REPORT

Rome, Italy
5-9 May 2014

Standards Committee
May, 2014

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

CONTENTS

APPENDIXES

1. Opening of the Meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

[1] The IPPC Secretary opened the meeting and welcomed the SC members. He encouraged the SC members to plan SC nominations for members and replacement members well in advance.

[2] The Chairperson welcomed all and in particular the new SC members Mr Guillermo SIBAJA CHINCHILLA (Costa Rica) and Mr Gamil Anwar Mohammad RAMADHAN (Yemen), noting the absence of Mr Ali Amin KAFU (Libya), Mr Imad NAHHAL (Lebanon) and Mr Mohammad Reza ASGHARI (Iran). She noted three observers attended the meeting.

1.2 Election of the Rapporteur

[3] The SC elected Ms Julie ALIAGA (USA) as Rapporteur.

1.3 Adoption of the Agenda

[4] The agenda was adopted as presented in Appendix 1.

2. Administrative Matters

[5] The Secretariat presented the Documents list (Appendix 2), provided SC members with a copy of the IPPC Standard Setting Procedure Manual (2013).

[6] The list of participants is attached as Appendix 3. The Secretariat reminded participants to update their contact details on the IPP (https://www.ippc.int).

[7] The Secretariat provided a document on local information[1] and invited participants to notify the Secretariat of any information that required updating or was missing.

3. Draft ISPMs from Expert Drafting Groups (EWG/TP) for Member Consultation

[24] All draft ISPMs approved by the SC for member consultation are listed in Appendix 4.

3.1. International movement of seed (2009-003), Priority 1

[8] The steward introduced the draft[2] and responded to the TPG February 2014 suggestions[3]. It was recalled that the SC had requested[4] the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ) to review the information in the draft annex on forest tree seeds and revise it.

[9] A group of SC members met to modify the draft standard.

[10] The SC reviewed the draft ISPM. The following general points were raised:

[11] It was felt the draft was comprehensive and provided useful guidance. Some sections that were found too general and already covered in other ISPMs were deleted. Some general guidance that was specifically applicable to this draft ISPM was retained such as the issue of official phytosanitary information not required by the first country of import (ISPM 12:2011) but requested by subsequent countries of importation. This was retained because it was deemed important to reiterate such guidance considering how frequently seeds are re-exported.

[1] IPP link to local information

[2] 2009-003; IPP link to specification; IPP link to EWG Seed report

[3] 11_SC_2014_May Rev.1

[4] IPP link to 2013 November SC report, Appendix 6, 2013_eSC_Nov_11

[12] Guidance on *equivalence of phytosanitary measures* was reduced because this is already a general principle for the IPPC.

[13] Reference to bilateral negotiations was deleted as the IPPC should focus on multilateral issues.

[14] Clarification was asked on the use of the term *seeds* vs *seed*. It was explained that the former refers to the commodity class whereas the latter could refer to seed in the botanical sense. Additionally, it was clarified that the draft does not include tubers (e.g. seed potatoes).

[15] The definitions were changed to use the term *transmitted* instead of *transferred* as this term fitted better the two definitions.

[16] The term *pre-commercial uses* was queried but it was clarified that this is a normal industry term; examples would be importation of seeds for research or for multiplication.

[17] The use of *regulated pests, regulated non-quarantine pests* and *quarantine pests* throughout the draft was reviewed, particularly in relation to *establishment*, because regulated non-quarantine pests would already be established in the area.

[18] It was discussed whether to change the draft as it relates to devitalized seed. However, the text was not changed at this stage for member consultation although it may be questioned whether devitalized seed is strictly covered by the definition of *seeds* in ISPM 5.

[19] It was suggested to not use the term *invasive alien species* in the section on biodiversity and environment because the CBD definition is very broad, and rather use IPPC terminology. It was clarified that the paragraph intended to explain concepts on biodiversity more generally to a CBD audience and that it would not provide clarity to change the term to *plants as pests*. Elsewhere throughout the draft the IPPC terminology was used.

[20] It was suggested to change *sowing* to *propagation* but this was not agreed to because they are not synonyms. Instead the term was changed to *planting* which better reflected the intention.

[21] The intended use of seeds as described in the draft was queried because ultimately, the intended use of seeds would be for planting. However, it was clarified that in some cases after some procedures the seeds may be destroyed.

[22] The inclusion of measures based on the actual risk of establishment was found to be already included in a PRA. It was pointed out that the purpose of the inclusion was to stress that it is only when a quarantine pest can establish that regulation is justified.

[23] Pests that are not seed-borne may be carried with a seed lot as contaminating pests.

[24] Some members did not consider weed seeds as contaminating pests because when the pest is present in the field and the harvested crop cannot reach the appropriate level of purity there is infestation and hence it is not a contaminating pest. Others believed that the ISPM 5 definition of contaminating pest was clear and included weed seeds. However, reference to weed seeds as contaminating pests was left in the draft ISPM.

[25] It was noted that there was a difference between how the term *lot* is normally used in connection with *seeds* and the meaning of the definition of ISPM 5.

[26] Reference to ISPM 36:2012 *(Integrated measures for plants for planting)* was deleted throughout because this standard specifically excludes *seeds*.

[27] It was queried whether to include mention of purity requirements because for many countries this refers to quality requirements only, but for other countries also to pest risk. Some members found it important because there may be aspects of purity that could be used in determining pest risk. It was decided that reference to the possible presence of weed seeds would suffice.

[28] It was suggested to use *tolerant varieties* instead of *resistant varieties* because few plants are truly resistant, but may have tolerance. A member queried if the resistance referred to seed varieties where the pest would still be viable because in that case there would be concerns about importing resistant seeds. It was agreed that tolerance did not convey the intended meaning and the SC agreed to keep *resistant*.

[29] The need for the standard to address record keeping was raised and the SC proposed that NPPOs should keep records associated with phytosanitary certification of seeds for at least 5 years.

[30] Text was modified in relation to coated seeds, as coated seeds may be difficult to inspect, so it was clear that NPPOs of importing countries may request a sample of the seed before coating in order to assess pest presence. It was noted that the coated seed may also be tested under laboratory conditions, as appropriate.

[31] There was concern whether all the examples of physical treatments in the appendix were appropriate considering some of them may affect the seed germination. It was recalled that the appendix does not contain requirements and the examples were kept.

[32] It was agreed to not present any text in the proposed annex on forest tree seeds, reflecting the fact that addition and amendment to the text by TPFQ are foreseen. A note was added in the draft ISPM explaining that the annex would be developed separately and later be presented to the SC.

[33] Regarding the EWG recommendations on implementation issues of the standard, the SC agreed that these should be discussed after members have commented on the draft (following the substantial concerns commenting period).

[34] The SC:

(1) *approved* for member consultation the draft *International movement of seed* (2009-003) as revised during the meeting (Appendix 5).

(2) *noted* the recommendations from the EWG on potential implementation issues[5] and *agreed* to discuss these after the member comments had been received (following substantial concerns commenting period).

3.2. Minimizing pest movement by sea containers (2008-001), Priority 1

[35] The steward introduced the draft including the comments received during the conceptual member consultation held in 2013 on the preliminary draft ISPM and his general responses[6]. The Secretariat provided an update from CPM-9 (2014) on sea containers[7]; CPM decisions are reported in CPM-9 (2014) report.

[36] Ms Julie ALIAGA (USA) summarized the work of the SC subgroup on the Sea Containers survey[8]. This group discussed whether a survey was necessary. The small group requested the help of statisticians (from New Zealand and USA). The statisticians summarized presently available information on contamination on the sea containers pathway previously gathered from surveys and interception data. She presented a paper that included guidance and a form for a potential IPPC survey. The paper concluded that the available information was comprehensive and robust, and recommended that an additional survey would not be necessary for the time being.

[5] IPP link to EWG Seed report

[6] 2008-001; IPP link to specification; IPP link to compiled comments; 10_SC_2014_May; IPP link to TPG meeting report, section 4.2

[7] 17_SC_2014_May

[8] 09_SC_2014_May

[37] One member presented a paper outlining his concerns regarding the sea container survey[9]. He stressed it would not be appropriate to continue the development of an ISPM without a thorough analysis of the level and nature of the pest risk, which would include: scrutiny of existing surveys and data, a new dedicated survey, and practical experience in countries where sea containers are regulated. In addition he felt further information could be gathered after the ILO/IMO/UNECE Code of Practice had been implemented.

[38] Some members found that it was clear from the information available that there is a major contamination issue and hence the continued examination of the extent of the problem in relation to sea containers should not be necessary. Others however, did not find that the available data from existing surveys were sufficient to define the level of risk posed by sea containers.

[39] Many members expressed concern that the draft was still unclear on how the standard would be implemented in practice.

[40] A small group of SC members met to discuss further these issues.

[41] The small group suggested, and the SC agreed, having another EWG that should work on the general concepts and more fundamental issues, and which would provide the SC with possible options on how to move forward. The group should base their conceptual discussions on an analysis the general member comments.

[42] It was suggested that the group should consist of the most active experts from the original EWG, two SC members and two regulatory experts. In addition, one expert from industry and a statistician (who worked with the SC subgroup) should be invited to participate as invited experts.

