changes are applied to the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting (2022-2023) (<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85024/>).

## SC-7 AND IPPC SECRETARIAT PROPOSALS TO STANDARD SETTING PROCEDURE

### 2. IPPC STANDARD SETTING PROCEDURE

[...]

#### Stage 1: Developing the *List of topics for IPPC standards*

##### Step 1: Call for topics

[...]

The IPPC Secretariat makes a Call for topics for standards and implementation every two years. During this call, contracting parties (CPs) and regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) can submit detailed proposals for new topics or for the revision of existing ISPMs to the IPPC Secretariat<sup>43</sup>. Submissions should be accompanied with a draft specification (except for diagnostic protocols (DPs)), a literature review and justification that the proposed topic meets the CPM-approved criteria for topics (available in the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*). To indicate a global need for the proposed topic, submitters are encouraged to gain support from CPs and RPPOs in other regions.

The submissions are reviewed by the Task Force on Topics (TFT), which makes recommendations to the Standards Committee (SC) and the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) respectively.

A separate call for submissions <sup>44</sup> for Technical Panels' work programme phytosanitary treatments (PTs) is made. Contracting parties (CPs) and regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) submit detailed proposals for subjects, which should follow the relevant submission documentation requirements. These are evaluated by the relevant technical panel.

The SC reviews the submissions, taking into account the IPPC Strategic Framework<sup>45</sup>, the *Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics*, the recommendation of the TFT and technical panels. The SC reviews the LOT (including subjects). The SC recommends to the CPM topics and their priority for addition to the workprogramme. The SC includes subjects into the work programme and recommends them to the CPM for noting.

[...]

---

<sup>43</sup> This is a call for ISPMs (including annexes not covered by a Technical Panel) and revisions of ISPMs.

<sup>45</sup> IPPC Strategic Framework available on the IPP at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/ippc-strategic-framework/>.

## - Stage 2: Drafting

[...]

### Step 4: Preparation of a draft ISPM<sup>46</sup>

An expert drafting group (EDG) (i.e. expert working group (EWG) or TP) drafts or revises the draft ISPM in accordance with the relevant specification. The SC may request the IPPC Secretariat to solicit comments from scientist around the world to ensure the scientific quality of draft DPs. The resulting draft ISPM is recommended to the SC.

[...]

### Stage 3: Consultation and review

Draft ISPMs are submitted to at least two consultation periods except for draft DPs and draft PTs (annexes to ISPM 27 and ISPM 28) which are submitted to one consultation period unless decided otherwise by the SC.

[...]

### Stage 4: Adoption and publication

#### Step 7: Adoption

- For draft ISPMs other than draft DPs:

Following recommendation by the SC, the draft ISPM is included on the agenda of the CPM session. The IPPC Secretariat should make the draft ISPM presented to the CPM for adoption available in the languages of the Organization as soon as possible and at least six weeks before the opening of the CPM session<sup>47</sup>.

If all CPs support the adoption of the draft ISPM, the CPM should adopt the ISPM without discussion.

If a CP does not support the adoption of the draft ISPM, the CP may submit an objection<sup>48</sup>. An objection must be accompanied by technical justification and suggestions for improvement of the draft ISPM which are likely to be acceptable to other CPs and be submitted to the IPPC Secretariat no later than ~~three~~ three weeks before the CPM session. Concerned CPs should make every effort to seek agreement before the CPM session. The objection will be added to the CPM agenda and the CPM will decide on a way forward.

[...]

<sup>46</sup> This procedure refers to “draft ISPMs” and “standards” to simplify wording, but also applies to any part of an ISPM, including annexes, appendixes or supplements.

<sup>47</sup> Draft ISPMs approved by the SC to go to the CPM for adoption are available in the SC November meeting report in English

<sup>48</sup> An objection should be a technically supported objection to the adoption of the draft standard in its current form and sent through the official IPPC contact point (refer to the *Criteria to help determine whether a formal objection is technically justified* as approved by CPM-8 (2013), recorded in the *IPPC Procedure manual for standard setting*). To submit the objection, CPs should use the template posted in languages on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85331/>) as decided by the Bureau 2017-06 and the SC 2017-11.

### 3. THE IPPC STANDARD SETTING PROCESS EXPLAINED

[...]

#### 3.2 Topics

##### 3.2.1 Submission of topics

[...]

