



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Standards Committee

18–22 November 2024

Rome, Italy

IPPC Secretariat

Required Citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2025. *Report of the meeting of the Standards Committee, 18–22 November 2024*. Rome. FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention.

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

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

© FAO, 2025



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original English edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <https://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

Third-party materials. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (<https://www.fao.org/publications>) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via <https://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request>. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org

CONTENTS

Executive summary	5
1. Opening of the meeting	7
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	7
2. Meeting arrangements	7
2.1 Election of the rapporteur.....	7
2.2 Adoption of the agenda	7
3. Administrative matters	7
4. Draft ISPMs for recommendation to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures for adoption (from second consultation)	8
4.1 Draft annex <i>International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit</i> (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (<i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i>), priority 1.....	8
4.2 Draft annex <i>Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risk associated with the movement of wood</i> (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (<i>International movement of wood</i>), priority 3.....	11
5. Issues raised from the first consultation period	14
6. Draft specification from first consultation for revision and approval.....	16
6.1 Draft specification on <i>Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM</i> (2023-037)	16
6.2 Draft specification on <i>Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid</i> (2021-020)	20
7. Review of specifications for new topics.....	22
7.1 Annex <i>Remote audits</i> to ISPM 47 (<i>Audit in the phytosanitary context</i>) (2023-031), priority 1.....	22
7.2 Revision of ISPM 12 (<i>Phytosanitary certificates</i>) (2023-020), priority 1	22
7.3 Revision of ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) (2023-014), priority 2	22
8. Urgent issues from the technical panels	23
8.1 Modifications to the <i>IPPC procedure manual for standard setting</i> for recommendation to CPM-19 (2025)	23
8.2 Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments workplan	23
8.3 Selection of the third expert for the English language for the Technical Panel for the Glossary.....	24
9. Topics	25
9.1 Task Force on Topics	25
9.2 List of topics.....	26
10. Standards Committee.....	27
10.1 Standards Committee working group (SC-7) May 2024.....	27
10.2 Summary on polls and fora discussed on e-decision site (from May 2024 to November 2024)	28
10.3 Selection of SC representatives.....	28
11. Implementation and Capacity Development (IC) Committee and SC–IC Interactions.....	28
11.1 Update on IC activities.....	28
12. Updates	29

12.1	CPM Bureau: Update from June, September and October 2024 meetings	29
12.2	Strategic Planning Group	30
12.3	SC small working groups	30
12.4	Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations, 2024 update	31
12.5	Update on the IPPC regional workshops.....	32
12.6	Briefings from IPPC Secretariat.....	32
13.	SC recommendations for CPM-19 (2025) decisions and discussions	33
14.	Agenda items deferred to future SC meetings	34
15.	Any other business.....	34
16.	Date and venue of the next SC meeting.....	34
17.	Evaluation of the meeting process	34
18.	Review and adoption of the decisions	35
19.	Close of the meeting	35
	Appendix 1: Agenda.....	36
	Appendix 2: Documents list.....	42
	Appendix 3: Participants list	46
	Appendix 4: DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 46: International movement of fresh <i>Mangifera indica</i> fruit (2021-011)	51
	Appendix 5: DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 39: Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risk associated with the movement of wood (2015-004).....	63
	Appendix 6: Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037).....	73
	Appendix 7: DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ISPM: Safe provision of humanitarian aid in the phytosanitary context (2021-020).....	79
	Appendix 8: Draft agenda for the 2025 SC-7 meeting.....	84
	Appendix 9: Participants list Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) 2025.....	86
	Appendix 10: Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions between 2024 May – 2024 November	88
	Appendix 11: List of action points arising from the meeting.....	92

Executive summary

- [1] The Standards Committee (SC) revised two draft annexes to International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) and recommended them to the Nineteenth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) for adoption in 2025:
- 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 risk associated with the movement of wood* (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*).
- [2] The draft annexes are available in English as appendices of this report, in advance of them being posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal in all FAO languages as CPM papers.
- [3] The SC received updates on the draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation in 2024. They noted that each request for text changes or additions to draft documents under consultation, aimed at improving clarity, needs to be supported by proposed text to ensure that it is considered and addressed appropriately by the stewards.
- [4] The SC reviewed two draft specifications:
- The SC approved Specification 76 (*Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM*), which aimed to revise the draft ISPM developed under the topic *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) to provide a more comprehensive revision.
 - The SC considered the draft specification on *Safe provision of humanitarian aid in the phytosanitary context*, which had been amended by the CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid following consultation. The SC made some modifications and, in accordance with the decision of CPM-18 (2024), agreed to present the draft specification to CPM-19 (2025) with a request for the CPM to decide whether to proceed with the development of an ISPM.
- [5] The SC deferred their review of the draft specifications added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by CPM-18 (2024) until the SC meeting in May 2025.
- [6] The SC agreed to move the start date of the notification period for diagnostic protocols (when diagnostic protocols are recommended for adoption) from 5 January to 30 January to align with the January consultation period for draft diagnostic protocols.
- [7] The SC added a vapour heat treatment to the work programme of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments and agreed that the panel would review two draft treatment manuals being developed to complement the IPPC guide on *Regulation of wood packaging material*.
- [8] The SC assigned stewards and assistant stewards to topics and subjects, made one change to the membership of the SC Working Group (SC-7), selected an expert for the English language for the Technical Panel for the Glossary and selected two SC representatives to CPM focus groups.
- [9] In considering interactions with the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC), the SC requested that the secretariat and CPM Bureau discuss applying flexible travel support criteria to ensure that the IC representative to the SC (who was an observer) could receive travel support to attend SC meetings if they met the World Bank criteria for support in other respects. The SC also requested that the secretariat develop a system to collect all potential implementation issues raised by various bodies at various stages for future consideration.
- [10] The SC continued their discussions about mechanisms to address technical issues raised that are not objections to draft ISPMs submitted for adoption. They recognized that the provisions for objections in the current Standard Setting Procedure already accommodated a means to address the concern, but there was a need to communicate the corresponding process better. The SC requested that a small working group of SC members draft a paper for CPM-19 (2025) for subsequent approval by SC e-decision.

- [11] The SC urged the secretariat to make the presentations at IPPC regional workshops available as Powerpoint files to regional committees (for forwarding to assigned presenters of the topics) in good time before the workshops.
- [12] In receiving briefings from the secretariat, the SC agreed to promote completion of the IPPC Observatory e-commerce survey by all contracting parties. The SC also highlighted the importance of early communication about the themes for the International Day of Plant Health and the availability of relevant material.
- [13] In a lunchtime session, representatives from the World Organisation for Animal Health and the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat provided an overview of their respective standard setting processes.

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The IPPC Standing Setting Unit (SSU) lead, Avetik NERSISYAN, and the IPPC Officer-in-Charge of daily matters, Arop DENG, opened the Standards Committee (SC) meeting and welcomed all participants.
- [2] The officer-in-charge explained the management arrangements for the transition between the retirement of the previous IPPC secretary and the appointment of a new one. He also outlined some of the issues discussed at recent governance meetings. He highlighted the important contribution of SC members to IPPC regional workshops and thanked them for their commitment to the mission of the IPPC.
- [3] The SSU lead recognized the fast pace of change in the external operating environment and encouraged the SC to provide its views to governance bodies on how such changes affected standard setting.
- [4] The SSU lead extended a particular welcome to the new SC members attending this meeting: Amani ALAWAMLEH (Jordan), María José MONTELONGO (Uruguay), Edouard NYA (Cameroon) and David Alfonso TELLO CEPEDA (Ecuador).
- [5] The SC noted the absence of J.P. Singh (India) and Sayed Muzammil HUSSAIN (Pakistan).
- [6] The SC chairperson, Sophie PETERSON (Australia) welcomed everyone and looked forward to a week of open discussion to reach consensus.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Election of the rapporteur

- [7] The SC elected Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy) and Stavroula IOANNIDOU (Greece) as rapporteurs.

2.2 Adoption of the agenda

- [8] The SC adopted the agenda (Appendix 1), agreeing to consider agenda item 12.1 (CPM Bureau update) and agenda item 12.2 (Strategic Planning Group (SPG) update) at the end of agenda item 3 and to consider agenda item 7 (Review of specifications for new topics) at the end of the meeting.
- [9] In addition to the agenda items, a lunchtime session with representatives from the World Organisation for Animal Health and the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat had been arranged to provide an overview of their respective standard setting processes.

3. Administrative matters

- [10] 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.
- [11] The secretariat provided a document on local information.
- [12] The SSU lead introduced the SSU staff¹ and explained that one member of the team had recently been seconded for six months to an FAO regional office. He thanked Argentina, Barbados and Japan for hosting meetings, the European Union and the Republic of Korea for financial contributions towards standard setting activities, and Australia for their continued in-kind contribution of a member of the secretariat.
- [13] New SC members were invited to attend a training session at lunchtime.

¹ Standard Setting Unit staff (2024-09-24): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/2463/>

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

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

[14] The Steward, Joanne WILSON (New Zealand), introduced the draft annex and supporting documentation.² A total of 198 consultation comments had been received. The main comments made (detailed under the review of the text below) were to amend the commodity description, check and reference pest–host associations in the list of pests, add or remove pests from the pest list, modify some parts of the text, add and correct options for measures, and check referencing.

[15] The SC reviewed the draft standard.

Review of the draft text

[16] The SC made various editorial changes to the text to improve its clarity and flow. The main technical and substantive issues discussed were as follows.

[17] **Commodity description.** The steward explained that she had accepted the consultation comment suggesting that reference to cultivars and varieties be deleted to simplify the commodity description. The SC agreed.

[18] The SC discussed at length a consultation comment suggesting that the term “stem” be used instead of “stalk” as they were anatomically the same. The SC noted that this change could give rise to confusion, as it was necessary to distinguish the small section of stem bearing the fruit (i.e. the pedicel), which would not have leaves and would often remain with the fruit as the traded commodity, from the rest of the stem with leaves, which would pose a greater pest risk. The SC therefore agreed to restrict the standard to fruits with or without pedicels, using plain language to explain a pedicel, and not otherwise to refer to stems.

[19] The SC agreed to refer to fruit that was “chopped” rather than “sliced” for consistency with ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*).

[20] **Quarantine pests vs regulated pests.** The SC considered a consultation comment suggesting that the standard refer to quarantine pests rather than regulated pests. The SC acknowledged that the regulated pests in this case would be quarantine pests, but they agreed that it was better to refer to regulated pests for consistency with ISPM 46.

[21] **Pests associated with fresh *M. indica* fruit.** The SC agreed, both in this section and elsewhere, that there was no need to say that the fruit was for consumption or processing, as this was already explained in the section on Description of the commodity.

[22] The SC distinguished between factors that may *affect* pest infestation (whether a plant is infested or not) and those that may *influence* pest infestation (which also included qualitative effects). They agreed that the latter was more appropriate to use in the context of factors such as cultivar or variety, geographical and ecological factors, and agricultural and production practices.

[23] **Removing and adding pests to the pest list.** The steward explained that she had not included two of the five pests suggested for inclusion, because no corresponding measure could be provided by the submitting country or the technical information submitted gave no indication that the pest is regulated by a national plant protection organization (NPPO). She had retained three of the six pests suggested for removal, because references or pest risk analysis (PRA) information and a corresponding measure had been provided by the submitting country to support a pest–host association.

² 2021-011; 15_SC_2024_Nov; 16_SC_2024_Nov.

- [24] **Synonyms.** The steward confirmed that the entry for *Bactrocera dorsalis* was for the species rather than the *B. dorsalis* complex, as the various species within the complex were regulated separately to each other, with different phytosanitary measures. When compiling the pest list, the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) had included *Bactrocera philippinensis* within the entry for *B. dorsalis* because it was a synonym of the species (for consistency with diagnostic protocol (DP) 29 (*Bactrocera dorsalis*)). The secretariat confirmed that the TPCS had used the more recent names *Zeugodacus cucurbitae* and *Zeugodacus tau* rather than the submitted names *Bactrocera cucurbitae* and *Bactrocera tau* (which were synonyms) for consistency with adopted phytosanitary treatments (PTs).
- [25] The SC discussed whether to include the synonyms in the table rather than in the footnote, but they recognized that this could be setting a precedent for future commodity standards, encouraging contracting parties to submit comprehensive lists of synonyms. The SC therefore opted to remove the footnote about *Z. cucurbitae*, *Z. tau* and *B. philippinensis* and replace it with a general footnote to the Species column heading, explaining that the scientific names in the table were based on the submissions of contracting parties or aligned with ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*) or ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*).
- [26] **References for pest–host association.** The steward explained that references for pest–host association had not been included because additional text had been added after first consultation, and modified after second consultation, to emphasize the factors affecting pest–host association and the responsibilities of NPPOs. She also referred to the plans of the TPCS to develop a database that would provide further details of the sources of information.
- [27] **Options for phytosanitary measures.** The SC agreed to omit reference to Article VII.2(g) of the IPPC (“contracting parties shall institute only phytosanitary measures that are technically justified”), as this was already included in the core text of ISPM 46.
- [28] Following consultation comments, the SC considered two options drafted by the steward for the part of this section that introduced the tables on pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures. The SC agreed to use the simpler option and modified it further for clarity.
- [29] The SC agreed that there was no need to say that the options for phytosanitary measures included in the standard met the criteria in the core text of ISPM 46, as this was obvious.
- [30] **Adding or changing options for phytosanitary measures.** The steward explained that, in response to consultation comments, she had added four measures, because they were supported by appropriate information. In addition, she had corrected the entry for one measure, based on advice from the submitting country.
- [31] **Table of general options for phytosanitary measures.** The SC recognized that ISPM 35 (*Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) had been intentionally omitted from this table to avoid duplication with the table on systems approaches and because it was not applicable to pests other than fruit flies. However, as ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) was also specific to fruit flies and yet was included in this table, the SC agreed to add ISPM 35 for completeness.
- [32] The SC considered a consultation comment suggesting that the entry for inspection in this table be expanded to refer to sampling (i.e. “sampling and inspection”) and that ISPM 31 (*Methodologies for sampling of consignments*) be listed as the corresponding reference. The SC considered sampling to be a part of inspection and so agreed to refer only to inspection, but they did agree to include ISPM 31 as a reference.
- [33] **Table of pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures.** The SC agreed to delete reference to “official laboratory analysis” as this was a consequence of inspection rather than a separate measure.

- [34] The SC acknowledged that the intended meaning of “export inspection” may not be clear, as it could refer to the final inspection before export or to field inspection. However, they recognized that the term may be used in the references for the measures and so it should not be changed at this stage of drafting.
- [35] The SC questioned the need to include field inspection as an option, as this was a measure that would be done anyway. However, the steward confirmed that it was listed in a bilateral agreement and hence the SC agreed to retain it.
- [36] The SC considered whether to delete the explanatory footnote about export inspection. The steward explained that it had been included because inspection on its own did not manage pest risk – it was the actions that followed as a consequence of the inspection that managed the pest risk. The SC therefore agreed to keep the footnote but also to add a separate footnote for “field and export inspection” and to distinguish between “remedial actions” (in the context of export inspection, as the action is often a treatment) and “corrective actions” (in the context of field inspection).
- [37] **Table of irradiation options.** The SC considered a consultation comment suggesting that two new options be added to this table, both of which related to a draft PT. The SC discussed whether to omit these options until the PTs were adopted or to include them as draft PTs with the intention of making an ink amendment once the PTs were adopted. They chose the latter approach.
- [38] **Table of methyl bromide options.** The SC noted that this table was included because some countries still required some imported commodities to be treated with methyl bromide, but text had been included earlier in the standard referring to the CPM recommendation on the *Replacement or reduction of the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure* (R-03). The SC chairperson explained that, although alternative treatments were available, information on them had not been submitted in the call for information materials for this standard and hence those alternatives could not be included at this stage.
- [39] **Table of systems approaches.** The steward confirmed that the independent measures listed for one of the systems approaches had all been drawn from ISPM 35.
- [40] The steward explained that the low level of detail for the other systems approach was because the information available was limited. She commented that systems approaches appeared to be poorly documented in both regulations and bilateral agreements, but she hoped that more detail could be added to the standard in future. The SC accepted this approach, given the ongoing discussions at CPM meetings about systems approaches, the forthcoming workshop on systems approaches, and the possible revision of ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*) that had been suggested in some fora.
- [41] **References.** The steward explained that, in response to consultation comments, she had added some new references and made a correction. She noted that some references were bilateral agreements that were not in the public domain.
- [42] The SC agreed with a consultation comment that the standard text at the start of the References section should say “The present annex refers to ISPMs” rather than “The present annex may refer to ISPMs”, as annexes to ISPM 46 would always refer to ISPM 46.
- [43] The SC asked the editor to check that all online references conformed to FAO style.

Potential implementation issues

- [44] The steward reported that the only implementation issue identified during consultation was the potential for the pest list to be misused to require unjustified measures to manage some pests. She commented that this may be a legitimate concern if countries using the annex lacked the capacity and capability to conduct adequate PRA.
- [45] The SC:
- (1) *thanked* the stewards and the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards for their efforts in developing this draft standard;

- (2) *recommended* the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit* (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*), as modified at this meeting, for submission to the CPM-19 (2025) for adoption (Appendix 4);³ and
- (3) *requested* that secretariat forward the implementation issue identified for this draft standard (namely, the potential for the pest list to be misused to require unjustified measures to manage some pests) to the Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU) of the secretariat for consideration by the IC.

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

Use of a pest free area as an integrated measure in a systems approach

- [46] Matías GONZALEZ BUTTERA (Argentina) presented a discussion paper submitted by the member countries of Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE) on whether a pest free area (PFA) could be included as an independent measure in a systems approach.⁴ The paper highlighted an apparent conflict between ISPM 14 and ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*): whereas ISPM 14 listed a PFA as one of the pre-planting measures commonly used in systems approaches, ISPM 4 said that NPPOs should “consider a PFA to be a phytosanitary measure that, when used alone, is sufficient for managing the risk associated with a specified pest”. Mr BUTTERA explained that the member countries of COSAVE considered a PFA to be a stand-alone measure with no need for it to be included as part of a systems approach. They therefore proposed that all mentions of PFAs be removed from the draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for the phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) and from the draft annex *Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risk associated with the movement of wood* (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*) and that ISPM 14 be revised to align with ISPM 4.
- [47] **ISPM 14.** The Steward, Steve CÔTÉ (Canada), recalled similar comments being raised during the first consultation, which had had been rejected because PFAs were listed in ISPM 14. He noted that it was very clear in ISPM 14 that PFAs, pest free places of production (PFPPs) and pest free production sites (PFPSs) were independent measures that could be used at the pre-planting stage. He also emphasized that the measures listed in the draft annex to ISPM 39 were only examples, so the annex did not constrain an exporting country from negotiating with an importing country to use another measure that those listed in the annex.
- [48] **Wood commodities moved from a PFA to another area for processing or dispatch.** The SC acknowledged that wood from trees grown in a PFA may be moved to another area for processing or dispatch and, if that area was not free from the pest, further measures may be required to prevent reinfestation. However, SC members expressed differing views about whether such measures would be components of a systems approach along with the PFA or not (e.g. whether they were simply part of maintaining phytosanitary security).
- [49] **PFAs vs pest absence.** The SC recognized that establishing and maintaining a PFA was very expensive for NPPOs and very restrictive; adding further measures on top of this would mean that it would be easier and cheaper to declare pest absence (“pest status: absent”, as defined by ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*)). The SC noted that PFAs and pest absence were two different concepts, although both could exist in the same country and wood commodities could be moved from one to the other.

³ Note that draft ISPMs approved by the SC for adoption by CPM-19 (2025) are available in English as appendices of this report, in advance of them being posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal in all FAO languages as CPM papers.

⁴ 36_SC_2024_Nov.

- [50] **The concept of systems approaches.** The SC acknowledged differences in the global understanding of systems approaches and that a review of ISPM 14 would be beneficial. The SC also noted that there may be value in reviewing other related ISPMs such as ISPM 4, ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) and ISPM 8.
- [51] The SC recognized that, whereas a PFA was focused on a pest, a systems approach was focused on a commodity and hence was far more complex. The SC recalled that the original intention for ISPM 36 (*Integrated measures for plants for planting*) was that it would be describing systems approaches, but it proved not to be feasible and hence it was framed in the context of integrated measures.
- [52] **Comparison with the draft annex on systems approaches for seeds.** The steward of the *Design and use of systems approaches for the phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 explained that the two draft annexes were conceptually different, as the draft annex to ISPM 38 was focused on critical control points whereas the draft annex to ISPM 39 was focused on the independent measures themselves. She also pointed out that it was very unlikely that a country would establish a PFA for a pest of seeds, whereas PFAs were far more likely for pests of wood commodities.

Draft annex to ISPM 39

- [53] The steward introduced the draft annex and supporting documentation.⁵ A total of 326 consultation comments had been received, most of which were supportive of the draft annex. Some amendments to improve readability and consistency in terminology had been suggested, but there had been no comments proposing major changes. The steward highlighted some specific issues for the particular attention of the SC (detailed under the review of the text below).

Review of the draft text

- [54] The SC made various editorial changes to the text to improve its clarity and flow. The main technical and substantive issues discussed were as follows.
- [55] **Format of the annex.** The steward explained that some comments had suggested that there be greater consistency between the format of this draft annex and that of the draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for the phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38. The SC agreed that this would not be possible given the different scope of these two annexes.
- [56] **Scope.** The SC agreed to omit three sentences that had been inserted by the steward in response to a consultation comment: two because they were over-complicated and the third to avoid duplication. The SC restructured the remaining text of this section.
- [57] **Seed selection.** The SC considered a consultation comment suggesting that seed selection be added to the list of pre-planting measures. However, they agreed not to add it, because seed selection was already covered by the measures related to species and cultivar selection and the use of resistant genotypes.
- [58] **PFAs, PFPPs, PFPSs and areas of low pest prevalence (ALPPs) at the pre-planting stage.** Mindful of their earlier discussion of the COSAVE paper, the SC considered how to address PFAs, PFPPs and PFPSs in the context of a systems approach for wood commodities. After considering various options, the SC avoided conflict with either ISPM 4 or ISPM 14 by removing reference to PFAs, PFPPs and PFPSs as independent measures and referring instead to a pest being declared absent in accordance with ISPM 8. For the pre-planting stage, the SC did this by inserting some text in the entry for Site selection to refer to planting in areas where the pest is absent or at low pest prevalence. For the pre-harvest stage, the SC removed the entry for PFAs, PFPPs, PFPSs and ALPPs and amended the entry for Surveillance to simplify it and refer to pest status. For the processing and treatment stage, the SC amended the entry for PFAs, PFPPs, PFPSs and ALPPs to refer to pest absence and low pest prevalence.
- [59] The SC considered referring to PFAs as an example of a single phytosanitary measure in the Background section. But they recognized that this would conflict with ISPM 14 and also that there was no need to

⁵ 2015-004; 23_SC_2024_Nov; 24_SC_2024_Nov.

refer to treatments or prohibition as other examples. The SC therefore simplified the text in the Background section, based on wording from ISPM 14.

- [60] The SC chairperson suggested that, in the SC update to CPM-19 (2025), she refer to the apparent discrepancy between ISPM 4 and ISPM 14 and the consequent need to consider a revision of ISPM 14 and possibly other related ISPMs.
- [61] **Natural forest areas.** One consultation comment had suggested that the conservation of natural forest relicts within forest plantations be included as a pre-planting measure. The SC agreed, however, that there was insufficient rationale for including this.
- [62] **Field inspection.** The SC recognized that the objectives of field inspection were different to those of surveillance. They therefore deleted text on field inspection that was also in the text on surveillance (regarding confidence that the site is free of the pest or that pest prevalence is acceptably low).
- [63] **Sawing and planning wood.** The SC recognized that sawing may not necessarily remove all the bark. They discussed whether to say that this was dependent on the incision model used, as suggested in a consultation comment, but they noted that the meaning of “incision model” may not be understood and so simplified and restructured the text instead.
- [64] **Lighting.** The SC agreed that this entry in the table referred to the lighting in the storage areas of processing facilities and noted that facility lighting was mentioned under the entry for pre-dispatch protection.
- [65] **Kiln-drying and irradiation.** One regional plant protection organization (RPPO) had enquired about the existence of information on moisture content, perhaps in international guidelines, in relation to both kiln-drying and irradiation. The steward reported that, for kiln-drying, he had found a scientific paper that had been discussed in 2013 by the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine. However, he was not aware of any internationally recognized guidance on moisture reduction or on the use of irradiation in wood. The SC chairperson suggested that perhaps this was a potential implementation issue to raise about the draft annex.
- [66] **Limiting the storage time.** The SC noted that the time frame could not be specified in the draft annex because it would depend on the species of wood and was subject to bilateral agreement between NPPOs. To avoid ambiguity, they simplified the text about this measure and added “documenting and agreeing the systems approach” to the later section on NPPO responsibilities.
- [67] **Verification of pest presence or absence.** The SC noted that the explanation of this measure referred to management as well as verification. They agreed that monitoring was needed outside the storage area; if pests were detected, pest management would be needed in the storage area and, depending on the pest, also outside it. The SC discussed the use of aggregation and anti-aggregation pheromones and where these would be used, but they opted to avoid an over-complicated description so that users of the annex could choose what to do when and where. The SC discussed how to describe the location of the outside monitoring: they noted that “perimeter” did not refer to a boundary such as a wall or fence but was related to the distance that an insect pest could fly, whereas “vicinity” was a looser term and could refer to the surrounding forest. The SC therefore agreed to refer to the “outer perimeter” as in the draft sent for second consultation.
- [68] **Practices, procedures and regulatory actions that can reduce pest risk.** One consultation comment had pointed out that the table on pre-import measures seemed to imply that “post-harvest” related to wood that was still within the forest while “processing and treatment” related to wood already removed from the forest, whereas some measures could apply to both. The SC resolved this by amending the body text that followed the table.
- [69] **Limiting the time before processing.** The SC deleted reference to the likelihood of pest entry or spread for consistency with the entries for other measures.