[43] One member was concerned that the full original expert working group would not be invited to participate because he felt the reasons for only selecting some of the original EWG members were very subjective.

[44] There was no consensus as to the composition of this group and the SC decided that terms of reference for the group should be prepared.

[45] The SC:

(3) *requested* the Steward of the draft ISPM on *Minimizing pest movement by sea containers* (2008-001) to draft terms of reference for the SC to review and approve.

3.3. International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004), Priority 3

[46] The steward introduced the draft[10], the TPG February 2014 suggestions[11], and provided an update from the EWG[12]. A group of SC members met twice to modify the draft. The SC reviewed the draft ISPM. In particular, the following issues were discussed:

[47] The standard should address only NPPOs whereas it was currently also addressing other authorities. It was noted that in some cases, NPPOs may not have the possibility to dialogue with their country's military, but guidance for NPPOs that could be used when interacting with the military could be very helpful. The draft ISPM therefore included an annexed Code of conduct for the international movement of used military vehicles, machinery and equipment. Some members, while acknowledging that this text may be useful, questioned the need for including such text in the standard. The SC decided to change the title and the text's status from an annex to an appendix.

[9] 34_SC_2014_May
[10] 2006-004; IPP link to specification
[11] 12_SC_2014_May
[12] IPP link to the EWG Used equipment report

[48] Vehicles driven across borders had been generally considered to be a lower pest risk by the EWG and hence had been excluded from the standard. This may not always be the case and other factors, such as origin, previous use and storage, may affect the pest risk.

[49] The draft was revised so that it was clear that PRA should always be carried out before regulation. Cleanliness should be in relation to regulated articles only.

[50] The examples of pests that may be associated with the international movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment were moved to an appendix.

[51] It was clarified that the CBD term *invasive alien species* was used in the draft, not the IPPC term *plants as pests*, because it intended to explain concepts on biodiversity more generally to a CBD audience.

[52] The use of the term *checking* vs *inspection* was queried. It was noted that *checking* is used when this is not officially done. To stress that this could also be done by the NPPO, it was agreed to use *inspection or checking* or *verification procedures* throughout the draft, as appropriate.

[53] It was decided not to refer to the different risk categories but rather rank the used vehicles, machinery and equipment in the order of decreasing pest risk in an appendix.

[54] The section on *phytosanitary measures* was changed to *measures* alone because some actions may not be carried out officially (e.g. cleaning). However, it was decided to continue to use the term *treatments* even if in all cases they were not official.

[55] It was clarified in the draft that PRA, in accordance with ISPM 2:2007 *(Framework for pest risk analysis)* and ISPM 11:2013 *(Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests)*, would be used to determine pest risk.

[56] Under *Verification Procedures*, the draft mentioned that phytosanitary certificates were not necessary to attest cleanliness of used vehicles, machinery and equipment because other means (e.g. cleaning certificates) may be used to attest that the used vehicles, machinery and equipment are as free as practically possible from pests and soil. However, it was decided to delete text referring to this issue, because requiring a phytosanitary certificate should not be excluded.

[57] Mention of ISPM 15:2009 was taken out of the draft because it was not deemed appropriate. For wood packaging material ISPM 15:2009 should be consulted.

[58] The SC:

(4) *approved* for member consultation the draft *International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment* (2006-004) as revised during the meeting (Appendix 6).

3.4. Phytosanitary pre-import clearance (2005-003), Priority 3

[59] The steward introduced the draft[13] and gave a summary of the conclusions reached during the SC e-decision forum which ended on 17 January 2014. Six SC members commented and no consensus had been reached. One of the main issues, she explained, was that the term "pre-clearance" had been indiscriminately used in relation to many other related activities under the general "pre-clearance programs" concept. It was suggested in the forum discussion that these related activities be grouped together under a more general concept other than "pre-clearance", for example, under the title of "offshore programs" or "foreign inspections", where the official pre-clearance activity is only one component under the general concept. Ms Julie ALIAGA had prepared a proposed revision to Specification 42 to accommodate this proposal[14].

[60] The SC discussed the different understandings of *pre-clearance*.

[13] 2005-003; IPP link to specification; 30_SC_2014_May;

[14] 26_SC_2014_May

[61] Some members suggested limiting the concept of pre-clearance to being a bilateral agreement where the NPPO of the importing country, in agreement with the exporting country, does import inspections of consignments in the exporting country after the exporting country has certified the consignment against the import requirements.

[62] Others found that the concept should cover pre-clearance programmes which would encompass pre-clearance as one element among several. For instance, field inspections, audit of the treatment facilities, and audit of the field records.

[63] Some found that also audit should be more clearly defined, but others found that the term was well explained in ISPM 20:2004 *(Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system)*.

[64] It was discussed whether the term "pre-clearance" should be deleted from ISPM 5 until it will have been reviewed by the TPG because it is causing confusion and is not in accordance with the Convention text. The SC agreed that the current ISPM 5 definition is incorrect but it was decided to defer this point to another SC meeting.

[65] A small group of SC members met to discuss further the understanding of the concept.

[66] The SC agreed to the concept that would be the basis for further refinement of the draft. The concept agreed was that *in some cases, for facilitating trade logistics, contracting parties may bilaterally negotiate an arrangement for allowing clearance of consignments in the exporting country by the NPPO of the importing country*. This concept was not named.

[67] It was suggested that a small group revise the draft standard based on this understanding, noting that there will be additional elements in the draft standard that will not have been considered and that will need further consideration by the SC.

[68] The SC:

(5) *agreed* that a small group (Marie-Claude FOREST (Canada), Stephen BUTCHER (New Zealand), Ana Lilia MONTEALEGRE (Mexico) and Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina)) would revise the draft standard on *Phytosanitary pre-import clearance* (2005-003) based on the understanding of the concept as described above, and present it to the SC.

3.5. Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) 2014 (1994-001)

[69] The steward introduced the draft[15]. The SC reviewed and modified the draft and, in particular, discussed the following terms:

[70] *Identity (of a consignment)* (2011-001): the definition of the term had been requested already at the occasion of the adoption of ISPM 12:2011 in order to further explain the use of that word in that standard. The TPG had identified that the definition proposed, or any other definition for *identity*, would still leave section 6.1 of ISPM 12:2011 self-contradictory. It was suggested that *identity (of a consignment), integrity (of a consignment) –, phytosanitary security (of a consignment)* (2013-008) and section 6.1 of ISPM 12:2011 be reviewed together for consistency by the TPG. The terms were withdrawn from the draft *Amendments to the Glossary* (2014) and the TPG asked to review them together with section 6.1 in ISPM 12:2011as a consistency review.

[71] *Isolated bark* (*bark* 2013-005): The change from *bark* to *isolated bark* was not agreed to because it was not found that *isolated* provided any additional clarification to the term. Instead it was agreed to change the term to *bark (as a commodity)* and the definition modified accordingly.

[72] *Grain* (2013-018): Some members thought that the definition of *grain* should be limited to only refer to *cereals, oilseeds and pulses*. It was noted that *commodity class* is defined in the Glossary as a group of similar commodities that can be considered together in phytosanitary regulations. Some members felt that all the types of grain, as understood in the current proposed definition (e.g. including coffee

[15] 1994-001

beans or coconuts) should not be considered together. However, others found it was not appropriate to limit the definition because the understanding of grain does vary between countries and because definitions are not developed for a single standard. The SC agreed to send the term for member consultation.

[73] *Kiln-drying* (2013-006): Several members had concerns about the definition stating that kiln-drying could be done with or without heat because in a phytosanitary context kiln-drying would always be done with heat. Having this definition would be contradictory to ISPM 15:2009 *(Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade)* and the draft standard on the *Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood* (2006-029). Others noted that this definition pertains to the industry term and that kiln-drying may or may not be used as a phytosanitary measure. While several members felt that the term should only be defined in the phytosanitary context, others suggested that the term may be used also outside of the phytosanitary context. Several members believed the term could be deleted altogether. The term was withdrawn from the amendments for the TPG to review it further.

[74] *Wood (2013-011)*: The SC generally found the inclusion of *bark as a commodity* in a merged commodity class in the proposed revision to the term confusing. It was noted that it would conflict with the draft on *Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood* (2006-029) because it would refer to one commodity class that included both *wood* and *bark.* Therefore, the words *bark* and *isolated bark* were removed from the definition.

[75] *The SC:*

(6) *approved for member con*sultation the draft *Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)* 2014 (1994-001) as revised during the meeting *(*Appendix 7).

(7) *asked* the TPG to do further review the definitions of *identity (of a consignment)* (2011-001), *integrity (of a consignment)* and *phytosanitary security (of a consignment)* (2013-008) taking into account section 6.1 of ISPM 12:2011 and propose revised definitions of the terms and possible consistency changes to section 6.1 of ISPM 12:2011.

(8) *asked* the TPG to further review *kiln-drying* (2013-006).

4. Draft Specifications for Review of Member Comments and Approval by the SC

4.1. International movement of grain (2008-007), Priority 1

[76] The revised draft specification and responses to member comments were introduced by the steward[16]. She recalled that it had been previously discussed by the SC May 2013 and SC November meetings.