Topics for standards or implementation resources are submitted using the submission form available on the Call for topics website (and attached as [ANNEX 7](#)). The SC strongly encourages submitters when submitting commodity standards proposals to also provide the Information Materials for Commodity Standards. Hence, a single submission for a commodity standard will have a commodity standards submission form , and the information material form for commodity standards.

[...]

##### 3.2.4 Hierarchy of terms for standards

A hierarchy of terms to clarify the different types of items on which expert drafting groups work was adopted by CPM-3 2008<sup>49</sup>.

The Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG), Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) and Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT), Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) are currently the only technical panels allowed to work on “subjects”, which do not have specifications.

[...]

## SC-7 PROPOSALS TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE

### 5. STANDARDS COMMITTEE

[...]

#### - 5.2 Rules of procedure for the Standards Committee<sup>50</sup>

[...]

##### Rule 6. Approval

Approvals relating to specifications or draft standards are sought by consensus. Final drafts of ISPMs which have been approved by the SC are submitted to the CPM without undue delay.

##### Rule 7. Observers

A contracting party to the IPPC or any regional plant protection organization may request to send up to two ~~one~~ observers from their NPPO or RPPO to attend a SC meeting. This request should be communicated by the official IPPC contact point to the IPPC Secretariat thirty days prior to the starting

<sup>49</sup> CPM-3 (2008), paragraph 89.1 and Appendix 7.

<sup>50</sup> Adopted by the CPM-1 (2006); aligned by the SC 2008-11 (Appendix 4), as requested by the CPM-3 (2008); revised by SC 2012-11 and adopted by CPM-8 (2013), Appendix 3; Rule 6 of the Rules of procedure amended by CPM-11 (2016).

date of the meeting and the decision to attend is made by the SC Chair. In response to this request, the observers will be invited to attend, depending whether logistical arrangements can be made.

A representative of the IC may attend as an observer.

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

[...]

## **5.8 E-decisions: IPPC SC procedures for conducting discussions and making decisions by electronic means<sup>51</sup>**

[...]

### **Types of discussion and decisions that the SC can make by electronic means**

The types of discussions and decisions listed below may be made through the use of electronic communication:

- approval of selected nominations for expert drafting groups
- approval of subjects (commodity standards, diagnostic protocols, phytosanitary treatments, and terms) to be included in the work programme of technical panels
- comment on explanatory documents in the reviewing process
- clearance of draft ISPMs for the first consultation (Step 4)
- consideration of comments (Step 5)
- determining how to proceed with draft ISPMs that are modified as a result of comments (Step 6)
- development and approval of draft specifications for consultation
- adjustments to stewards (of specifications, draft ISPMs and technical panels)
- any other tasks decided by the CPM or the SC during a face-to-face meeting
- exceptional cases determined in consultation with the Secretariat and the SC Chairperson.

### **Rules for agreement**

If there are no objections by the deadline, the SC is considered to be in agreement and a course of action in line with the decision should be taken.

If one or more SC members raise objection before the deadline, there is no consensus.

If there is no consensus, the SC Chairperson should summarize the issues and try to reformulate the proposed decision and submit for another round of consultation among SC members in order to try to reach consensus.

When selecting experts for EWGs, the SC members express their preference from the list of nominated experts by considering the expertise of the nominees and the regional representation. The secretariat compiles this information into a list, ranked in order of SC preference, and the maximum number of experts allowed by the specification are then selected based on that ranking. If the selection of the last position in the EWG is inconclusive those candidates receiving an equal amount of support are then subjected to a poll. If there is still no consensus, the SC Chairperson should communicate what he or she feels are the main points to the SC and the SC is asked to make the ultimate decision.

---

<sup>51</sup> SC 2010-11, Appendix 5, modified by SC 2022-11; previously ICPM-6 (2004); SC 2005-11, section 19.2; CPM-3 (2008); SC 2009-11; SC 2005-11.

When selecting experts for Technical Panels, the Secretariat opens a forum. The selection is only confirmed if all the SC agrees (confirmed via poll). The SC members express their preference from the list of nominated experts by considering the expertise of the nominees and the regional representation.

If there is still no consensus, the SC chair should communicate what he or she feels are the main points to the SC and the SC is asked to make the ultimate decision at the next face-to-face meeting.”

[...]