- [70] **Designing a systems approach for wood commodities.** One consultation comment had suggested that reference be made to ISPM 14 and ISPM 24 (*Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures*) in the context of the NPPO of the importing country evaluating whether the proposed measures meet their phytosanitary import requirements. However, the SC concluded that it was not necessary to refer to these ISPMs.
- [71] **Implementation procedures documented by participating entities and NPPOs.** One consultation comment had noted that, because of the long production cycle of wood, it may be difficult to ensure traceability at all critical control points. The SC considered the text suggested in the comment, which referred to ensuring, *if necessary*, traceability for *specific control points*. They noted that traceability was needed for critical control points (the points in the production chain that were critical to controlling the pest risk), rather than just “specific control points”. However, as critical control points were mentioned in the section on Traceability, the SC agreed that it was sufficient here to refer to traceability.
- [72] **Traceability.** The SC considered the last sentence of this section, which referred to the retention of records in the exporting and importing country. They recognized that it was important that traceability include the importing country if post-import measures were applied. However, they noted that ISPMs did not usually set requirements for importing countries; it was not clear whether the text was referring only to entities performing these post-import measures or also to NPPOs; and the responsibilities of NPPOs regarding retention of implementation records was already covered in the section on records. The SC therefore deleted the last sentence of this section.

Potential implementation issues

- [73] The following issues and suggestions had been raised in consultation comments regarding potential implementation issues:
- **Guidance on the use of wood-chip piles to control pests** is needed because the irregular distribution of heat through wood-chip piles means that they need careful management and monitoring to be effective.
 - **Guidance on record-keeping and traceability** is needed, given that wood is a unique commodity with a very long production cycle. Traceability for the application of measures applied during production in a systems approach could occur decades before export. The exporter may be a different entity from the producer of the wood commodity.
- [74] In addition, the SC identified the need for guidance on moisture-content parameters for kiln-drying and irradiation of wood commodities, given the apparent lack of internationally agreed guidance on this.
- [75] The SC:
- (4) *thanked* the stewards for their efforts in developing the draft annex *Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risk associated with the movement of wood* (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*);
 - (5) *recommended* the draft annex *Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risk associated with the movement of wood* (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*), as modified at this meeting, for submission to CPM-19 (2025) for adoption (Appendix 5);³ and
 - (6) *requested* that the secretariat forward implementation issues identified for this draft annex to the IFU for consideration by the IC.

5. Issues raised from the first consultation period

- [76] The SC considered some of the issues raised on draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation in 2024.⁶

⁶ Draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/member-consultation-draft-ispms/#a>

Draft revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010), priority 2

[77] The Steward, Joanne WILSON (New Zealand), gave an update on the outcome of the first consultation,⁷ during which 822 comments had been received. The steward reported that the main comments received were to:

- consider annexing the draft standard to ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) instead of ISPM 26;
- provide further explanation for second consultation on the rationale for the reorganization, the removal of annexes and the addition of Annex 3;
- add or remove specific pieces of information from the text;
- change certain terms; and
- remove some areas of unnecessary detail or redundancy and clarify or make text more consistent.

[78] The steward explained that many of the comments requesting additions or modifications to text in order to improve clarity did not propose what these should be, which made it more difficult to address the issues raised. She therefore encouraged SC members to highlight, in their respective regions, the need to provide suggested text when submitting comments during consultations. She explained that the secretariat would discuss the terminology proposals with the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG), although she noted that the draft text might change anyway.

[79] **Proposed changes to definitions in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).** The SC chairperson referred to the SC's decision in May 2024 to defer consideration of the need for changes to the ISPM 5 definition of "pest free area" and the distinction between declarations of "absence" and an "official pest free area".⁸ She explained that she had asked the secretariat not to raise this issue with the TPG yet, because the SC had not yet asked the TPG to consider it and because the steward was still in the process of responding to the consultation comments. The SC chairperson also suggested that it was not necessary for the TPG to conduct an extensive analysis.

[80] **Removal of annexes.** The SC noted the importance of retaining access to some of the information being proposed for removal from ISPM 26. The assistant IC representative to the SC reported that the IC had discussed the matter, acknowledging the inevitable delay between the adoption of a standard and the publication of implementation guidance. The IC had suggested two options: to have both the old and the new version of the standard available alongside each other; or to post the extracted information on the Phytosanitary resources page of the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP). The SC recognized that there may also be other options, besides the two presented, to make the crucial information available.

Draft annex to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection) on field inspection (2021-018), priority 2

[81] The Steward, Masahiro SAI (Japan), gave an update on the outcome of the first consultation.⁹ He reported that 573 consultation comments had been received and he highlighted some of the general issues raised. The first of these was a proposal that the annex be a stand-alone ISPM, separate to ISPM 23, as ISPM 23 related only to consignments whereas the scope of the annex included plants that did not necessarily form a consignment. The steward explained that this discrepancy should be resolved with the revision of ISPM 23 (2023-014), the draft specification for which included a task to revise the core text of ISPM 23 to cover the annex for field inspection. Some other general comments had proposed that the structure of the annex be reorganized to provide a more logical flow and reduce duplication, and the steward confirmed that he would take these into account when addressing the consultation comments.

⁷ 39_SC_2024_Nov.

⁸ SC 2024-05, agenda item 5.1.

⁹ 26_SC_2024_Nov.

- [82] The SC noted that, if time allowed, they would be considering the draft specification on the revision of ISPM 23 (2023-014) under agenda item 7.3.

Draft annex to ISPM 38 (International movement of seeds) on the design and use of systems approaches for the phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009), priority 1

- [83] The Steward, Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America), gave an update on the outcome of the first consultation.¹⁰ She reported that approximately 600 consultation comments had been received. Some comments had raised concerns about the draft, but none had proposed that the development of the annex be stopped. Several constructive suggestions had been made for improving the draft, which the steward confirmed she would incorporate. The steward explained that the draft annex would be amended to outline two scenarios where a systems approach for seeds could be implemented: the more traditional situation where a country does not have market access to export their seed to another country and the NPPO of the importing country might require a specific systems approach; and the alternative, voluntary situation where there might already be market access but the seed industry approaches NPPOs to express interest in producing seed under a voluntary systems approach. She also reported that some comments had sought greater clarity on the content of additional declarations in phytosanitary certificates when a systems approach for seeds had been applied.
- [84] The secretariat confirmed that the paper for the SC-7, at which the draft annex would be discussed, would be accessible to all SC members.

- [85] The SC:

- (7) *noted* the main comments on the draft standards subjected to first consultation in 2024;
- (8) *noted* that requests for text changes or additions to draft documents under consultation need to be supported by proposed text to ensure that they are considered and addressed appropriately by the stewards;
- (9) *thanked* the IC for their suggested options on how annexes removed from ISPM 26 (*Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) as a result of its revision (2021-010) could be made available on the International Phytosanitary Portal, and *deferred* a decision on the way forward until a future SC meeting; and
- (10) *deferred* consideration of the need for further explanation in the ISPM 5 definition of “pest free area” and the distinction between declarations of “absence” and an “official pest free area” until a future SC meeting.

6. Draft specification from first consultation for revision and approval

6.1 Draft specification on *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037)*

- [86] The Steward, Masahiro SAI (Japan), introduced this agenda item, which encompassed two topics. The original topic was for the *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001), but its scope had limited the extent of revision to adopted text. The aim of the second topic, *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037)*, was therefore to allow a more comprehensive revision by revising the draft ISPM resulting from the first topic.
- [87] The steward recalled that the SC, at its meeting in November 2023, had requested that he review and provide responses to the 2023 consultation comments on the draft reorganized ISPM (2020-001), prepare steward’s notes on them and revise the text of the draft ISPM.¹¹ The SC had set a provisional timeline in which the SC, at this meeting, would conduct a detailed review of the revised draft ISPM and would review and approve the draft specification on *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037)*.

¹⁰ 27_SC_2024_Nov.

¹¹ SC 2023-11, agenda item 5.

- [88] The steward confirmed that he had therefore revised the draft ISPM, drafted responses to the 2023 consultation comments on it, and prepared steward's notes.¹² With regard to the draft specification on *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037)*, a total of 190 consultation comments had been received in 2024 and the steward had revised the draft specification to take account of the comments and to reflect changes made to the text of the draft ISPM.¹³ The steward had also prepared steward's notes on the draft specification and responses to the consultation comments.¹⁴
- [89] **Main issues requiring consideration by the SC in relation to the draft specification.** The steward highlighted the following issues for the particular attention of the SC:
- the rationale for the reorganization and revision of the PRA ISPMs (see below regarding generic issues);
 - whether countries would find the draft reorganized ISPM challenging to read, understand and implement (for which the steward had provided some proposed text);
 - the task on reviewing existing standards and guidelines for risk analysis developed by other standard setting organizations (as some consultation comments had questioned the need for this);
 - the task on streamlining and clarifying the draft ISPM;
 - the task on separating guidance from requirements;
 - various specific points that had also been raised during the 2023 consultation (including whether social impact should be considered, the most appropriate place for text on probability of transfer to a suitable host, whether or not to incorporate climate-change considerations, the need for consistency of terminology, and whether to revise the text about the pest categorization stage – all of which the steward had addressed in amendments to the draft specification);
 - the suggested incorporation of ISPM 21 (*Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*) into the draft reorganized ISPM (which the steward advised against); and
 - various suggestions on expertise and participants.

Generic issues

- [90] The steward recalled the rationale for the original topic, the *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001)*, which aimed to integrate ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*), ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) and the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests (2014-001)*. However, in the 2023 consultation on the draft reorganized ISPM, some contracting parties had proposed that it be streamlined and, at the SPG meeting in 2024, one contracting party had submitted a paper proposing that ISPMs focus on core requirements. The steward noted the uncertainty about the outcome of such discussions on simplifying ISPMs and therefore suggested two options for the SC to consider: to continue to revise the draft reorganized ISPM as planned or to return to the original topic – the *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001)*.
- [91] The SC agreed to review the draft specification first and then return to the options suggested by the steward.
- [92] **Review of draft specification**
- [93] The SC made various editorial changes to the text to improve its clarity and flow. The main technical and substantive issues discussed were as follows.
- [94] **Tasks.** The SC agreed to list the tasks in chronological order, including splitting or combining some tasks, as this would help the expert working group (EWG) organize their work. In doing this, the SC agreed that the first task would be to review the draft reorganized ISPM, after which the EWG would identify the core principles, steps, requirements and guidance information for PRA. This, together with

¹² 2020-001; 09_SC_2024_Nov; 10_SC_2024_Nov.

¹³ 2023-037.

¹⁴ 38_SC_2024_Nov; 37_SC_2024_Nov.

background information on the draft reorganized ISPM (recommendations from the EWG that drafted the ISPM, and the subsequent consultation comments and steward's notes) would then feed into the later task of revising the reorganized draft ISPM.

- [95] **Issues identified by the steward.** The SC considered the specific issues from the 2023 consultation that the EWG was tasked with considering, but they concluded that it was better to replace these with a generic task to consider the steward's notes and consultation comments. The SC noted that the EWG was not being asked to respond to the consultation comments, only to consider the comments to appraise themselves of the pertinent issues.
- [96] **Revision of the draft ISPM.** The SC agreed that it was important to be explicit that the EWG was tasked with revising the draft ISPM, rather than just reviewing it. They also confirmed that the purpose of the revision (which would dictate the extent of the revision) was to streamline and clarify the principles, stages and requirements of PRA.
- [97] **Guidelines and standards of other standard setting bodies.** The SC discussed the task on considering the risk analysis standards and guidelines developed by the World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH) and the Codex Alimentarius Commission. They agreed that it would not be appropriate for the EWG to be asked to apply concepts and principles from these standards and guidelines or to identify best practices. However, they recognized the potential benefit of the EWG identifying elements that could be applied, where appropriate, to improve the draft ISPM.
- [98] **Moving guidance to implementation material.** The secretariat clarified that the EWG was not being tasked with drafting implementation guidance but only with formulating recommendations to the SC on which material should be moved from the draft reorganized ISPM into implementation material. The assistant IC representative to the SC explained that the development of the implementation material would be the responsibility of the IC. The secretariat further clarified that the EWG needed to make its recommendations to the SC rather than the IC, as the EWG was under the scope of the SC.
- [99] The SC noted that the implementation material would not be developed until after the ISPM had been adopted, so there would be an interim need to make the guidance available on the IPP in some form (e.g. by having the old ISPM still available or posting the guidance on another part of the IPP).
- [100] **Biodiversity.** Although the agenda for this agenda item included a review of the need for, and content of, the section on "Impacts on biodiversity and the environment" that is included in ISPMs (deferred from the SC's meeting in May 2024¹⁵), this matter was not discussed.
- [101] **Expertise.** The SC removed reference to climate-change expertise, as they had deleted the reference to climate change in the EWG tasks (in the issues identified by the steward).
- [102] **Participants.** The SC agreed that it would be preferable for at least one former member of the EWG on *Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) and one former member of the EWG on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) to be full members of the EWG rather than invited experts.
- [103] The SC agreed that, although it would be helpful to have input from a "sister" organization to the IPPC Secretariat, such as WOAH, it was more appropriate for this to be in the form of a presentation to the EWG rather than through an invited expert. The SC also agreed that it would be beneficial for the WOAH and the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat to be invited to give a presentation to the SC on their respective risk analysis standards.
- [104] The SC agreed that the EWG should consist of eight to ten members, noting that this would allow for there to be full regional representation but technical expertise would be the principal criterion for selection.

¹⁵ SC 2024-05, agenda item 6.1.

[105] **Discussion papers.** The SC removed the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) from the section on discussion papers, because the material from that had been incorporated into the draft ISPM developed under the topic *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001)), which was listed in the References section.

[106] **Duration of EWG.** The SC noted that, based on the experience of the EWG for the *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001), it was anticipated that this new EWG would need to meet in person for up to two weeks, plus additional meetings held in virtual mode. The SC noted that the two weeks need not be consecutive, as the EWG may need time in-between to resolve issues.

The way forward

[107] After completing their review of the draft specification, the SC considered the way forward for the revision of the draft reorganized PRA ISPM following the recent discussion about streamlining and clarifying the texts of ISPMs. The SC chairperson referred to the two options outlined earlier by the steward: proceeding with the draft specification on *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM* (2023-037) without delaying its progress, or returning to the original topic, *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001), and working on it until the conclusion of the recent discussion. One SC member suggested a third option: to seek direction from CPM-19 (2025) and then consider at the SC meeting in May 2025, as the paper presented to the SPG about simplifying ISPMs would have been presented to the CPM by then. The SC agreed to proceed with the draft specification (i.e. the first option).

[108] The SC discussed whether the draft reorganized ISPM needed to be reviewed by the SC or SC-7 before being provided to the EWG. The SC recognized that, although the SC-7 reviewed draft ISPMs after the first consultation according to the Standard Setting Procedure, there was no point in doing this in this case, as the draft would be used as an input to the EWG rather than being submitted for second consultation, and the EWG would be revising the text anyway.

[109] *Presentation on PRA e-learning course*

[110] During the course of the discussion about the draft specification, the secretariat gave a brief presentation on the PRA implementation materials available on the IPP.

[111] The SC:

- (11) *approved* Specification 76 (*Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM*) as modified in this meeting (Appendix 6);
- (12) *agreed* that the background documents to be provided to the EWG on *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM* (2023-037) would include:
 - the draft ISPM from the topic *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) as revised by the steward following first consultation,
 - the compiled comments from the first consultation on the *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) and the steward's responses to those comments, and
 - the steward's notes to the SC in 2023 and 2024 on the *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001);
- (13) *agreed* not to send the draft ISPM developed under the topic *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) to the SC-7, as it would be an input to the EWG on *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM* (2023-037) and would not be proceeding to a second consultation;
- (14) *recommended* to CPM-19 (2025) that the topic *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) be removed from the *List of topics for IPPC standards*;
- (15) *requested* that the secretariat invite representatives from the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat and the World Organisation for Animal Health to share information on the risk analysis processes described in their standards at the meeting of the EWG on *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM* (2023-037) and provide documentation in advance; and

- (16) *requested* that the secretariat invite representatives from the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat and the World Organisation for Animal Health to share information on the risk analysis processes described in their standards during a lunchtime session at the SC's meeting in May 2025.

6.2 Draft specification on *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid* (2021-020)

- [112] The SC representative on the CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid, Sophie PETERSON (Australia), recalled that CPM-18 (2024) had approved the draft specification on *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid* (2021-020) for consultation and had agreed that the focus group would review the consultation comments first and then present a revised draft specification, and responses to the comments, to the SC.¹⁶ The CPM had agreed that the SC, after considering the draft specification, would present the finalized draft specification to the CPM with a request for the CPM to decide whether the development of an ISPM should proceed.
- [113] The SC representative reported that over 200 consultation comments had been received and the focus group had discussed these at their face-to-face meeting. She thanked the NPPO of Barbados for hosting the meeting. The focus group had revised the draft specification in response to the comments and had provided notes and responses to the comments received during the first consultation.¹⁷ Significant changes to the use of terms included the use of “humanitarian aid” instead of “food and other humanitarian aid”, “regulated articles” instead of listing different types of articles, and “disaster relief pathway” instead of “emergency pathway”. The SC representative also referred the SC to a draft diagram developed by the focus group, which depicted the gaps that it was envisaged the proposed ISPM would fill.¹⁸ She confirmed that this diagram was not part of the draft specification and was for illustrative purposes only.

Review of the draft text

- [114] The SC made various editorial changes to the text to improve its clarity and flow. The main technical and substantive issues discussed were as follows.
- [115] **Scope.** The SC agreed that, although some measures for addressing phytosanitary issues may also minimize other risks, including risks to food safety or animal health, there was no need to refer to this in the specification.
- [116] **Purpose.** The SC agreed that, although the standard to be developed would support the activities of stakeholders such as aid agencies and development partners, the prime purpose of the standard was to provide guidance to NPPOs and the support to stakeholders would be as a consequence of this.
- [117] **Groups of pests.** The SC noted that the intention was to group pests into groups that shared similar characteristics and so could be managed in a similar way.
- [118] **Participants.** The SC considered whether all members of the EWG needed to have knowledge of the provisions of the IPPC, the IPPC strategic framework and the activities of bodies mandated under the IPPC. They noted that some experts may have relevant expertise in the provision of aid but not fulfil this requirement for knowledge of the IPPC; on the other hand, experts would be nominated by NPPOs, which should ensure an adequate IPPC background. The steward and secretariat would also be able to advise the EWG and the EWG could be provided with the strategic framework as a reference. The SC therefore agreed to remove the requirement for all the members to have the above knowledge and instead included reference to the provisions of the IPPC in one of the specific areas of expertise listed.
- [119] To avoid the number of participants being too many, the SC changed the number of invited experts from donor agencies from three to two. They noted that “private sector” in this context was referring to non-governmental organizations. To ensure that the call for experts reached potential nominees, the SC

¹⁶ CPM-18 (2024), agenda item 13.1.

¹⁷ 2021-020; 30_SC_2024_Nov; 31_SC_2024_Nov.

¹⁸ 32_SC_2024_Nov.

chairperson suggested that, in addition to the call for experts, the secretariat and the focus group could highlight it to relevant connections and NPPOs could reach out to relevant organizations within their country.

- [120] The SC noted that an RPPO representative would be invited to participate (as an invited expert) because some RPPOs have a coordination and communication role in their region during disaster-relief situations.
- [121] With regard to inviting an IC member to participate in the EWG, the secretariat explained that the text specified that this could either be as an invited expert or an IC representative, because the IC may not include anyone with expertise in the provision of safe aid. The SC agreed that it was sufficient to simply say that an IC member would be invited, without specifying the role.
- [122] **References.** The SC considered a general statement in the References section that referred to information published by United Nations agencies, by CABI and in academic journals. They noted that one of the references listed had been prepared by CABI and agreed that there was no use in including a general statement. They therefore deleted it.
- [123] The SC added three references to the References section: the paper from the focus group to CPM-18 (2024); two papers presented at CPM-4 (2009) in a scientific session on pest movement through food-aid shipments; and the CPM recommendation on *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation* (R-09). The SC representative on the focus group confirmed that there were no regional standards on the provision of safe aid.
- [124] **Gap-analysis diagram.** The SC representative on the focus group confirmed that the diagram would be presented to CPM-19 (2025) by the focus group. She reiterated that it was not part of the specification and clarified that it had been developed because previous feedback from the SPG had questioned the need for an ISPM.
- [125] The SC considered the diagram and suggested some amendments to ensure that all boxes connected eventually to an end-point.
- [126] The SC representative on the focus group clarified the three procedural routes illustrated on the diagram. She confirmed that the bottom one related only to those situations where both the receiving country and the country providing the aid agreed that there were no existing phytosanitary import requirements. If it was not known whether such requirements existed (e.g. where a receiving country had not published its requirements and relevant personnel were not responding to communications), then the middle route applied, which was the draft ISPM on *Safe provision of humanitarian aid in the phytosanitary context* (2021-020). The top route in the diagram related to situations where there were existing phytosanitary import requirements or where a country chose to adopt the phytosanitary requirements of another country as emergency measures.
- [127] The SC recognized that, in a disaster situation, there was a need for a minimum set of measures that could be implemented without reference to phytosanitary import requirements. The SC representative on the focus group explained that the tasks described in the specification addressed this. She also confirmed that the focus group had recognized that preservation of human life was the first priority.
- [128] **Procedure for the draft specification.** The SC noted that the draft specification was not on their work programme and the decision about the next steps rested with the CPM. They noted that, if the CPM decided that the draft specification needed many changes, then the CPM may opt to return it to the SC for revision.
- [129] The SC:
- (17) *agreed* to present the draft specification on *Safe provision of humanitarian aid in the phytosanitary context* as modified in this meeting (Appendix 7) to CPM-19 (2025);
 - (18) *invited* the CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid to consider the amendments to the draft gap-analysis diagram suggested by the SC at this meeting;

- (19) *agreed* that the SC paper to CPM-19 (2025) on this draft specification would be separate to the main SC update to CPM-19 and *requested* that the secretariat seek to ensure that the draft specification would be considered immediately after the focus group's update in the CPM-19 agenda; and
- (20) *requested* CPM-19 (2025), in accordance with the decision of CPM-18 (2024), to decide whether to proceed with the development of an ISPM and, if proceeding, to approve this specification, add it as a topic to the *IPPC list of IPPC standards* and assign a priority to the topic.

7. Review of specifications for new topics

7.1 Annex Remote audits to ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*) (2023-031), priority 1

[130] This item was deferred to the May 2025 meeting of the SC.

7.2 Revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) (2023-020), priority 1

[131] This item was deferred to the May 2025 meeting of the SC.

7.3 Revision of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) (2023-014), priority 2

[132] The Steward, Masahiro SAI (Japan), introduced the draft specification for this topic, which had been added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by CPM-18 (2024). He had converted the text submitted to the CPM¹⁹ into the usual format for a draft specification, made some further modifications, and provided the revised version to the SC for consideration.²⁰

[133] The steward highlighted the rationale for the revision of ISPM 23 and the main changes that would therefore need to be made to it. He explained that ISPM 23 had not been revised since its adoption in 2005 and subsequent changes to the definitions of terms in ISPM 5 (most notably, “identity”, “integrity” and “inspection”) had resulted in discrepancies between ISPM 23 and ISPM 5. In particular, as highlighted by the TPG, the term “inspection” was used in a broader sense in ISPM 23, including the examination of documentation and the verification of consignment identity and integrity. As well as resolving this conflict, there was also a need to cover some issues not covered by the current ISPM 23, such as authorization of third parties, and the text also needed to be revised to connect it to the draft annex on field inspection currently under development (agenda item 5).