[77] The Secretariat provided an update on the CPM-9 (2014) discussion on the topic[17] where the CPM had agreed that the concept of *traceability* in the phytosanitary context and *diversion from intended use* should be considered further by the Strategic Planning Group (SPG).

[78] One member suggested adding a task on traceability but as this will be discussed by the SPG it should not be added to this specification.

[79] The SC reviewed the draft. In particular, the following issues were discussed:

[80] There was concern that the use of the term *grain* in this specification was intended to only refer to *cereals, oilseeds and pulses* and it may be confused with *grain* as defined in ISPM 5. Some noted that in that case, *grain* should not be used at all in the specification. The SC agreed to delete "*(hereafter: grain)*".

[16] 2008-007; 06_SC_2014_May

[17] 17_SC_2014_May

[81] The SC did not agree to adding text on "risk factors to be taken into account when performing PRA" because ISPM 11:2013 *(Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests)* provides appropriate guidance on PRA.

[82] It was agreed to add *technical justifications* in relation to *phytosanitary measures* because mention of this had been deleted in the preceding paragraph.

[83] Regarding expertise, some SC members did not agree with the statement that experts should be "drawn equally from importing and exporting countries". It was also noted that this did not mean that there would be an equal number of experts physically coming from importing and exporting countries, but rather that the expertise of the group would be balanced and the original text was reinstated.

[84] The SC:

(9) *approved* the Specification 60 *International movement of grain* (2008-007) as revised in the meeting (Appendix 8).

4.2. Revision of ISPM 6:1997 *Guidelines for Surveillance* (2009-004), Priority 1

[85] The revised draft specification and responses to member comments were introduced by the steward[18].

[86] The SC reviewed the draft. In particular, the following issues were discussed:

[87] One member suggested deleting reference to "levels of confidence" because he did not feel that it would be possible to obtain statistical confidence levels for surveillance methodologies. The SC agreed to change "levels of confidence" to "reliability" throughout the specification because this would more adequately reflect the intention.

[88] *Surveillance programmes* was changed to different wording (e.g. actions and methodologies) to not limit the scope of the ISPM, which may not necessarily lead to the development of actual programmes.

[89] It was queried if "reporting procedures" referred to national reporting obligations. It was clarified that this term referred to reporting obligations within countries (i.e. not between countries), and the specification was amended to reflect this throughout. It was noted that the EWG would need to take into account guidance on this provided in ISPM 17:2002 *(Pest reporting).*

[90] It was agreed to delete mention of "surveillance for biodiversity maintenance" because it was not clear what was meant. The remaining text referring to protecting wild flora was sufficient.

[91] One member queried if *use of general surveillance* was an appropriate addition to task two of the specification because the standard should provide guidance on surveillance procedures, not how to use them. This may be more appropriate for ISPM 8:1998 *(Determination of pest status in an area)*. It was explained that because specific surveys are very costly, countries would like to be able to use general surveillance more often with higher reliability, and guidance on the use of general surveillance would be important. The SC agreed on the usefulness of this and amended the task to "design of general surveillance in order to obtain reliable records on pest presence or absence".

[92] A task was added for the EWG to consider whether harmonized survey protocols should be developed for specific pests or pest groups. Some members were hesitant about adding this task, but finally the SC agreed that it would be valuable to consider whether harmonized protocols would be useful.

(10) *approved* the Specification 61 *Revision of ISPM 6:1997* Guidelines for Surveillance (2009-004) as revised in the meeting (Appendix 9).

[18] 2009-004; 08_SC_2014_May

5. List of Topics for IPPC Standards

5.1. Update from CPM-9 (2014) and review of the *List of topics for IPPC standards*

[93] The Secretariat updated the SC on the changes to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* made by CPM-9 (2014)[19].

[94] It was recalled that the *List of topics for IPPC standards* is posted on the IPP in languages before the CPM sessions and after the SC-7 meetings[20].

[95] The SC:

(11) *approved* changes related to subjects to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* as discussed in this meeting.

5.2. Adjustments to stewards

[96] The SC reviewed and made modifications to stewards and assistant stewards for some topics:

[97] 2001-001 *Efficacy of measures*. No steward was assigned because the topic is priority 4 and no work is foreseen in the near future.

[98] 2004-003 *Technical Panel on Pest Free Areas and Systems Approaches for Fruit Flies*. A vacancy for an assistant steward was not filled because the topic already has one assistant steward.

[99] 2008-001 *Minimizing the pest movement by sea containers*: the draft is so advanced that it was not deemed necessary to assign a new assistant steward.

[100] 2008-008 *International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood*. D.D.K. SHARMA (India) was assigned steward.

[101] 2009-002 *Revision of ISPM 4 Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*. Alexandre MOREIRA PALMA (Brazil) was assigned assistant steward.

[102] 2009-003 *International movement of seed*: no additional assistants were assigned because the topic already has two assistant stewards.

[103] 2014-001 *Guidance on pest risk management*. Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina) was assigned steward and Alice NDIKONTAR (Cameroon) was assigned assistant steward.

[104] 2014-002 Authorization of non-NPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions. Marie-Claude FOREST (Canada) was assigned tseward.

[105] TPPT members were selected as stewards and assistant stewards for the five new topics for developing treatment requirements.

[106] 2014-003 *Requirements for the use of chemical treatments as a phytosanitary measure*. Patrick GOMES (USA) was assigned steward and David REES (Australia) assistant steward.

[107] 2014-004 *Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure*. Yuejin WANG (China) was assigned steward and Mike ORMSBY (New Zealand) assistant steward.

[108] 2014-005 *Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure*. Eduardo WILLINK (Argentina) was assigned steward and Andrew JESSUP (Australia) assistant steward.

[109] 2014-006 *Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure*. David REES (Australia) was assigned steward and Scott MEYERS (USA) assistant steward.

[19] 16_SC_2014_May_Rev1

[20] The *List of topics for IPPC standards* is available at: https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards

[110] 2014-007 *Requirements for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure (Revision to ISPM 18)*. Guy HALLMAN (USA) was assigned steward and Andrew PARKER (FAO-IAEA) Assistant steward.

[111] The updates on topics and assigned stewards are reflected in the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (2014-05) as posted on the IPP.

6. Draft Specifications for Approval for Member Consultation

6.1. Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20:2004 Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006), Priority 3

[112] The steward introduced the draft specification[21].

[113] The SC:

(12) *agreed* to have an e-decision to approve the draft specification *Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20:2004* Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006) for member consultation.

6.2. Draft specifications for new topics added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by CPM-9 (2014)

[114] The Secretariat introduced the seven specifications presented at the call for topics 2013 (topics approved then by CPM-9 2014))[22], noting the CPM decision in relation to the revised standard setting process that foresees the submission of a draft specification together with the topic[23].

[115] The Secretariat explained that five of the specifications were related to requirements for the use of specific treatments as a phytosanitary measure (fumigation, temperature, modified atmosphere, irradiation and chemical treatments). To reduce redundancy and the amount of work that member countries have to do in commenting on draft specifications, the Secretariat, supported by the TPPT, had developed a generic specification that encompasses the various treatments into one draft specification (2014-008) for the development of the five standards. The SC agreed to this approach.

[116] The SC made some suggestions to clarify the draft, for example the expertise section of this generic specification may be modified to address the need for additional and specific experts to be invited to provide specific expertise to work with the TPPT for the drafting of the different individual standards.

[117] The SC:

(13) *invited* SC members to submit written comments to the TPPT steward Bart ROSSEL (Australia) and the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) on the draft specification *Requirements for the use of phytosanitary treatments as phytosanitary measures* (2014-008), no later than 31 May 2014.

(14) *invited* SC members to submit written comments to the steward Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina) and the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) on the draft specification on *Guidance on pest risk management* (2014-001), no later than 31 May 2014.

(15) *invited* SC members to submit written comments to the steward Marie-Claude FOREST (Canada) and the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) on the draft specification on *Authorization of non-NPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002) no later than 31 May 2014.

(16) *agreed* to have an e-decision to approve the three draft specifications as listed above for member consultation.

[21] 2008-006

[22] 31_SC_2014_May; 2014-001; 2014-002; 2014-003; 2014-004; 2014-005; 2014-006; 2014-007

[23] See decision 14 from CPM-7 (2012) decisions on improving the standard setting process

7. Standards Committee

7.1. Report of the SC November 2013

[118] There was no comment on the report[24].

7.2. Follow-up on actions from the SC November 2013

Concept note: purpose, status and content of ISPMs

[119] SC November 2013 had tasked Mr NORDBO (Denmark) and Mr HEDLEY (New Zealand) to produce a consolidated document on the Purpose, status and content of ISPMs, based also on comments from other SC members. Mr NORDBO summarized the paper[25] explaining the main considerations. It had been suggested that this guidance should be included as an annex to the IPPC Style Guide.

[120] Some members suggested that due to the importance and the extent of implications of this document, it should be reviewed by the FAO Legal office and requested the Secretariat to discuss with the CPM Bureau with the hope that it could also be presented to the SPG for review. It was also suggested that it should be presented to the CPM.