## 6. EXPERT WORKING GROUPS

[...]

### 6.1 Guidelines for the composition and organization of expert working groups<sup>52</sup>

#### *Criteria for the composition of an EWG*

An EWG:

should have 6–10 members;

should have members representing a wide geographic area (including proportional developing country participation);

should allow a participant from the host country to participate regardless of the EWG composition;

should have a member from the SC if possible (e.g. steward);

may be attended by any member of the Commission Bureau;

may be attended by IC ~~members as invited experts~~ or IC representatives;

may ~~invite~~ include - subject to SC approval - representatives of industry or other organizations to provide expertise to attend as invited experts, but not to participate as members or in the decision-making process; and

should ~~not~~ only allow observers as agreed in advance with the IPPC Secretariat in consultation with the Steward of the EWG

[...]

### - 6.2 Guidelines for the operation of expert working groups<sup>53</sup>

[...]

#### *Roles of meeting organizers and participants*

[...]

##### Members

The ~~experts in an~~ members of an EWG should:

take responsibility for their travel and accommodation arrangements and visa requirements. Experts are expected to be in attendance for the entirety of the EWG meeting and should plan to arrive before the meeting starts and depart after the meeting concludes. They should undertake whatever needs to be done in a timely manner so there are no urgent arrangements to be made by the organizers.

prepare discussion papers, consulting with national or regional experts, as requested

actively participate in the EWG meeting and in email discussions prior to and after the meeting, if appropriate

study discussion papers prior to the meeting and develop specific comments and text as appropriate in reflecting their individual viewpoints, aim to produce a globally acceptable standard

assist stewards as needed, particularly when reviewing country comments

respond, as appropriate, with comments to draft ISPMs within the agreed time.

[...]

<sup>52</sup> ICPM-5 (2003), Appendix XV.

<sup>53</sup> ICPM-7 (2005), Appendix VI.

### Invited experts

The SC may invite representatives of industry or other organizations to attend as invited experts.

The role of the invited experts is to provide expertise, information, data, and insights to the members of the EWG through the submission of discussion papers during the call for papers issued by the IPPC Secretariat prior to the meeting.

The invited experts may receive the documents, other than those of a restricted nature.

The invited experts are expected to:

take responsibility for their travel and accommodation arrangements and visa requirements;

;

prepare discussion paper(s) to submit to the call for papers issued by the IPPC Secretariat and deliver a presentation at the meeting;

provide additional information and data as requested;

understand that information provided by invited experts may not be considered by EWG; and

check the IPPC Secretariat website to be informed of the call for papers.

The Chairperson may restrict the participation of the invited experts in the discussion. The invited experts may be eligible to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat. The criteria are updated annually and can be found on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/criteria-used-prioritizing-participants-receive-travel-assistance-attend-meetings/>).

### Observers

Observers are expected to:

take responsibility for their travel and accommodation arrangements and visa requirements;

provide additional information and data, if requested.

Subject to the approval of the Chairperson, observers may participate in discussions without the right to participate in decision-making process.

Observers are not eligible to receive travel assistance to attend meetings under any circumstances.

[...]

## Appendix 10: Summary on poll and forums discussed on e-decisions sites 2023 may - 2023 November

*(Prepared by the IPPC Secretariat)*

### Background

- [1] This paper provides a summary of the outcomes of the e-decision forums and polls that the Standards Committee (SC) has conducted between 2023 May - November.
- [2] To review the concluded e-decision forums please see this page: <https://www.ippc.int/en/forum/category/sc-forum-may-2023-november-2023/>. The background documents and other documents (e.g. drafts, complied comments) are posted in the forum.
- [3] Visit the following page to review the forum and poll summaries (<http://www.ippc.int/en/work-area-pages/background-e-decisions/>).

### Recommendations to the SC

- [4] The SC is invited to:
  - (4) *agree* that the “Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions between 2023 May – 2023 November” accurately reflects the outcome of the SC e-decisions (Appendix 1).



