



REPORT

The Hague, The
Netherlands
1-5 July 2013

**Expert Working
Group on the
International
movement of seed
(2009-003)
July 2013**



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the meeting	3
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat.....	3
1.2 Welcome by the host	3
1.3 Introductions	3
1.4 Roles of the Participants	3
1.5 Selection of the Chair and Rapporteur.....	3
1.6 Adoption of the Agenda.....	3
2. Administrative Matters.....	3
3. Review of Specification	4
4. Development of draft ISPM	4
4.1 Discussion papers	4
4.2 Outline of points for draft.....	4
4.3 Develop text for draft.....	6
4.4 Agreement on draft	14
5. Next Steps	14
6. Other business	14
7. Close of the meeting.....	14
APPENDIX 1: Agenda.....	15
APPENDIX 2 : Documents List.....	17
APPENDIX 3 : Participants List	19

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat welcomed the participants of the Expert Working Group (EWG) on the topic *International movement of seed* (2009-003) to The Hague, The Netherlands, thanked them for their work in preparing for this meeting and hoped that the meeting would be productive. The meeting was organized and hosted by the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs.
- [2] It was noted that the steward for the topic *International movement of seed* (2009-003), Ms Maria Soledad CASTRO DOROCHESSI (Chile) had not confirmed her participation and was not attending the meeting; Ms Julie ALIAGA (USA), the assistant steward, who had been invited to the meeting and performed the duties of the steward during the meeting. It was also noted that Ms Tami LEVI (Israel) was unable to attend the meeting.

1.2 Welcome by the host

- [3] Mr Wim VAN ECK, Deputy Director of the Dutch National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) in the Ministry of Economic Affairs, welcomed the participants and wished them a constructive meeting and a pleasant stay in The Hague.

1.3 Introductions

- [4] The members introduced themselves and outlined their experience in dealing with the international movement of seed and the expertise they would bring to the EWG. They collectively had expertise in the following areas: the development and/or implementation of phytosanitary measures to manage pest risk associated with the international movement of seed, pest risk analysis (PRA), seed testing and storage, knowledge of existing international guidance relating to the international movement of seed. One member had expertise in tropical forest tree seed. The invited expert from the International Seed Federation (ISF) and the representatives from the host country and the organizer were also introduced.

1.4 Roles of the Participants

- [5] The IPPC Secretariat informed the participants that the role of the experts is to help produce a globally acceptable International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) in line with the Specification. The Secretariat reviewed the different roles and responsibilities of the participants (steward, EWG members, host country/organizer, Rapporteur, Chair, invited experts), and noted that the participants are here as experts, not as representatives of their region or country. The IPPC Secretariat noted that its role is to facilitate these discussions. The Secretariat presented an overview of the standard setting process, and stressed that long-term commitment is necessary for the adoption of a standard, which is at least a five-year process.

1.5 Selection of the Chair and Rapporteur

- [6] Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN (The Netherlands) was selected as the Chair and Mr Edward PODLECKIS (USA) was selected as the Rapporteur.

1.6 Adoption of the Agenda

The EWG approved the Agenda as attached in Appendix 1.

2. Administrative Matters

- [7] The Secretariat reviewed the Documents List which is attached in Appendix 2, noting that a revision was submitted for one of the documents and an additional document was prepared.
- [8] The Participants List was circulated and updated by participants; it is attached in Appendix 3. The host reviewed the Local Information document and further described some details of local arrangements. A field trip was organized on Thursday 4 July 2013 to Rijk Zwaan facilities, a worldwide vegetable

breeding company, with head office located in De Lier in the Netherlands. After this field trip, a dinner was hosted by ISF in Rotterdam.

3. Review of Specification

- [9] The EWG reviewed Specification 54 *International movement of seed* (2009-003). The steward presented the history of the topic, the specification, the adjustments the SC had agreed to as well as the discussions of the SC. This topic was submitted by Canada, USA, the European Commission, Turkey and the International Seed Federation (ISF). The standard would apply to seed moved internationally, but would not apply to grain, and the SC had decided that it should include forest tree seeds. It should identify and describe specific phytosanitary measures that could be used to reduce pest risk associated with the international movement of seed, and it was highlighted in the specification that it was important that national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) do not confuse measures applied to ensure seed quality with phytosanitary measures applied to manage pest risk.
- [10] One participant gave a brief update on the Draft Appendix 1 to ISPM 12:2011 *Electronic phytosanitary certificates, information on standard XML schemas, and exchange mechanisms* (2006-003), which had been sent to the substantial concerns commenting period (1 June – 30 September 2013), and on the ePhyto page on the IPPC website (<http://ePhyto.ippc.int>), as it was thought this information might be useful for the EWG in addressing some of the tasks of the specification.

4. Development of draft ISPM

4.1 Discussion papers

- [11] The EWG reviewed the discussion papers and other reference material provided by some participants. These documents collectively aimed at addressing the tasks that are listed in Specification 54. Based on these papers, the group identified a list of issues found in section 4.2., which were then further discussed by the group.
- [12] North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) 36 *Phytosanitary Guidelines for the Movement of Seed* was also presented. While recognising that the content of NAPPO RSPM 36 would not be directly transposable to the draft ISPM and more details may be needed for the draft ISPM, the EWG agreed to use NAPPO RSPM 36 as a first basis for their discussion.