Review of the draft text

[134] The SC recognized the importance of deciding whether the standard should cover inspection in the broader sense. They also recalled questions that had been raised about the distinction between surveillance and inspection under the new ISPM 5 definitions.

[135] The SC started to review the draft text.

[136] **Reason for the revision.** The SC acknowledged the need for the revised standard to cover requirements for the authorization of third parties if conducting inspection. They recognized, however, that the use of third parties to conduct inspection was voluntary and mentioning an activity that was within the scope of ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*) did not necessarily mean that a standard should always cite ISPM 45. The SC therefore agreed that there was no need to refer to ISPM 45.

[137] The SC deferred their review of the rest of the text until their meeting in May 2025.

¹⁹ 20_SC_2024_Nov.

²⁰ 22_SC_2024_Nov.

8. Urgent issues from the technical panels

8.1 Modifications to the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting for recommendation to CPM-19 (2025)*

Additional consultation period for DPs

[138] The secretariat introduced the paper for this agenda item.²¹ The paper explained that, in May 2024, the SC had recommended to CPM-19 (2025) that the Standard Setting Procedure be adjusted to include the January–May consultation period for DPs as a permanent feature of the Standard Setting Procedure (in addition to the consultation period in July–September).²² However, the secretariat had subsequently reviewed the Standard Setting Procedure and noted that there was no mention of the timing of consultation periods in the procedure itself, only elsewhere in the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*, where it could easily be amended.

[139] To communicate this change in consultation arrangements to contracting parties, the secretariat suggested that the SC invite CPM-19 (2025) to note the additional consultation period.

Request SC to align the January DP notification period with the consultation period, from 5 to 30 January each year, while maintaining the 1 July 45-day DP notification period

[140] The secretariat referred to an item in the SSU update to the SC (agenda item 12.6), relating to the notification period for DPs. The Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) had requested that the SC change the start date of the notification period for DPs from 5 January to 30 January to align with the January consultation period for draft DPs.

[141] The SC:

- (21) *invited* CPM-19 (2025) to note that an additional consultation period may be opened for DPs only, in January–May (in addition to the consultation period in July–September); and
- (22) *agreed* to move the DP notification period from “5 January – 20 February” to “30 January – 15 March” and *invited* CPM-19 (2025) to note this.

8.2 Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments workplan

[142] The Steward of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT), David OPATOWSKI, referred the SC to the update from the panel.²³ This outlined three issues:

- The TPPT were in the process of completing revisions to the draft criteria for ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) treatments, which would be submitted to the May 2025 meeting of the SC for consideration and approval, before being included in the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*.
- Further information was being sought from the submitter on the subject Vapour heat (hot steam) treatment of coniferous bark for the elimination of *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* (2024-001). In the meantime, the TPPT had recommended that the SC add this subject to the TPPT work programme with priority 3.
- The IFU had requested that the TPPT assist in considering the peer-review comments on two draft IPPC guides under development: *Wood packaging material heat treatment manual* (2017-043a) and *Wood packaging material fumigation treatment manual* (2017-043b). These two manuals were being produced to complement the IPPC guide, *Regulation of wood packaging material*, which had been published in May 2023. The TPPT had agreed that they were willing to review the draft documents but had noted that no procedure was in place for technical panels to review

²¹ 05_SC_2024_Nov,

²² SC 2024-05, agenda item 7.3.

²³ 33_SC_2024_Nov.

draft guides. The TPPT had therefore requested that the secretariat seek approval or guidance from the SC on the addition of this task to the TPPT workplan.

[143] **Criteria for ISPM 15 treatments.** The SC recalled that the SC had expressed an expectation that every effort should be made to avoid conflict of interest, given that the author of the paper on which the criteria were based was a member of the TPPT.²⁴ The steward explained how this had been managed by the TPPT.

[144] **ISPM 15 manuals.** The SC sought clarity on why their approval was being sought for the TPPT to review the two manuals. The secretariat confirmed that Specification TP 3 (*Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments*) only included provision for the TPPT to work on standards, so any other work required the approval of the SC.

[145] **TPPT stewardship.** The SC noted that Mr OPATOWSKI was no longer able to serve as steward of the panel and had resigned.

[146] The SC:

- (23) *noted* the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) update;
- (24) *added* the subject *Vapour heat (hot steam) treatment of coniferous bark for the elimination of Bursaphelenchus xylophilus (2024-001)* to the TPPT work programme with priority 3;
- (25) *added* the review of the draft *Wood packaging material heat treatment manual (2017-043a)* and the draft *Wood packaging material fumigation treatment manual (2017-043b)* to the TPPT workplan; and
- (26) *thanked* the outgoing TPPT Steward, David OPATOWSKI (Israel), for his contribution to the work of the panel during his time as steward.

8.3 Selection of the third expert for the English language for the Technical Panel for the Glossary

[147] The SC chairperson summarized the progress to date in replacing one of the English language experts on the TPG who had completed his term and was not able to serve another term.²⁵ Two complete nominations had been received in response to the call for experts and the secretariat had subsequently opened an SC e-decision (2024_eSC_Nov_07), followed by an e-poll. However, the response rate had been very low and so the secretariat had brought the matter to this meeting for confirmation.

[148] **Selection of expert for the English language.** The SC agreed their selection (see decisions below).

[149] **Procedure for selecting technical panel members by e-decision.** The secretariat confirmed that, in the existing procedure, the secretariat first opened an e-forum; if all the responses in the forum preferred the same candidate, then there was no poll; if different preferences were expressed, then an e-poll was conducted to confirm the result. If there was no consensus in the e-poll (i.e. if at least one response was negative), then the issue was brought to the next face-to-face meeting of the SC. The SC considered whether to lengthen the response period for the e-poll stage but opted instead to have more reminders so that e-decisions would not be unduly delayed. The SC chairperson highlighted the responsibility of SC members to participate in the process and to recognize the implications of not doing this.

[150] **Request for observer to participate in 2024 face-to-face TPG meeting.** The SC discussed a request from a contracting party for an observer to participate in the forthcoming face-to-face TPG meeting.

[151] The secretariat clarified that, according to the rules of procedure for technical panels, observers were not allowed (only invited experts and a representative from the host country or organization). The SC

²⁴ SC 2023-11, agenda item 6.1.

²⁵ 34_SC_2024_Nov.

chairperson recalled a previous occasion where, because of this rule, a request from a non-host country for an observer to attend the TPDP had been denied.

[152] The SC:

- (27) *selected* Stephanie M. DUBON as a third expert for the English language for the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG), starting in 2025;
- (28) *noted* that it is the responsibility of the SC members representing the region of unsuccessful nominees to inform those nominees of the outcome of the selection;
- (29) *requested* that, for future e-polls for the selection of technical panel members, the secretariat send two reminders to SC members to participate in the e-poll – one partway through the seven-day polling period and one on the final day (taking account of time zones); and
- (30) *acknowledged* the request from a representative from a contracting party to join the TPG meeting in December 2024 as an observer, *agreed* that such participation was not appropriate as it was outside the rules of procedure for technical panels, and *requested* that the secretariat inform the contracting party of this decision.

9. Topics

9.1 Task Force on Topics

[153] Steve CÔTÉ (Canada), one of the SC representatives on the Task Force on Topics (TFT), presented some changes to the submission form used for the Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation and the criteria for the justification and prioritization of proposed topics, which were being proposed by the TFT following CPM-18 (2024).²⁶ He explained that, the CPM Bureau, the SPG, the SC and the IC were being invited to comment on the proposed changes, after which the revised form would be presented to CPM-19 (2025). The TFT had also agreed to review other forms (including the submission forms for draft specifications and DPs) if the need arose.

[154] Further to the decision by CPM-18 (2024) that the Call for IPPC Observatory Topics for Studies and Surveys would be included in the IPPC Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation, the TFT representative also introduced the submission form for this.²⁷

[155] The SC chairperson recalled that the same paper had been presented to the SPG the previous month and participants had provided feedback on the submission forms.

[156] The secretariat confirmed that the IC had already provided its input and the TFT would be reviewing all the feedback at their meeting on 10 December.

[157] The SC agreed to submit any feedback by email to the secretariat. The SC chairperson highlighted her main comments, which were to make some of the form optional, as completing all of the form was a heavy burden on contracting parties, and to make it clear what information was needed for standards and what information for implementation material.

[158] The SC:

- (31) *agreed* that SC members with comments on the draft revised submission forms for the Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation (including the criteria for the justification and prioritization of proposed topics) and the Call for IPPC Observatory Topics for Studies and Surveys would send them to the secretariat (Emmanuel KRAH) by 2 December 2024; and
- (32) *noted* that, if needed and at the request of SC, the Task Force on Topic would review the other submission forms, notably the forms for draft specifications.

²⁶ 35_SC_2024_Nov; CPM-18 (2024), agenda item 16.5.

²⁷ 35_SC_2024_Nov; CPM-18 (2024), agenda item 14.3.

9.2 List of topics

Review and adjustments to the List of topics for IPPC standards

- [159] 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 2024.²⁸ The list already included the subject *Vapour heat (hot steam) treatment of coniferous bark for the elimination of Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* (2024-001), agreed under item 8.2 of this meeting, in anticipation of this meeting.
- [160] The SC assigned stewards and assistant stewards to the following topics:
- Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (2004-005) – Matías GONZALEZ BUTTERA (Argentina) as steward until the SC meeting in May 2025 (pending confirmation from his region) and Edouard NYA (Cameroon) as assistant steward;
 - Revision of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) (2023-014), priority 2 – Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) as assistant steward; and
 - Annex to ISPM 46: Seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris* (2023-008), priority 1 – Stavroula IOANNIDOU (Greece) as steward.
- [161] The SC corrected the entry for the annex *International movement of Citrus fruit* (2023-019) to ISPM 46 to show André Felipe C.P. da SILVA (Brazil) as the steward, as agreed in May 2024.
- [162] The SC agreed to recommend that the topic *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) be removed from the list, because the text resulting from that topic had been incorporated into the draft ISPM to be revised under the topic *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM* (2023-037).
- [163] The SC also noted the following:
- *Requirements for the use of chemical treatments as a phytosanitary measure* (2014-003) – David OPATOWSKI (Israel) would continue as steward;
 - *Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade* (2006-010), priority 2 – the SC had recommended in May to ask CPM-19 (2025) to remove this from the list of topics; and
 - *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) – the SC had recommended in agenda item 6.1 to ask CPM-19 (2025) to remove this from the list of topics.
- [164] The secretariat confirmed that once standards are adopted, the secretariat remove the topics from the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and the CPM is invited to note the amended list at their next session.
- [165] For commodity standards, the SC agreed to follow the same approach as the TPPT, where the lead for each subject is an SC member but the assistant is a member of the technical panel.
- [166] The SC:
- (33) *noted* the modified *List of topics for IPPC standards*;
 - (34) *assigned* stewards and assistant stewards as agreed at this meeting;
 - (35) *invited* CPM-19 (2025) to note the updates to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*;
 - (36) *invited* the TPCS to nominate assistant stewards from the membership of the TPCS for subjects on the TPCS work programme; and
 - (37) *recommended* to CPM-19 (2025) that *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) be removed from the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

²⁸ 21_SC_2024_Nov.

10. Standards Committee

10.1 Standards Committee working group (SC-7) May 2024

Update from the 2024 SC-7 meeting

[167] The SC-7 representative from Latin America and the Caribbean, André Felipe C.P. da SILVA (Brazil), gave an update from the SC-7 meeting held in May 2024.²⁹ The SC-7 had reviewed two draft standards following first consultation. He thanked the stewards of the draft standards for their participation. The SC-7 had also highlighted the value of listing consultation comments submitted in French or Spanish with the related English comments and the secretariat had agreed to consider the feasibility.

[168] **Online Comment System.** The secretariat reported that they had contacted the developers of the Online Comment System (OCS), who had explained that a specification would be required for any updates and this would need to be agreed with the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat, as OCS is shared with them. The secretariat explained that the OCS was shared with the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat because of the high costs, but the costs borne by the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat were greater than those of the IPPC Secretariat because of their greater usage. Any updates to the OCS needed to be agreed with the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat because they would affect the whole system. The secretariat confirmed that they had managed to get the comment number reinstated in the past year and were now following up about the languages.

[169] The SC asked whether, as an alternative solution, the secretariat could manually move the consultation comments in French or Spanish, as there were not usually many. The secretariat confirmed that they would look at the feasibility of both this solution and the updating of the OCS.

Agenda of the 2025 SC-7 meeting

[170] The SC reviewed the draft agenda, which included the review of three draft standards for approval for second consultation.³⁰ There were no comments from SC members. The SC agreed that the meeting would be scheduled to last four days.

Selection or reconfirmation of SC-7 members

[171] The SC reviewed the SC-7 membership list³¹ and agreed one change (see decisions).

[172] The SC noted that, on this occasion, there was no need to invite the stewards of the draft standards on the agenda, as they were all SC-7 members and so would be in attendance anyway.

[173] The SC:

- (38) *noted* the update from the 2024 SC-7 meeting;
- (39) *requested* that the secretariat provide, at the SC meeting in May 2025, an update on the relationship between the secretariat and the developers of the Online Comment System and how the secretariat can influence its functionality;
- (40) *agreed* to the draft agenda for the 2025 SC-7 meeting and *agreed* that the duration of the meeting would be four days (Appendix 8); and
- (41) *agreed* that Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) would be the SC representative on the SC-7 for the Southwest Pacific and the representatives from the other regions would remain unchanged (Appendix 9).

²⁹ SC-7 2024-05 report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/92470/>

³⁰ 07_SC_2024_Nov.

³¹ SC and SC-7 membership list: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1109/>

10.2 Summary on polls and fora discussed on e-decision site (from May 2024 to November 2024)

[174] The secretariat presented a paper listing the e-decision polls and fora conducted from May 2024 to November 2024,³² and the SC reviewed it.

[175] Forthcoming SC e-decisions may include:

- title adjustments to the draft DP on immature stages of Tephritidae;
- one draft DP (*Heterobasidion annosum*) for recommendation for approval for DP notification period in January 2025;
- the selection of a TPDP expert (mycologist);
- the selection of two TPCS experts;
- the selection of experts for the EWG on the *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037)*; and
- draft DPs for approval for consultation.

[176] The SC:

- (42) *agreed* that the “Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions between 2024 May – 2024 November” (Appendix 10) accurately reflected the outcome of the SC e-decisions; and
- (43) *requested* that the secretariat investigate the problems experienced by Glen PANGANIBAN (Philippines) in receiving IPPC emails.

10.3 Selection of SC representatives

[177] The SC chairperson highlighted the need for the SC to select two representatives: one for the CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking and the other for the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers.

[178] The SC:

- (44) *selected* Amani ALAWAMLEH (Jordan) as the SC representative for the CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking;
- (45) *selected* Mi Chi YEA (Republic of Korea) as the SC representative on the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers, pending approval from her NPPO; and
- (46) *noted* that Prudence Tonator ATTIPOE (Ghana) had been selected as the SC representative on the IC Team on E-Commerce at the SC meeting in November 2023 and *requested* that the secretariat convey this information to the IFU.

11. Implementation and Capacity Development (IC) Committee and SC–IC Interactions

11.1 Update on IC activities

[179] Kyu-Ock YIM (Republic of Korea), the assistant IC representative to the SC, referred the SC to the discussion paper on collaboration between the IC and SC, which outlined the advantages and disadvantages of changing the status of the IC representative to the SC from observer to SC member.³³ She also gave an update on pertinent issues from the two IC meetings in 2024:

- As well as suggesting two options for ensuring the continued availability of material removed from ISPM 26 after its revision (see agenda item 5), the IC had agreed that, when the time came, the IC would form a small group to decide whether to produce a new guide on PFAs for fruit flies or to incorporate the guidance into a revision of the current PFA guide.
- The IC had agreed a revised *Process for the development of IPPC guides and training materials*, in which the SC could submit a topic proposal directly to the IC, outside of the Call for Topics:

³² 14_SC_2024_Nov.

³³ 25_SC_2024_Nov.

Standards and Implementation. Unlike the call for topics, such proposals would only require a draft specification, not a “Submission form for topics for standards and implementation”.

- The IFU had asked for TPPT input to the two ISPM 15 manuals because it was beyond their technical capacity to address the peer-review comments.
- The IC had asked the IFU and SSU to continue discussing the options for the status of the IC representative to the SC.
- The IC had asked the secretariat to consider a simple system for collecting and archiving all implementation issues raised by various bodies at various stages, so that they are not lost.

[180] The assistant IC representative to the SC also thanked the SC representative to the IC, Prudence Tonator ATTIPOE (Ghana), for his contribution to the IC November meeting, which had been his first.

[181] **Archiving potential implementation issues.** The assistant IC representative to the SC explained that a system to archive implementation issues had been proposed because such issues were raised by different bodies over a long period of time and there was currently no system of gathering these together. The secretariat recalled that the SC had previously agreed that implementation issues would be forwarded to the IC at the final stage of development (i.e. when a draft standard was recommended to the CPM for adoption). The secretariat also noted that not all implementation issues raised during consultation were forwarded to the IC, because the SC sometimes concluded that an issue raised was not a potential implementation issue.

[182] The SC agreed to return to the matter at their meeting in May.

[183] **Flexible travel support criteria.** The paper for this agenda item invited the SC to request that the secretariat and the CPM Bureau discuss applying flexible travel support criteria to ensure that IC representatives could receive travel support to attend SC meetings. The assistant IC representative to the SC explained that IC representatives attending SC meetings were not eligible for travel support because they were observers. She confirmed, however, that the IC had not yet decided whether they wished the observer status of the role to be changed.

[184] The SC supported the need for travel support but agreed that it should only apply if the person met the World Bank criteria for financial support.

[185] The SC chairperson clarified that the issue did not affect the role of the SC representative to the IC, because that role was an IC member and hence eligible for travel support if the role holder met the World Bank criteria for support in other respects.

[186] The SC:

- (47) *agreed* that, at their meeting in May 2025, they would clarify how and when the SC would forward potential implementation issues to the IC for consideration;
- (48) *requested* that the secretariat and CPM Bureau discuss applying flexible travel support criteria to ensure that the IC representative (observer) to the SC can receive travel support to attend SC meetings if they meet the World Bank criteria for support in other respects; and
- (49) *requested* that the IFU and the SSU develop a system to collect all potential implementation issues raised by various bodies at various stages for future consideration.

12. Updates

12.1 CPM Bureau: Update from June, September and October 2024 meetings

[187] The SSU lead gave an update on the June, September and October 2024 meetings of the CPM Bureau.³⁴ The reports of these CPM Bureau meetings are, or will soon be, available on the IPP.³⁵

³⁴ 28_SC_2024_Nov.

³⁵ CPM Bureau meeting reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/commission/bureau/>

[188] In answer to a question from the SC, the SSU lead confirmed that letters would be sent to contracting parties inviting them to contribute to the IPPC ePhyto Solution in 2025.

[189] The SC:

(50) *noted* the update from the June, September and October 2024 meetings of the CPM Bureau.

12.2 Strategic Planning Group

[190] The SC chairperson gave a brief verbal update on the items of most relevance to the SC from the October 2024 meeting of the SPG but did not give a detailed account of the SPG discussions as the report was not yet available.³⁶ The SC chairperson encouraged SC members to read the SPG papers³⁷ of significance to standard setting and to gather information on the outcomes of the discussion from their own region's participants.

[191] The SC chairperson confirmed that the proposal to disestablish the TFT would be submitted to CPM-19 (2024). She explained that the paper was by the SC chairperson and IC chairperson and also included a proposal to change from a biennial call for topics to an ongoing call. The SC chairperson explained that these changes would not affect the work of the SC, as the SC already reviewed the topic submissions at its November meeting and already invited the relevant technical panels to comment on the feasibility of submissions.

[192] The SSU lead emphasized that the SPG is not a decision-making body and just makes recommendations. He explained that he did not foresee a CPM decision on the size of the SC at CPM-19 (2025), but he encouraged the SC to take a proactive role on matters affecting standard setting and to be ready to consider future changes. The SC chairperson speculated that the CPM was likely to seek the SC's opinion.

[193] The SC:

(51) *noted* the update from the October 2024 meeting of the Strategic Planning Group.

12.3 SC small working groups

Mechanisms to address technical issues regarding draft ISPMS presented for adoption by CPM but are not formal objections

[194] Matías GONZALEZ BUTTERA presented a paper from the small working group that had been established by the SC in May 2024 to explore mechanisms to address technical issues that are raised about draft ISPMS submitted for adoption but that are not objections.³⁸ The group had recommended that the existing procedure for lodging objections could be used to propose improvements, but with a limit of five such submissions per region, and the CPM would then be asked whether it accepted the changes proposed or not. In the latter case, the CPM chairperson would need to decide whether to convene a Friends of the Chair meeting or to invite the CPM to adopt the standard without the proposed changes.

[195] The SC discussed the proposed mechanism.

[196] **The objection process.** The SC noted that, under the existing Standard Setting Procedure, if no objections were submitted then ISPMS were adopted without discussion, but if there was an objection then the CPM discussed the objection. Hence, the distinction between substantial objections and “softer” objections proposing technical improvements lay in the response of the objector to the outcome of this discussion, rather than the submission itself (i.e. whether the objector decided to sustain or to withdraw their objection if the CPM decided not to accept the proposed changes). The SC concluded, therefore, that there was no need to change the Standard Setting Procedure itself – just to communicate better about

³⁶ SPG meeting reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/strategic-planning-group>

³⁷ SPG papers: <https://www.ippc.int/en/commission/strategic-planning-group/2024-spg/>

³⁸ 04_SC_2024_Nov; SC 2024-05, agenda item 11.

how it may be used and to emphasize the importance of submitting technical improvements at the first consultation stage.

[197] **Number of submissions.** The SC noted that setting a limit of five submissions per region could result in a substantial number of proposed technical improvements, which would all need to be considered by the CPM. However, they noted that, if that happened, it would indicate that there was a bigger problem with the draft ISPM and it needed to be submitted for a third round of consultation.

[198] **Technical justification.** The SC referred to the “Criteria to help determine if an objection is technically justified” in the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*³⁹ and concluded that these could accommodate technical improvements. The secretariat explained that, in the template form for submitting objections, the objector was required to explain the reason for the objection and to suggest improvements. If the CPM decided not to make the changes proposed in an objection and the objection was sustained by the objector, then the CPM was likely to return the draft to the SC.

[199] The SC chairperson suggested that the SC could review the template submission form.

Developing guidance for lead stewards and assistant stewards in relation to technical panels

[200] David KAMANGIRA (Malawi) gave a verbal update from the small working group that had been established by the SC at its meeting in May 2025 to develop guidance for lead stewards and assistant stewards in relation to technical panels and for the “regular” role of assistant stewards.⁴⁰ Mr KAMANGIRA reported that the group had met once online, with a second virtual meeting planned for December 2024, and that a paper would be submitted to the May 2025 meeting of the SC.

[201] The SC:

- (52) *recognized* that the provisions for objections in the current Standard Setting Procedure already accommodated a means to address the concern about technical issues with draft ISPMs that are not objections, but there was a need to communicate the corresponding process better;
- (53) *requested* that the small SC group for this issue draft a paper for CPM-19 (2025), to be submitted for SC e-decision by 2 December 2024; and
- (54) *noted* the update from the small SC group on developing guidance for lead stewards and assistant stewards in relation to technical panels.

12.4 Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations, 2024 update

[202] The SC received an update on the Thirty-Sixth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPO), which had been held in Panama City, Panama, on 1–4 October 2024.⁴¹

[203] The report from the TC-RPPO will be posted on the IPP.⁴²

[204] The SC:

- (55) *noted* the update from the Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations.

³⁹ *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*, section 3.5.1.

⁴⁰ SC 2024-05, agenda item 8.

⁴¹ 08_SC_2024_Nov.

⁴² TC-RPPO reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/ippc-community/regional-plant-protection-organizationstechnical-consultation-among-rppos/>

12.5 Update on the IPPC regional workshops

[205] The SC received an update on the 2024 IPPC regional workshops, which had been held during August and September and had been timed to coincide with the July–September consultation period.⁴³

[206] The SC discussed how presentations could be made available to presenters beforehand as Powerpoint files, rather than PDFs, to allow the presentations to be adjusted to regional circumstances. The secretariat explained that the FAO publishing team had recommended that presentations be provided as PDFs, but the secretariat speculated that it may be possible to provide Powerpoint files via the regional organizing committees.

[207] The SC:

(56) *noted* the update on the 2024 IPPC regional workshops; and

(57) *urged* the secretariat to make the presentations at IPPC regional workshops available as Powerpoint files to regional organizing committees (e.g. on the joint SC–IC work area of the IPP) in good time before the workshops.

12.6 Briefings from IPPC Secretariat

Update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Unit

[208] A member of the IFU gave an update on the unit's activities.⁴⁴ The update covered the four development-agenda items led by IFU (harmonization of electronic data exchange, e-commerce and postal and courier pathways, strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems, and developing guidance on the use of third-party entities), the IPPC guides and training materials completed in 2024, the two ongoing IPPC Observatory surveys (on e-commerce and on antimicrobial resistance), phytosanitary capacity evaluation activities, IFU support for IPPC regional workshops, project management, and global coordination of *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *cubense* Tropical Race 4.