## Appendix 1: Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions between 2023 May – 2023 November

**Table 1: SC e-decisions presented between 2023 May – 2023 November**

SC decision	SC members commenting in the forum	Polls (yes/no)
2023_eSC_Nov_01: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28 Vapour heat treatment for <i>Planococcus lilacinus</i> (2021-028)	11	
2023_eSC_Nov_02: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 27 Ips spp (2021-004)	19	
2023_eSC_Nov_03: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28 on Cold treatment for <i>Thaumatotibia leucotreta</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i> (2017-029)	19	
2023_eSC_Nov_04: Approval for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 27: Genus ceratitis (2016-001)	19	
2023_eSC_Nov_05: Approval for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 27: <i>Mononychelus tanajoa</i> (2018-006)	19	
2023_eSC_Nov_06: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 27 Genus <i>Anastrepha</i> Schiner (2021-002)	19	
2023_eSC_Nov_07: Approval for consultation: Draft revision of DP 25: <i>Xylella fastidiosa</i> (2021-003)	18	
2023_eSC_Nov_08: Selection of experts for the EWG on Field inspection	15	
2023_eSC_Nov_09: Adoption of the 2023 May SC meeting report	16	
2023_eSC_Nov_10: Selection of botany expert for the TPDP	16	
2023_eSC_Nov_11: Selection of Spanish language expert for the TPG	20	4
2023_eSC_Nov_12: Note to Bureau on draft annex to ISPM 38	8	
2023_eSC_Nov_13: Selection of the Steward for the Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010)	15	
2023_eSC_Nov_14 Adding new phytosanitary treatments to the workprogramme	16	
2023_eSC_Nov_15: Selection of botany expert for the TPDP	19	

**2023\_eSC\_Nov\_01: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28 Vapour heat treatment for *Planococcus lilacinus* (2021-028)**

**Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [6] During the SC e-decision The SC was invited to approve the following draft PT for consultation: Vapour heat treatment for *Planococcus lilacinus* (2021-028).
- [7] The SC e-forum was open from the 8-22 May 2023. 11 SC members provided their comments.

**SC e-decision**

- [8] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the draft PT on the Vapour heat treatment for *Planococcus lilacinus* (2021-028) for consultation.

**2022\_eSC\_May\_02: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 27 Ips spp (2021-004)****Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [9] During the SC e-decision The SC was invited to approve the following draft DP for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 27 Ips spp (2021-004).
- [10] The SC e-forum was open from the 2-16 June 2023. 19 SC members provided their comments.

**SC e-decision**

- [11] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the draft DP for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 27 Ips spp (2021-004).

**2023\_eSC\_May\_03: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 28 on Cold treatment for *Thaumatotibia leucotreta* on *Citrus sinensis* (2017-029)****Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [12] During the SC e-decision The SC was invited to approve the following draft PT for consultation: Cold treatment for *Thaumatotibia leucotreta* on *Citrus sinensis* (2017-029).
- [13] The SC e-forum was open from the 2-16 June 2023. 19 SC members provided their comments.

**SC e-decision**

- [14] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the draft PT on the Cold treatment for *Thaumatotibia leucotreta* on *Citrus sinensis* (2017-029) for consultation.

**2023\_eSC\_May\_04: Approval for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 27: Genus *Ceratitidis* (2016-001)****Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [15] During the SC e-decision The SC was invited to approve the responses to the consultation comments and the following draft DP for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 27 Genus *Ceratitidis* (2016-001).
- [16] The SC e-forum was open from the 2-16 June 2023. 19 SC members provided their comments.

**SC e-decision**

- [17] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the consultation comments and the following draft DP for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 27: Genus *Ceratitidis* (2016-001).

**2023\_eSC\_May\_05: Approval for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 27: *Mononychelus tanajoa* (2018-006)****Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [18] During the SC e-decision The SC was invited to approve the responses to the consultation comments and the following draft DP for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 27 *Mononychelus tanajoa* (2018-006).
- [19] The SC e-forum was open from the 2-16 June 2023. 19 SC members provided their comments.

**SC e-decision**

- [20] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the consultation comments and the following draft DP for adoption: Draft annex to ISPM 27: *Mononychelus tanajoa* (2018-006).

### **2023\_eSC\_May\_06: Approval for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 27: *Genus Anastrepha Schiner (2021-002)***

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [21] During the SC e-decision The SC was invited to the following draft DP for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 27 Genus *Anastrepha Schiner (2021-002)*.
- [22] The SC e-forum was open from the 2-16 June 2023. 19 SC members provided their comments.