4.2 Outline of points for draft

- [13] The EWG identified the following list of issues to be further discussed.
- Scope:
 - Should the standard cover only true botanical seed (or should it also include vegetative plant parts commonly referred to as “seed”, e.g., seed potatoes)?
 - The draft ISPM should not apply to genetically modified organisms (GMOs).
 - Definitions:
 - Possible definitions for the terms seed-borne pest and seed-transmitted pest.
 - Possible definitions for the terms obscured seeds, coated seeds and pelletized seed.
 - Pest risk analysis (PRA) - Seed as a pathway:
 - Seed as a pathway for entry and establishment
 - Pest establishment as the endpoint for PRA
 - Distinction between seed-borne pests and seed-transmitted pests
 - Pest as contaminants on seeds

- Transmission under field conditions versus experimental conditions
- Sharing and re-use of PRA information
- Regulated pests: quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests

- Pest risk analysis (PRA) - Intended use:
 - Consider commercial and non-commercial (hobbyists) uses
 - Consider seed for research and development
 - Consider the movement of infested seed lots for research

- Phytosanitary measures:
 - Seed certification schemes: seed certification schemes can be used for phytosanitary purposes (not refer to specific schemes)
 - Pest free production site / pest free place of production as phytosanitary measure
 - Treatments
 - Issue of organic seeds
 - Requirements for field inspection
 - Sampling:
 - Sampling of small lots, sampling size of small lots
 - Sampling of seeds in sealed (air-tight) containers
 - Sampling of coated seeds/lots
 - Diagnostic Protocols:
 - Validated tests for import requirements
 - Direct and indirect tests
 - Seed treatments may affect tests
 - Packaging of seeds
 - Production
 - Equivalence of phytosanitary measures
 - Emergency situations
 - Post-entry quarantine

- Specific requirements for small lots (to define: intended use, size, etc ...)
- Phytosanitary certification:
 - Harmonization of phytosanitary certificates
 - Additional declarations
 - Issue of origin / unknown origin
 - Traceability

- Forest tree seeds: small lots, methods of collection, years of abundant flowering
- Environmental / biodiversity issues (Reference to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)).
- Technical information to add in annexes / appendices: list of organisms of relevance for seeds, relative risks, references to existing databases.

4.3 Develop text for draft

[14] The issues identified above were discussed in the meeting and most of them were included in the draft ISPM as follows.

Scope section

[15] The wording from Specification 54 was used to draft the section on the scope.

[16] The EWG considered that the standard should only cover true botanical seed. Therefore, to clarify that only true seed are covered in the standard, it was decided to specifically mention in the scope of the standard that “this standard applies to seed¹ moved internationally (including forest tree seed) and only true seed (i.e. a ripened plant ovule containing an embryo)”.

[17] The group felt there was no need to specifically mention that the scope covered invasive alien species, as invasive alien species that are pests are already covered by the definition of a pest in ISPM 5.

[18] The EWG considered the draft ISPM would not apply to GMOs and there was no need to specifically mention living modified organisms (LMOs) in the scope as they were already covered by ISPM 11:2004 *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms*.

Definitions section

[19] The EWG agreed that *seed-borne pest* and *seed-transmitted* would need to be defined and proposed the following wording for these definitions to be included in this section, as these terms are not currently defined in ISPM 5:

- **Seed-borne pest:** a pest that can be found on the seed (externally) or within the seed (internally) but is not necessarily transferred to the resulting plant.
- **Seed-transmitted pest:** a pest that can be transferred via seed to progeny plants resulting in infestation.

[20] The group also discussed whether the terms ‘coated’ seeds and ‘obscured’ seeds, which are synonyms, should be defined. In the end, it was decided not to include them in the definition section, but to explain these terms in the body of the ISPM (in section 4.1 Inspection). The International Seed Testing Association (ISTA) definition for coated seeds (i.e. any seed encased in non-seed material which includes pelletized seed as well as seed tapes, seed granules, encrusted seed, and seed mats) was used for that purpose.

Background section

[21] Some wording from Specification 54 and NAPPO RSPM 36 was used to draft this section and was further modified.

Pest risk analysis section

- *Seed as pathway*

[22] The EWG considered the following issues that were identified from the review of the discussion papers:

- It should be highlighted that, during the pest risk analysis (PRA) process, care should be taken to ensure that seed is not only a pathway for the entry but can also lead to establishment of regulated pests.

¹ Seeds are defined as “A commodity class for seeds for planting or intended for planting and not for consumption or processing” (ISPM 5).