[209] In response to a question from the SC, the presenter and the SC chairperson confirmed that the deadline for the e-commerce survey had been extended to the end of November.

Update from the Integration and Support Team

[210] The SC received a report from the secretariat's Integration and Support Team (IST).⁴⁵

[211] The SC highlighted the need for contracting parties and RPPOs to be informed of the theme, including the availability of associated communication material, well in advance of each International Day of Plant Health.

Update from the Standard Setting Unit

[212] The SC received an update on the activities of the SSU during 2024.⁴⁶ The secretariat also presented an overview of planned SSU activities and events for 2025, with the detail circulated as a tentative workplan.⁴⁷

[213] **Workplan.** In response to questions from the SC, the secretariat confirmed that a second TPCS meeting, to be held in June 2025, had been added to the workplan and that the draft specification on *Safe provision of humanitarian aid in the phytosanitary context* (2021-020) was pending approval by CPM-19 (2025).

⁴³ 06_SC_2024_Nov.

⁴⁴ 12_SC_2024_Nov.

⁴⁵ 13_SC_2024_Nov.

⁴⁶ 29_SC_2024_Nov.

⁴⁷ 17_SC_2024_Nov.

[214] The secretariat also clarified that the side session on commodity standards planned for CPM-19 (2025) had been deferred to CPM-20 (2026) by the CPM Bureau at their meeting in October 2024, so that it was after the first commodity standard (annex to ISPM 46) had been adopted.

[215] **Funding.** The secretariat confirmed that there was sufficient funding for the two EWGs listed in the workplan (on *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037)* and *Safe provision of humanitarian aid in the phytosanitary context (2021-020)*) and the extra TPCS meeting, although the staff resource still needed to be resolved. Sophie PETERSON (Australia) confirmed that Australia had provided financial support for the CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid and some of that could be used for an EWG if needed, or the Southwest Pacific region could host the meeting.

[216] One SC member encouraged those SC members from organizations that may have funding available to contact the secretariat to enquire about providing financial support for standard setting activities. The secretariat noted that the first meeting of the CPM Focus Group on Laboratory Diagnostic Network was scheduled for 2025; however, although some funding was in place, more was needed.

[217] The SC:

- (58) *noted* the update from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit;
- (59) *agreed* to promote completion of the IPPC Observatory e-commerce survey by all contracting parties;
- (60) *noted* the update from the Integration and Support Team (IST);
- (61) *emphasized* the importance of early communication about the themes for the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH);
- (62) *noted* that the secretariat would liaise with the IST to ensure that any IDPH events involving SC members during the SC May 2025 meeting could be incorporated into the SC schedule for the week;
- (63) *noted* the SSU update;
- (64) *thanked* Julie PATTMORE (Australia) for her services to the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP);
- (65) *noted* that the secretariat would open a call for a mycologist member of the TPDP by the end of 2024;
- (66) *thanked* Martin DAMUS (Canada) and Hideki TANIGUCHI (Japan) for their services to the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS);
- (67) *noted* that the secretariat would open a call for two TPCS members before the end of 2024;
- (68) *noted* the tentative list of SSU activities for 2025; and
- (69) *noted* the tentative dates for the SC meetings in 2025.

13. SC recommendations for CPM-19 (2025) decisions and discussions

[218] The SC noted that the following would be recommended to CPM-19 (2025):

- draft ISPMs for adoption: draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit (2021-011)* to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*), annex *Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risk associated with the movement of wood (2015-004)* to ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*);
- draft specification for consideration: *Safe provision of humanitarian aid in the phytosanitary context (2021-020)* (together with a covering paper, inviting the CPM to decide whether to proceed with the development of an ISPM); and
- *List of topics for IPPC standards* (to note the updates, including the addition of subjects; to remove the topics *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001)* and *Pest risk management for quarantine pests (2014-001)*).

[219] The SC noted that papers on the following would be prepared for CPM-19 (2025):

- SC update and covering paper on adoption of standards (including inviting the CPM to note the DPs adopted since CPM-18 (2024), the possible additional consultation period for DPs, the changes to the dates for DP notification, and a cross-reference to the paper on the draft specification on *Safe provision of humanitarian aid in the phytosanitary context*); and
- a paper from the small SC working group on addressing technical issues with draft ISPMs that are not formal objections.

[220] These items are in addition to those identified by the SC in May 2024 for consideration by CPM-19 (2025),⁴⁸ except:

- the paper on technical issues that are not objections (which was also listed in May); and
- the adjustment of the Standard Setting Procedure to include a January–May consultation period for DPs as a permanent feature (which was identified by the SC in May 2024, but is superseded by the above).

14. Agenda items deferred to future SC meetings

[221] The following items were deferred to future SC meetings:

- review of draft specifications added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by CPM-18 (2024), deferred to the SC meeting in May 2025;
- consideration of how annexes removed from ISPM 26 as a result of its revision (2021-010) can be made available on the IPP (agenda item 5 of this meeting);
- consideration of the need for further explanation in the ISPM 5 definition of “pest free area” and the distinction between declarations of “absence” and an “official pest free area” (agenda item 5 of this meeting); and
- consideration of the need for, and content of, the section on “Impacts on biodiversity and the environment” that is in all ISPMs (agenda item 6.1 of the SC meeting in May 2024 and item 6.1 of this meeting).

15. Any other business

[222] One SC member referred to the difficulties in attending SC meetings when there were delays in receiving visas and asked whether it would be possible for a contracting party to host an SC meeting. The secretariat explained that it was not feasible to host an SC meeting outside of FAO because of the need to offer translation in all FAO languages.

[223] Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy) shared her experience of being a member of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Board since being selected for this role by the SC in May 2024.⁴⁹

[224] The SC:

- (70) *requested* that the secretariat provide invitations, draft agendas and specific letters to SC members as early as possible to facilitate travel planning, including visa applications.

16. Date and venue of the next SC meeting

[225] The next SC meeting is scheduled for 12–16 May 2025 in Rome, Italy.

17. Evaluation of the meeting process

[226] 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.

⁴⁸ SC 2024-05, agenda item 12.

⁴⁹ SC 2024-05, agenda item 11.

18. Review and adoption of the decisions

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

[228] For ease of reference, a list of action points arising from the meeting is attached as Appendix 11.

[229] The SC:

- (71) *requested* that the secretariat open an e-decision to approve the report from this meeting, following approval of the text by the rapporteurs; and
- (72) *requested* that the secretariat circulate the decisions from this meeting soon after the meeting.

19. Close of the meeting

[230] In wishing the SC well in their future work, an outgoing SC member recommended that the terms of SC members be increased, because of the time needed for new members to become sufficiently familiar with the work and processes of the committee.

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

Appendix 1: Agenda

	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER/ SECRETARIAT SUPPORT
1.	Opening of the Meeting		
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	---	IPPC OIC / NERSISYAN
2.	Meeting Arrangements		
2.1	Election of the Rapporteur	---	Chairperson (PETERSON)
2.2	Adoption of the Agenda	01_SC_2024_Nov	Chairperson
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1	Documents List	02_SC_2024_Nov	KRAH
3.2	Participants List	03_SC_2024_Nov SC membership list	KRAH
3.3	Local Information	Link to local information	KRAH
3.4	Standard Setting Unit staff	Link to standard setting staff	NERSISYAN / KRAH
4	Draft ISPMs for recommendation to Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) for adoption (from second consultation)		
4.1	<p><i>Draft annex International movement of fresh <i>Mangifera indica</i> fruit (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Joanne WILSON ❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response) ❖ Steward's notes and potential implementation issues (2021-011) ❖ SC-7 2024 meeting report 	<p>2021-011</p> <p>15_SC_2024_Nov</p> <p>16_SC_2024_Nov Link SC-7 2024 meeting report</p>	WILSON / MOREIRA

	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER/ SECRETARIAT SUPPORT
4.2	<p><i>Draft annex Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risk associated with the movement of wood (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Steve CÔTÉ - Assistant steward: Mr Harry ARIJS ❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response) (2015-004) ❖ Steward's notes and potential implementation issues (2015-004) ❖ SC-7 2024 meeting report ❖ Discussion paper PFA x SA: Use of a Pest Free Area as an Integrated Measure in a Systems Approach 	<p>2015-004</p> <p>23_SC_2024_Nov</p> <p>24_SC_2024_Nov</p> <p>Link SC-7 2024 meeting report</p> <p>36_SC_2024_Nov</p>	<p>CÔTÉ / SHAMILOV</p> <p>BUTTERA</p>
5	Issues raised from the first consultation period		
5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ <i>Draft revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consideration of the need for further explanation in the ISPM 5 definition of "pest free area" and the distinction between declarations of "absence" and an "official pest free area" (SC May" to the cross-references in this agenda item (e.g. "from agenda item 5.1, SC May: Draft revision of ISPM 26");); ❖ <i>Draft annex to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection) on field inspection (2021-018)</i> ❖ <i>Draft annex to ISPM 38 (International movement of seeds) on the design and use of systems approaches for the phytosanitary certification of seeds. (2018-009).</i> 	<p>First consultation period</p> <p>39_SC_2024_Nov</p> <p>26_SC_2024_Nov_Rev</p> <p>27_SC_2024_Nov</p>	<p>WILSON</p> <p>SAI</p> <p>ZLOTINA</p>
6	Draft Specification from first consultation for revision and approval		
6.1	<p><i>Draft specification on revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Masahiro SAI - Assistant steward: Ms Stavroula IOANNIDOU 	<p>2023-037</p>	<p>SAI / MOREIRA</p>

	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER/ SECRETARIAT SUPPORT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response) ❖ Steward's notes <p>Reference documents:</p> <p><i>Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards: Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests (2020-001)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response) ❖ Steward's notes ❖ Revision flow diagrams of the Reorganized PRA ISPMs (2020-001) from EPPO (PPT) <p>A review of the need for, and content of, the section on "Impacts on biodiversity and the environment" that is included in ISPMs (from agenda item 6.1: Draft specification on holistic revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis standard);</p>	<p>38_SC_2024_Nov</p> <p>37_SC_2024_Nov</p> <p>2020-001</p> <p>09_SC_2024_Nov</p> <p>10_SC_2024_Nov</p> <p>11_SC_2024_Nov</p>	
6.2	<p><i>Draft specification on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid (2021-020)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lead: Sophie PETERSON ❖ Compiled comments (including Focus Group's response) ❖ Focus Group's notes ❖ Diagram on Safe Aid Movements 	<p>2021-020</p> <p>30_SC_2024_Nov</p> <p>31_SC_2024_Nov</p> <p>32_SC_2024_Nov</p>	<p>PETERSON / MOREIRA /STIRLING</p>
7	Review of Specifications for new topics		
7.1	Annex Remote audits to ISPM 47 (Audit in the phytosanitary context) - Priority 1	<p>2023-031</p> <p>Specification 66</p> <p>18_SC_2024_Nov</p>	CÔTÉ
7.2	Revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) - Priority 1	<p>2023-020</p> <p>Specification 67</p> <p>19_SC_2024_Nov</p>	IOANNIDOU
7.3	Revision of ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection)- Priority 2	<p>2023-014</p> <p>Specification 74</p> <p>20_SC_2024_Nov</p> <p>22_SC_2024_Nov</p>	SAI
8	Urgent issues from the Technical Panels		

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER/ SECRETARIAT SUPPORT
8.1	<p>Modifications proposed to the Standard Setting Procedure Manual to the CPM-19 (2025)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Additional consultation period for DPs (already agreed by SC May 2024) ❖ Request SC to align the January DP notification period with the consultation period, from 05 to 30 January each year, while maintaining the 01 July 45-Day DP notification period 	05_SC_2024_Nov	MOREIRA
8.2	<p>TPPT work plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Vapour heat (hot steam) treatment of coniferous bark for the elimination of <i>Bursaphelenchus xylophilus</i> (2024-001) ❖ Update on ISPM 15 criteria development ❖ IC request for TPPT to consider the comments from the peer reviewers on two wood packaging material treatment manuals 	33_SC_2024_Nov	OPATOWSKI / SHAMILOV
8.3	Selection of the third expert for the English language for the TPG	34_SC_2024_Nov	NERSISYAN / TORELLA
9.	Topics		
9.1	Task Force on Topics (TFT)		
	<p>Briefing from the work of the TFT in 2024.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Proposed changes of the submission forms and the criteria for the justification and prioritization of proposed topics 	<p>TFT virtual meetings report</p> <p>35_SC_2024_Nov</p>	CÔTÉ / PETERSON / KRAH
9.2	<p>List of Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Review and adjustments to the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i> 	<p>21_SC_2024_Nov</p> <p>Link to List of Topics for IPPC standards</p>	Chairperson / KRAH
10.	Standards Committee		
10.1	<p>Standards Committee working group (SC-7) May 2024</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Update from the 2024 SC-7 meeting ❖ Agenda of the 2025 SC-7 meeting ❖ Selection or reconfirmation of SC-7 members 	<p>Link SC-7 2024 meeting report</p> <p>07_SC_2024_Nov</p> <p>Link to SC membership list</p>	C.P. Da SILVA / SHAMILOV
10.2	Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (from May 2024 to November 2024)	14_SC_2024_Nov	KRAH

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER/ SECRETARIAT SUPPORT
10.3	Selection of the SC representative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking. ❖ CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers. 		Chairperson
11.	Implementation and Capacity Development (IC) Committee and SC/IC Interactions		
11.1	Update on IC activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ SC update to IC 	Link to IC meeting reports 25_SC_2024_Nov	YIM
12	Updates		
12.1	CPM Bureau: Update from June, September and October 2024 meetings	Link to Bureau meeting reports 28_SC_2024_Nov	NERSISYAN
12.2	Strategic Planning Group: Update 2024 meeting	Link to SPG meeting reports	PETERSON
12.3	SC small group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Mechanisms to address technical issues regarding draft ISPMS presented for adoption by CPM but are not formal objections ❖ Developing guidance for lead stewards and assistant stewards in relation to technical panels. 	04_SC_2024_Nov	BUTTERA / NERSISYAN KAMANGIRA / MOREIRA
12.4	Technical-consultation among Regional Plant Protection organizations (TC-RPPOs) 2024 update	Link to the 2024 webpage – TC RPPOs 08_SC_2024_Nov	GILMORE
12.5	Update on the IPPC Regional Workshops	06_SC_2024_Nov	GILMORE
12.6	Briefings from IPPC Secretariat <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Unit (IFU) ❖ Update from the Integration and Support Team (IST) ❖ Update from the Standard Setting Unit (SSU) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Work plan and calendar 	12_SC_2024_Nov 13_SC_2024_Nov 29_SC_2024_Nov 17_SC_2024_Nov Link to the IPP calendar	BRUNEL DENG NERSISYAN
13	SC recommendations for CPM-19 (2025) decisions and discussions		Chairperson

	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER/ SECRETARIAT SUPPORT
14.	Agenda items deferred to future SC Meetings		Chairperson
15.	Any other business:		Chairperson
16.	Date and venue of the next SC Meeting	12 to 16 May 2025 (FAO HQ, Rome)	Chairperson
17.	Evaluation of the meeting process	Link to survey	Chairperson
18.	Review and Adoption of the decisions		Chairperson
19.	Close of the meeting		Chairperson

Appendix 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGE NDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
Draft ISPMs			
2020-001	6.1	Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards: Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests (2020-001)	2024-10-21
2021-011	4.1	Draft annex International movement of fresh <i>Mangifera indica</i> fruit (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (<i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i>)	2024-10-22
2015-004	4.2	Draft annex Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risk associated with the movement of wood (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (<i>International movement of wood</i>)	2024-10-30
2021-020	6.2	Draft specification on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid (2021-020)	2024-11-05
2023-037	6.1	Draft specification on revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037)	2024-11-07
Other Documents			
01_SC_2024_Nov	2.2	Provisional Agenda	2024-09-17 2024-09-23 2024-10-04 2024-10-07 2024-10-04 2024-10-07 2024-10-16 2024-10-21 2024-10-22 2024-10-23 2024-10-25 2024-10-28 2024-10-30 2024-11-01 2024-11-04 2024-11-05 2024-11-06 2024-11-07 2024-11-15
02_SC_2024_Nov	3.1	Documents List	2024-11-07 2024-11-15
03_SC_2024_Nov	3.2	Participants List	2024-11-06
04_SC_2024_Nov	12.3	Discussion paper to address technical issues regarding draft ISPMs presented for adoption by CPM but are not formal objections	2024-09-23
05_SC_2024_Nov	8.1	Additional consultation period for DPs	2024-09-23
06_SC_2024_Nov	12.5	Update on the IPPC Regional Workshops	2024-10-04

DOCUMENT NO.	AGE NDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
07_SC_2024_Nov	10.1	Agenda of the 2025 SC-7 meeting	2024-10-07
08_SC_2024_Nov	12.4	Technical-consultation among Regional Plant Protection organizations (TC-RPPOs) 2024 update	2024-10-16
09_SC_2024_Nov	6.1	Compiled comments (including Steward's response): Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards: Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests (2020-001)	2024-10-21
10_SC_2024_Nov	6.1	Steward's notes: Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards: Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests (2020-001)	2024-10-21
11_SC_2024_Nov	6.1	Revision flow diagrams of the Reorganized PRA ISPMs (2020-001) from EPPO (PPT)	2024-10-21
12_SC_2024_Nov	12.6	Update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Unit (IFU)	2024-10-22
13_SC_2024_Nov	12.6	Update from the Integration and Support Team (IST)	2024-10-22
14_SC_2024_Nov	10.2	Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (from May 2024 to November 2024)	2024-10-22
15_SC_2024_Nov	4.1	Compiled comments (including Steward's response): Draft annex International movement of fresh <i>Mangifera indica</i> fruit (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures)	2024-10-22
16_SC_2024_Nov	4.1	Steward's notes and potential implementation issues (2021-011): Draft annex International movement of fresh <i>Mangifera indica</i> fruit (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures)	2024-10-22
17_SC_2024_Nov	12.6	Standard Setting Unit (SSU) 2025 tentative work plan	2024-10-22
18_SC_2024_Nov	7.1	Draft specification: Annex Remote audits to ISPM 47 (Audit in the phytosanitary context) - Priority 1	2024-10-23
19_SC_2024_Nov	7.2	Draft specification: Revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) - Priority 1	2024-10-23
20_SC_2024_Nov	7.3	Draft specification: Revision of ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection)- Priority 2 (Clean document)	2024-10-28
21_SC_2024_Nov	9.2	Review and adjustments to the List of topics for IPPC standards	2024-10-23
22_SC_2024_Nov	7.3	Draft specification: Revision of ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection)- Priority 2 (Track Changes)	2024-10-28
23_SC_2024_Nov	4.2	Compiled comments (including Steward's response) (2015-004): Draft annex Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risk associated with the movement of wood (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (<i>International movement of wood</i>).	2024-10-30

DOCUMENT NO.	AGE NDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
24_SC_2024_Nov	4.2	Steward's notes and potential implementation issues (2015-004): Draft annex Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risk associated with the movement of wood (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (<i>International movement of wood</i>)	2024-10-30
25_SC_2024_Nov	11.1	SC and IC collaboration	2024-10-30
26_SC_2024_Nov_Rev	5.1	Steward's notes: Draft annex Field Inspection to ISPM 23	2024-11-01 2024-11-07
27_SC_2024_Nov	5.1	Steward's notes: Draft annex to ISPM 38	2024-11-04
28_SC_2024_Nov	12.1	CPM Bureau: Update from June, September and October 2024 meetings	2024-11-04
29_SC_2024_Nov	12.6	Update from the Standard Setting Unit (SSU)	2024-11-05
30_SC_2024_Nov	6.2	Compiled comments (including Focus Group's response): Draft specification on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid (2021-020)	2024-11-05
31_SC_2024_Nov	6.2	Focus Group's notes: Draft specification on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid (2021-020)	2024-11-05
32_SC_2024_Nov	6.2	Diagram on Safe Aid Movements	2024-11-05
33_SC_2024_Nov	8.2	TPPT Urgent issues	2024-11-05
34_SC_2024_Nov	8.3	Selection of the third expert for the English language for the TPG	2024-11-06
35_SC_2024_Nov	9.1	Briefing from the work of the TFT in 2024	2024-11-06
36_SC_2024_Nov	4.2	Discussion paper PFA x SA: Use of a Pest Free Area as an Integrated Measure in a Systems Approach	2024-11-06
37_SC_2024_Nov	6.1	Steward's notes: Draft specification on revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037)	2024-11-07
38_SC_2024_Nov	6.1	Compiled comments (including Steward's response): Draft specification on revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037)	2024-11-07
39_SC_2024_Nov	5.1	Steward's notes: revision of ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>) (2021-10)	2024-11-15

IPP LINKS:	Agenda item
SC membership list	3.2
Link to local information	3.3
Link to survey	3.4
Link to standard setting staff	3.5
Link to CPM 18 Report (CPM-18 Report Part 1 & CPM-18 Report Part 2)	4
CPM Bureau	4.1
EWG meeting report	5

IPP LINKS:	Agenda item
Specification 75	5.1
Specification 74	5.2
Specification 70	5.3
Link to Technical Panels	7
Link to List of Topics for IPPC standards	8.1
Follow up from CPM COSAVE paper (CPM 2024/INF/20)	11
Link to the IPP calendar	14

Appendix 3: Participants list

Members

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed ⁵⁰	Term expires
Africa Member	<p>Mr Edouard NYA M.Sc. Ingénieur Agronome Chief National Laboratory For Analysis and Diagnosis of Agricultural Products and Inputs Directorate of Regulations and Quality Control of Agricultural Inputs and Products Ministry Of Agriculture and Rural Development Republic of Cameroon CAMEROON Tel : (+237) 696 18 99 73</p>	nyaedouard@yahoo.fr ;	CPM-18 (2024) 1 st term / 3 years	2027
Africa Member SC-7	<p>Mr David KAMANGIRA Senior Deputy Director and IPPC Focal Point Department of Agricultural Research Services Headquarters, P.O. Box 30779, Lilongwe 3 MALAWI Tel: +265 888 342 712 Tel: +265 999 122 199</p>	davidkamangira1@gmail.com ;	CPM-11 (2016) CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022) 3rd term / 3 years	2025
Africa Member	<p>Mr Theophilus Mwendwa MUTUI Managing Director, Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) P.O. BOX 49592, 00100 Nairobi KENYA Tel: +254 725 294445</p>	tmutui@kephis.org ; director@kephis.org ;	CPM-15 (2021) CPM-18 (2024) 2 nd term / 3 years	2027
Africa Member	<p>Mr Prudence Tonator ATTIPOE Deputy Director, Head Plant Quarantine Division. Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate (PPRS), Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA) P.O. Box M37, Accra GHANA Tel: 0209793292, 0262235397</p>	tonattipoe@yahoo.co.uk ;	CPM-15 (2021) CPM-18 (2024) 2 nd term / 3 years	2027

⁵⁰ Bracketed number indicates the Criteria used for prioritizing participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat when Statement of Commitment was signed: (0) no funding, (1) airfare only, (2) full funding (<https://www.ippc.int/publications/criteria-used-prioritizing-participants-receive-travel-assistance-attend-meetings>)

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed ⁵⁰	Term expires
Asia Member	Ms Mi Chi YEA Department of Plant Quarantine, Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency 177, Hyeoksin 8-ro Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, REP. OF KOREA Tel: 82-54-912-0627 Fax: 82-54-912-0635, Mobile: 82-10-8405-9278	kittymc@korea.kr ;	CPM-18 (2024) 1 st term / 3 years	2027
Asia Member	Mr Gerald Glenn F. PANGANIBAN, Ph.D. Director Address: Bureau of Plant Industry 692 San Andres Steet, Malate, Manila Philippines 1004 PHILIPPINES Telephone: +632 8525 7857 Mobile (Viber/WhatsApp) +63915 314 1568	glenn.panganiban@da.gov.ph ; gfpanganiban@gmail.com ;	CPM-15 (2021) CPM-18 (2024) 2 nd term / 3 years	2027
Asia Member SC-7	Mr Masahiro SAI Head Pest Risk Analysis Division. Yokohama Plant Protection Station, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) 1-16-10 Shin-Yamashita, Naka-ku, Yokohama. 2310801 JAPAN Tel: +81456228693	masahiro_sai670@maff.go.jp ;	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) CPM-18 (2024) 3 rd term / 3 years	2027
Europe Member	Mr Harry ARIJS European Commission, Health and Consumers Directorate-General, Unit G1, Plant Health Rue Froissart 101, 6-60, 1040 Brussels, BELGIUM Tel: +3222987645	harry.arijs@ec.europa.eu ;	CPM-15 (2021) CPM-18 (2024) 2 nd term / 3 years	2027
Europe Member	Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI Servizio Fitosanitario DG Agricoltura Regione Lombardia Piazza Città di Lombardia 1 20124 Milano ITALY Tel: (+39) 3666603272	mariangela_ciampitti@regione.lombardia.it ;	CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022) 2 nd term / 3 years	2025
Europe Member	Ms Stavroula IOANNIDOU Department of Phytosanitary Control, Directorate of Plant Produce Protection, Hellenic Ministry of Rural Development and Food 150 Sygrou Ave, 17671, Kalithea, Athens, GREECE Phone: +30 210 9287133	stioannidou@minagric.gr ;	CPM-18 (2024) 1 st term / 3 years	2027