#### ***SC e-decision***

- [23] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the following draft DP for consultation: Draft annex to ISPM 27: Genus *Anastrepha Schiner (2021-002)*

### **2023\_eSC\_May\_07: Approval for consultation: Draft revision of DP 25: *Xylella fastidiosa (2021-003)***

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [24] During the SC e-decision The SC was invited to the following draft DP for consultation: Draft revision of DP 25: *Xylella fastidiosa (2021-003)*.
- [25] The SC e-forum was open from the 6-20 June 2023. 18 SC members provided their comments.

#### ***SC e-decision***

- [26] Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the following draft DP for consultation: Draft revision of DP 25: *Xylella fastidiosa (2021-003)*.

### **2023\_eSC\_May\_08: Selection of experts for the EWG on Field inspection**

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [27] During the SC e-decision, the SC was invited to review the nominations and select six to eight experts for the EWG on field inspection (annex to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*)) (2021-018);
- [28] The SC e-forum was open from the 15-29 June 2023. 15 SC members provided their comments.

#### ***SC e-decision***

- [29] Based on the forum discussions, the following experts were selected:

- Tracy Bruns
- Natalia Larrea
- Laura Jayne Stevens
- Saleh Abdelsattar Bahig
- Akosua Agyekumwaa Adofo
- Anh Tuan Nguyen
- Tamás Székely
- Hongxia Jiang\*

### **2023\_eSC\_May\_09: Adoption of the 2023 May SC meeting report**

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [30] During the SC e-decision, the SC was invited to review and adopt the 2023 May SC meeting report;

- [31] The SC e-forum was open from the 6-20 July, later extended to the 5 September 2023. 16 SC members provided their comments. Some suggestions were made, and the Secretariat consulted the Rapporteur, however the SC did not agree to include the additions. The SC requested to discuss the process of adopting SC reports.

#### *SC e-decision*

- [32] Based on the forum discussions, the SC adopted the 2023 May SC meeting report and requested to discuss the process of adopting SC reports.

### **2023\_eSC\_May\_10: Selection of botany expert for the TPDP**

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [33] During the SC e-decision, the SC was invited to select a botany expert for the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) for a 5-year term starting in 2023;

- [34] The SC e-forum was open from the 25 July – 25 August 2023. 16 SC members provided their comments.

#### *SC e-decision*

- [35] The SC reviewed the nominations but the selection was inconclusive, and a new call for botanist was issued.

### **2023\_eSC\_May\_11: Selection of Spanish language expert for the TPG**

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [36] During the SC e-decision, the SC was invited to select Spanish language expert for the Technical Panel on the Glossary (TPG) for a 5-year term starting in 2023;

- [37] The SC e-forum was open from the 25 July – 8 August 2023. 20 SC members provided their comments.

#### *SC e-decision*

- [38] Based on the forum discussion, the SC selected Patricia Raquel Carua Guaigua (Ecuador) as Spanish language expert for the member of the Technical Panel on the Glossary (TPG) for a 5-year term starting in 2023. The selection was confirmed via poll.

### **2023\_eSC\_May\_12: Note to Bureau on draft annex to ISPM 38**

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [39] During the SC e-decision, the SC was invited to review the note to Bureau on draft annex to ISPM 38: design and use of systems approaches for the phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009), that was drafted by the small SC group and make suggestions on the way forward.

- [40] The SC e-forum was open from the 31 July – 28 August 2023. 8 SC members provided their comments.

#### *SC e-decision*

- [41] Based on the forum discussion, the SC made suggestions on the text, later reviewed by the small SC group but did not agree to send the current version to the Bureau on behalf of the SC.

### **2023\_eSC\_May\_13: Selection of the Steward for the Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010)**

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [42] During the SC e-decision, the SC was invited to confirm the selection of the Steward for the Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010) as recommended by the SC-7.
- [43] The SC e-forum was open from the 10-24 August 2023. 15 SC members provided their comments.

#### ***SC e-decision***

Based on the forum discussion, the SC confirmed the selection of Mr Harry ARJIS as the Steward for the Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010).

### **2023\_eSC\_May\_14: Selection of the Steward for the Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010)**

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [44] During the SC e-decision, the SC was invited to add the recently received 6 phytosanitary treatment proposals to the workprogramme as recommended by the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT).
- [45] The SC e-forum was open from the 25 September – 9 October 2023. 16 SC members provided their comments.