- The distinction between seed-borne pest and seed-transmitted pest should be explained and contaminating pests should be mentioned as an example for seed-borne pests that are not seed-transmitted but may lead to the establishment.
- Many studies have documented that while certain seed borne pests may be transferred by seed under laboratory conditions, such transferral may not be observed under field conditions. The group noted that expert interpretation of scientific publications regarding seed as a means for establishment was critical when seed transmission was not demonstrated under natural conditions.
- The group discussed whether NPPOs should be encouraged in the draft standard to share PRA data and re-use the existing information, where possible. Given the global characteristics of seed trade, they thought it would be useful if countries would share PRA data and if a database was available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP). It was noted that there is currently no obligation under the IPPC for contracting parties to report and publish their PRA data. The EWG thought it should be mentioned in the draft standard that NPPOs are encouraged to share the information of PRAs that address seed as a potential pathway for regulated pests. The group also agreed that while sharing PRA data should be encouraged, the reuse of whole PRAs was unlikely since phytosanitary situations and regulatory requirements differ among member countries.
- The EWG agreed that guidance on the likelihood for pest groups to be present in the seed pathway and their potential to establish and spread would be useful for NPPOs when they prepare PRA and that an annex containing such guidance should be drafted.

- ***Intended use***

[23] The group agreed that the level of risk should be assessed in the PRA depending on the intended use and that this should be described for different categories of seed:

- (1) Seed with no potential to germinate or generate plants;
- (2) Seed not for planting but retaining viability;
- (3) Seed for planting under restricted conditions and not for general release;
- (4) Seed for planting under restricted conditions with the intention of release;
- (5) Seed for planting.

[24] This section covered the issues mentioned above in section 4.2 regarding intended use of seed (commercial and non-commercial uses, seed for research and development, infested seed lots for research).

Phytosanitary measures section

[25] The group agreed this section should provide guidance for phytosanitary measures to prevent the entry and establishment of regulated pests identified during the PRA process, and they considered the elements that were listed in task 4 of Specification 54 to draft this section. They agreed that in the draft standard it would be logical to rearrange the measures listed below from the least restrictive to the most restrictive measure.

- ***Pest free options***

[26] The group added references to ISPM 4:1995 and ISPM 10:1999 for the recognition, establishment and maintenance of pest free areas, pest free places of production and pest free production sites.

[27] Because seed for sowing is a high risk commodity, in that the seed is for direct planting into the environment for propagation and further multiplication, the group felt it would not be possible to accept areas of low pest prevalence as a stand-alone measure to prevent seed transmissible pests. It may be possible to consider this measure in a systems approach for seed but the effort and cost is likely to outweigh the benefit for this trade.

- **Seed treatments**

[28] The group drafted a general guidance for treatments, recognising that some seed treatments may prevent introduction of regulated pests and can be used as phytosanitary measures.

[29] They considered the specific issue of organic seed, for which some seed treatments may not be allowed, and agreed for the need of alternative equivalent measures for organic seed in case seed treatment is a phytosanitary measure. The group felt the section on seed treatments was the only section where it was relevant to specifically mention the issue of organic seed.

[30] They agreed to add an appendix providing general information on available treatments per pest category.

- **Inspection**

[31] The group agreed that, for inspection, a short introduction which would refer to the section on specific requirements for further details should be added under the section on phytosanitary measures.

- **Sampling**

[32] The group agreed that, for sampling, a short introduction which would refer to the section on specific requirements for further details should be added under the section on phytosanitary measures.

- **Pest Diagnosis**

[33] The group agreed that, for diagnostic protocols, a short introduction which would refer to the section on specific requirements for further details should be added under the section on phytosanitary measures.

- **Packaging**

[34] This element was present in task 4 of Specification 54, and the group drafted a short guidance on packaging of seed to prevent exposure from pest risks.

- **Integrated measures for seed production**

[35] Although the scope of ISPM 36:2012 excludes seed, the group agreed that many of the measures as described in ISPM 36:2012 could also be applied for the risk management of seed production. They decided to list in the draft standard examples of possible measures, in addition to referencing ISPM 36:2012.

- **Prohibition**

[36] The group decided to add references to:

- (1) ISPM 20:2004 regarding the prohibition by NPPOs of the importation of seed considered as high risk;
- (2) ISPM 13:2001 for prohibition based on an emergency measure.

[37] They agreed to mention the possibility for the NPPO to allow the import of high risk seed for research or specialized commercial purposes under a permit with specified conditions.

[38] They also thought a specific reference should be made to seed posing a high risk of becoming an invasive alien species.

- **Post-entry quarantine (PEQ)**

[39] Whereas one EWG member mentioned PEQ could be applied for high-value seeds, other members considered because of the considerable cost and effort involved, PEQ would likely only be applied to high-risk seeds. Therefore it was decided to mention that NPPOs may apply PEQ to seed that is considered to pose a high risk of introducing pests of quarantine concern. The group agreed to add a

reference to ISPM 34:2010 and to mention that PEQ may be useful in case of small quantities of seed (e.g., coming from gene banks or coming from research and development programmes).

- ***Designation of planting areas***

[40] The group drafted a short section providing guidance on the designation of planting areas and isolation.

- ***Seed certification scheme***

[41] The group discussed whether more wording was needed on seed certification schemes in addition to the sub-section on integrated measures for seed production, and they agreed to only add a short sentence stating that certain elements of seed certification schemes may include phytosanitary measures if approved by the NPPO of the exporting country.

- ***Use of resistant varieties***

[42] The EWG agreed that a short sub-section on the use of resistant varieties was needed in the Phytosanitary measures section. However, they had no time to draft it during the meeting.