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed ⁵⁰	Term expires
Europe Member SC-7	Mr David OPATOWSKI Head, Plant Biosecurity, Plant Protection and Inspection Services (PPIS), P.O. Box 78, Bet Dagan, 50250 ISRAEL Tel: 972-(0)3-9681518 Mob: 972-(0)506-241885	dopatowski@yahoo.com ; davido@moag.gov.il ;	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) CPM-12 (2017) CPM-15 (2021) CPM-18 (2024) 5 th term / 3 years	2027
Latin America and Caribbean Member SC-7	Mr André Felipe C. P. da SILVA Federal Inspector Quarantine Division Ministry of Agriculture, Live Stock and Food Supply BRAZIL Tel: (61) 3218-2925	andre.peralta@agro.gov.br ;	CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022) 2 nd term / 3 years	2025
Latin America and Caribbean Member	Ms María José MONTELONGO Evaristo Ciganda 906, Libertad – San José URUGUAY TEL:(+598) 99 151 454	mmontelongo@mgap.gub.uy ;	CPM-18 (2024) 1 st term / 3 years	2027
Latin America and Caribbean Member	Mr Matías GONZALEZ BUTTERA Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA Venezuela 162 (C1063), City of Buenos Aires ARGENTINA Tel/Fax: (+54 9 11) 36661284	mbuttera@senasa.gob.ar ;	CPM-16 (2022) 1 st term / 3 years	2025
Latin America and Caribbean Member	Mr David Alfonso TELLO CEPEDA Agencia de Regulación y Control Fito y Zoonosanitario - AGROCALIDAD ECUADOR Tel: +593 2194571 Mobile: +593 987900286 - +593984270668	david.tello@agrocalidad.gob.ec ; fitosanitario.tello@gmail.com ;	CPM-18 (2024) 1 st term/ 3 years	2027
Near East Member SC-7	Mr Nader ELBADRY Phytosanitary Specialist, Central Administration of Plant Quarantine, 6 Michel Bakhoum St., Dokki, Giza, EGYPT Tel: +201096799493	nader.badry@gmail.com ;	CPM-15 (2021) CPM-18 (2024) 2 nd term / 3 years	2027
Near East Member	Mr Eyad MOHAMED Ministry of Agriculture and Agrarian reform Al Abed street Sabeh Bahrat Area, Damascus SYRIA Tel: +963933492111- 00963112220187	ppdsyr@gmail.com ; Eyadm2009@gmail.com ;	CPM-18 (2024) 1 st term / 3 years	2027

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed ⁵⁰	Term expires
Near East Member	Ms. Amani ALAWAMLEH Almedan St., Al Salt, Jordan JORDAN Tel: +962791997167	amaniawamleh@yahoo.com ; amani.alawameleh@moa.gov.jo ;	CPM-18 (2024) 1 st term / 3 years	2027
North America Member SC-7	Ms Marina ZLOTINA IPPC Technical Director USDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) 4700 River Rd, 5c-03.37 Riverdale, MD 20737 USA Tel: 1-301-851-2200 Cell: 1 -301-832-0611	Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov ;	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) CPM-18 (2024) 4 th term / 3 years	2027
North America Member	Mr Steve CÔTÉ National Manager, International Phytosanitary Standards Plant Export Division 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 CANADA Tel: (+1) 343-543-1432 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7576	Steve.Cote@inspection.gc.ca ;	CPM-15 (2021) CPM-18 (2024) 2 nd term / 3 years	2027
Southwest Pacific Member	Ms Joanne WILSON Principal Adviser, Risk Management Plant Imports Group Ministry for Primary Industries NEW ZEALAND Tel: +64 489 40528 Mob: +64 2989 40528	joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz ;	CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022) 2 nd term / 3 years	2025
Southwest Pacific Member SC Chairperson SC-7	Ms Sophie PETERSON Director, Pacific Engagement and International Plant Health Australian Chief Plant Protection Office Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment AUSTRALIA Tel: +61 2 6272 3769 Mob: +61 466 867 519	sophie.Peterson@aff.gov.au ; sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au	CPM-15 (2021) CPM-18 (2024) 2 nd term / 3 years	2027

Others

Role	Name	Email address
Observer	Kyuock Yim IC Representation	koyim2022@gmail.com
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Avetik NERSISYAN Standard Setting Unit Lead	Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Adriana MOREIRA Standard Setting Officer	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Colleen Stirling Standard Setting Specialist	colleen.stirling@fao.org

Role	Name	Email address
Observer	Kyuock Yim IC Representation	koyim2022@gmail.com
IPPC Secretariat	Mr. Emmanuel Plarhar Krah Phytosanitary Standard Setting Support Specialist	Emmanuel.krah@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Daniel Torella Phytosanitary Standard Setting Support Specialist	daniel.torella@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Marina Martino Phytosanitary Standard Setting Specialist	marina.martino@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Giulia Gaviano Office Assistant	giulia.gaviano@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Aixa DEL GRECO Standard Setting Specialist	Aixa.DelGreco@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Karen ROUEN Report writer	karen.Rouen@fao.org

Members who did not attend

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed ⁵¹	Term expires
Asia Member	Mr J. P. Singh, PhD Plant Protection Adviser, Government of India, Deptt. of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare, Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare INDIA Mobile: +91- 9818836622	ppa@nic.in ; j.p.singh@nic.in ; drjps1109@gmail.com ;	CPM-18 (2024) 1 st term / 3 years	2027
Near East Member	Mr. Sayed Muzammil HUSSAIN H* B38, Street 8, B-III, Saadi Town Karachi PAKISTAN Tel: +92-34692544187	nppopakistan@plantprotection.gov.pk ; Pathologist49@gmail.com ;	CPM-18 (2024) 1 st term / 3 years	2027

⁵¹ Bracketed number indicates the Criteria used for prioritizing participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat when Statement of Commitment was signed: (0) no funding, (1) airfare only, (2) full funding (<https://www.ippc.int/publications/criteria-used-prioritizing-participants-receive-travel-assistance-attend-meetings>)

Appendix 4: DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 46: International movement of fresh *Mangifera indica* fruit (2021-011)

Status box

This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
Date of this document	2024-11-27
Document category	Draft annex to ISPM 46
Current document stage	To CPM-19 (2025) for adoption
Major stages	2021-04 CPM-16 added topic Annex <i>International movement of mango (Mangifera indica) fruit</i> (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (<i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i>) to the work programme, priority 1. 2022-11 Standards Committee (SC) approved Specification 73 (<i>International movement of fresh mango (Mangifera indica) fruit</i>). 2023-01 Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) drafted. 2023-02 TPCS revised and recommended to SC for approval for consultation. 2023-05 SC revised and approved for first consultation. 2023-07 First consultation. 2024-05 SC-7 revised and approved for second consultation. 2024-07 Second consultation. 2024-10 Steward revised and recommended to SC for approval for CPM adoption. 2024-11 SC revised and approved for adoption.
Steward history	2022-05 SC Joanne WILSON (NZ, Lead Steward) 2022-05 SC Hernando MORERA-GONZÁLEZ (CR, Assistant Steward)
Notes	2023-01 TPCS removed common name “mango” from title (as per IPPC style to use scientific names) 2023-02 Edited 2023-05 Edited As per new FAO style, references cited in tables listed below tables rather than in References 2024-01 Edited 2024-06 Edited (references cited in tables moved to References section, following change in FAO style that permits this) 2024-11 Edited

CONTENTS

1. Scope	52
2. Description of the commodity and its intended use.....	52
3. Pests associated with fresh <i>Mangifera indica</i> fruit.....	52
4. Options for phytosanitary measures	54
5. References	60

Tables

1. Pests considered to be associated with fresh <i>Mangifera indica</i> fruit.....	52
2. General options for phytosanitary measures.....	4
3. Pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures.....	55
4. Options for hot water immersion treatment (HWIT).....	57
5. Options for irradiation (IRDN).....	58
6. Options for methyl bromide fumigation (MB) (applied under normal atmospheric pressure).....	58
7. Options for systems approaches	59
8. Options for vapour heat treatment (VHT)	59

Adoption

[Text to this paragraph will be added following adoption.]

1. Scope

This commodity standard provides guidance for national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) on pests associated with fresh *Mangifera indica* (mango) (Sapindales: Anacardiaceae) fruit and options for phytosanitary measures for the international movement of fresh *M. indica* fruit.

2. Description of the commodity and its intended use

This commodity standard applies to the fresh fruit of *M. indica*. It applies to fresh whole *M. indica* fruit, with or without a small section of fruit stem (pedicel) attached but without leaves. The standard applies to fruit that has been produced for international trade and is intended for consumption or processing in an importing country. It does not apply to fruit that has already been processed (e.g. chopped, dried, frozen, canned).

3. Pests associated with fresh *Mangifera indica* fruit

The pests included in Table 1 are considered to be associated with fresh *M. indica* fruit and are regulated in international trade by at least one contracting party based on technical justification. The list of pests is not exhaustive, nor country specific.

The list of pests does not consider factors that may influence pest infestation of fruit in the country of origin (e.g. cultivar or variety, geographical and ecological factors, agricultural and production practices).

Inclusion of a pest in Table 1 does not constitute technical justification for its regulation by importing countries using this standard. When determining whether to regulate a pest listed in this commodity standard, the NPPO of the importing country should base its decision on technical justification using either a pest risk analysis or, where applicable, another comparable examination and evaluation of available scientific information.

Table 1. Pests considered to be associated with fresh *Mangifera indica* fruit*

Pest group	Family	Species (scientific name and authority) [†]
Weevils (Coleoptera)	Curculionidae	<i>Sternochetus frigidus</i> (Fabricius, 1787)
		<i>Sternochetus mangiferae</i> (Fabricius, 1775)
		<i>Sternochetus olivieri</i> (Faust, 1892)
Fruit flies (Diptera)	Tephritidae	<i>Anastrepha distincta</i> Greene, 1934
		<i>Anastrepha fraterculus</i> (Wiedemann, 1830)
		<i>Anastrepha ludens</i> (Loew, 1873)
		<i>Anastrepha obliqua</i> (Macquart, 1835)
		<i>Anastrepha serpentina</i> (Wiedemann, 1830)
		<i>Anastrepha striata</i> Schiner, 1868
		<i>Bactrocera aquilonis</i> (May, 1965)
		<i>Bactrocera carambolae</i> Drew & Hancock, 1994
		<i>Bactrocera caryeae</i> (Kapoor, 1971)
		<i>Bactrocera correcta</i> (Bezzi, 1916)
<i>Bactrocera curvipennis</i> (Froggatt, 1909)		

Pest group	Family	Species (scientific name and authority) [†]
		<i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i> (Hendel, 1912)
		<i>Bactrocera facialis</i> (Coquillett, 1909)
		<i>Bactrocera frauenfeldi</i> (Schiner, 1868)
		<i>Bactrocera jarvisi</i> (Tryon, 1927)
		<i>Bactrocera kirki</i> (Froggatt, 1911)
		<i>Bactrocera melanotus</i> (Coquillett, 1909)
		<i>Bactrocera neohumeralis</i> (Hardy, 1951)
		<i>Bactrocera occipitalis</i> (Bezzi, 1919)
		<i>Bactrocera passiflorae</i> (Froggatt, 1911)
		<i>Bactrocera psidii</i> (Froggatt, 1899)
		<i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> (Froggatt, 1897)
		<i>Bactrocera tuberculata</i> (Bezzi, 1916)
		<i>Bactrocera umbrosa</i> (Fabricius, 1805)
		<i>Bactrocera xanthodes</i> (Broun, 1904)
		<i>Bactrocera zonata</i> (Saunders, 1842)
		<i>Ceratitidis capitata</i> (Wiedemann, 1824)
		<i>Ceratitidis cosyra</i> (Walker, 1849)
		<i>Ceratitidis rosa</i> Karsch, 1887
		<i>Zeugodacus cucurbitae</i> (Coquillett, 1899)
		<i>Zeugodacus tau</i> (Walker, 1849)
Mealybugs (Hemiptera)	Pseudococcidae	<i>Dysmicoccus neobrevipes</i> Beardsley, 1959
		<i>Ferrisia malvastra</i> (McDaniel, 1962)
		<i>Formicococcus robustus</i> (Ezzat & McConnell, 1956)
		<i>Maconellicoccus hirsutus</i> (Green, 1908)
		<i>Nipaecoccus nipae</i> (Maskell, 1893)
		<i>Paracoccus marginatus</i> Williams & Granara de Willink, 1992
		<i>Planococcus lilacinus</i> (Cockerell, 1905)
		<i>Planococcus minor</i> (Maskell, 1897)
		<i>Pseudococcus baliteus</i> Lit, 1994
		<i>Pseudococcus cryptus</i> Hempel, 1918
		<i>Pseudococcus jackbeardsleyi</i> Gimpel & Miller, 1996
		<i>Pseudococcus solenedyos</i> Gimpel & Miller, 1996
		<i>Rastrococcus iceryoides</i> (Green, 1908)
		<i>Rastrococcus invadens</i> Williams, 1986
		<i>Rastrococcus rubellus</i> Williams, 1989
		<i>Rastrococcus spinosus</i> (Robinson, 1918)
Scales (Hemiptera)	Coccidae	<i>Milviscutulus mangiferae</i> (Green, 1889)
Whiteflies (Hemiptera)	Aleyrodidae	<i>Aleurodicus dispersus</i> Russell, 1965
Other Hemiptera	Coreidae	<i>Acanthocoris scabrator</i> (Fabricius, 1803)

Pest group	Family	Species (scientific name and authority) [†]
		<i>Amblypelta nitida</i> Stål, 1873
	Pentatomidae	<i>Bathycoelia thalassina</i> (Herrich-Schäffer, 1844)
Moths (Lepidoptera)	Crambidae	<i>Deanolis sublimbalis</i> Snellen, 1899
Thrips (Thysanoptera)	Thripidae	<i>Retithrips syriacus</i> (Mayet, 1890)
		<i>Rhipiphorothrips cruentatus</i> Hood, 1919
		<i>Scirtothrips aurantii</i> Faure, 1929
		<i>Thrips palmi</i> Karny, 1925
Fungi	<i>Incertae sedis</i>	<i>Cytosphaera mangiferae</i> Died., 1916
Bacteria	Lysobacteraceae	<i>Xanthomonas citri</i> pv. <i>mangiferaeindicae</i> (Patel, Moniz & Kulkarni, 1948) Constantin <i>et al.</i> , 2016

Notes: * Information used to compile this list was supplied by at least one contracting party and may be provided by the IPPC Secretariat upon request.

[†] Scientific names used in this table are based on the submissions by contracting parties or aligned with ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*) or ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*).

4. Options for phytosanitary measures

This section provides options for phytosanitary measures that may be relevant for the pests listed in Table 1. The options presented are not exhaustive and contracting parties may consider other options as phytosanitary measures.

Table 2 provides general options for phytosanitary measures that may be relevant to pests listed in Table 1.

Table 3 lists some specific options to manage the pest risk of pests listed in Table 1, with further details in Table 4 to Table 8. Abbreviations used for options for phytosanitary measures are listed in Box 1, as well as below in relevant tables.

Importing-country NPPOs should decide whether the options listed in Table 3 are effective at managing the pest risk to an acceptable level before selecting them as phytosanitary measures. Importing-country NPPOs should also consider whether a measure for one pest will effectively manage the pest risk of other regulated pests of *M. indica* fruit. In addition, when applying these options as phytosanitary measures, NPPOs should consider the procedures for successful application.

When considering the use of methyl bromide (Table 7), NPPOs should refer to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) recommendation on the *Replacement or reduction of the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure* (R-03). Where possible, alternative options to methyl bromide fumigation that are effective and more environmentally friendly should be selected and applied by NPPOs.

Options for phytosanitary measures included in this commodity standard may be effective at managing pest risk when used alone or when integrated with other measures in a systems approach as described in ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*).

Phytosanitary treatments (PTs) that have been adopted by the CPM as annexes to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) are shown in bold in Table 3 to Table 8.

Table 2. General options for phytosanitary measures

Options for phytosanitary measures	References
Pest free areas	ISPM 4 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>) ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>)

Pest free places of production and pest free production sites	ISPM 10 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites</i>)
Areas of low pest prevalence	ISPM 22 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence</i>)
Systems approaches	ISPM 14 (<i>The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management</i>) ISPM 35 (<i>Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>)
Phytosanitary treatments	ISPM 28 (<i>Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests</i>)
Inspection	ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>) ISPM 31 (<i>Methodologies for sampling of consignments</i>)
Testing and pest identification	ISPM 27 (<i>Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests</i>)
Phytosanitary certification	ISPM 7 (<i>Phytosanitary certification system</i>) ISPM 12 (<i>Phytosanitary certificates</i>)

Sources: See References section.

Box 1. Abbreviations used in this commodity standard for options for phytosanitary measures

HWIT	hot water immersion treatment
IRDN	irradiation
MB	methyl bromide fumigation
SA	systems approach
VHT	vapour heat treatment

Table 3. Pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures

Pest species	Options for phytosanitary measures
Weevils	
<i>Sternochetus frigidus</i>	IRDN 8 ; SA 1
<i>Sternochetus mangiferae</i>	IRDN 13; SA 1
<i>Sternochetus olivieri</i>	SA 1
Fruit flies	
<i>Anastrepha distincta</i>	HWIT 3; IRDN 1 ; SA 2
<i>Anastrepha fraterculus</i>	HWIT 1, 3; IRDN 1 ; SA 2; VHT 2
<i>Anastrepha ludens</i>	HWIT 1; IRDN 1 ; SA 2
<i>Anastrepha obliqua</i>	HWIT 1, 3; IRDN 1 ; SA 2; VHT 2
<i>Anastrepha serpentina</i>	HWIT 1, 3; IRDN 1 ; SA 2
<i>Anastrepha striata</i>	HWIT 1, 3; IRDN 1 ; SA 2; VHT 2
<i>Bactrocera aquilonis</i>	IRDN 6 ; SA 2; VHT 6
<i>Bactrocera carambolae</i>	HWIT 5; IRDN 6 ; SA 2; VHT 5, 9, 11
<i>Bactrocera caryeae</i>	HWIT 5; IRDN 6 ; SA 2
<i>Bactrocera correcta</i>	HWIT 5; IRDN 3, 6 ; SA 2; VHT 4, 9, 11
<i>Bactrocera curvipennis</i>	IRDN 6 ; SA 2; VHT 9
<i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i>	HWIT 2, 4, 5, 6, 7; IRDN 5 ; MB 1; SA 2; VHT 1, 5, 9, 11
<i>Bactrocera facialis</i>	IRDN 6 ; SA 2; VHT 10
<i>Bactrocera frauenfeldi</i>	IRDN 6 ; SA 2; VHT 6

Pest species	Options for phytosanitary measures
<i>Bactrocera jarvisi</i>	IRDN 4 ; SA 2; VHT 6
<i>Bactrocera kirki</i>	IRDN 6 ; SA 2; VHT 10
<i>Bactrocera melanotus</i>	IRDN 6 ; SA 2; VHT 10
<i>Bactrocera neohumeralis</i>	IRDN 6 ; SA 2; VHT 5, 6
<i>Bactrocera occipitalis</i>	IRDN 6 ; SA 2; VHT 1
<i>Bactrocera passiflorae</i>	IRDN 6 ; SA 2; VHT 10
<i>Bactrocera psidii</i>	IRDN 5 ; SA 2; VHT 10
<i>Bactrocera tryoni</i>	IRDN 4 ; SA 2; VHT 6, 7, 10
<i>Bactrocera tuberculata</i>	IRDN 6 ; SA 2; VHT 5, 9, 11
<i>Bactrocera umbrosa</i>	IRDN 6 ; SA 2; VHT 8
<i>Bactrocera xanthodes</i>	IRDN 6 ; SA 2; VHT 10
<i>Bactrocera zonata</i>	HWIT 5; IRDN 6 ; SA 2; VHT 5, 9, 11
<i>Ceratitis capitata</i>	HWIT 1, 3, 4, 7; IRDN 4 ; MB 1; SA 2; VHT 2, 3, 4, 6
<i>Ceratitis cosyra</i>	HWIT 4, 7; IRDN 6 ; MB 1; SA 2; VHT 3
<i>Ceratitis rosa</i>	HWIT 4, 7; IRDN 6 ; MB 1; SA 2; VHT 3
<i>Zeugodacus cucurbitae</i>	IRDN 6 ; SA 2; VHT 2, 5, 9, 11
<i>Zeugodacus tau</i>	IRDN 2 ; SA 2; VHT 5, 9, 11
Mealybugs	
<i>Dysmicoccus neobrevipes</i>	IRDN 12 ; export inspection*
<i>Ferrisia malvastra</i>	IRDN 14; export inspection*
<i>Formicococcus robustus</i>	IRDN 14; SA 1; export inspection*
<i>Maconellicoccus hirsutus</i>	SA 1; export inspection*
<i>Nipaecoccus nipae</i>	Export inspection*
<i>Paracoccus marginatus</i>	IRDN 11
<i>Planococcus lilacinus</i>	IRDN 7; SA 1; export inspection*
<i>Planococcus minor</i>	IRDN 12 ; SA 1; export inspection*
<i>Pseudococcus baliteus</i>	IRDN 10
<i>Pseudococcus cryptus</i>	IRDN 14; SA 1; export inspection*
<i>Pseudococcus jackbeardsleyi</i>	IRDN 9 ; SA 1; export inspection*
<i>Pseudococcus solenedyos</i>	IRDN 14; SA 1; export inspection*
<i>Rastrococcus iceryoides</i>	IRDN 14; SA 1; export inspection*
<i>Rastrococcus invadens</i>	IRDN 14; SA 1; export inspection*
<i>Rastrococcus rubellus</i>	IRDN 14; SA 1; export inspection*
<i>Rastrococcus spinosus</i>	IRDN 14; SA 1; export inspection*
Scales	
<i>Milviscutulus mangiferae</i>	Field and export inspection†
Whiteflies	
<i>Aleurodicus dispersus</i>	Export inspection*
Other hemipterans	
<i>Acanthocoris scabrator</i>	Export inspection*

Pest species	Options for phytosanitary measures
<i>Amblypelta nitida</i>	Export inspection*
<i>Bathycoelia thalassina</i>	Export inspection*
Moths	
<i>Deanolis sublimalis</i>	IRDN 14; export inspection*
Thrips	
<i>Retithrips syriacus</i>	Export inspection*
<i>Rhipiphorothrips cruentatus</i>	Export inspection*
<i>Scirtothrips aurantii</i>	Export inspection*
<i>Thrips palmi</i>	Export inspection*
Fungi	
<i>Cytosphaera mangiferae</i>	SA 1
Bacteria	
<i>Xanthomonas citri</i> pv. <i>mangiferaeindicae</i>	SA 1

Notes: Options in bold are **PTs** (phytosanitary treatments adopted as annexes to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*)): **PTs** are adopted by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM); other treatments included in the table meet the criteria in ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) but are not adopted by the CPM.

* Export inspection targeting the pest of concern and the application of a remedial action if the pest is detected.

† Field and export inspection targeting the pest of concern and the application of a corrective or remedial action if the pest is detected.

HWIT, hot water immersion treatment (see Table 4); IRDN, irradiation (see Table 5); MB, methyl bromide fumigation (see Table 6); SA, systems approach (see Table 7); VHT, vapour heat treatment (see Table 8).

Table 4. Options for hot water immersion treatment (HWIT)

Measure number	Weight of a single fruit (g)	Water temperature (°C)	Immersion time of fruit (minutes)	References*
HWIT 1	0–375	46.1	65	APHIS-PPQ (2023)
	376–500	46.1	75	
	501–700	46.1	90	
	701–900	46.1	110	
HWIT 2	400–500	46.1	68	Ndlela <i>et al.</i> (2017)
HWIT 3	0–425	46.1	75	MERCOSUR (2006) MPI (n.d.)
	426–650	46.1	90	
HWIT 4	0–500	46.1	75	Armstrong and Mangan (2007) DAFF (n.d.)
	501–700	46.1	90	
	701–900	46.1	110	
HWIT 5	0–500	48.0	60	APQA (2012, 2016) DAFF (n.d.)
	501–700	48.0	75	
	701–900	48.0	90	
Measure number	Weight of a single fruit (g)	Fruit pulp temperature (°C)	Time (minutes)†	References*
HWIT 6	All	46.0	10	Srikachar and Damrak (2024)

HWIT 7	All	50.0	11	European Union (2019) Zakariya and Alhassan (2014)
--------	-----	------	----	---

Notes: National plant protection organizations should also refer to ISPM 42 (*Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures*).