#### ***SC e-decision***

Based on the forum discussion, the SC added the following topics to the TPPT workprogramme:

- Cold treatment of *Citrus sinensis* for *Zeugodacus tau* (2023-004)
- Methyl iodide fumigation of *Carposina sasakii* on *Malus × domestica* (2023-006)
- Combination of Modified Atmosphere and Irradiation Treatment for *Trogoderma granarium* (2023-032)
- Irradiation treatment for *Pseudococcus baliteus* (2023-033)
- Irradiation treatment for *Paracoccus marginatus* (2023-034)
- Irradiation treatment for *Planococcus lilacinus* (2023-035)

### **2023\_eSC\_May\_15: Selection of botany expert for the TPDP**

#### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [46] During the SC e-decision, the SC was invited to select a botany expert for the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) for a 5-year term starting in 2023, as the continuation of the e-forum 2023\_eSC\_May\_10.
- [47] The SC e-forum was open from the 3-19 October 2023. 19 SC members provided their comments.

#### ***SC e-decision***

Based on the forum discussion, the SC selected Mr Vijayasankar RAMAN (USA) a botany expert for the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) for a 5-year term starting in 2023.

## Appendix 11: Proposals for ink amendments to adopted Arabic and Chinese versions of standards, for consistency with Arabic and Chinese translations of ISPM 5

(Prepared by the IPPC Secretariat)

### Background

- [1] The following translation consistency changes were submitted for the attention of the IPPC Secretariat by the Language Review Group (LRG) Coordinators for Arabic (Ar) and Chinese (Zh) following the LRG review of the CPM-16 adopted ISPMs in 2022, aiming at aligning terminology to relevant ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) translations. The proposed translation consistency changes were initially discussed with FAO Senior Revisers for Ar and Zh, who both agreed that these changes should be implemented in ISPMs translated so far:

LRG	Proposals for translation consistency changes	ISPMs to be checked and eventually amended
Arabic Language Review Group	The term “treatment(s)”, originally translated as “معالجة”, was erroneously replaced in ISPM 28 title (and across all relevant annexes, i.e. PTs) with “معاملة”, while the term “معالجة” should be kept, as per ISPM 5 correct translation. Same changes shall be applied to the PTs’ headers: the word “treatments”, where reading “ملات”, should be replaced by the correct term “معالجات”.	ISPM 28. PTs from 1 to 45.
Chinese Language Review Group	The term "irradiation" was occasionally translated as "辐射", which is not in line with the definition in ISPM 5, where the correct translation of "irradiation" is "辐照".	ISPM 3; ISPM 11; ISPM 12; ISPM 14; ISPM 18; ISPM 26; ISPM 27; ISPM 28; ISPM 32; ISPM 38; ISPM 39.  PTs from 1 to 14; PT 19; PT 20; PT 33; PT 38; PT 39; PT 40; PT 42; PT 43; PT 45.

- [2] During the TPG virtual meeting held on 01 March 2023<sup>54</sup>, the TPG members for Ar and Zh languages discussed and agreed with the suggestions made by the two LRG Coordinators.

### Recommendations to the SC

- [3] The SC is invited to:
- (5) *consider* the proposed translation consistency changes to be applied to the adopted Arabic and Chinese versions of standards, aligning them to the ISPM 5 translation in their respective languages; and
  - (6) *approve* the translation consistency changes as ink amendments, to be submitted to CPM-18 for *noting*.

<sup>54</sup> 2023 March TPG meeting report (virtual): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/92120/>