[43] The EWG agreed to:

- (1) Ask two EWG participants to draft a short sub-section on the use of resistant varieties after the meeting and submit it to the Secretariat by 20 July 2013.

Equivalence of phytosanitary measures section

[44] The group drafted a section on equivalency making references to ISPM 1:2006 and ISPM 24:2005. They felt it would be useful to also give some examples of phytosanitary measures that may be considered as equivalent.

Specific requirements section

- ***Inspection***

[45] The group decided that 3 sub-sections would be needed:

- Inspection of seeds: inspection of infected seed (as opposed to contaminants- e.g., sclerotia, weed seeds, soil), would only be effective where seeds are known to display characteristic symptoms of infection such as discoloration or shrivelling. Several examples were mentioned (e.g., infection from *Cercospora kikuchii* in soybean, *Phomopsis longicolla* of soybean and *Arachis hypogaeae* and *Cylindrocladium parasiticum* in peanut).
- Inspection of coated seeds or obscured seeds, as inspection may not be appropriate when the coating material reduces visibility.
- Field inspection, which can be a useful phytosanitary measure for pests of quarantine concern known to produce visible and diagnostic symptoms. It was felt a reference to ISPM 6:1997 should be added. There was also a discussion on whether to add a reference to Appendix 1 to ISPM 36:2012 in this sub-section, but the group decided it was more relevant to add this reference in the introduction of the section on phytosanitary measures.

- ***Sampling***

[46] Regarding sampling of small lots, the group agreed that a reference to ISPM 31:2008 should be made, but examples of equivalent strategies should be provided when statistical samples required as per in ISPM 31:2008 may result in a destruction of an unacceptable large proportion of the lot.

[47] Regarding sampling of seeds in sealed (air-tight) containers, the EWG felt it was important to mention that NPPOs are encouraged to consider the integrity of the consignment when designing sampling protocols.

[48] Regarding sampling of coated seeds/lots, it was decided to mention that NPPOs of the importing and exporting countries should confer bilaterally to determine if there are specific requirements for obscured seed.

- **Detection**

[49] The group added a general reference to ISPM 27:2006. As it is more complicated to detect a pest in a seed than in a plant (more specificity and more sensitivity is needed because of potentially lower titers and more difficult extractions), the group agreed that additional guidance should be provided. They highlighted the need for harmonisation or at least the acceptance of equivalent protocols, and they felt it was important to state in the draft standard that NPPOs are encouraged to apply validated protocols or protocols reviewed by experts, and that further information on available validated or reviewed protocols (such as ISTA rules, International Seed Health Initiative (ISHI) Veg methods, European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) protocols, IPPC protocols, National Seed Health System (NSHS) protocols) should be provided in an appendix to the standard.

[50] They also agreed to mention that careful interpretation of indirect protocols was needed, because of false-positives, and that in these cases confirmation tests may be performed.

[51] They discussed the issue of testing of treated seeds and recognised that specific guidance on this was needed as treatments may interact with tests.

- **Importation of small lots of seeds**

[52] The EWG considered the issue of small lots of seeds. They agreed small lots should not be categorically excluded from the scope of the standard as they may present phytosanitary risks. They discussed whether the draft standard should define what a small lot is and what requirements should apply to small lots, and they reviewed the wording from NAPPO RSPM 36 for small quantities of seed. The EWG agreed that NPPOs should have some flexibility to deal with small lots of seed, and that the standard should only mention that “the NPPO of the importing country may establish specific procedures for the importation of small lots of seeds taking into account their intended use, size, production history, origin, etc...”. They did not feel that mentioning that phytosanitary risks were lower for small lots was correct, and decided not to retain the specific wording from NAPPO RSPM 36 on this standard.

Phytosanitary certification section

[53] The group discussed whether additional guidance was needed in addition to a reference to ISPM 12:2011. They agreed that seed trade differed from other commodities as it presented specific characteristics (i.e. long-term storage, global trade, frequent re-exports).

[54] Considering these specificities, as minor variations in the wording of additional declarations may create obstacles to the international movement of seed, the EWG felt the need to emphasize in the draft ISPM that NPPOs are encouraged to use the standard wording for additional declarations provided in Appendix 2 of ISPM 12:2011.

[55] The group noted that the availability of import requirements for seeds was important as seeds are frequently re-exported, and agreed to encourage in the draft standard NPPOs to publish their import requirements.

[56] The EWG decided that specific guidance was also needed on additional official phytosanitary information which are not required by the first country of import, but may be included on the phytosanitary certificate in order to facilitate future re-export to other countries. Some examples may include the following:

- (1) possible additional field inspections upon the request of the producer to facilitate future re-exports,

- (2) NPPOs encouraged to provide other additional official phytosanitary information when requested by the exporter,
- (3) NPPOs of the importing country considering equivalent phytosanitary measures as options to fulfil import requirements when field inspections are not possible.