* For each option, references are listed in alphabetical order. Specific supporting information is not publicly available for all options listed. Where this information is not publicly available, related references are provided.

† Length of time that fruit pulp temperature should be maintained regardless of fruit size and immersion time of fruit.

Sources: See References section.

Table 5. Options for irradiation (IRDN)

Measure number	Minimum absorbed dose (Gy)	References
IRDN 1	70	PT 39 (Irradiation treatment for the genus <i>Anastrepha</i>)
IRDN 2	72 or 85	PT 42 (Irradiation treatment for <i>Zeugodacus tau</i>)
IRDN 3	93	GACC (2023)
IRDN 4	100	PT 4 (Irradiation treatment for <i>Bactrocera jarvisi</i>) PT 5 (Irradiation treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i>) PT 14 (Irradiation treatment for <i>Ceratitidis capitata</i>)
IRDN 5	116	PT 33 (Irradiation treatment for <i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i>)
IRDN 6	150	PT 7 (Irradiation treatment for fruit flies of the family Tephritidae (generic))
IRDN 7	163	Draft PT Irradiation treatment for <i>Planococcus lilacinus</i> (2023-035)
IRDN 8	165	PT 43 (Irradiation treatment for <i>Sternochetus frigidus</i>)
IRDN 9	166	PT 45 (Irradiation treatment for <i>Pseudococcus jackbeardsleyi</i>)
IRDN 10	183	Draft PT Irradiation treatment for <i>Pseudococcus baliteus</i> (2023-033) Zhao <i>et al.</i> (2023)
IRDN 11	185	Song <i>et al.</i> (2023)
IRDN 12	231	PT 19 (Irradiation treatment for <i>Dysmicoccus neobrevipes</i>, <i>Planococcus lilacinus</i> and <i>Planococcus minor</i>)
IRDN 13	300	APHIS-PPQ (2023)
IRDN 14*	400	APPPC (2021)

Notes: Options in bold are **PTs** (phytosanitary treatments adopted as annexes to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*)); **PTs** are adopted by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM); other treatments included in the table meet the criteria in ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) but are not adopted by the CPM.

National plant protection organizations should also refer to ISPM 18 (*Requirements for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*).

* IRDN 14 treatment excludes pupae and adults of the order Lepidoptera.

Sources: See References section.

Table 6. Options for methyl bromide fumigation (MB) (applied under normal atmospheric pressure)

Measure number	Minimum temperature (°C)	Minimum dose (g/m ³)	Minimum time (hours)	Reference
----------------	--------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	-----------

MB 1	21	32	2	DAC (2003)
------	----	----	---	------------

Note: National plant protection organizations should also refer to ISPM 43 (Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure) and the CPM recommendation on Replacement or reduction of the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure (R-03).

Source: See References section.

Table 7. Options for systems approaches

Systems approach number	Independent measures	Reference
SA 1	<p><i>Pre-harvest control measures</i> (e.g. pest-specific field management using pest control, disposal of fallen and infested fruit)</p> <p><i>Harvest control measures</i> (e.g. removal of infested fruit)</p> <p><i>Post-harvest control measures</i> (e.g. washing and brushing, treatment, targeted inspection and remedial action to remove external pests)</p>	APQA (2016)
SA 2	<p><i>Pre-planting control measures</i> (e.g. area of low pest prevalence)</p> <p><i>Growing period control measures</i> (e.g. chemical controls, sterile insect technique, mass trapping)</p> <p><i>Harvest control measures</i> (e.g. harvest at mature green stage)</p> <p><i>Post-harvest and handling control measures</i> (e.g. activities to prevent infestation, treatments)</p> <p><i>Transportation and distribution control measures</i> (e.g. activities to prevent infestation)</p> <p><i>Control measures applied at several or all stages</i> (e.g. community awareness programme, control on movement of host fruit into the area)</p>	ISPM 35 (<i>Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>)

Note: National plant protection organizations should also refer to ISPM 14 (The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management).

Sources: See References section.

Table 8. Options for vapour heat treatment (VHT)

Measure number	Minimum pulp temperature (°C)	Minimum relative humidity (%)	Minimum exposure time (minutes)	References*
VHT 1	46.0	95	10	APHIS-PPQ (2023)
VHT 2	46.0	90	20	ICA (2021)
VHT 3	46.2	95	30	KEPHIS (2022)
VHT 4	46.5	95	10	PT 30 (Vapour heat treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Mangifera indica</i>)
VHT 5	46.5	95	30	APPPC (2021)
VHT 6	47.0	90	15	DAFF (n.d.)

VHT 7	47.0	95	15	PT 31 (Vapour heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Mangifera indica</i>)
VHT 8	47.0	90	20	APQA (2019)
VHT 9	47.0	95	20	APPPC (2021) APQA (2019)
VHT 10	47.2	60	20	APPPC (2021) MPI (n.d.) Waddell <i>et al.</i> (1993)
VHT 11	47.5	95	20	APPPC (2021)

Notes: Options in bold are **PTs** (phytosanitary treatments adopted as annexes to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*)); **PTs** are adopted by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM); other treatments included in the table meet the criteria in ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) but are not adopted by the CPM.

National plant protection organizations should also refer to ISPM 42 (*Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures*).

For VHT 1–8 and VHT 10, fruit is treated in a vapour heat chamber, whereas for VHT 9, fruit is treated in a high temperature forced air chamber.

* For each option, references are listed in alphabetical order. Specific supporting information is not publicly available for all options listed. Where this information is not publicly available, related references are provided.

Sources: See References section.

5. References

The present annex refers to ISPMs. ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms>.

5.1 Main text

CPM R-03. 2017. *Replacement or reduction of the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure.* CPM Recommendation. IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO. Adopted 2008. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/84230>

5.2 Tables

APHIS-PPQ (Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Plant Protection and Quarantine, Manuals Unit). 2023. *Treatment manual*, interim edn. United States Department of Agriculture. [Cited 18 November 2024]. <https://www.aphis.usda.gov/trade-management/manuals>; <https://acir.aphis.usda.gov/s/treatment-hub>

APPPC (Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission). 2021. *International movement of fresh mango (Mangifera indica) fruit.* Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) 11. APPPC. Bangkok, FAO. 12 pp. <https://openknowledge.fao.org/handle/20.500.14283/cb5357en>

APQA (Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency). 2012. [*Import requirement for fresh mango fruits from Pakistan into Korea.*] Republic of Korea (in Korean). [Cited 25 November 2024]. <https://www.qia.go.kr/bbs/lawAnn/viewLawWebAction.do?id=190958&type=0>

APQA. 2016. [*Import requirement for fresh mango fruits from India into Korea.*] Republic of Korea (in Korean). [Cited 25 November 2024]. <https://www.qia.go.kr/lawAnn/viewLawWebAction.do?id=190961&type=0>

APQA. 2019. [*Import requirement for fresh mango fruits from Cambodia into Korea.*] Republic of Korea (in Korean). [Cited 25 November 2024]. <https://www.qia.go.kr/bbs/lawAnn/viewLawWebAction.do?id=201720&type=0>

Armstrong, J.W. & Mangan, R.L. 2007. Commercial quarantine heat treatments. In: J. Tang, E. Mitcham, S. Wang & S. Lurie, eds. *Heat treatments for postharvest pest control – Theory and practice*, pp. 311–340. Wallingford, UK, CABI. 349 pp.

- DAC (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation).** 2003. *Plant Quarantine (Regulation of Import into India) Order, 2003*. New Delhi. 105 pp. [Cited 25 November 2024]. <https://www.pqqs.gov.in/acts>
- DAFF (Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry).** n.d. Manual of import country requirements. In: *Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry*. [Cited 1 June 2024]. <https://micor.agriculture.gov.au/Pages/default.aspx>
- European Union.** 2019. List of plants, plant products and other objects, originating from third countries and the corresponding special requirements for their introduction into the Union territory. In: Regulation (EU) 2019/2072 of 28 November 2019 establishing uniform conditions for the implementation of Regulation (EU) 2016/2031 of the European Parliament and the Council, as regards protective measures against pests of plants, and repealing Commission Regulation (EC) No 690/2008 and amending Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/2019. Annex VII, pp. 94–177. *Official Journal of the European Union L*, 319: 1–279. http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2019/2072/oj
- GACC (General Administration of Customs of the People's Republic of China).** 2023. The minimum absorbed dose for phytosanitary irradiation treatment of *Bactrocera correcta* (Bezzi). In: *People's Republic of China entry–exit inspection and quarantine industry standards. SN/T5397–2022*. Beijing, China Customs Publishing House Co., Ltd. [Cited 25 November 2024]. <http://codeofchina.com/standard/SNT5397-2022.html>
- ICA (Instituto Colombiano Agropecuario).** 2021. *Work plan for the export of mango from the Republic of Colombia*. Bogotá. 9 pp. [Cited 1 August 2023]. <https://www.ica.gov.co/getattachment/9bace868-59ec-4202-bcf3-381dc1897cce/Mango.aspx>
- KEPHIS (Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service).** 2022. *Efficacy test report for a mango hot vapor treatment facility (HVT)*. KEPHIS/HQ/3/59/687. Reference available upon request.
- MERCOSUR (Southern Common Market).** 2006. [Phytosanitary requirements for *Mangifera indica* (mango), according to country of destination and origin, for MERCOSUR member states.] MERCOSUR/GMC/RES. N° 61/06, sub-standard 3.7.45 (in Spanish). Brasília. 9 pp. <https://faolex.fao.org/docs/pdf/mrc104485.pdf>
- MPI (Ministry for Primary Industries).** n.d. Requirement documents for importing fresh fruit and vegetables. In: *Ministry for Primary Industries*. New Zealand Government. [Cited 1 March 2023]. <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/import/food/fresh-fruit-vegetables/requirements>
- Ndlela, S., Ekesi, S., Ndegwa, P.N., Ong'amo, G.O. & Mohamed, S.A.** 2017. Post-harvest disinfestation of *Bactrocera dorsalis* (Hendel) (Diptera: Tephritidae) in mango using hot-water treatments. *Journal of Applied Entomology*, 141(10): 848–859. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jen.12404>
- Srikachar, S. & Damrak, K.** 2024. Hot water immersion treatment of Nam Dorkmai mango infested with Oriental fruit fly, *Bactrocera dorsalis* (Hendel) for export. *Thai Agricultural Research Journal*, 42(1): 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.14456/thaidoa-agres.2024.9>
- Song, Z.-J., Zhao, Q.-Y., Ma, C., Chen, R.-R., Ma, T.-B., Li, Z.-H. & Zhan, G.-P.** 2023. Quarantine disinfestation of papaya mealybug, *Paracoccus marginatus* (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae) using gamma and X-rays irradiation. *Insects*, 14(8): 682–695. <https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4450/14/8/682>
- Waddell, B.C., Clare, G.K., Maindonald, J.H. & Petry, R.J.** 1993. *Postharvest disinfestations of Bactrocera melanotus and B. xanthodes in the Cook Islands. Report 3*. Wellington, New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries – Regulatory Authority. 44 pp.
- Zakariya, A.A.-R.M. & Alhassan, N.** 2014. Application of hot water and temperature treatments to improve quality of Keitt and Nam Doc Mai mango fruits. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 3(9): 262–266. www.ijstr.org/final-print/sep2014/Application-Of-Hot-Water-And-Temperature-Treatments-To-Improve-Quality-Of-Keitt-And-Nam-Doc-Mai-Mango-Fruits.pdf
- Zhao, Q.-Y., Ma, F.-H., Deng, W., Li, Z.-H., Song, Z.-J., Ma, C., Ren, Y. L., Du, X., & Zhan, G.-P.** 2023. Phytosanitary irradiation treatment of the aerial root mealybug, *Pseudococcus baliteus*

(Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae). *Journal of Economic Entomology*, 116(5): 1567–1574.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jee/toad170>

Appendix 5: DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 39: Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risk associated with the movement of wood (2015-004)

Status box

This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
Date of this document	2024-12-02
Document category	Draft annex to ISPM 39
Current document stage	To CPM-19 (2025) for adoption
Major stages	2017-04 CPM-12 added topic <i>Use of systems approaches in managing risks associated with the movement of wood commodities</i> (2015-004), priority 3. 2018-11 Standards Committee (SC) approved Specification 69 (<i>Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood</i>). 2022-06 Expert working group drafted the annex. 2023-05 SC revised and approved for consultation. 2023-07 First consultation. 2024-05 SC-7 revised and approved for second consultation. 2024-07 Second consultation. 2024-10 Steward revised. 2024-11 SC revised and approved for adoption.
Steward history	2021-11 SC Steve CÔTÉ (CA, Lead Steward) 2022-05 SC Harry ARIJS (EU, Assistant Steward) 2021-11 SC Sophie PETERSON (AU, Assistant Steward) 2019-05 SC Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (CA, Lead Steward)
Notes	2022-07 Edited 2023-05 Edited 2024-06 Edited 2024-12 Edited

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

The annex is a prescriptive part of the standard.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	64
Scope	64
Background	64
REQUIREMENTS.....	64
1. General considerations for developing a systems approach for wood commodities	64
2. Practices, procedures and regulatory actions that can reduce pest risk	65
3. Designing a systems approach for wood commodities.....	69
4. Responsibilities for implementation of a systems approach for wood commodities.....	69
4.1 Responsibilities of NPPOs	69
4.2 Responsibilities of entities participating in the systems approach	70
5. Documentation.....	70
5.1 Description of systems approach requirements.....	70
5.2 Implementation procedures documented by participating entities and NPPOs	70

5.3	Records that demonstrate implementation	70
6.	Traceability	71
7.	Evaluating the effectiveness of a systems approach for wood commodities and its component measures	71
8.	Further reading	71
APPENDIX 1 TO ANNEX [X]: Major wood pests grouped according to where they live and reproduce		71

INTRODUCTION

Scope

This annex provides guidance to national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) on the use of specific integrated measures that, when applied together, reduce the pest risk posed by quarantine pests associated with the international movement of wood. This annex applies to the wood of gymnosperms and angiosperms, as described in the core text of this standard, and relates to quarantine pests associated with wood and their specific locations within the wood. It identifies examples of specific practices, procedures and regulatory actions that may be applied as integrated measures in a systems approach, from pre-planting to post-import of wood, to meet phytosanitary import requirements. It also details the documentation required to demonstrate that measures have been applied. The responsibilities of NPPOs and participating entities in developing, implementing and supervising the systems approach are described.

Background

Countries predominantly rely on treatments and processing to manage the pest risk associated with the movement of wood commodities across their borders. A systems approach can provide an alternative to single phytosanitary measures to meet the phytosanitary import requirements of an importing country. By doing so, a systems approach may provide countries with additional opportunities to facilitate or expand trade while effectively managing pest risk.

Any systems approach for wood commodities should be developed in accordance with ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*).

REQUIREMENTS

1. General considerations for developing a systems approach for wood commodities

Development of a systems approach for wood commodities requires knowledge of the biology of the pests associated with the wood commodities (Appendix 1 to this annex), the geographical distribution and host range of the pests, and the production chain of the commodities, including the post-harvest treatments or processing that are applied. Specific practices, procedures and regulatory actions to be included as measures in the systems approach should be effective and feasible. The selection of the measures in the systems approach should be agreed upon by the NPPO of the importing country and the NPPO of the exporting country.

Good forestry practices should be one of the basic requirements for implementing a systems approach for wood commodities. Because of the long production cycle of wood, the pest status of the area of production can change. This means that some measures (e.g. those applied before planting or during the early stages of plant growth) may be less relevant in a systems approach for wood commodities than in systems approaches for other commodities.

2. Practices, procedures and regulatory actions that can reduce pest risk

Practices, procedures and regulatory actions that can reduce pest risk, related to activities in an exporting country from pre-planting to transport, are described in Table 1. These may be included as integrated measures in a systems approach.

Table 1. Examples of pre-import practices, procedures and regulatory actions that may be used in a systems approach for wood commodities

Pre-planting	
Site selection	Pre-planting assessments, including determining the site suitability for the host species and pests of concern, may be used to avoid planting in unsuitable conditions. Planting in areas where a pest is absent as described in ISPM 8 (<i>Determination of pest status in an area</i>) or at low pest prevalence as described in ISPM 22 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence</i>) may be used.
Drainage	Tillage to improve drainage before planting may be used to reduce pest populations.
Species and cultivar selection	Planting species and cultivars of trees that are appropriate for the particular region, soil and climatic conditions can reduce plant stress and susceptibility to pests. Planting forests with mixed species rather than using monoculture stands or clonal trees can reduce the vulnerability of forests to pests.
Use of resistant genotypes	Planting genotypes that are resistant to certain pests can reduce infestation.
Pre-harvest	
Silvicultural practices	Planning and operational practices that can result in pest risk reduction may be applied to both planted and naturally regenerated forests. Post-planting assessments may be conducted to regularly review the progress of planted seedlings. Pruning may be carried out to remove unhealthy or infested branches. Thinning may be used to improve spacing, reduce competition and improve tree health. Similarly, roguing (routine removal of trees that show evidence of infestation, off-type characteristics or undesirable traits) reduces pest incidence, improves harvest quality and reduces the risk of exporting infested wood. Well-planned and managed forests provide an opportunity to improve and regularly check tree health while optimizing timber production. Any equipment used to perform these practices should be cleaned before and after if there is a risk that such practices could contribute to the introduction and spread of pests.
Field inspection (section 2.4 of this standard)	Data from field inspections and regular forest inventories (e.g. observations of pests or signs of pests) may be used to identify infested trees and guide harvest-planning decisions and to help ensure that infested trees are not selected for export.
Surveillance	Surveillance may be used for early detection and intervention in the case of a pest outbreak or to confirm pest status (ISPM 8). Surveillance should be conducted in accordance with ISPM 6 (<i>Surveillance</i>).
Application of semiochemicals	Semiochemicals may be used to reduce pest populations (via techniques such as trapping as well as pest-mating disruption) or to check for pest presence to ensure early detection. Synthetic anti-aggregation pheromones (chemical substances that interrupt pest aggregation on a host) may be used to reduce pest populations or protect healthy tree stands that may be susceptible to pests.
Application of pesticides	Pesticides may be used to reduce pest incidence.
Biological control	Biological control agents may be used to reduce pest incidence.
Harvest	
Timing of harvest	In some situations, infestation by a particular pest can be reduced by altering the timing of the harvest. Some pests, such as bark beetles and ambrosia beetles, are seasonal in temperate forests. For a seasonal pest, it may be feasible to identify the ideal timing of harvest to reduce levels of attack by the pest and therefore infestation. This may not be possible in tropical forests. In tropical forests, pests can have multiple overlapping generations throughout the year or

	year-round activity with peak levels of activity in the dry or wet season. The age of the trees at harvest can also be a factor that affects pest populations.
Post-harvest	
Rapid removal, appropriate means of transport and timely transport of harvested round wood	Round wood can be susceptible to infestation after it has been harvested. The season of harvest, the length of time that the round wood remains in the forest after harvesting, and the length of time that it takes to transport the wood to the processing facility or holding yard can influence post-harvest infestation. The transport of round wood on the platform of a vehicle can reduce soil contamination. In regions where the temperature during harvest, post-harvest, transport and storage is below -15°C , the cold temperature may reduce the pest risk.
Visual examination for pests during volume and quality determination	To reduce the likelihood or quantity of infested wood entering the production chain, round wood may be visually examined for evidence of pests during the process of scaling and grading.
Application of repellents	Repellents (including synthetic anti-aggregation pheromones), if available, may be used to repel pests from places of natural disturbance (e.g. windthrows) or logging and storage areas.
Protection of round wood after harvest	Protection of round wood after harvest (e.g. storing in water, sprinkling with water, insect nets, pesticides) may be used to prevent post-harvest infestations by bark beetles and wood borers.
Removal of bark (section 2.1 of this standard)	Removal of bark substantially reduces the number of pests inhabiting the outer surface and those found directly beneath the bark. Bark removal can also prevent post-harvest infestation by some pest species.
Removal of branches (or boughs)	Branch (or bough) removal can be an effective method to reduce infestation by pests of foliage and twigs, thus preventing the movement of those pests.
Washing or water-blasting	Washing or water-blasting can remove pests and soil.
Processing and treatment	
Rapid processing of round wood	Rapid processing of wood after harvest can reduce the risk of post-harvest infestation.
Removal of bark (section 2.1 of this standard)	Removal of bark substantially reduces the number of pests inhabiting the outer surface and those found directly beneath the bark. Bark removal can also prevent post-harvest infestation by some pest species.
Sawing and planing wood (section 1.2 of this standard)	The process of sawing wood can remove insect pests present in the wood and render it less suitable for pest survival. The presence or absence of bark and the thickness of a piece of sawn wood affect pest risk. Sawn wood with rounded edges resulting from the curvature of the round wood poses a greater pest risk than square-edged sawn wood, as a larger percentage of the wood just below the surface of the bark is included. Planing reduces the dimensions of sawn wood and may be used to remove residual bark.
Quality control of sawn wood	During grading of sawn wood and quality control, wood with insect galleries or fungal infection may be removed from the production chain or marked for treatment.
Inventory and contamination management	Post-harvest inventory management and keeping storage and processing areas free from pests, wood debris and soil play an important role in reducing infestation. Segregation of wood into different pest risk categories at appropriate stages of the production chain may be an important component of a systems approach.
Selecting processing sites where pest status is “absent” or “present: at low prevalence”	The pest risk posed by a particular pest can be reduced by processing wood commodities in areas where the pest is absent as described in ISPM 8 or at low prevalence as described in ISPM 22.
Trapping	Trapping may be conducted within and around a storage and processing facility, allowing for early detection of a pest.

Lighting	Lighting used in storage areas can be very attractive to wood pests. Use of lighting frequencies that are less attractive to wood pests or push-pull lighting to divert pests can reduce infestation.
Visual examination of wood commodities	Visual examination may be used to identify specific signs or symptoms of pests and determine if measures applied have been effective. The size and disposition of the wood commodities and the cryptic nature of some pests can, however, make visual examination challenging or not effective.
Chipping (section 1.3.1 and section 2.3 of this standard)	<p>The pest risk associated with wood chips varies depending on the tree species, presence of pests in the original material, bark content, chip size and intended use (i.e. fuel, landscape mulch, or pulp for fibre production). Commercial specifications for chip quality related to specific intended uses may be used to reduce pest risk. For example, chips for fibre production have minimal bark, consistent moisture content and uniform shape and size, resulting in low pest risk for some pests compared with chips used as a bioenergy source that can have greater variation in size and can contain bark.</p> <p>The process of wood chipping or grinding is lethal to many insect pests; the process can destroy living organisms or disrupt the host material so that the insect cannot complete its life cycle. Chipping into small pieces is an effective method of reducing populations of wood borers (e.g. cerambycids) in wood chips. Chip piles can generate heat to destroy pests if managed correctly.</p>
Heat treatment (section 2.2 of this standard)	<p>Heat treatment involves heating wood to kill, or otherwise cause sublethal effects. Heat treatment does not necessarily involve moisture reduction. Types of heat treatments include, but are not limited to, steam, hot-water bath and vacuum-steam heating, kiln-heating, solar heating, joule heating and dielectric (microwave or radio-frequency) heating.</p> <p>Establishment of technical standards for heat treatment schedules and approval of facilities by NPPOs should be in accordance with ISPM 42 (<i>Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures</i>).</p>
Air-drying (section 2.2 of this standard)	Air-drying wood to the equilibrium moisture content can prevent some pests from completing their life cycle and make it unattractive for some pests, because of the reduction in moisture content.
Kiln-drying (section 2.2 of this standard)	Kiln-drying can prevent some pests from completing their life cycle in wood commodities, because of the heat exposure and reduction in moisture content.
Irradiation (section 2.2 of this standard)	Irradiation may be used as a pest risk reduction measure during or after processing of wood commodities. Irradiation should be applied in accordance with ISPM 18 (<i>Requirements for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i>).
Fumigation (section 2.2 of this standard)	Fumigation may be used as a pest risk reduction measure to treat wood commodities. Some phytosanitary treatments using fumigants are described in ISPM 28 (<i>Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests</i>) and some are described in ISPM 15 (<i>Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade</i>). Fumigation should be applied in accordance with ISPM 43 (<i>Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure</i>).
Spraying or dipping (section 2.2 of this standard)	Wood commodities may be treated with anti-fungal sap-stain chemical spray or dips to prevent the growth of stain fungi on logs or sawn wood.
Modified atmosphere treatment (section 2.2 of this standard)	Wood commodities may be exposed to a modified atmosphere as a pest risk reduction measure. Modified atmosphere treatment should be applied in accordance with ISPM 44 (<i>Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as phytosanitary measures</i>).
Pre-dispatch	
Limiting the storage time	Limiting the time that wood commodities are stored before dispatch reduces opportunities for post-harvest infestation.
Storage-area segregation	Wood commodities may be segregated or stored in a manner designed to prevent infestation. This may be achieved by covering, containerizing, or storing in buildings where pheromone traps are deployed.