[121] The SC:

(17) *asked* the Secretariat to present the paper on the *Purpose, status and content of ISPMs* to the CPM Bureau with the request that the SPG review it.

(18) *asked* the Secretariat to subsequently invite the FAO Legal service to review the paper on the *Purpose, status and content of ISPMs* to determine the legal implications it may have.

Supporting documentation

[122] This issue was deferred to a future meeting.

Framework for IPPC standards

[123] The SC was updated on the work on the Framework for standards[26] and the CPM-9 (2014) conclusions, highlighting that CPM urged the SC to finalize the Framework for standards gap analysis and present it to CPM for adoption[27]. The Secretariat explained that members of the SC subgroup, in the margins of CPM-9 (2014), had developed the draft terms of reference for finalization of the Framework.

[124] The Standards Officer informed the SC that the Framework would be a fundamental tool for the IPPC in particular for implementation needs, and suggested other experts, outside of the SC, be invited to participate in the upcoming meeting on the Framework scheduled for the last week of August 2014 to be hosted by the NPPO of Costa Rica.

[125] The SC reviewed and adjusted the composition of the group as presented in Appendix 10. The SC also decided to invite the current chairs of the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) and the National Reporting Obligation Advisory Group (NROAG), as well as Magda GONZÁLEZ ARROYO in her capacity as former SC member and host.

[126] The SC:

(19) *reviewed* and *approved* the terms of reference as revised in this meeting for the development of the Framework for IPPC Standards (Appendix 10).

[24] IPP link to November 2013 SC report
[25] 18_SC_2014_May
[26] 27_SC_2014_May
[27] 17_SC_2014_May

Initiation of the review of the standard setting procedure

[127] The Chairperson introduced the paper on the review of the standard setting[28]. The SC agreed to collect comments from the SC members for the small SC group to consider[29]. It was suggested that any comments on the establishment of an editorial team[30] (see agenda item 9.3) should also be submitted along with the comments.

[128] The SC:

(20) *invited* SC members to submit written comments to the small SC group (Piotr WLODARCZYK (Poland) (lead), Jane CHARD (United Kingdom), Julie ALIAGA (USA), Alexandre MOREIRA-PALMA (Brazil) and Motoi SAKAMURA (Japan)) and the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) on the review of the standard setting procedure and the establishment of an editorial team no later than 15 August 2014.

(21) *requested the* small SC group to present a new discussion paper to the SC taking into account the SC member comments.

Consistency in languages[31]

[129] This issue was deferred to a future meeting.

Engaging experts in the standard setting process[32]

[130] This issue was deferred to a future meeting.

Transparency in selecting TP and EWG experts[33]

[131] This issue was deferred to a future meeting.

7.3. Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (December 2013 - April 2014)

[132] The Secretariat presented a summary of polls and forums discussed on the e-decision site[34]. It was noted that the participation of SC members in the e-decision process is important and active participation from all was encouraged. As suggested by SC members in the 2013 November SC meeting, the IPPC Secretariat had tried to group and plan e-decisions by set dates and the SC agreed to continue this practice.

[133] The SC noted the six draft phytosanitary treatments and four draft diagnostic protocols had been approved for member consultation (as listed in Appendix 11).

[134] The SC:

(22) *noted* the update on polls and forums discussed on the e-decision site (December 2013 - April 2014) (Appendix 11).

[28] 20_SC_2014_May

[29] The members of the small SC group were selected by the SC November 2013, see Section 3.1 of the 2013 November SC report.

[30] 07_SC_2014_May

[31] 05_SC_2014_May

[32] 29_SC_2014_May

[33] 04_SC_2014_May

[34] 33_SC_2014_May

8. Review of Technical Panels

[135] The SC thanked the technical panels (TPs) for the great amount of work that all members, stewards, technical leads and DP authors do and the significant results produced, as well as the organizations and NPPOs that provide in-kind support and funding for the TP meetings and inter-sessional work.

[136] The Standards Officer thanked all the Secretariat panel leads and support staff for the all their efforts to ensure productive meetings and inter-sessional work of the technical panels.

8.1. Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT)

[137] The Secretariat presented the activities of the TPPT[35] as well as a TPPT position paper on acceptance of the phytosanitary treatments based on historical evidence[36].

[138] It was noted that a call for additional members would be issued soon.

[139] The TPPT steward highlighted that the panel does an enormous amount of work and that the experts are there in their technical capacity, not to represent countries. He reminded the SC to keep this in mind during the consultative steps of the standard setting process where countries have ample possibility to review the drafts, in order to avoid receiving numerous formal objections on phytosanitary treatments during the final stages.

[140] The SC Chairperson echoed this by noting that sometimes countries cannot find the relevant information to understand the work done on the draft PTs. She suggested that, for instance, TP position papers could be posted publicly on the IPP because it is fundamental that countries have access to relevant information. However, it was noted that the SC would need to approve them before making them publicly available.

[141] The SC was reminded that supporting documents for e-decisions (such as TPPT responses to the formal objections) are archived on the IPP and can be accessed by SC members after login.

[142] One member queried the current process for treatments having received formal objections 14 days prior to CPM. The SC Chairperson noted that the TPPT response to the formal objections will be approved by the SC. The member, however, stressed that experts in member countries may not have this information available and would not understand how the formal objections had been addressed. It was pointed out that countries need to work with SC members in their region to be kept informed of SC decisions.

[143] In this context, the Secretariat noted that an additional challenge currently is that PTs and DPs that are submitted to the SC via e-decision are not available to contracting parties. This issue is being addressed by setting up a webpage on the IPP where all draft phytosanitary treatments and diagnostic protocols submitted to the SC for approval can be viewed by NPPOs or RPPOs after login.

[144] The Secretariat additionally proposed to publicly post the responses to member comments on DPs and PTs once the SC approved them.

[145] Some members queried why the SC does not approve the *Working TPPT criteria for treatment evaluation* because they felt that the criteria are fundamental for the TPPT work and that the SC should review and approve them. It was clarified that these criteria are fully based on ISPM 28:2007 *(Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests)* or other SC decisions are added to the IPPC Procedure Manual for standard setting to ensure transparency about how treatments are evaluated. Also, these criteria may be used by national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) and regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) as a reference when developing and submitting treatments. It was clarified that the working criteria are reviewed at each TPPT face-to-face meeting and updated as needed.

[35] IPP link to TPPT meeting reports; 22_SC_2014_May

[36] 21_SC_2014_May

[146] The TPPT had proposed that an IPPC Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) survey be carried out on the implementation of ISPM 18:2003 *(Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measures)*. Some members suggested that the survey should be done before proceeding with the revision of the specification for ISPM 18:2003 because the survey could determine the revision needs. Several members agreed that a survey should be requested but were worried that it would set a precedent if the outcomes of IRSS surveys were always needed before finalizing specifications for the revision of ISPMs. The Secretariat also recalled that the IRSS proposal would depend on CPM Bureau approval.

[147] It was queried if there should be a new call for treatments, because there are few treatments left on TPPT work programme. The Secretariat recalled that there are limited resources currently available for this work. The Secretariat would prefer to not make a new call for treatments in 2014, unless additional long-term resources to support the completion of these PTs would be identified as it would be frustrating for members to submit treatments and not have them reviewed. One member noted that there is much ongoing research on phytosanitary treatments and additional calls would encourage the development of new treatments.

[148] Some members queried the proposal for the TPPT to liaise with the Phytosanitary Temperature Treatments Expert Group, which is an informal group not under the auspices of the IPPC. The concerns related particularly to formalizing ties with this group when the SC had no role in managing the group. Others expressed appreciation for the work carried out by this group that works independently and is not funded by the IPPC; they considered that it could provide useful scientific information for use by the TPPT. The Secretariat stressed that the SC oversees the TPPT work and would therefore review any outcomes from this liaison. It was also explained that the TPFQ liaises with IFQRG in a similar fashion.

[149] Regarding the TPPT position paper on acceptance of the phytosanitary treatments based on historical evidence, the SC agreed to submit comments on this paper to the TPPT Steward and Secretariat by the end of August 2014. The TPPT steward would then revise the paper and present it back to the SC.

[150] The SC:

(23) *noted* the TPPT reports from: 2013 June Virtual Meeting; 2013 July Meeting (Fukuoka, Japan); 2013 September Virtual Meeting; 2014 January Virtual Meeting.

(24) *agreed* that SC responses to member consultation comments on draft PTs and DPs are publically posted on the IPP.

(25) *agreed* that TP position papers be posted publically after they are approved by the SC.

(26) *requested* the Secretariat to present to the CPM Bureau a proposal on an IPPC Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) survey on the implementation of ISPM 18:2003 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*).

(27) *agreed* to add a task on taking into account any relevant results from IRSS activities when revising the specification for the *Revision of ISPM 18:2003*.

(28) *approved TPPT* medium term plan (Appendix 8 to the 2013 July TPPT meeting report).

(29) *noted* that the *Working TPPT criteria for treatment evaluation* has been added to the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting and is reviewed at every face-to-face meeting, and *asked* the Secretariat to emphasize to contracting parties the availability of this document on the IPP.