[57] Regarding the issues of traceability and origin, the group considered the guidance provided in ISPM 12:2011 was clear enough. However, they felt that if seed is stored or moved, the new location should be added to the place of origin in addition to the country of production in accordance with ISPM 12:2011, as the seed's phytosanitary status may change over a period of time and as a result of its new location. The EWG also considered that when different lots within a consignment originate from different countries, all country names should be indicated. The EWG decided that because ISPM 12:2011 specifically requires that origin be stated on the phytosanitary certificate, additional guidance on the issue of consignments of unknown origin was not needed in the draft standard

[58] One of the discussion papers suggested phytosanitary certificates (PCs) for seed include original lot numbers to allow trace-back. However, the EWG felt the PC could provide sufficient trace-back to the producer and then the producer could trace-back to the original lot.

- **Mixing and blending of seeds**

[59] The group discussed specific requirements for mixed and blended seed. They stressed that the title of the sub-section should mention both mixing and blending as these were different things. They had initially placed this sub-section under the phytosanitary measures section; however they decided in the end it was more relevant to the section on phytosanitary certification.

[60] The group discussed whether the term *cultivar* or *variety* should be used in the draft standard. Because varieties often occur in nature and most varieties are true to type, meaning the seedlings grown from a variety will have the same characteristics of the parent plant while cultivars are not necessarily true to type and must be propagated, the group decided to use only *variety* as this was a more appropriate term for seed (i.e. cultivars are cultivated varieties and can be selected).

International movement of forest tree seed section

[61] The group noted that over the last few decades, afforestation and reforestation programmes worldwide have resorted to the use of exotic species from proven seed sources and this has significantly increased movement of forest tree seeds across international borders and therefore increased phytosanitary risks. The group recognized that most of the procedures described for seeds in this standard would apply to forest tree seeds; however there would be some unique aspects (especially regarding the methods for collection, storage, packaging).

[62] The EWG discussed the issue of forest tree seeds and discussed whether a separate section highlighting the specificities of forest tree seeds should be drafted, or if the information was more appropriate as an annex to the draft standard. When the group reviewed the draft text, they felt that this information would better fit in an annex. Reference to this annex was added in the scope section.

Annex 1 - Additional guidance on the likelihood for pest groups to be present in the seed pathway and their potential to establish and spread.

[63] The EWG drafted this guidance using information that was provided by some of the discussion papers. Pests associated with seed were categorized into pest groups with information to consider for PRAs analyzing their likelihood to be present on the seed pathway and their potential to establish and spread. A section on possible outcomes, describing different categories where seed can be a pathway for entry and lead to establishment or not, was also drafted. Some of the experts questioned whether the addition of the decision tree in Figure 1 was necessary, but the group decided to leave it in the draft ISPM at this stage.

Annex 2 - Forest tree seed

[64] While reviewing the text that has been drafted for the annex on forest tree seed, the EWG agreed that the draft annex only dealt with tropical forest tree seed issues, and not temperate forest tree seed, and more information was needed on this issue. It was also mentioned that the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ) had previously started to work on forest tree seed but did not conclude their work. The EWG felt the information in the draft annex on forest tree seed should be sent for review and further drafting to the TPFQ.

[65] The EWG agreed to:

- (1) *Recommend* the SC to send the information from the draft annex on forest tree seed on forest tree seed to the TPFQ for review and further drafting.

Review of the tasks from Specification 54

[66] The EWG reviewed all the tasks from Specification 54 to make sure all of them had been addressed during the meeting. Regarding task 1, existing international guidance was mentioned in several of the discussion papers prepared by the participants and has been reviewed in the meeting. Task 2 (with the issue of development of tolerances for regulated non-quarantine pests excepted), task 3, task 4, task 5 and task 6 had been addressed by the group when drafting the text (refer to the above discussion). The issue of development of tolerances for regulated non-quarantine pests and tasks 7, 8 and 9 were further discussed:

- *Development of tolerances for regulated non-quarantine pests (RNQPs)*

[67] This issue was mentioned in one of the discussion papers. The group discussed whether the draft ISPM would need to be so specific and define tolerance for RNQPs in seed. They noted that there are few examples of RNQPs for seed and that would be already covered by ISPM 16:2002. They concluded that tolerances for RNPQs for seed were not frequently used and agreed there was no specific need to include it in the draft ISPM.

- *Task 7 – Technical annexes and appendices*

[68] Two annexes had been drafted by the group:

- Annex 1 - Additional guidance on the likelihood for pest groups to be present in the seed pathway and potential to establish and spread for a PRA and possible outcomes.
- Annex 2 - Forest tree seed

[69] The EWG had also drafted an appendix on the general classification of seed treatments.

[70] The EWG decided that an additional appendix listing useful resources would be needed. The EWG discussed whether to include references to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Seed Schemes and to the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV). They agreed that these references would be more related to quality issues, and not relevant for the purpose of the draft ISPM. In addition, OECD membership was limited to 34 countries in the world, and, as OECD Seed Schemes refer to ISTA rules for seed testing, a reference to ISTA rules in the draft ISPM would be enough. It was also suggested and agreed that the EWG recommends to ISF and ISTA to submit relevant references to the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) for inclusion in the Phytosanitary Resources website (<http://www.phytosanitary.info/>). As some concern was expressed about the updating of this page, it was highlighted that direct links to ISTA and ISF websites should be submitted.