**Appendix 12: SC November 2023 Decision points and follow-up actions**

Decisions & Actions	Agenda Item (Decision #)	Responsible	Deadline
1. <i>agreed</i> that, while still complying with Rule 8 of the Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee, SC reports should reflect the discussions held by the SC and focus on major issues.	2.3 (3)	Standard Committee	
2. <i>recommended</i> the draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001), with the draft definitions as approved at this meeting, for submission to CPM-18 (2024) for adoption	4.1 (7)	SECRETARIAT	11 December
3. <i>recommended</i> the 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) as modified in this meeting for submission to CPM-18 (2024) for adoption	4.2 (10)	SECRETARIAT	11 December
4. <i>requested</i> that the SC representative to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) present the implementation issues identified for this draft annex (namely, the development of “worked” examples as case studies in implementation material) to the IC for consideration; and	4.2 (11)	Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE / Ms Kyu-Ock YIM	IC May 2024
5. <i>invited</i> the IC to consider how to improve the process by which suggestions on potential implementation issues raised during consultation on draft ISPMs are possibly incorporated in the work programme of the IC.	4.2 (12)	Ms Kyu-Ock YIM / IC / SECRETARIAT	IC May 2024
6. <i>selected</i> Steve CÔTE (Canada), Nader ELBADRY (Egypt), Stavroula IOANNIDOU (Greece), David KAMANGIRA (Malawi), Masahiro SAI (Japan), André Felipe C. P. da SILVA (Brazil), Joanne WILSON (lead, New Zealand) and Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America) to form a small working group to develop a draft specification for this holistic revision for presentation at the SC meeting in May 2024;	5 (14)	Steve, Nader, Stavroula, David, Masahiro, André, Joanne, and Marina / SECRETARIAT	SC May 2024
7. <i>agreed</i> that one of the tasks of the EWG would be to decide where best to present guidance on environmental risks in the holistic standard	5 (15)	EWG (holistic approach to the revision of PRA standards)	SC May 2024
8. <i>requested</i> that the steward of the topic Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001), Masahiro SAI (Japan): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>review the 2023 consultation comments and prepare steward’s notes highlighting the themes that have emerged from the comments (initially to feed into the</li> </ul>	5 (16)	Masahiro SAI (Japan) / SECRETARIAT	SC May 2024

Decisions & Actions	Agenda Item (Decision #)	Responsible	Deadline
development of the draft specification and subsequently to accompany the compiled responses to consultation comments and the revised draft ISPM for presentation to the EWG for the holistic standard), and			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>address the consultation comments by providing responses and revising the text of the draft ISPM</li> </ul>			
9. <i>recommended</i> to CPM-18 (2024) that the topic Holistic revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis standard (2023-037) be added to the List of topics for standards;	5 (17)	SECRETARIAT	CPM-18 (2024)
10. <i>invited</i> the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards to consider how to address the comments related to the addition of sources for the pests included in the list of pests in commodity standards; and	5 (19)	TPCS / SECRETARIAT	SC November 2024 / SC May 2025
11. <i>SC invited</i> the TPPT to advise the SC on whether the process for testing new treatments for ISPM 15 should be included in the IPPC framework	6.1 (21)	TPPT / SECRETARIAT	SC May 2024
12. <i>SC invited</i> the TPPT to <i>advise</i> the SC on the best location within the IPPC framework to place the description of the process for testing new treatments for ISPM 15, including the pros and cons of each option and the rationale for the preferred option	6.1 (22)	TPPT	SC May 2024
13. <i>SC invited</i> the TPPT to assess whether the model described in Ormsby (2022) and other relevant publications provide a sufficient basis for the development of treatment schedules for ISPM 15	6.1 (23)	TPPT	SC November 2024 / SC May 2025
14. The SC <i>recommended</i> that the following topics be added to the List of topics for IPPC standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2023-014: Revision of ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection), priority 2,</li> <li>2023-020: Revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates), priority 1,</li> <li>2023-031: Annex Remote audits to ISPM 47 (Audit in the phytosanitary context), priority 1,</li> <li>2023-008: ISPM 46 Annex: Seeds of <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i>, priority 1,</li> <li>2023-018: ISPM 46 Annex: International movement of <i>Vitis vinifera</i> fruit, priority 2,</li> <li>2023-019: ISPM 46 Annex: International movement of citrus fruit, priority 1,</li> <li>2023-023: ISPM 46 Annex: International movement of fresh taro</li> </ul>	6.1 (24)	SECRETARIAT	After CPM 18