(30) *requested* the TPPT to review section 3.1 of the *Working TPPT criteria for treatment evaluation* and revise it to be in line with ISPM 28:2007 if needed.

(31) *requested* a member of the TPPT to act as liaison with the Phytosanitary Temperature Treatments Expert Group to exchange information on the research of temperature treatments to help support the development of international phytosanitary treatments.

(32) *thanked* Mr Antarjo DIKIN (Indonesia) for his work as Steward for the TPPT.

(33) *thanked* Mr Min-Goo PARK (Republic of Korea) for his contribution to the TPPT as a member.

(34) *asked* the SC members to submit comments on the TPPT position paper on acceptance of experience or historical based phytosanitary treatments (21_SC_2014_May) to the Secretariat (IPPC@fao.org) and the TPPT Steward Bart ROSSEL (Australia) by 31 August 2014 for the TPPT Steward to revise the paper and present it back to the SC.

8.2. Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG)

[151] The Secretariat presented the activities of the TPG[37].

[152] The Standards Officer queried the work scheduled on the official CBD translations for CBD terms and definitions which have been used in Appendix 1 of ISPM 5, because he felt that this was not the mandate of the TPG but rather an issue to be brought to the attention of the CBD Secretariat. Some SC members also worried about the extent of the TPG work programme, and did not find this translation issue to be a technical task for the TPG. The TPG steward noted that the issue is of concern to contracting parties. After some discussion, it was agreed to not add it to the TPG work programme.

[153] The Secretariat had asked that new terms added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* be translated by the TPG members to ensure that the first translation of these terms is correct from a phytosanitary viewpoint.

[154] The TPG had been consulted on how to ensure that it is clear which Glossary terms are being worked on. The Secretariat proposed to list the new terms being worked on by the TPG in the publication history of ISPM 5 and the Glossary terms under revision would have a * added to indicate that they are also on the TPG work programme.

[155] There was concern that the proposal to analyze consistency in ISPM titles would entail reviewing existing titles, but it was clarified that it would be to ensure consistency in titles of future ISPMs and to save time when discussing titles of ISPMs. The SC did not agree with the recommendation.

[156] As to the recommendation on considering a task related to the terms *authorize, accredit, certify* (2013-004) when discussing the draft specification *Authorization of non-NPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002), it was decided that the steward should keep this in mind when revising the draft specification.

[157] Regarding the understanding of the term *phytosanitary measure* in the IPPC context, the TPG had asked that the SC discuss this because it was clear from the member comments on *exclusion, suppression, eradication, containment* and *control* that contracting parties have different understandings of this term. The TPG Steward explained the two understandings that the TPG had outlined: narrow which would include only measures established by the importing country (*official measures* would be used in the exporting country), and broad, which would include measures established by either the importing or the exporting country. Phytosanitary measures should be used in relation with regulated pests only.

[158] He explained that the Convention text mentions *phytosanitary measures* several times, but always with the narrow understanding, and that this is not the case in all ISPMs.

[159] The SC agreed to have a small group to discuss the issue and prepare a paper for the SC to consider.

[160] One member requested that a revision of the definition of *endangered area* be reinstated on the TPG work programme and offered to provide a rationale and inputs to the TPG on this.

[161] The SC:

(35) *noted* the issues associated with *phytosanitary measure* and *asked* a small group (lead: Alexandre MOREIRA-PALMA (Brazil), Stephen BUCTHER (New Zealand), John HEDLEY (New Zealand), Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark), Bart ROSSEL (Australia), D.D.K. SHARMA

[37] IPP link to TPG meeting report; 32_SC_2014_May Rev.1

(India), Lifeng WU (China), to discuss the meaning of *phytosanitary measure* taking into consideration the TPG analysis, and report back to the SC November 2014.

(36) *Agreed* that the proposed revisions of the terms *exclusion (2010-008), suppression (2011-002), eradication (2011-003), containment (2011-004), control* (2011-005) are withdrawn from the *Amendments to the Glossary* (2013) until the SC has discussed and clarified the understanding of *phytosanitary measure* and *asked* the Secretariat to apply this change.

(37) Regarding *contaminating pest* (2012-001):

a) *agreed* that the proposed deletion of *contaminating pest* (2012-001) is withdrawn from the *Amendments to the Glossary* (2013) and *asked* the Secretariat to apply this change.

b) *approved* the addition of *contamination* to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* under the same topic number as *contaminating pest* (2012-011).

c) *requested* the TPG to rediscuss *contaminating pest* and *contamination* at its next meeting (also taking account of member comments made at the 2013 MC on *contaminating pest*) and make a proposal to the SC May 2015.

(38) Regarding *area of low pest prevalence* (2013-014):

a) *noted* that the change from "surveillance, control or eradication" to "surveillance or control" in the definition of *area of low pest prevalence* was already made in the *Amendments for the Glossary 2013* and is a consistency change.

b) *agreed* that this change is maintained in the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2013* to be processed through the SC-7 to SCCP and CPM.

c) *requested the SC-7* to review and modify the explanation added to the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2013* before the SCCP, in order to inform CPM members in a transparent manner.

(39) Regarding authorize, accredit, certify (2013-004):

a) *noted* that a draft statement to be included in the *General recommendations for consistency* will be prepared on the terms for discussion in the TPG 2015 meeting.

(40) *agreed* that the current definition of *bark* in ISPM 5 may remain as it is.

(41) *added* the term *bark (as a commodity)* to the *Amendments to the Glossary 2014* (1994-001)

(42) Regarding *commodity pest list* (2013-013):

a) *agreed* that the definition of *commodity pest list* does not need to be modified.

b) *removed commodity pest list* (2013-013) from the *List of topics for IPPC standards.*

(43) Regarding *pest list* (2012-014):

a) *agreed* that it is not necessary to define *pest list* (nor *pest listing*).

b) *noted* that ambiguities in the use of *pest list* in ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 6:1997, ISPM 8:1998 and ISPM 11:2013 should be corrected at revision of these standards and request the Secretariat to archive this until revision (Appendix 8 of the TPG report).

c) *removed pest list* (2012-014) from the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

(44) *noted* the proposal that ISPM 25:2006 be modified at revision with regards to *phytosanitary security* and the escape of pests from consignments in transit, and *request* the Secretariat to archive this case for future revision (Appendix 8 of the TPG report).

(45) *agreed* that the term *survey* (2013-015) be made "pending" on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, until a draft revised ISPM 6:1997 is available.

(46) *noted* the changes to be made to ISPMs for consistency in relation to *visual inspection* at revision, and *request* the Secretariat archive those until revision (Appendix 8 of TPG February 2014 report).

(47) *asked* the TPPT to discuss *effective dose* (2013-017), envisaging the options proposed by the TPG.

(48) *noted* the modified *General recommendations on consistency* (Appendix 7 of the TPG report).

(49) *requested* the Secretariat to transfer the ink amendments not accepted by CPM-8 (2013) to Tables B and archive them for future consideration when the standards concerned are revised.

(50) *noted* the paper *TPG activities in relation to languages* for inclusion in the Procedure Manual under the TPG (Appendix 2 of the TPG report).

(51) *noted* that the Secretariat had requested the help of TPG members in relation to the translation of terms in the *List of topics for IPPC standards.*

(52) *noted* the TPG work plan (Appendix 9 of the TPG report).

(53) *approved* the TPG medium term plan (Appendix 10 of the TPG report).

(54) *agreed* that Mr Smith be invited to the TPG February 2015 meeting as an invited expert.

(55) *added* the term *endangered area* (2014-009) to the List of topics for IPPC standards.

(56) *agreed* to offer a second five-year term on the TPG to Beatriz MELCHO (Spanish) and Andrei ORLINSKI (Russian) at the end of their terms in 2015.

***Consistency across ISPMs: specific proposals related to* phytosanitary status**

[162] The TPG Assistant steward introduced the consistency proposal related to *phytosanitary status* (2010-004)[38], noting that this is often used in ISPMs with different meanings. He also reiterated the importance of using consistent terminology and that one concept should have one term.

[163] The SC:

(57) *reviewed* and *approved* the ink amendments proposed to some ISPMs in order to replace *phytosanitary status*, to be presented to the CPM for noting (Appendix 12).

(58) *requested* the Secretariat to archive changes proposed in Tables B for future consideration when revising the ISPMs concerned.

(59) *noted* that work continues on the need for, and content, of a definition of *phytosanitary status (of a consignment)* (2010-004), based upon a few cases where the term could usefully remain in use.

(60) *noted* that an amendment to the *General recommendations on consistency* was proposed with regards to *phytosanitary status*.

***Consistency across ISPMs: specific proposals related to* trading partners**

[164] The TPG Steward introduced the paper on the consistency proposal related to *trading partners* (2013-009)[39].

[165] There were some concerns regarding the proposal for replacing all the uses of *trading partners* with *importing countries.* The TPG was therefore asked to review the proposals again.

[166] The SC:

(61) *agreed* that the TPG review the proposed ink amendments for the term *trading partners* (2013-009) again.