Storage-area cleanliness	Keeping storage areas clean and free from pests, wood debris and soil can help to prevent infestation of commodities.
Pre-dispatch protection	A storage enclosure can be very effective at protecting wood commodities from infestation before dispatch. As contact with the ground can risk commodities becoming infested with soil-borne pests, storing commodities on cement pads or raised platforms can be beneficial. Regular checks for pests combined with measures to prevent or deter pests (e.g. host removal, reduction or altering of facility lighting, pesticide application, use of nets (including those treated with insecticide), wrapping in protective material), may be used to protect wood commodities during storage and loading.
Water application	Round wood may be sprinkled with water in storage areas (where appropriate) to reduce pest infestation and water pressure-washing may be used to remove pests, soil and debris.
Chemical treatment (section 2.2 of this standard)	To prevent pests from infesting wood commodities, chemical treatments may be applied.
Verification of pest presence or absence	In the outer perimeter of the storage area, push-pull systems with synthetic pheromones and traps may be used to check whether insects are present in and around the storage area and to manage them.
Packaging	Packaging (including wrapping) may be used to prevent infestation, contamination and damage by the weather before and during transport.
Pre-dispatch inspection (section 2.4 of this standard)	To ensure that the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country are met, inspection may be conducted at various points within a systems approach.
Sampling for laboratory testing and pest identification (section 2.4 of this standard)	When the identity of microscopic organisms such as fungi and nematodes on the outer surfaces of wood, or within the wood, cannot be confirmed through inspection, wood tissues may be collected according to methods approved by NPPOs and the pest species determined in the laboratory.
Transport	
Timing of dispatch	Dispatching wood commodities only when pests are inactive can be effective in reducing pest risk.
Protection during transport	Wood commodities may be protected during transport (e.g. by covering them, wrapping them, or sealing them in closed containers) to reduce infestation by pests during transport.
Treatment during transport	Wood commodities may be treated in either containers or ship holds during transport. The type of treatment that is appropriate depends on the type of container required or available, the expertise needed, shipping laws (including occupational and health requirements), the wood commodities being transported and the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country.
Planned transport routes	The choice of transport route can affect pest risk. Pest risk may be reduced by choosing a route based on the known distribution and phenology of pests associated with the wood commodities being transported and the weather and climatic conditions during transport.
Cleaning conveyances	Cleaning of conveyances before loading or after unloading reduces infestation of wood commodities by pests from previous cargoes.

Note: NPPO, national plant protection organization.

Sources cited: ISPMs are available at <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispm>

When applicable and feasible, some of the practices, procedures or regulatory actions described in Table 1 may be applied at different parts of the production chain or as post-import measures. In addition, practices, procedures or regulatory actions that are specific to the post-import part of the production chain may be employed as components of a systems approach, if agreed upon by the NPPO of the importing country and the NPPO of the exporting country (Table 2).

Table 2. Examples of post-import practices, procedures and regulatory actions that may be used in a systems approach for wood commodities

Storage in an importing country	A systems approach may include provisions for wood-commodity storage that are designed to prevent pest escape from storage areas, infestation and contamination.
Treatment on arrival	Treatment on arrival may be included as part of a systems approach.
Inspection on arrival	Inspection on arrival may be used to verify that wood commodities meet the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country. Inspections should be conducted in accordance with ISPM 23 (<i>Guidelines for inspection</i>).
Limiting the intended use (section 3 of this standard)	The intended uses of the wood commodities being imported may be stipulated in a systems approach. The systems approach may be set up for a particular intended use, such as wood chipping (as wood chipping effectively reduces potential infestation by wood borers), and this intended use may also determine the measures to be applied along the production chain and result in a different pest risk compared to other intended uses.
Limiting the time before processing	Some wood commodities may only be suitable for storage and processing within a certain time frame on arrival via an NPPO-approved system for a particular pest (e.g. chipping and pelleting of wood on arrival).
Limiting the points of entry and distribution	Specific points of entry or restrictions on the distribution of wood commodities after import (e.g. permitting initial movement only to a treatment facility) may be stipulated in a systems approach. The importing country shall publish a list of such points of entry (Article VII.2(d) of the IPPC).

Notes: NPPO, national plant protection organization.

Sources cited: ISPMs are available at <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispm>

IPPC Secretariat. 1997. *International Plant Protection Convention*. IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO. <https://www.ippc.int/en/about/convention-text/>

3. Designing a systems approach for wood commodities

When designing a systems approach, the NPPO of the exporting country should select appropriate practices, procedures and regulatory actions, for example from those described in Table 1 and Table 2, and propose these to the NPPO of the importing country along with an explanation of how these practices, procedures and regulatory actions would reduce the pest risk associated with wood commodities to meet the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country. The NPPO of the importing country should evaluate whether the proposed measures meet its phytosanitary import requirements. The NPPO of the importing country may request scientific evidence from the NPPO of the exporting country regarding the effectiveness and feasibility of the proposed measures.

Consideration of best practices and standards used by industry to produce wood commodities may promote the development of the systems approach in a way that is feasible for, and acceptable to, both the exporting and the importing country. National plant protection organizations are encouraged to engage industry in the early stages of the development of the systems approach.

4. Responsibilities for implementation of a systems approach for wood commodities

4.1 Responsibilities of NPPOs

The responsibilities of the NPPOs participating in a systems approach are described in ISPM 14. In addition, in a systems approach for wood commodities, the responsibilities should include, but are not limited to, the following:

- documenting and agreeing the systems approach;
- communicating the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country and the requirements, specifically, of the systems approach for wood commodities, to all participating entities;
- documenting and agreeing to compliance procedures;

- determining the necessary corrective actions and conducting follow-up audits when nonconformities have been detected;
- reviewing the requirements or the design of the systems approach to address nonconformities, in order to prevent recurrence of the failures identified;
- confirming whether the importing country requires entities to be authorized to participate in the systems approach;
- ensuring that any entities that are required to be authorized are authorized in accordance with ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*); and
- ensuring that the systems approach is audited in accordance with ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*).

4.2 Responsibilities of entities participating in the systems approach

The authorized entities participating in the systems approach, whether in the importing or exporting country, should conform with the requirements of ISPM 45.

5. Documentation

To facilitate the successful implementation and effective communication of a systems approach for wood commodities, documents should include a description of the NPPOs' requirements for the systems approach, the procedures for implementing the systems approach and the records of its implementation.

5.1 Description of systems approach requirements

The NPPOs should produce a description of the requirements for the systems approach. This description should cover aspects including, but not limited to:

- the scope and purpose of the systems approach;
- the measures to be applied;
- the responsibilities of the NPPOs and participating entities; and
- traceability.

5.2 Implementation procedures documented by participating entities and NPPOs

Documented procedures, for example production manuals or standard operating procedures, should describe the actions, elements, processes and operational systems that make up the measures applied by participating entities and NPPOs. The documented procedures should include:

- a description of the organizational structure and responsibilities of the personnel involved in implementing the systems approach;
- training procedures used to ensure the competency of personnel responsible for implementing the systems approach;
- a description of the measures (e.g. measures selected from Table 1 and Table 2), how they will be applied as part of the systems approach, and how they meet the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country;
- procedures associated with maintaining records of the measures applied in the systems approach and ensuring traceability; and
- procedures used to record, address and correct nonconformities that may occur (e.g. corrective actions).

5.3 Records that demonstrate implementation

The NPPOs and participating entities should record the measures that have been applied in implementing the systems approach and should retain these records for auditing purposes to demonstrate the implementation of the systems approach. The retention time of these records should be agreed upon by the NPPO of the importing country and the NPPO of the exporting country.

6. Traceability

Participating entities in a systems approach should ensure that adequate records are retained to allow traceability in relation to all critical control points along the wood-commodity production chain.

7. Evaluating the effectiveness of a systems approach for wood commodities and its component measures

Guidance on evaluation methods can be found in ISPM 14.

8. Further reading

Information to support the implementation of this annex may be available on the IPP at <https://www.ippc.int/en/about/core-activities/capacity-development/guides-and-training-materials/>.

This appendix is for reference purposes only and is not a prescriptive part of the standard.

APPENDIX 1 TO ANNEX [X]: Major wood pests grouped according to where they live and reproduce

Pests associated with trees can be grouped according to the plant tissues they use to live and reproduce. They include pests that live and reproduce in the following locations: on, in or just under the bark; in wood tissue under the bark; and in foliage and twigs.

Pests on or in the bark or just under the bark in the cambium

Certain species of insects, fungi and nematodes live on or in the bark or immediately under the bark in the cambium:

- **Bark beetles** (Coleoptera: Curculionidae: Scolytinae, except Corthylini, Xyleborini and Xyloterini) – The members of this highly diverse subfamily spend most of their life cycle under the bark of their host trees, foraging on the inner bark (phloem).
- **Scale insects, mites, aphids, adelgids, non-wood-boring moths and wasps** – These pests may be present on or in the bark or immediately under the bark in the cambium.
- **Fungi and oomycetes** (e.g. *Phytophthora* species) – Many fungal pests, including stem rusts and canker fungi, grow and sporulate in close association with bark and phloem tissues. These pests may be present on the outer surfaces of some wood commodities.
- **Nematodes** – Pathogenic nematodes may be found just under the bark (e.g. phoretic nematodes associated with beetles may be found in the inner bark layer).

Pests associated primarily with wood tissue under the bark

Certain species of insects, fungi and nematodes live primarily in wood tissue under the bark:

- **Ambrosia beetles** (Coleoptera: Curculionidae: Scolytinae (Corthylini, Xyleborini, Xyloterini) and Platypodinae) – These beetles may be found in the inner bark (phloem) and xylem.
- **Wood borers** (Coleoptera: Cerambycidae, Curculionidae, Buprestidae; Diptera: Pantophthalmidae; Hymenoptera: Siricidae; Lepidoptera: Cossidae and Sesidae; and Isoptera) – Most of the life stages of these insects occur in the phloem and xylem.
- **Fungi** – Many fungal species inhabit the woody portion of tree stems. The success, location and extent of fungal colonization is largely governed by the nutritional requirements of the fungi, the physical characteristics of the wood (chemical composition, pH, cell structure, etc.), the wood moisture, the temperature and the presence of competing organisms. Decay fungi and vascular wilt fungi may be present throughout the wood or, depending on the species, may be restricted to the sapwood (xylem) or heartwood. Most canker and rust infections of trunk wood are restricted to the outer few centimetres of wood.
- **Nematodes** – Pathogenic nematodes (Nematoda: e.g. *Bursaphelenchus cocophilus* (Cobb, 1919) Baujard, 1989, *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* (Steiner & Bühner, 1934) Nickle, 1970) live primarily in the sapwood (xylem).

Pests primarily associated with foliage and twigs

Although foliage and twigs are not a major wood commodity, many forest pests live and reproduce in these plant tissues, either exclusively or at certain points in their life cycle:

- Pests that live in and on foliage may include, but are not limited to, adelgids, ants, aphids, flies, moths, nematodes, scale insects and wasps.
- Twig borers may be found in small branches that are large enough to allow these pests to complete their life cycle.
- Spores of fungi and fungus-like organisms may be present on outer surfaces, as on all other forest commodities.

Appendix 6: Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037).**SPECIFICATION 76****Revision of the draft reorganized
pest risk analysis ISPM***(Approved 2024, published 2024)***Title**

Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037).

Reason for the revision of the draft reorganized standard

Pest risk analysis (PRA) is a core process within the scope of the IPPC and an important science-based evaluation tool for national plant protection organizations (NPPOs). It is used to identify pests and pathways of concern, determine whether pests qualify as quarantine pests, and identify the options for phytosanitary measures that are appropriate to manage the risk of introduction and spread of these pests in a specified PRA area.

In 2022, the expert working group (EWG) on *Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) reorganized the ISPMs related to PRA – ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*), ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) and the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) – into one draft overarching ISPM with annexes for each stage of PRA (referred to hereafter as “the reorganized PRA ISPM”). The reorganization removed redundancy in the text without substantial modifications. The reorganized PRA ISPM was reviewed by the Standards Committee (SC) and submitted to a first round of consultation in 2023. It was subsequently revised to take account of the consultation comments (this version being referred to hereafter as “the draft reorganized PRA ISPM”). However, some general comments submitted during the consultation had supported a full, comprehensive revision of the reorganized PRA ISPM. The reasons supporting a comprehensive revision were as follows:

- The reorganized PRA ISPM is based on old versions of ISPMs (i.e. ISPM 2 and ISPM 11) that have not been reviewed in their entirety for several years. ISPM 2 and ISPM 11 were last revised in 2007 and 2013, respectively.
- The reorganized PRA ISPM includes a combination of requirements and detailed guidance on the process of conducting a PRA that still amounts to a considerable volume.
- There is a need to address new challenges identified during the first consultation (e.g. the inclusion of climate-change considerations in PRA, consideration of economic, environmental and social consequences).

Scope

The standard developed by revising the draft reorganized PRA ISPM (referred to hereafter as “the revised, draft reorganized PRA ISPM”) should outline the core principles and requirements for PRA. The standard should also outline the requirements for a PRA to clearly describe the relationship between the pest risk and phytosanitary measures, and the strength of these measures at managing the pest risk, based on the principles outlined in ISPM 1 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*) and ISPM 24 (*Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures*).

The standard should not include guidance on PRA for regulated non-quarantine pests, which is provided in ISPM 21 (*Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*).

Purpose

The purpose of the revision of the draft reorganized PRA ISPM is to facilitate implementation of the standard by streamlining the text to emphasize the requirements for PRA and by providing greater clarity.

Tasks

The EWG should undertake the following tasks:

- (1) Review the text of the draft reorganized PRA ISPM as developed by the steward of the topic *Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) after the consultation in 2023 (including the annexes).
- (2) Identify the core principles, steps, requirements and guidance information for PRA.
- (3) Consider recommendations made by the EWG that drafted the reorganized PRA ISPM in 2022, including whether:
 - the requirements relating to environmental and social impacts should be addressed as part of the requirements on economic consequences as described in Supplement 2 of ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*); and
 - the requirements relating to the probability of transfer to a suitable host should be located under the section on probability of entry or the section on probability of establishment.
- (4) Consider the steward’s notes on the draft reorganized PRA ISPM and the consultation comments received in 2023.
- (5) Revise the text to streamline and clarify the principles, stages and requirements of PRA.
- (6) As part of the streamlining process:
 - review examples of the PRA schemes of NPPOs and regional plant protection organizations to identify elements of best practice; and
 - consider existing standards and guidelines for risk analysis developed by other standard setting organizations named in the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (i.e. World Organisation for Animal Health, Codex Alimentarius Commission) and the WTO principles for the development of international standards (WTO, 2000) to identify elements that could be applied where appropriate to improve the draft standard.
- (7) Formulate a recommendation to the SC on what guidance information removed from the standard by this EWG, if any, should be included in an IPPC guide.
- (8) Consider whether the revision of the draft reorganized PRA ISPM could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft standard.
- (9) Consider implementation of the revised, draft reorganized PRA ISPM by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and recommendations on possible solutions to these issues to the SC.

- (10) Review all references to PRA in other ISPMs to ensure that they are still relevant and propose consequential changes if necessary. Review all references to other ISPMs in the revised, draft reorganized PRA ISPM and amend as necessary.

Provision of resources

Funding for the meeting may be provided from sources other than the regular programme of the IPPC (FAO). As recommended by ICPM-2 (1999), whenever possible, those participating in standard setting activities voluntarily fund their travel and subsistence to attend meetings. Participants may request financial assistance, with the understanding that resources are limited and the priority for financial assistance is given to developing country participants. Please refer to the *Criteria used for prioritizing participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat* posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) (see <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities>).

Collaborator

To be determined.

Steward

Please refer to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* posted on the IPP (see <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards>).

Expertise

Members with a combined and wide knowledge and experience in:

- pest risk assessment, with experience in conducting and implementing PRA in accordance with ISPM 2 and ISPM 11;
- the development of PRA methodologies for NPPOs or regional plant protection organizations (desirable);
- pest risk management, including experience in evaluating and selecting pest risk management options; and
- pest risk communication.

Former members of the EWG on *Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) are encouraged to apply.

Participants

Eight to ten members, with a preference for at least one former member of the EWG on *Guidance on pest risk management* (2014-001) and one former member of the EWG on *Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001).

In addition, a member of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee should be invited to attend as an invited expert.

Bibliography

The IPPC, relevant ISPMs and other national, regional and international standards and agreements as may be applicable to the tasks, and discussion papers submitted in relation to this work.

References

- ISPM 1.** 2016. *Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*. IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO. Adopted 2006. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/596/>
- ISPM 2.** 2019. *Framework for pest risk analysis*. IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO. Adopted 2007. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/592/>
- ISPM 5.** *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*. IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/622/>

- ISPM 11.** 2019. *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*. IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO. Adopted 2013. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/639/>
- ISPM 21.** 2021. *Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*. IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO. Adopted 2004. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/601/>
- ISPM 24.** 2021. *Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures*. IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO. Adopted 2005. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/597/>
- ISPM [X].** 2024. Draft. *Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards*. IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO.
- WTO (World Trade Organization).** 2000. Principles for the development of international standards, guides and recommendations. In: *WTO*. www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/tbt_e/principles_standards_tbt_e.htm

Further reading

Information to support the development of this standard may be available on the IPP at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/about/core-activities/capacity-development/guides-and-training-materials/>

COSAVE (Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur). 2016. *Guía para el desarrollo de Análisis de Riesgo de Plagas (ARP) por plaga*. COSAVE. 15 pp. <http://www.cosave.org/sites/default/files/resoluciones/anexos/Anexo%20Resoluci%C3%B3n%2020221-%20Guia%20ARP%20por%20plaga%20julio%202016.pdf>

COSAVE. 2016. *Guía para el desarrollo de Análisis de Riesgo de Plagas (ARP) por vía*. COSAVE. 16 pp. <http://www.cosave.org/sites/default/files/resoluciones/anexos/Anexo%20Resoluci%C3%B3n%2020221-%20Guia%20ARP%20por%20v%C3%ADa%20julio%202016.pdf>

European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization. 2011. *Guidelines on pest risk analysis – Decision-support scheme for quarantine pests*. PM 5/3(5). 44 pp. https://www.eppo.int/media/uploaded_images/RESOURCES/eppo_standards/pm5/pm5-03-05-en.pdf

FAO and World Health Organization. 2007. *Working principles for risk analysis for food safety for application by governments*. CXG 62-2007. Codex Alimentarius Commission. Rome. 4 pp. <https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/codex-texts/guidelines/>

IICA (Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture), COSAVE & McClay, A. 2018. *Guidelines of procedures for risk assessment of plants as pests (weeds)*. Montevideo, IICA. 42 pp. <https://repositorio.iica.int/bitstream/handle/11324/7253/BVE19029517i.pdf?sequence=2&isAlloWed=y>

IICA, COSAVE & Schrader, G. 2019. *Guidelines to assess the economic effects and non-commercial and environmental consequences of the entry of pests*. Montevideo, IICA. 20 pp. <https://repositorio.iica.int/bitstream/handle/11324/7905/BVE19040206i.pdf?sequence=2&isAlloWed=y>

NAPPO (North American Plant Protection Organization). 2012. *General guidelines for pathway risk analysis*. Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) No. 31. Ottawa. 20 pp. https://www.nappo.org/application/files/8615/8352/2976/RSPM_31-01-06-12-e.pdf

NAPPO. 2014. *Principles of pest risk management for the import of commodities*. Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) No. 40. Ottawa. 28 pp. https://nappo.org/application/files/1315/8352/2979/RSPM_40-07-28-14-e.pdf

WOAH (World Organisation for Animal Health). 2010. *Handbook on import risk analysis for animals and animal products – Volume 1, Introduction and qualitative risk analysis*, 2nd edn. Paris. xii + 88 pp. https://rr-africa.woah.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/handbook_on_import_risk_analysis_-_oie_-_vol_1.pdf

WOAH. 2019. Risk analysis. In: *Terrestrial animal health code – Volume 1, General provisions*, 28th edn, pp. 101–106. Paris. https://rr-europe.woah.org/app/uploads/2020/08/oie-terrestrial-code-1_2019_en.pdf

Discussion papers

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

Publication history

This is not an official part of the specification

2023-11 Standards Committee (SC) recommended to CPM-18 that topic *Holistic revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis standard (2023-037)* be added to *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

2023-11 SC formed a small working group to develop a draft specification.

2024-04 CPM-18 added topic to *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

2024-05 SC revised and approved for first consultation.

2024-07 Consultation.

2024-11 SC revised and approved the specification.

Specification 76. 2024. *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM*. IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO.

Publication history last updated: 2024-12

Appendix 7: DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ISPM: Safe provision of humanitarian aid in the phytosanitary context (2021-020)

Status box

This is not an official part of the specification and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after approval	
Date of this document	2024-12-11
Document category	Draft specification for ISPM
Current document stage	To CPM-19 (2025)
Major stages	<p>2021-06 Topic <i>Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid</i> (2021-020) submitted during IPPC call for topics.</p> <p>2023-02 CPM Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid revised.</p> <p>2023-04 Focus group revised.</p> <p>2023-06 CPM Bureau commented.</p> <p>2023-10 Focus group revised.</p> <p>2023-10 Presented to CPM Bureau and Strategic Planning Group.</p> <p>2023-11 Focus group revised.</p> <p>2024-04 CPM-18 approved for consultation.</p> <p>2024-07 Consultation.</p> <p>2024-10 Focus group revised.</p> <p>2024-11 Standards Committee revised.</p>
Steward history	-
Notes	<p>This is a draft document</p> <p>2023-11 Edited</p> <p>2024-12 Edited</p>

Title

Safe provision of humanitarian aid in the phytosanitary context (2021-020).

Reason for the standard

The IPPC recognizes the necessity for international cooperation to prevent the global spread of plant pests. The regulation of traditional trade pathways is well defined and understood within the rules-based systems that underpin implementation of the IPPC. However, the pest risk associated with the provision of humanitarian aid in disaster situations is not adequately addressed by these systems. In the phytosanitary context, disaster situations and the disaster-relief pathway⁵² are characterized by factors including:

- the inability of the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of the recipient country (the country experiencing the disaster situation and requiring humanitarian aid) to fulfil its core import functions as described in the IPPC (e.g. pest risk analysis (PRA), inspection, treatments, communication of phytosanitary import requirements);
- the emergence of new pathways (novel regulated articles or trading partners) and the potential lack of established phytosanitary import requirements as a consequence;
- pressure to expedite the movement of humanitarian aid through borders and to deliver supplies; and

⁵² For the purposes of this ISPM, the “disaster-relief **pathway**” is a means that allows the **entry** or **spread** of a **pest** through **regulated articles** provided to meet the immediate needs of disaster-affected communities.

- the recipient country, country of origin and potential transit countries for the humanitarian aid not always being known in advance, leading to a complex aid supply chain.

These factors expose the country experiencing the disaster situation and receiving humanitarian aid to pest risk that can threaten the country's recovery, its food, nutritional and economic security, and its resilience against future disasters.

The Commission on Phytosanitary Measures Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid has recognised that, *saving lives is of the utmost importance*, and has also *noted that there are other considerations to be made regarding the provisions of safe movement of aid, and do no harm* (FGSA & IPPC Secretariat, 2024; Sperling and McGuire, 2010). Consequently, an agreed solution to provide and implement appropriate and timely phytosanitary measures is needed to avoid long-term impacts to the economy, environment and communities after the country has recovered from the disaster. The growing number of global cases of pest introductions through aid demonstrates a gap in current processes (Etherton *et al.*, 2024; FGSA & IPPC Secretariat, 2024; Hodges, 2009; Indonesian Agriculture Quarantine Agency, 2009; Murphy and Cheesman, 2006; Sperling and McGuire, 2010), and there is recent evidence of pest interceptions by border services during disaster situations.

Scope

This standard should provide guidance for the NPPOs of origin, transit and recipient countries on the safe movement of regulated articles⁵³ as humanitarian aid. The standard should apply in situations where the NPPO of the recipient (or transit) country is unable to fulfil its core import functions (e.g. PRA, inspection, treatments, communication of phytosanitary import requirements) because of human-induced or natural disaster. The standard is also intended to be used only for the term of declared states of emergency or until these NPPO functions are restored, whichever is sooner. It is intended that NPPOs use best endeavours to restore functions as quickly as possible.