[71] The EWG agreed to:

- (1) *Invite* all EWG participants to submit by 20 July 2013 relevant references for inclusion in the draft appendix listing useful resources to the Secretariat, which will compile the information.

(2) *Invite* ISF and ISTA to submit relevant references to the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) for inclusion in the Phytosanitary Resources website (<http://www.phytosanitary.info/>).

- ***Task 8 – Whether the ISPM could affect in a specific way the protection of biodiversity and the environment***

[72] Wording proposed in some of the discussion papers was used to draft a short section in the draft ISPM on the impact on biodiversity and the environment.

[73] The group discussed whether a reference to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) should be added and it could be mentioned that for regulated trade NPPOs should ensure that endangered species listed under CITES have valid CITES export permits for every single shipment before they issue phytosanitary certificates. It was mentioned that NPPOs need to be aware of CITES regulations. However, the group recognised it was the responsibility of the seed exporter to comply with CITES requirements, and not the responsibility of the NPPOs, and decided not to add this reference to CITES.

- ***Task 9 - Potential implementation issues***

[74] Based on one of the discussion papers, the EWG addressed the implementation of the standard.

[75] The EWG agreed to:

(1) *Recommend* to the SC that the following operational technical issues would be required to facilitate effective implementation of the standard:

- Infrastructure: well equipped laboratories, inspection items, media, diagnostic equipment, material for surveillance, transport and offices;
- human and financial resources;
- upgraded phytosanitary regulations and laws;
- production of updated pests lists;
- inspection manual and procedures;
- capacity building: phytosanitary organization and structures should be strengthened through training of inspectors on pest identification, surveillance, inspection procedures, pest diagnostics and PRA.

[76] In addition, the invited expert from ISF indicated that, once the standard is adopted, ISF will be willing to help facilitating its implementation and organize workshops where needed. The group also noted that ISF could raise awareness of their stakeholders so that they can comment through their NPPOs in the following periods:

- member consultation on the draft standard (1 July – 1 December) after the draft standard is approved by the SC for member consultation;
- substantial concerns commenting period on the draft standard (1 June – 30 September).

Field trip to Rijk Zwaan facilities

[77] The EWG visited Rijk Zwaan on Thursday 4 July 2013 afternoon. Rijk Zwaan is one of the 9 main worldwide vegetable breeding companies. Its head office is located in De Lier in the Netherlands.

[78] Company representatives presented to the EWG their:

- seed handling and treatments
- Good Seed and Plant Practices (GSPP) facilities (greenhouses)
- phytopathology laboratories.

[79] Rijk Zwaan develops about 150 new varieties per year and has breeding stations all over the world. Seed produced all over the world is shipped to the Netherlands, where quality control (germination,

variety and genetic purity, seed-borne diseases, seed purity) is performed. Seed is then exported to about 100 countries. The challenges associated with re-export of seed and the need for harmonized additional declarations on phytosanitary certificates and protocols within the world were highlighted.

4.4 Agreement on draft

- [80] The EWG finalized the draft ISPM and reviewed the sections that had been drafted during the meeting. They agreed to all the concepts that are present in the draft and that were discussed above.
- [81] The group noted that some wording may still need to be clarified and that the sub-section on the use of resistant varieties and the appendix listing useful resources were still to be drafted. They agreed that they would finalize the draft ISPM using sharepoint tool. The Secretariat emphasized that specific changes to the concepts or structure of the draft ISPM should not be made at this stage.

5. Next Steps

- [82] The EWG agreed to the following next steps:
- Two EWG participants to draft a short sub-section on the use of resistant varieties after the meeting and submit it to the Secretariat by 20 July 2013.
 - All EWG participants to submit by 20 July 2013 relevant references for inclusion in the draft appendix listing useful resources to the Secretariat, which will compile the information.
 - The Secretariat to edit the draft ISPM and compile the above information, and to send it to the assistant steward (Ms Julie ALIAGA) for further review.
 - The Secretariat to draft the report of the meeting, which would then be reviewed by the Rapporteur, the Chair and the assistant steward, before being submitted to the EWG for final review in September.
 - The Secretariat, with the help of the assistant steward, to present to an SC e-decision the EWG recommendation to send the information from the draft annex on forest tree seeds to the TPFQ for review and further drafting.
 - The assistant steward to review the draft ISPM by mid-August.
 - The Secretariat to submit the draft ISPM to the EWG for final comments (editorial, clarification comments only; at this stage changes to the concepts or the structure should not be made anymore) by mid-September, trying to use Sharepoint tool (if not possible, via a normal e-mail consultation).
 - The assistant steward to finalize the draft ISPM based on EWG participants and re-submit it to the Secretariat.
- [83] The draft standard would then be submitted to the SC meeting for approval for member consultation and the Secretariat outlined the next steps in the process for the draft ISPM

6. Other business

- [84] None

7. Close of the meeting

- [85] The group expressed their thanks to the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs for hosting the meeting, to the representatives of the organizer and the host country for their help during the meeting. They also thanked the Chair and the Rapporteur.
- [86] The Secretariat thanked all those who helped to make logistical arrangements for the meeting and thanked all the experts for their participation and closed the meeting.