Proposed ink amendments to ISPM 5

[167] The TPG Steward introduced the proposed ink amendments to ISPM 5[40], noting that the terms and definitions for commodity classes in the Glossary do not follow the current practice where descriptive or delimiting elements (here: "as a commodity class") belong to the term and not to the definition. For this reason corrections of the cases presented in Table A would ensure consistency across ISPM 5 in this respect.

[38] 14_SC_2014_May

[39] 15_SC_2014_May

[40] 13_SC_2014_May

[168] The SC:

(62) *approved* the ink amendments proposed to ISPM 5, to be presented to the CPM for noting (Appendix 13).

8.3. Technical Panel for Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP)

[169] The Secretariat presented the activities of the TPDP[41], highlighting major accomplishments and noting that in the upcoming years, many diagnostic protocols (DPs) will become available for member consultation and/or notification periods.

[170] For some DPs there were very few to no nominations in response to calls for DP authors which makes the development of DPs challenging. The Secretariat encouraged the SC members to help identify suitable authors and submit nominations in response to calls for authors.

[171] The SC:

(63) *noted* the 2013 TPDP June Meeting report, the 2013 TPDP December Virtual Meeting report and the 2014 TPDP February Virtual Meeting report.

(64) *approved* the TPDP medium term plan (Appendix 6 of the 2013 TPDP June meeting report).

(65) *noted* the modified version of *Study on the utility of IPPC diagnostic protocols* (Appendix 5 of the 2013 June meeting report).

(66) *noted* the revised TPDP *Instructions for authors protocols* which are included in the IPPC Procedure Manual for standard setting.

(67) *agreed* offering a second five-year term on the TPDP to Delano JAMES (Canada – Virology).

(68) *thanked* Fabienne GROUSSET, who no longer supports this panel, for her excellent work.

8.4. Technical Panel on Pest Free Areas and Systems Approaches for Fruit Flies (TPFF)

[172] The Secretariat presented the activities of the TPFF[42].

[173] The SC:

(69) *noted* the activities of the TPFF.

8.5. Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ)

[174] The Secretariat presented the activities of the TPFQ[43].

[175] The steward for the draft ISPM on *Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood* (2006-029) expressed appreciation for the help provided by members of the TPFQ in responding to technical comments.

[176] The SC:

(70) *noted* the following TPFQ meeting reports: June 2013 face-to-face meeting report; May 2013, July 2013, October 2013, December 2013, and February 2014 virtual meeting reports.

(71) *noted* the activities of the TPFQ.

[41] IPP link to TPDP meeting reports; 23_SC_2014_May

[42] IPP link to TPFF page; 24_SC_2014_May

[43] IPP link to TPFQ meeting reports; 25_SC_2014_May

9. Updates from other relevant bodies

9.1. Items arising from CPM-9 (2014)

Election of the SC Vice-Chairperson (term starting after SC-7 meeting)

[177] The current SC Vice-chairperson's term would end after this meeting and a new SC member to fill the position was elected. Additionally, since the current Vice-Chairperson was absent, the newly elected Vice-Chairperson was asked to take on the position immediately.

[178] The SC:

(72) *elected* Ms Ruth WOODE as SC Vice-chairperson.

Confirmation of SC-7 membership for 2015

[179] The Secretariat presented the membership of the SC as confirmed by CPM-9 (2014). The SC selected the SC membership for the SC-7[44].

[180] The SC:

(73) *agreed* to the membership of the SC-7 as presented in the Participants list (Appendix 3).

Draft ISPM on Determination of host status of fruit to fruit fly (Tephritidae) (2006-031): formal objection received prior to CPM-9 (2014)[45]

[181] The draft ISPM on *Determination of host status of fruit to fruit fly (Tephritidae)* (2006-031) had received formal objections 14 days prior to CPM-9 (0214) in relation to the use of *conditional host* instead of *non-natural host*.

[182] The Standards Officer noted that the normal practice to resolve issues such as formal objections is to request assistance from the steward.

[183] The steward joined the meeting via conference call and presented a revised version of the draft where reference to *conditional host* had been modified to *host under the conditions specified in this standard.*

[184] He stressed that the TPFF found that both terms previously proposed in the standard (*conditional host* instead of *non-natural host*) could be used. However, the proposed revised draft addressed the formal objection by suggesting a compromise where the concept did not have a term and definition.

[185] Some members felt a need to have a specific term that NPPOs could use because implementation of the standard may otherwise be difficult in practice.

[186] Others noted that several countries already implement the concept and they use different terminology. Additionally, conditions change between countries and the current draft accommodates this.

[187] The SC generally agreed with the steward's proposal but suggested that the TPFF review if the proposed revision was consistent with how this concept was referred to in the draft ISPM. The TPFF may amend the draft for consistency in relation to this concept. The SC would review the TPFF suggestions at their November 2014 meeting.

[188] The SC:

(74) *asked* the TPFF to review, as input to the SC November 2014 meeting, the revised draft ISPM on *Determination of host status of fruit to fruit fly (Tephritidae)* (2006-031) in relation to the concept *host under the conditions specified in this standard* only and provide their opinion on whether the proposed revision was appropriate, or make minor adjustments for consistency. If not present a revised proposal to SC November 2014, taking into account the SC's discussion.

[44] 17_SC_2014_May
[45] 2006-031; CPM 2014/INF/05; IPP link to TPG meeting report, section 5.1

Seven draft cold treatments: formal objections received prior to CPM-9 (2014)[46]

[189] The Standards Officer introduced the issue, noting that the TPPT discussed responses to the formal objections in their virtual meeting, April 2014, but had not been able to conclude.

[190] The SC Chairperson highlighted some of the major issues presented in the formal objections that warranted SC discussions. For instance whether there is cold tolerance in different populations of fruit flies; whether a PT should be applicable for all countries or whether treatments are available as choices for countries to use. The SC reiterated that the use of IPPC adopted PTs is not mandatory; and whether an ISPM on operation of cold treatments was necessary before the cold treatments would be adopted.

[191] She noted that some of the PTs had now received two formal objections and that this should be kept in mind when processing PTs in the future because they may need to be presented to CPM for adoption by a voting process. Furthermore, she noted that there are cold treatments that will be submitted for member consultation in 2014, i.e. before the issues presented in the formal objections will have been resolved.

[192] A member suggested some appropriate wording to be developed to accompany PTs out for consultation.

[193] It was agreed that the issues should be thoroughly discussed by the TPPT in their face-to-face meeting in June 2014. The TPPT should address technical issues and identify issues that are philosophical and require further discussion by the SC.

[194] The SC:

(75) in relation to the formal objections received before CPM-9 (2014) on seven cold treatments, *invited* the TPPT, in their 2014 face-to-face meeting, to address technical issues and identify issues that require further discussion by the SC, and prepare a response for the SC November 2014.

9.2. General update from the IPPC Secretariat (November 2013 – April 2014)

[195] The Coordinator presented an update of the IPPC Secretariat activities highlighting some of the CPM-9 (2014) outcomes and providing the SC members a copy of the IPPC Secretariat 2013 annual report.

[196] The IPPC Communications plan will be finalized soon and this will be used as a tool also to raise extra-budgetary funds.

[197] The Secretariat is working towards becoming a member of the liaison group for biodiversity related conventions because this would open up access to additional funding opportunities.

[198] He noted that there will be an Open-ended working group meeting on implementation 4-7 August 2014 at FAO HQ. Some SC members expressed concern that this meeting had not been announced earlier because it may be challenging for SC members and contracting parties, especially from developing countries, to get approval to attend at such short notice.

[199] The ePhyto steering group will also meet in July 2014 and the feasibility study on establishing an ePhyto hub will be discussed at this meeting.

[200] The IRSS Officer reported on the IRSS activities noting that the second three-year cycle of IRSS started on 1 April 2014, thanks to funding from the EU and Switzerland. CPM had expressed interest in incorporating IRSS activities into the overall implementation scheme, and this will be discussed in the Open-ended working group meeting on implementation.

[46] CPM 2014/INF/05

[201] He also noted that the IRSS results for ISPM 17:2002 *(Pest reporting)* and ISPM 19:2003 *(Guidelines on lists of regulated pests)* have been posted on the IPP, and he encouraged SC members to review the findings and use them should these standards be revised in the future.

[202] He noted that new IRSS work proposals should be received before the end of May 2014 so they can be considered by the Bureau in June 2014 and to see how they fit into the implementation scheme.

[203] The SC informed the IRSS officer that the SC had one proposal for the IRSS, a request for a survey on ISPM 18:2003 implementation similar to the one conducted on ISPM 6:1997 (see also agenda item 8.1). The IRSS officer noted that a study on the concept of equivalence would be released by the end of June 2014. He stressed it could be used when ISPM 24:2005 *(Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures)* is revised.

9.3. Update from the Standard setting team of the IPPC Secretariat

[~~204~~] The Standards Officer introduced the paper highlighting the Standard setting team's major accomplishments since November 2013[47].

[205] He noted that some Regional workshop participants had suggested it would be helpful if the steward presentations on ISPMs would contain some additional details on the main issues related to the draft standards presented for member consultation.

[206] Lastly, the Standards Officer introduced the Standard stetting team, pointing out that the details about the staff are now available on the IPP[48].