Where recipient countries have established phytosanitary import requirements, it is expected that these are used by countries of origin or transit countries for all movement of humanitarian aid even if the full implementation of these has been disrupted in the recipient country. This standard should address how full implementation can be alternatively achieved. The standard should also provide options to minimize the pest risk associated with the movement of humanitarian aid supplies in disaster situations and allow for issuance of a phytosanitary certificate where phytosanitary import requirements are unknown. It should describe which adopted ISPMs apply in such situations, as well as address the remaining gaps identified along the aid supply chain.

The standard should focus only on phytosanitary issues associated with the disaster-relief pathway.

Purpose

This standard will provide guidance to NPPOs of origin, transit and recipient countries to minimize the pest risk associated with humanitarian aid that is moved along the disaster-relief pathway. Consequently, it may also support the activities of other stakeholders (e.g. governments, aid agencies, development partners, exporters, regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs), community networks, importers and the private sector).

The standard will support the preservation of contracting parties' sovereign authority to regulate the entry of regulated articles as set out in Article VII.I of the IPPC text.

Tasks

The expert working group (EWG) should undertake the following tasks:

- (1) Identify and describe the disruption to the core import functions for the safe importation of regulated articles that the NPPO of the recipient country is unable to perform (e.g. PRA,

⁵³ Any **plant, plant product**, storage place, **packaging**, conveyance, container, soil and any other organism, object or material capable of harbouring or spreading **pests**, deemed to require **phytosanitary measures**, particularly where international transportation is involved (ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*)).

- inspection, treatments, communication of phytosanitary import requirements) because of human-induced or natural disaster, requiring implementation of this standard.
- (2) Identify the categories of regulated articles (e.g. bulk grain, shelter material, building materials, heavy equipment) frequently moved as humanitarian aid, including types of packaging.
 - (3) Identify and group pests of concern that have similar characteristics and may be associated with the identified categories of regulated articles (from task 2).
 - (4) Identify feasible pest risk management options (including references to existing ISPMs where applicable), for those pest groups identified in task 3 and the categories identified in task 2, that could be implemented along the aid supply chain and so provide a level of protection to the recipient country when this standard is in use.
 - (5) Develop a standardized statement for use on phytosanitary certificates to attest to the meeting of the phytosanitary requirements developed from tasks 2, 3 and 4.
 - (6) Identify the impacts that transport, storage and consolidation in a hub may have on the integrity of the categories of regulated articles (from task 2). Describe how, in addition to following the guidance of ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*), these impacts could be addressed along the disaster-relief pathway (e.g. secure packaging, segregation).
 - (7) Develop descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of NPPOs (of origin, transit and recipient countries) and humanitarian aid agencies with regard to minimization of pest risk along the disaster-relief pathway. Align and coordinate these descriptions with the objectives of the World Organisation for Animal Health, the Codex Alimentarius Commission, the World Customs Organization, other United Nations agencies and other relevant conventions (e.g. Food Assistance Convention, Geneva Convention) that have a role in the safe provision of humanitarian aid.
 - (8) Regarding situations where the NPPO of the recipient (or transit) country is unable to fulfil its core import functions (e.g. PRA, inspection, treatments, communication of phytosanitary import requirements) and requests assistance, consider mechanisms (e.g. mutual cooperative arrangements) for other NPPOs to provide these functions when this standard is in use.
 - (9) Consider whether the ISPM could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft ISPM.
 - (10) Consider implementation of the standard by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the Standards Committee.

Provision of resources

Funding for the meeting may be provided from sources other than the regular programme of the IPPC (FAO). As recommended by ICPM-2 (1999), whenever possible, those participating in standard setting activities voluntarily fund their travel and subsistence to attend meetings. Participants may request financial assistance, with the understanding that resources are limited and the priority for financial assistance is given to developing country participants. Please refer to the *Criteria used for prioritizing participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat* posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) (see <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/>).

Collaborator

To be determined.

Steward

Please refer to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* posted on the IPP (see <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards>).

Expertise

Members should have knowledge and expertise in one or more of the following areas:

- providing or receiving humanitarian aid;

- plant-health policy, the management of pest risk and the provisions of the IPPC;
- clearance, pest risk assessment or management of imported goods, preferably under operating conditions compromised by disaster; and
- emergency management systems.

Participants

Seven to nine members.

In addition, up to two experts from donor agencies with expertise in the procurement and supply of humanitarian aid in the private sector and the public sector (e.g. International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, and World Food Programme) and an RPPO representative should be invited to participate as invited experts. A member of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee should also be invited.

References

The IPPC, relevant ISPMs and other national, regional and international standards and agreements as may be applicable to the tasks, and discussion papers submitted in relation to this work.

CPM R-09. 2021. *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation.* CPM Recommendation. IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89786/>

Etherton, B.A., Choudhury, R.A., Alcalá Briseño, R.I., Mouafo-Tchinda, R.A., Plex Sulá, A.I., Choudhury, M., Adhikari, A., et al. 2024. Disaster plant pathology: smart solutions for threats to global plant health from natural and human-driven disasters. *Phytopathology*, 114(5): 855–868. <https://doi.org/10.1094/PHTO-03-24-0079-FI>

FGSA (CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid) & IPPC Secretariat. 2024. Update from the CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid. Agenda item 13.1 (CPM 2024/23), Eighteenth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, 15–19 April 2024. IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO. 10 pp. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/93067/>

Hodges, R. 2009. Insect infestation in food aid: phytosanitary risks and responses. Presentation to the Ninth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, 30 March to 3 April 2009, Rome Italy. <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/cpm/scientific-sessions-during-commission-phytosanitary-measures/2009-food-aid/>

Indonesian Agriculture Quarantine Agency. 2009. Pest movement by food aid shipment: Indonesia's experience. Presentation to the Ninth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, 30 March to 3 April 2009, Rome Italy. <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/cpm/scientific-sessions-during-commission-phytosanitary-measures/2009-food-aid/>

IPPC Secretariat. 1997. *International Plant Protection Convention.* IPPC secretariat. Rome, FAO. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/131/>

IPPC Secretariat. 2021. *Strategic framework for the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) 2020–2030.* IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO. 28 pp. <https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb3995en>

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

ISPM 20. 2023. *Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system.* IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/602/>

ISPM 32. 2016. *Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk.* IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO. Adopted 2009. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/587/>

ISPM 41. 2019. *International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment.* IPPC Secretariat. Rome, FAO. Adopted 2017. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/84343/>

Murphy, S.T. & Cheesman, O.D. 2006. *The aid trade: international assistance programs as pathways for the introduction of invasive alien species – A preliminary report.* Environment Department

Working Papers, No. 109. Biodiversity series. Washington, DC, World Bank. 40 pp.
<https://hdl.handle.net/10986/18388>. Licence: CC BY 3.0 IGO.

Sperling, L. & McGuire, S.J. 2010. *Persistent myths about emergency seed aid*. *Food Policy*, 35(3): 195–201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2009.12.004> (Also available at: <https://seedssystem.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Myths-in-emergency-seed-aid.pdf>).

Discussion papers

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

Appendix 8: Draft agenda for the 2025 SC-7 meeting

	Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
1.	Opening of the Meeting		Nersisyan
2.	Meeting Arrangements		Secretariat
2.1	Election of the Chairperson		Secretariat
2.2	Election of the Rapporteur		Chairperson
2.3	Adoption of the Agenda	01_SC7_2025_May	Chairperson
3.	Administrative Matters		Chairperson
3.1	Documents list	02_SC7_2025_May	Torella
3.2	Participants list	03_SC7_2025_May	Torella
4.	Draft ISPMs for Approval for Second Consultation		Chairperson
4.1	Draft annex Field inspection (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection) - Steward: Masahiro SAI o Steward's responses to comments from 2024 consultation (2021-018) o TPG recommendations to the steward on terminology and consistency (2021-018) o Steward's notes and potential implementation issues (2021-018)	2021-018 XX_SC7_2025_May XX_SC7_2025_May XX_SC7_2025_May	Sai / Shamilov
4.2	Draft annex Design and use of systems approaches for the phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (International movement of seeds) - Steward: Marina ZLOTINA o Steward's responses to comments from 2024 consultation (2018-009) o TPG recommendations to the steward on terminology and consistency (2018-009) o Steward's notes and potential implementation issues (2018-009)	2018-009 XX_SC7_2025_May XX_SC7_2025_May XX_SC7_2025_May	Zlotina / Shamilov
4.3	Draft revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010) - Steward: Joanne WILSON o Steward's responses to comments from 2024 consultation (2021-010) o TPG recommendations to the steward on terminology and consistency (2021-010) o Steward's notes and potential implementation issues (2021-010)	2021-010 XX_SC7_2025_May XX_SC7_2025_May XX_SC7_2025_May	Wilson / Shamilov
5.	Items Arising from May 2025 SC		Chairperson
6.	Review of the Standard Setting Calendar	IPP Calendar	Torella
7.	Any Other Business		Chairperson

	Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
8.	Date and Venue of the Next Meeting		Chairperson
9.	Evaluation of the Meeting		Chairperson
10.	Close of the Meeting		Chairperson

Appendix 9: Participants list Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) 2025

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Africa Member	Mr David KAMANGIRA Senior Deputy Director and IPPC Focal Point Department of Agricultural Research Services Headquarters, P.O. Box 30779, Lilongwe 3 MALAWI Tel: +265 888 342 712 Tel: +265 999 122 199	davidkamangira1@gmail.com	CPM-11 (2016) CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022) 3 rd term / 3 years	2025
Asia Member	Mr Masahiro SAI Head Pest Risk Analysis Division. Yokohama Plant Protection Station, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) 1-16-10 Shin-Yamashita, Naka-ku, Yokohama. 2310801 JAPAN Tel: +81456228693	masahiro_sai670@maff.go.jp	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) CPM-18 (2024) 3 rd term / 3 years	2027
Europe Member	Mr David OPATOWSKI Head, Plant Biosecurity, Plant Protection and Inspection Services (PPIS), P.O. Box 78, Bet Dagan, 50250 ISRAEL Tel: 972-(0)3-9681518 Mob: 972-(0)506-241885	dopatowski@yahoo.com davido@moad.gov.il	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) CPM-12 (2017) CPM-15 (2021) CPM-18 (2024) 5 th term / 3 years	2027
Latin America and Caribbean Member	Mr André Felipe C. P. da SILVA Federal Inspector Quarantine Division Ministry of Agriculture, Live Stock and Food Supply BRAZIL Tel: (61) 3218-2925	andre.peralta@agro.gov.br	CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022) 2 nd term / 3 years	2025
Near East Member	Mr Nader ELBADRY Phytosanitary Specialist, Central Administration of Plant Quarantine, 6 Michel Bakhoum St., Dokki, Giza, EGYPT Tel: +201096799493	nader.badry@gmail.com	CPM-15 (2021) CPM-18 (2024) 2 nd term / 3 years	2027
North America Member	Ms Marina ZLOTINA IPPC Technical Director USDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) 4700 River Rd, 5c-03.37 Riverdale, MD 20737 USA Tel: 1-301-851-2200 Cell: 1 -301-832-0611	Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) CPM-18 (2024) 4 th term / 3 years	2027

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Southwest Pacific Member	Ms Joanne WILSON Principal Adviser, Risk Management Plant Imports Group Ministry for Primary Industries NEW ZEALAND Tel: +64 489 40528 Mob: +64 2989 40528	joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz	CPM-14 (2019) CPM-16 (2022) 2 nd term / 3 years	2025

Appendix 10: Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions between 2024 May – 2024 November

Background

This paper provides a summary of the outcomes of the e-decision forums and polls that the Standards Committee (SC) has conducted between 2024 May - 2024 November.

To review the concluded e-decision forums please see this page: <https://www.ippc.int/en/forum/category/sc-forum-may-2024-november-2024/>. The background documents and other documents (e.g. drafts, complied comments) are posted in the forum.

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

The SC is invited to:

- (1) *agree* that the “Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions between 2024 May – 2024 November” accurately reflects the outcome of the SC e-decisions (Appendix 1).

Appendix 1: **Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions** between **2024 May – 2024 November**

Table 1: SC e-decisions presented between 2024 May – 2024 November

E-decision number	SC decision	SC members commenting in the forum	Polls (yes/no)
2024_eSC_Nov_01	Approval of draft DP for Notification Period: <i>Genus Anastrepha Schiner</i> (2021-002)	12	
2024_eSC_Nov_02	Approval of draft DP for Notification Period: <i>Ips spp</i> (2021-004)	11	
2024_eSC_Nov_03	Approval of draft DP for Notification Period: <i>Xylella fastidiosa</i> (2021-003)	14	
2024_eSC_Nov_04	Approval of draft DP for Consultation: <i>Meloidogyne mali</i> (2018-019)	14	
2024_eSC_Nov_05	Adoption of the 2024 May SC meeting report	8	
2024_eSC_Nov_06	Scope adjustment <i>Bactrocera zonata</i> (2021-013) to include <i>Bactrocera correcta</i> (2023-015)	13	
2024_eSC_Nov_07	Selection of the third English language expert for TPG	17	Yes

2024_eSC_Nov_01: Approval of draft DP for Notification Period: Genus *Anastrepha Schiner* (2021-002)

Summary of SC e-forum discussion

During the SC e-decision the SC was invited to approve the responses to the consultation comments and the draft DP for *Genus Anastrepha Schiner* (2021-002) for adoption (after the Notification Period).

The SC e-forum was open from 21 May-04 June 2024. 12 SC members provided their comments.

SC e-decision

Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the responses to the consultation comments and draft DP for *Genus Anastrepha Schiner* (2021-002) to the DP notification period

2024_eSC_Nov_02: Approval of draft DP for Notification Period: *Ips spp* (2021-004)

Summary of SC e-forum discussion

During the SC e-decision the SC was invited to approve the responses to the consultation comments and draft DP for *Ips spp* (2021-004) for adoption (after the Notification Period).

The SC e-forum was open from 21 May-04 June 2024. 11 SC members provided their comments.

SC e-decision

Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the responses to the consultation comments and draft DP for *Ips spp* (2021-004) to the DP notification period.

2024_eSC_Nov_03: Approval of draft DP for Notification Period: *Xylella fastidiosa* (2021-003)

Summary of SC e-forum discussion

During the SC e-decision the SC was invited to approve the responses to the consultation comments and draft revision of DP 25 for *Xylella fastidiosa* (2018-006) for adoption (after the Notification period).

The SC e-forum was open from 21 May-04 June 2024 and later extended to 14 June 2024. 14 SC members provided their comments.

SC e-decision

Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the responses to the consultation comments and draft revision of DP 25 for *Xylella fastidiosa* (2018-006) for adoption (after the Notification period).

2024_eSC_Nov_04: Approval of draft DP for Consultation: *Meloidogyne mali* (2018-019)**Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

During the SC e-decision the SC was invited to approve the draft DP for *Meloidogyne mali* (2018-019) for consultation.

The SC e-forum was open from 10 -24 June 2024. 14 SC members provided their comments.

SC e-decision

Based on the forum discussions, the SC approved the draft DP for *Meloidogyne mali* (2018-019) for consultation.

2024_eSC_Nov_05: Adoption of the 2024 May SC meeting report**Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

During the SC e-decision the SC was invited to adopt the 2024 May SC report.

The SC e-forum was open from the 17 June - 01 July 2024. 8 SC members provided their comments.

SC e-decision

Based on the forum discussions, the SC adopted the 2024 May SC report.

2024_eSC_Nov_06: Scope adjustment *Bactrocera zonata* (2021-013) to include *Bactrocera correcta* (2023-015)**Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

During the SC e-decision the SC was invited to agree to change the scope and title of the topic “*Bactrocera zonata* (2021-013)” to “*Bactrocera zonata* and *Bactrocera correcta* (2021-013)” and remove the subject “*Bactrocera correcta* (2023-015)” from the TPDP work programme.

The SC e-forum was open from 26 July -09 August 2024. 13 SC members provided their comments.

SC e-decision

Based on the forum discussions, the SC agreed with the recommendation from the TPDP to broaden the scope and title of the topic “*Bactrocera zonata* (2021-013)” to “*Bactrocera zonata* and *Bactrocera correcta* (2021-013)” and remove the subject “*Bactrocera correcta* (2023-015)” from the TPDP work programme.

2024_eSC_Nov_07: Selection of the third English language expert for TPG**Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

During the SC e-decision the SC was invited to review the nominations and select the third expert in English language for a 5-year term in the IPPC Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) starting in 2025.

The SC e-forum was open from 24 September - 08 October 2024. 17 SC members participated in the forum and majority of voting SC members supported Ms. Stephanie M. Dubon (USA) as the third expert in English language for a 5-year term in the IPPC Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) starting in 2025.

The secretariat opened a poll from 09 October to 16 October 2024 according to the e-decision procedure to confirm consensus in selecting Ms. Stephanie M. Dubon (USA). This decision was to be brought to the attention of the 2024 November SC meeting.

SC e-decision

Based on the forum discussions and poll, the SC will discuss and confirm if Ms. Stephanie M. Dubon (USA) should be selected as the third expert in English language for a 5-year term in the IPPC Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) starting in 2025.

Appendix 11: List of action points arising from the meeting

Decisions & Actions	Agenda Item (Decision #)	Responsible	Deadline
1. <i>recommended</i> the draft annex International movement of fresh <i>Mangifera indica</i> fruit (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures), as modified at this meeting, for submission to the CPM-19 (2025) for adoption	4.1 (2)	Secretariat	CPM-19
2. <i>requested</i> that secretariat forward the implementation issue identified for this draft standard (namely, the potential for the pest list to be misused to require unjustified measures to manage some pests) to the Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU) of the secretariat for consideration by the IC.	4.1 (3)	Secretariat	IC May 2025
3. <i>recommended</i> the draft annex Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risk associated with the movement of wood (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood), as modified at this meeting, for submission to CPM-19 (2025) for adoption.	4.2 (5)	-	CPM-19
4. <i>requested</i> that the secretariat forward implementation issues identified for this draft annex to the IFU for consideration by the IC.	4.2 (6)	Secretariat	IC May 2025
5. <i>approved</i> Specification XX (Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM) as modified in this meeting;	6.1 (11)	Secretariat	
6. <i>agreed</i> that the background documents to be provided to the EWG on Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037) would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · the draft ISPM from the topic <i>Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards</i> (2020-001) as revised by the steward following first consultation, · the compiled comments from the first consultation on the <i>Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards</i> (2020-001) and the steward's responses to those comments, and · the steward's notes to the SC in 2023 and 2024 on the <i>Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards</i> (2020-001); 	6.1 (12)	Secretariat	
7. <i>recommended</i> to CPM-19 (2025) that the topic <i>Reorganization of pest risk analysis</i>	6.1 (14)	Secretariat	After CPM-19

Decisions & Actions	Agenda Item (Decision #)	Responsible	Deadline
standards (2020-001) be removed from the List of topics for IPPC standards;			
8. <i>requested</i> that the secretariat invite representatives from the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat and the World Organisation for Animal Health to share information on the risk analysis processes described in their standards at the meeting of the EWG on Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037) and provide documentation in advance;	6.1 (15)	Secretariat	EWG meeting
9. <i>requested</i> that the secretariat invite representatives from the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat and the World Organisation for Animal Health to share information on the risk analysis processes described in their standards during a lunchtime session at the SC's meeting in May 2025.	6.1 (16)	Secretariat	SC May 2024
10. <i>agreed</i> to present the draft specification on Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid as modified in this meeting to CPM-19 (2025);	6.2 (17)	Secretariat	CPM-19 2025
11. <i>invited</i> the CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid to consider the amendments to the draft gap-analysis diagram suggested by the SC at this meeting;	6.2 (18)	Secretariat	
12. <i>agreed</i> that the SC paper to CPM-19 (2025) on this draft specification would be separate to the main SC update to CPM-19 and requested that the secretariat seek to ensure that the draft specification would be considered immediately after the focus group's update in the CPM-19 agenda;	6.2 (19)	Secretariat	
13. <i>requested</i> CPM-19 (2025), in accordance with the decision of CPM-18 (2024), to decide whether to proceed with the development of an ISPM and, if proceeding, to approve this specification, add it as a topic to the IPPC list of IPPC standards and assign a priority to the topic.	6.2 (20)	Secretariat	
14. <i>invited</i> CPM-19 (2025) to note that an additional consultation period may be opened for DPs only, in January–May (in	8.1 (21)	Secretariat	CPM-19

Decisions & Actions	Agenda Item (Decision #)	Responsible	Deadline
addition to the consultation period in July–September); and			
15. agreed to move the DP notification period from “5 January – 20 February” to “30 January – 15 March” and invited CPM-19 (2025) to note this.	8.1 (22)	Secretariat	CPM-19
16. added the subject Vapour heat (hot steam) treatment of coniferous bark for the elimination of <i>Bursaphelenchus xylophilus</i> (2024-001) to the TPPT work programme with priority 3;	8.2 (24)	Secretariat	-
17. added the review of the draft Wood packaging material heat treatment manual (2017-043a) and the draft Wood packaging material fumigation treatment manual (2017-043b) to the TPPT workplan; and	8.2 (25)	Secretariat	-
18. requested that, for future e-polls for the selection of technical panel members, the secretariat send two reminders to SC members to participate in the e-poll – one partway through the seven-day polling period and one on the final day (taking account of time zones); and	8.3 (29)	Secretariat	-
19. agreed that SC members with comments on the draft revised submission forms for the Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation (including the criteria for the justification and prioritization of proposed topics) and the Call for IPPC Observatory Topics for Studies and Surveys would send them to the secretariat (Emmanuel KRAH) by 2 December 2024; and	9.1 (31)	Secretariat	2 nd December 2024
20. assigned stewards and assistant stewards as agreed at this meeting;	9.2 (34)	Secretariat	-
21. invited CPM-19 (2025) to note the updates to the List of topics for IPPC standards;	9.2 (35)	Secretariat	CPM-19
22. invited the TPCS to nominate assistant stewards from the membership of the TPCS for subjects on the TPCS work programme; and	9.2 (36)	Secretariat	TPCS face-to-face meeting
23. recommended to CPM-19 (2025) that <i>Pest risk management for quarantine pests</i> (2014-001) be removed from the List of topics for IPPC standards.	9.2 (37)	Secretariat	After CPM-19
24. requested that the secretariat provide, at the SC meeting in May 2025, an update on	10.1 (39)	Secretariat	SC May 2025

Decisions & Actions	Agenda Item (Decision #)	Responsible	Deadline
the relationship between the secretariat and the developers of the Online Comment System and how the secretariat can influence its functionality;			
25. <i>agreed</i> to the draft agenda for the 2025 SC-7 meeting and agreed that the duration of the meeting would be four days.	10.1 (40)	Secretariat	-
26. <i>agreed</i> that Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) would be the SC representative on the SC-7 for the Southwest Pacific and the representatives from the other regions would remain unchanged.	10.1 (41)	Secretariat	-
27. <i>agreed</i> that, at their meeting in May 2025, they would clarify how and when the SC would forward potential implementation issues to the IC for consideration;	11.1 (47)		SC May 2025
28. <i>requested</i> that the secretariat and CPM Bureau discuss applying flexible travel support criteria to ensure that the IC representative (observer) to the SC can receive travel support to attend SC meetings if they meet the World Bank criteria for support in other respects; and	11.1 (48)	Secretariat	Future Bureau meeting
29. <i>requested</i> that the IFU and the SSU develop a system to collect all potential implementation issues raised by various bodies at various stages for future consideration.	11.1 (49)	Secretariat	-
30. <i>requested</i> that the small SC group for this issue draft a paper for CPM-19 (2025), to be submitted for SC e-decision by 2 December 2024;	12.3 (53)		CPM-19 (2025)
31. <i>urged</i> the secretariat to make the presentations at IPPC regional workshops available as Powerpoint files to regional organizing committees (e.g. on the joint SC–IC work area of the IPP) in good time before the workshops.	12.5 (57)	Secretariat	
32. <i>emphasized</i> the importance of early communication about the themes for the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH);	12.6 (61)	Secretariat	
33. <i>noted</i> that the secretariat would liaise with the IST to ensure that any IDPH events involving SC members during the SC May 2025 meeting could be incorporated into the SC schedule for the week;	12.6 (62)	Secretariat	

Decisions & Actions	Agenda Item (Decision #)	Responsible	Deadline
34. <i>noted</i> that the secretariat would open a call for a mycologist member of the TPDP by the end of 2024;	12.6 (65)	Secretariat	31 January 2025
35. <i>noted</i> that the secretariat would open a call for two TPCS members before the end of 2024;	12.6 (67)	Secretariat	31 January 2025
36. <i>requested</i> that the secretariat provide invitations, draft agendas and specific letters to SC members as early as possible to facilitate travel planning, including visa applications.	15 (70)	Secretariat	January
37. <i>requested</i> that the secretariat open an e-decision to approve the report from this meeting, following approval of the text by the rapporteurs; and	18 (71)	Emmanuel	
38. <i>requested</i> that the secretariat circulate the decisions from this meeting soon after the meeting.	18 (72)	Emmanuel	