APPENDIX 1: Agenda**EXPERT WORKING GROUP MEETING**
International movement of seed (2009-003)

1 – 5 July 2013

NOVOTEL Den Haag City Centre
The Hague, THE NETHERLANDS

Daily Schedule: 09:00-12:00 and 13:00-17:00

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	--	GERMAIN
1.2 Opening of meeting by host	--	VAN ALPHEN
1.3 Introductions	--	GERMAIN
1.4 Roles of the Participants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPPC Secretariat • Steward • Host Country/Organization • Rapporteur • Chair • Experts 		GERMAIN
1.5 Selection of the Chair and Rapporteur	--	
1.6 Adoption of the Agenda	EWGSeed_2013_July_01	CHAIR
2. Administrative Matters		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents List • Participants List • Local Information 	EWGSeed_2013_July_02 EWGSeed_2013_July_03 EWGSeed_2013_July_04	CHAIR
3. Review of Specification	EWGSeed_2013_July_05	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History of the topic and draft specification 	EWGSeed_2013_July_28	ALIAGA
4. Development of draft ISPM		
4.1 Discussion papers	EWGSeed_2013_July_06	ALIAGA (Prepared by NARGS)

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
	EWGSeed_2013_July_07	ASOMANING
	EWGSeed_2013_July_08	GRIMAULT
	EWGSeed_2013_July_09	HANCOCKS
	EWGSeed_2013_July_10	ISF
	EWGSeed_2013_July_11	ISF
	EWGSeed_2013_July_12	ISF
	EWGSeed_2013_July_13	ISF
	EWGSeed_2013_July_14	ISF
	EWGSeed_2013_July_15	ISF
	EWGSeed_2013_July_16	ISF
	EWGSeed_2013_July_17	ISF
	EWGSeed_2013_July_18	ISF
	EWGSeed_2013_July_19	ISF
	EWGSeed_2013_July_20	ISF
	EWGSeed_2013_July_21	ISF
	EWGSeed_2013_July_22	ISF
	EWGSeed_2013_July_23	LEVI
	EWGSeed_2013_July_24	HORN
	EWGSeed_2013_July_25	NAPPO
	EWGSeed_2013_July_26	NDIKOTAR
	EWGSeed_2013_July_27_rev	SAI
4.2 Outline of points for draft		
4.3 Develop text for draft		
4.4 Agreement on draft		
5. Next Steps		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work plan if needed 		
6. Other business		
7. Close of the meeting		
7.1 Adoption of the report		CHAIR
7.2 Close		CHAIR

APPENDIX 2 : Documents List

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
EWGSeed_2013_July_01	1.6	Agenda	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_02	2.1	Documents list	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_03	2.2	Participants list	2013-04-22
EWGSeed_2013_July_04	2.3	Local information	2013-04-22
EWGSeed_2013_July_05	3.0	Specification 54 - International Movement of Seed	2013-04-03
EWGSeed_2013_July_06	4.1	Background information from the North American Rock Garden Society	2013-05-13
EWGSeed_2013_July_07	4.1	Discussion Paper (Joseph Mireku Asomaning)	2013-05-16
EWGSeed_2013_July_08	4.1	Discussion Paper (Valérie Grimault)	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_09	4.1	Discussion Paper (Bruce Hancocks)	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_10	4.1	Discussion Paper (ISF) – <i>Specifics on the international movement of seed</i>	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_11	4.1	Discussion Paper (ISF) – <i>Regulatory framework</i>	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_12	4.1	Discussion Paper (ISF) – <i>Is seed a pest risk</i>	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_13	4.1	Discussion Paper (ISF) – <i>PRA</i>	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_14	4.1	Discussion Paper (ISF) – <i>Pest classification</i>	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_15	4.1	Discussion Paper (ISF) – <i>Export certification</i>	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_16	4.1	Discussion Paper (ISF) – <i>Diagnostic Protocol</i>	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_17	4.1	Discussion Paper (ISF) – <i>Indirect tests</i>	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_18	4.1	Discussion Paper (ISF) – <i>Phyto measures and verification methods</i>	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_19	4.1	Discussion Paper (ISF) – <i>Equivalency of phyto measures</i>	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_20	4.1	Discussion Paper (ISF) – <i>Additional info in PC</i>	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_21	4.1	Discussion Paper (ISF) – <i>Technical annexes</i>	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_22	4.1	Discussion Paper (ISF) – <i>Technical annexes</i>	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_23	4.1	Discussion Paper (Tami Levi)	2013-05-23
EWGSeed_2013_July_24	4.1	Discussion Paper (N.M. Nico Horn)	2013-05-28
EWGSeed_2013_July_25	4.1	NAPPO RSPM 36	2013-05-31

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
EWGSeed_2013_July_26	4.1	Discussion Paper (Alice Ndikontar)	2013-05-31
EWGSeed_2013_July_27_rev	4.1	Discussion Paper (Masahiro Sai)	2013-07-01
EWGSeed_2013_July_28	3	History of the topic and draft specification (Julie Aliaga)	2013-07-01

APPENDIX 3 : Participants List

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates confirmed attendance at the meeting.