Replacement of old versions of ISPMs by latest versions of ISPMs and mechanism for the future

[207] The Secretariat presented the in-depth analysis, carried out in close consultation with the FAO Legal service, of all ISPMs undertaken to determine whether replacing previous versions of ISPMs by latest versions would be possible[49]. Currently, several versions of the same ISPM are in principal in force, because old versions are not formally replaced by later adopted versions. Additionally, some ISPMs currently contain cross-references to old versions that have been revised. The Secretariat proposed a simplified mechanism to clarify which versions of ISPMs are in force and to put in place a mechanism to ensure older versions of ISPMs are replaced by new versions and previous versions are revoked.

[208] The Secretariat suggest minor changes would be decided by the SC and only noted by the CPM and the proposed changes in Table 1, Annex 2, would need further study by the SC.

[209] He further clarified that there would be a revocation process where all previous versions would be replaced by current versions. Hereafter, revised versions of the standards would automatically replace the previous ones and older versions revoked. Previous version of ISPMs would not be made available on the IPP but only upon request.

[210] It was suggested to have a small group to discuss the analysis presented and prepare a discussion paper to (i) adjust and finalize the proposals as listed in Annex 2 of document 28_SC_2014_May, and; (ii) c*onsider* and *propose* a mechanism for the future to help ensuring that proper revisions are made to relevant standards each time a revised version of an existing standard is adopted. The proposal would be presented to CPM.

[211] The SC:

(76) *invited* SC members to submit comments to the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) and to the small group (Jane CHARD (United Kingdom) (lead), John HEDLEY (New Zealand), Thanh Huong

[47] 19_SC_2014_May

[48] Standard setting staff: https://www.ippc.int/publications/standard-setting-staff-updated-2013-03-17

[49] 28_SC_2014_May

HA (Viet Nam), Rebecca LEE (NAPPO)) on the proposal presented in document 28_SC_2014_May no later than 15 August 2014.

(77) *requested* a small group to discuss the analysis presented and prepare a discussion paper for the SC and a draft CPM paper taking into account the above considerations.

Establishing an editorial team for draft ISPMs [50]

[24] This was discussed under agenda item 7.2 *Initiation of the review of the standard setting procedure*.

10. SC recommendations for CPM-10 (2015) decisions

[25] There were no SC recommendations for CPM-10 (2015) decisions.

11. Agenda items deferred to future SC Meetings

[26] The following agenda items were deferred to the next SC meeting:

- Deletion of the term *pre-clearance* from ISPM 5 *Glossary of Phytosanitary terms* (under agenda item 3.4)
- Supporting documentation (under agenda item 7.2)
- Consistency in languages (under agenda item 7.2)
- Engaging experts in the standard setting process (under agenda item 7.2)
- Transparency in selecting TP and EWG experts (under agenda item 7.2)

12. Review of the Standard Setting Calendar

[212] The Secretariat explained that the standard setting calendar is presented on the IPP[51].

[213] Stewards for draft ISPMs approved for member consultation were reminded to provide presentations for the IPPC regional workshops, and the deadline for submission to the Secretariat is 15 June 2014 (a template will be emailed to the stewards).

[214] The SC:

(78) *noted* the standard setting calendar for 2014.

13. Other business

13.1 Future e-decisions

[215] E-decisions on the following items were likely to be submitted to the SC before the next meeting:

Draft DPs for adoption by the SC on behalf of the CPM:

- *Phyllosticta citricarpa* Kiely on fruit (2004-023)
- *Potato spindle tuber viroid* (2006-022)
- *Xanthomonas citri* subsp. *citri* (2004-011)

Draft DPs for approval for member consultation:

- *Xanthomonas fragariae* (2004-012)
- *Sorghum halepense* (2006-027)

[50] 07_SC_2014_May

[51] Link to the IPP calendar

- Genus *Liriomyza* spp. (2006-017)
- *Xiphinema americanumm* (2004-025)
- *Aphelenchoides besseyi*, *A. ritzemabosi* and *A. fragariae* (2006-025)
- *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* (2004-016)
- *Citrus tristeza virus* (2004-021)
- *Tomato spotted wilt virus* (TSWV), *Impatiens necrotic spot virus* (INSV) and *Watermelon silver mottle virus* (WSMoV) (2004-019).

Draft PTs for approval for member consultation

- Vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Mangifera indica* (2010-107)
- Sulfuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material (2007-101)
- Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating (2007-114)

Draft phytosanitary treatments for approval for CPM-10 adoption

- Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus sinensis* (2007-206A)
- Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus reticulata* x *Citrus sinensis* (2007-206B
- Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus limon* (2007-206C)
- Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Citrus sinensis* (2007-206E)
- Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Citrus reticulata* x *Citrus sinensis* (2007-206F)
- Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Citrus limon* (2007-206G)
- Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus paradisi* (2007-210)
- Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus reticulata* cultivars and hybrids (2007-212)
- Irridiation treatment for *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes*, *Planococcus lilacinus* and *Planococcus minor* (2012-011)

Draft specifications for approval for member consultation

- *Use of permits as import authorization* (Annex to ISPM 20:2004 *Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) (2008-006)
- *Requirements for the use of phytosanitary treatments as phytosanitary measures* (2014-008)
- *Guidance on pest risk management* (2014-001)
- *Authorization of non-NPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002)

Selection of experts for expert drafting groups

- Selection of experts for the EWGs on the *International movement of grain* (2008-007) and on the Revision of ISPM 6:1997 *Guidelines for Surveillance* (2009-004) and for the TPPT.

14. Date and venue of the next SC Meeting

[216] The next SC meeting is scheduled on 10-14 November 2014, Rome, Italy, but the SC members were reminded to check the calendar on the IPP.

15. Evaluation of the meeting process

[217] The following suggestions were made:

[218] Members expressed appreciation for having started the meeting discussing the standards and supported that this approach be taken in the future.

[219] One member noted that it was challenging to discuss drafts that had been modified by the stewards between being posted for the meeting and the actual discussions and suggested that this should not be done without notice.

16. Adoption of the report

[27] The SC adopted the report.

[28] For ease of reference, a list of action points arising from the meeting is attached as Appendix 14.

17. Close of the Meeting

[220] Mr Ren Wang, Assistant Director-General for the Agriculture and Consumer Protection (AG) Department, on behalf of the Director-General and the AG Department, congratulated the SC for all the significant work they had done.

[221] Mr Wang recalled that the Secretariats for the IPPC, Codex Alimentarius and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture had been moved under his direct supervision. He emphasized the crucial importance of these standard setting entities under FAO, strengthening the Organization's commitment to normative work. He underlined that this will help boost their profile and will also provide an opportunity for the two "sisters", now under the same roof, to build better synergies in standard setting. He informed the SC on the new FAO Strategic Objectives (SO), and explained how IPPC links to SO 2 (on sustainable production) and SO 4 (on market access and trade) and in particular, he felt that ISPMs were at the centre of SO 4.

[222] He expressed his confidence that the Enhancement Evaluation of the IPPC Secretariat will produce positive results. He concluded by reiterating his appreciation and support for the important work of the SC and specifically thanked the SC for their work on the topics of seeds, grain, used equipment and sea containers.

[223] The SC Chairperson thanked the members of the SC, the stewards and the SC-7 for their hard work, and expressed her special gratitude to the SC members whose last meeting this was. She expressed her appreciation of the work of all others that had contributed to the success of the meeting, especially interpreters, the messenger and the Secretariat staff.

[224] On behalf of the SC, one SC member expressed appreciation for the guidance of the SC Chairperson and her excellent coordination of SC activities, always done with a touch of good humor, and expressed the trust of the SC in her leadership.

[225] Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark) and Ephrance TUMUBOINE (Uganda) thanked the SC for the good experiences and positive collaboration during their time in this committee.

Appendix 1 - Agenda

Commission on Phytosanitary Measures

Standards Committee

5-9 May 2014

German Room C-269, FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy

5 May start time: 10:00 hrs (coffee at 09:30hrs)

Daily Schedule:
Monday 10:00-13:00 and 15:00-18:00

Tuesday to Thursday 09:00-12:00 and 14:00-17:00

Friday 09:00-12:00 and 15:00-18:00

Coffee: Monday welcome coffee 9:30, Monday afternoon and Friday afternoon 16:30, rest of the week at 10:30 and 15:30

*Monday **Cocktail** 18:30*
*Wednesday **Dinner** 19:30*

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
1.1. Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat ❖ Welcome to new SC members	---	LARSON
1.2. Election of the Rapporteur	---	Chairperson
1.3. Adoption of the Agenda	01_SC_2014_May	Chairperson
2. Administrative Matters		
❖ Documents List	02_SC_2014_May	GERMAIN
❖ Participants List	03_SC_2014_May	GERMAIN
❖ Local Information	IPP link to local information	GERMAIN
3. Draft ISPMs from expert drafting groups (EWG/TP) for member consultation		
3.1. International movement of seed (2009-003), Priority 1 - Steward: Julie ALIAGA	2009-003	ALIAGA
❖ Specification 54 (for information)	IPP link to specification	
❖ Update from the Expert working group (EWG) o Report (1-5 July 2014)	IPP link to EWG report	GERMAIN
❖ TPG comments on consistency	11_SC_2014_May_rev1	ALIAGA
3.2. Minimizing pest movement by sea containers (2008-001), Priority 1 - Steward: John HEDLEY	2008-001	HEDLEY