Decisions & Actions	Agenda Item (Decision #)	Responsible	Deadline
<p>(Colocasia esculenta) corm for consumption, priority 1,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2023-024: ISPM 46 Annex: International movement of Malus domestica fruit for consumption, priority 2,</li> <li>2023-027: ISPM 46 Annex: International movement of fresh orange (Citrus sinensis) fruit, priority 2, and</li> <li>2023-028: ISPM 46 Annex: International movement of fresh banana (Musa paradisiaca) fruit, priority 1</li> </ul>			
15. noted that the TPCS would consider the topic proposals in more detail at a future meeting, with a view to providing further advice to the SC about which of the priority 1 commodity standards to develop first once the CPM has decided which topics to include on the work programme;	7.1 (26)	TPCS / SECRETARIAT	SC May 2024
16. invited the TPCS to consider, as they are developing the commodity standards, what criteria may be useful to the SC when considering priorities in future;	7.1 (27)	TPCS	SC May 2024
17. added the following diagnostic protocols to the List of topics for IPPC standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2023-003: ISPM 27 Annex: <i>Oryctes rhinoceros</i>, priority 2,</li> <li>2023-009: ISPM 27 Annex: High-throughput sequencing identification of pure culture of phytopathogenic regulated bacteria isolated from plants, priority 2,</li> <li>2023-010: ISPM 27 Annex: <i>Alopecurus myosuroides</i>, priority 3,</li> <li>2023-012: ISPM 27 Annex: Detection and identification of <i>Halyomorpha halys</i>, priority 1,</li> <li>2023-015: ISPM 27 Annex: <i>Bactrocera correcta</i>, priority 2,</li> <li>2023-016: ISPM 27 Annex: <i>Bactrocera tsuneonis</i> and <i>Bactrocera minax</i>, priority 2,</li> <li>2023-026: ISPM 27 Annex: Avocado sun blotch viroid, priority 1, and</li> <li>2023-029: ISPM 27 Annex: <i>Thaumatotibia leucotreta</i>, priority 1;</li> </ul>	7.1 (29)	SECRETARIAT	Before CPM 18
18. noted that the TPDP would further reassess the priorities for DPs, considering the existing DPs in the work programme; and	7.1 (31)	TPDP	SC May 2025
19. requested that the secretariat open a call for a new TPDP member for entomology.	7.1 (32)	SECRETARIAT	January / February 2024
20. The SC noted that they would need to select a new steward for the Technical Panel for the	7.2 (34)	SC / SECRETARIAT	SC May 2024

Decisions & Actions	Agenda Item (Decision #)	Responsible	Deadline
Glossary (2006-013) at their meeting in May 2024;			
21. <i>recommended</i> to CPM-18 (2024) that the following topics be removed from the List of IPPC standards:	7.2 (35)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Guidelines for phytosanitary [measures] of international mail items (2018-014), and</i></li> <li>• <i>Requirement for phytosanitary certificate on cross-border online-shopping plants, plant products and other regulated articles (2018-021)</i></li> </ul>		SECRETARIAT	After CPM-18 (2024)
22. <i>requested</i> that the secretariat update the List of topics for IPPC standards to include the subjects for diagnostic protocols added to the work programme under agenda item 7.1 of this meeting, for noting by CPM-18 (2024); and	7.2 (38)		
		SECRETARIAT	Before CPM-18 (2024)
23. <i>requested</i> that the secretariat make arrangements for stewards of draft ISPMs being considered by the SC-7 for second consultation to join the meeting virtually for the relevant agenda item;	8.2 (44)		
		SECRETARIAT	SC-7 May 2024
24. <i>recommended</i> the proposed revisions to the Standard Setting Procedure and the Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee, as modified at this meeting, to CPM-18 (2024) for adoption (Appendix XX);	8.2 (46)		
		SECRETARIAT	CPM-18 (2024)
25. <i>invited</i> the TPCS and the TPCS stewards to review the proposed text for section 7.4 of the IPPC procedure manual for standard setting, for presentation to the SC meeting in May 2024;	8.2 (48)		
		TPCS and the TPCS Stewards	SC May 2024
26. <i>agreed</i> to remove the subject “emerging pest” (2018-003) from the work programme of the TPG.	10.1 (55)		
		SECRETARIAT	Before CPM-18 (2024)
27. <i>selected</i> Harry ARIJS (European Union, lead), Matías GONZALEZ BUTTERA (Argentina), Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) and Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America) to form a small group of SC members to redraft Specification 70 (Design and use of systems approaches for the phytosanitary certification of seeds) for consideration at the SC meeting in May 2024.	10.2 (56)		
		Harry, Matías, Steve and Marina / SECRETARIAT	SC May 2024
28. <i>agreed</i> that these translation consistency changes would be applied as ink amendments (Appendix XX), to be submitted to CPM-18 (2024) for noting.	11 (67)		
		SECRETARIAT	CPM-18 (2024)