Members not attending are listed at the end.

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Assistant Steward	Ms Julie ALIAGA Program Director, International Standards Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service U.S. Department of Agriculture 4700 River Road, Unit 140 Riverdale, MD 20737 USA Phone: (+1) 301 851 2032 Fax: (+1) 301 734 7639	julie.e.aliaga@aphis.usda.gov
✓	Member	Mr Bruce HANCOCKS Assistant Director, Grains, Nursery stock and Weed Assessment Plant Biosecurity, Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2600 AUSTRALIA Phone: +61 2 6272 3826 Fax: +61 2 6272 3307	bruce.hancocks@daff.gov.au
✓	Member	Ms Alice Ntoboh Siben NDIKONTAR National Project Coordinator TCP/CMR/3303 Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development. Department of Regulation and quality control of Agricultural products and Inputs. Yaounde CAMEROON Phone: + 237 77 56 12 40; +237 22 31 11 36	ndikontarali@yahoo.co.uk
✓	Member	Ms Valérie GRIMAULT Head of Laboratory of Phytopathology GEVES-SNES (Variety and Seed Study and Control Group - Official Seed Testing Station) 25 rue Georges Morel, CS 90024, 49071 Beaucouzé Cedex FRANCE Phone: + 33 2 41 22 58 50	valerie.grimault@geves.fr
✓	Member	Mr Joseph Mireku ASOMANING Research Scientist and Head of the National Tree Seed Centre CSIR-Forestry Research Institute of Ghana GHANA Phone: + 233-268-152571/ 233-244-724894 Fax: + 233 3220 60121	joemirekuaso@gmail.com ; joemirekuaso@yahoo.co.uk

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Member	<p>Mr Masahiro SAI Deputy Director Plant Quarantine Office, Plant Protection Division, Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8950 JAPAN Phone: (+81) 3 3502 5978 Fax: (+81) 3 3502 3386</p>	<p>masahiro_sai@nm.maff.go.jp; saim@pps.maff.go.jp; karafuto masu@hotmail.com;</p>
✓	Member	<p>Ms Mi Chi YEA Quarantine officer, Risk Management Division Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency(QIA), MAFRA 178 Anyang-ro, Manan-gu, Anyang-si, Gyeonggi-do, 430-016, REPUBLIC OF KOREA Phone: +82-31-420-7651 Fax: +82-31-420-7606</p>	<p>kittymc@korea.kr</p>
✓	Member	<p>Ms Phindile N.B. NGESI Chief Agricultural Food and Quarantine Technician South Africa, Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries (nppoza) Po Box 56864 Arcadia, Pretoria 0007 SOUTH AFRICA 6043 Phone: +2712 319 3043/ +2776 223 9055 Fax: +2712 319 6131</p>	<p>PhindileN@daff.gov.za</p>
✓	Member	<p>Mr Edward PODLECKIS Senior Risk Manager USA / USDA-APHIS-Plant Protection and Quarantine 4700 River Road, Unit 133, 4A03.28, Riverdale, MD 20737-1237, USA Phone: 1-301-851-2258</p>	<p>edward.v.podleckis@aphis.usda.gov</p>
✓	Invited expert (ISF)	<p>Mr Gerard MEIJERINK Senior Government Relations Advocate EAME, Syngenta International Seed Federation (ISF) Address: Papenveer 41, 1691 ET, Hauwert, THE NETHERLANDS Phone: +31228366402 (office) +31651206913 (mobile) Fax: +31228317144</p>	<p>gerard.meijerink@syngenta.com</p>
✓	Representative from the Organizer	<p>Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN Coordinating policy officer plant health Ministry of Economic Affairs Directorate-General for Agro Plant Supply Chain and Food Quality Department THE NETHERLANDS Phone: + 31 - 703785552 Mobile: + 31 – 618596867</p>	<p>c.a.m.vanalphen@minez.nl</p>

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Representative from the Host Country	Mr Nico HORN Senior Officer Plant Health Ministry of Economic Affairs National Plant Protection Organization of the Netherlands P.O. Box 9102 6700 HC Wageningen THE NETHERLANDS Phone: +31 6 51 99 81 51 Fax: + 31 – 70 – 421701	n.m.horn@minlnv.nl
✓	IPPC Secretariat / Secretariat lead	Ms Celine GERMAIN FAO, Viale della Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome ITALY Phone: +39 0657054468	Celine.Germain@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Brent LARSON FAO, Viale della Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome ITALY Phone: +39 0657054915	Brent.Larson@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Adriana MOREIRA FAO, Viale della Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome ITALY Phone: +39 0657055809	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org

Not attending:

	Member	Ms Tami LEVI Head of PRA Division, PPIS Plant Protection and Inspection Services (PPIS) P.O.Box 78, Bet-Dagan 50250, ISRAEL Phone: + 972-3-9681586 Fax: + 972-3-9681571	tamil@moag.gov.il
	Steward	Ms Maria Soledad CASTRO DOROCHESSI Head Plant Health Plant Protection Division Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero Av. Bulnes 140, Piso 3 Santiago CHILE Phone: (+562) 3451425 Fax: (+56 2) 3451203	soledad.castro@sag.gob.cl