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
❖ Specification 51 (for information)	IPP link to specification	
❖ Update from CPM-9 (2014) on sea containers	17_SC_2014_May	GERMAIN
❖ Review of the sea containers survey proposal	09_SC_2014_May	HEDLEY ALIAGA /
❖ Comments on the Review of the sea containers survey proposal	34_SC_2014_May	NORDBO
❖ Compiled general comments on the preliminary draft standard	IPP link to compiled comments	HEDLEY
❖ Steward's response	10_SC_2014_May	HEDLEY
❖ Consistency issues raised by the TPG	IPP link to TPG meeting report, section 4.2	HEDLEY
3.3. International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004), Priority 3	2006-004	NGATOKO
- Steward: Ngatoko NGATOKO		
❖ Specification 48 (for information)	IPP link to specification	
❖ Update from the Expert working group (EWG)	IPP link to the EWG report	LARSON
○ Report (27-31 May 2013)		
❖ TPG comments on consistency	12_SC_2014_May	NGATOKO
3.4. Phytosanitary pre-import clearance (2005-003), Priority 3	2005-003	FOREST
- Steward: Marie-Claude FOREST		
❖ Specification 42 (for information)	IPP link to specification	
❖ Update from the SC forum (January 2014) - Concepts linked to pre-clearance	30_SC_2014_May	
❖ Proposed revision of Specification 42	26_SC_2014_May	ALIAGA
3.5. Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)	1994-001	HEDLEY
- Steward: John HEDLEY		
4. Draft specifications for review of member comments and approval by the SC		
4.1. International movement of grain (2008-007), Priority 1	2008-007	WOODE
- Steward: Ruth WOODE		
❖ Update from CPM-9 (2014) on the "grain" topic	17_SC_2014_May	GERMAIN
❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response)	06_SC_2014_May	WOODE
4.2. Revision of ISPM 6:1997 - Guidelines for Surveillance (2009-004), Priority 1	2009-004	HEDLEY
- Steward: John HEDLEY		
❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response)	08_SC_2014_May	
5. List of Topics for IPPC standards		

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
5.1. Update from CPM-9 (2014) and review of the *List of topics for IPPC standards*	16_SC_2014_May_Rev1	MONTUORI
5.2. Adjustments to stewards	16_SC_2014_May_Rev1	LARSON
6. Draft specifications for approval for member consultation		
6.1. Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20:2004 Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006), Priority 3 - Steward: Piotr WLODARCZYK	2008-006	WLODARCZYK
6.2. Draft specifications for new topics added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by CPM-9 (2014)	31_SC_2014_May	MIGNAULT
❖ Speeding up the approval of draft specifications for member consultation, after new topics have been added to the List of topics by CPM[52]		
○ Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure (2014-004), priority 1	2014-004	SHAMILOV
○ Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-005), priority 1	2014-005	SHAMILOV
○ Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006), priority 2	2014-006	SHAMILOV
○ Requirements for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure (Revision to ISPM 18:2003) (2014-007), priority 2	2014-007	SHAMILOV
○ Requirements for the use of chemical treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-003), priority 3	2014-003	SHAMILOV
○ *Or* Requirements for the use of phytosanitary treatments as phytosanitary measures (proposal for a generic specification instead of the above)	2014-008	SHAMILOV
○ Guidance on pest risk management (2014-001), priority 1	2014-001	MIGNAULT
○ Authorization of non-NPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002), priority 3	2014-002	MIGNAULT
7. Standards Committee		
7.1. Report of the SC November 2013	IPP link to November 2013 SC report	Chairperson
7.2. Follow-up on actions from the SC November 2013		
❖ Concept note: purpose, status and content of ISPMs	18_SC_2014_May	NORDBO
❖ Supporting documentation		CHARD
❖ Inclusion of a bibliography in standards	-	MOLLER
❖ Framework for IPPC standards	27_SC_2014_May	CHARD
○ Update from CPM-9 (2014) on the framework for IPPC standards	17_SC_2014_May	LARSON

[52] See decision 14 from CPM-7 (2012) decisions on improving the standard setting process

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
❖ Initiation of the review of the standard setting procedure	20_SC_2014_May	CHARD
❖ Consistency in languages	05_SC_2014_May	HEDLEY
❖ Engaging experts in the standard setting process	29_SC_2014_May	SHAMILOV
❖ Transparency in selecting TP and EWG experts	04_SC_2014_May	ALIAGA
7.3. Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (From December 2013 To April 2014)	33_SC_2014_May	GERMAIN
8. Review of technical panels		
8.1. Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT)		SHAMILOV
❖ TPPT meeting reports	IPP link to TPPT meeting reports	
❖ Update on activities of the TPPT	22_SC_2014_May	
❖ TPPT position paper on acceptance of the phytosanitary treatments based on historical evidence	21_SC_2014_May	
8.2. Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG)		MOLLER
❖ TPG meeting report	IPP link to TPG meeting report	
❖ Update on activities of the TPG	32_SC_2014_MayRev1	MOLLER
❖ Information on phytosanitary measures	35_SC_2014_May	HEDLEY
❖ Consistency across ISPMs: specific proposals related to *phytosanitary status*	14_SC_2014_May	HEDLEY
❖ Consistency across ISPMs: specific proposals related to *trading partners*	15_SC_2014_May	HEDLEY
❖ Proposed ink amendments to ISPM 5	13_SC_2014_May	HEDLEY
8.3. Technical Panel for Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP)		MOREIRA
❖ TPDP meeting reports	IPP link to TPDP meeting reports	
❖ Update on activities of the TPDP	23_SC_2014_May	
8.4. Technical Panel on Pest Free Areas and Systems Approaches for Fruit Flies (TPFF)	IPP link to TPFF page	GERMAIN
❖ Update on activities of the TPFF	24_SC_2014_May	
8.5. Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ)	IPP link to TPFQ meeting reports	LARSON
❖ TPFQ meeting reports		
❖ Update on activities of the TPFQ	25_SC_2014_May	
9. Updates from other relevant bodies		
9.1. Items arising from CPM-9 (2014)	17_SC_2014_May	LARSON
❖ Election of the SC Vice-Chairperson (term starting after SC-7 meeting)		
❖ Confirmation of SC-7 membership for 2015		

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
❖ Draft ISPM on *Determination of host status of fruit to fruit fly (Tephritidae)* (2006-031): formal objection received prior to CPM-9 (2014) ❖ Seven draft cold treatments: formal objections received prior to CPM-9 (2014)	2006-031[53]; CPM 2014/INF/05; IPP link to TPG meeting report, section 5.1 CPM 2014/INF/05	
9.2. General update from the IPPC Secretariat (November 2013 – April 2014) ❖ IRSS update		FEDCHOCK SOSA
9.3. Update from the Standard setting team of the IPPC Secretariat ❖ Replacement of old versions of ISPMs by latest versions of ISPMs and mechanism for the future ❖ Establishing an editorial team for draft ISPMs	19_SC_2014_May 28_SC_2014_May 07_SC_2014_May	LARSON LARSON MONTUORI
10. SC recommendations for CPM-10 (2015) decisions		Chairperson
11. Agenda items deferred to future SC Meetings		Chairperson
12. Review of the standard setting calendar	Link to the IPP calendar	MONTUORI
13. Other business		Chairperson
14. Date and venue of the next SC Meeting		GERMAIN
15. Evaluation of the meeting process		Chairperson
16. Adoption of the report		Chairperson
17. Close of the meeting		ADG (Mr Ren WANG)

[53] New version of the draft *Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)* (2006-031), proposed by the Steward to respond to the formal objections..

Appendix 2 - Documents List

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
Draft ISPMs				
2005-003	3.4	**Phytosanitary pre-clearance**	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-02-25
2006-004	3.3	**International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment**	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-02-24
2008-001	3.2	**Minimizing pest movement by sea containers**	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-02-24
2009-003	3.1	**International movement of seed**	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-02-24
2006-004	3.3	**International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment**	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-03-03
1994-001	3.5	**Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)**	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-04-17
2006-031	9.1	**Draft ISPM - Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)**	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-04-28
Draft Specifications				
2008-006	8.2	**Import Permits**	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-02-27
2008-007	4.1	International movement of grain	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-03-12
2009-004	4.2	Revision of ISPM 6:1997 Guidelines for surveillance	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-03-27
2014-001	6.2	Guidance on pest risk management	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-04-17
2014-002	6.2	Authorization of non-NPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-04-17
2014-003	6.2	Requirements for the use of chemical treatments as a phytosanitary measure	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-04-17
2014-004	6.2	Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-04-17
2014-005	6.2	Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-04-17
2014-006	6.2	Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-04-17

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
2014-007	6.2	Requirements for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-04-17
2014-008	6.2	Requirements for the use of phytosanitary treatments as a phytosanitary measure	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-04-17
Other Documents				
01_SC_2014_May	1.3	Draft Agenda	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-03-27
02_SC_2014_May	2	Documents list	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-03-28
03_SC_2014_May	2	Participants list	SC, NPPOs and RPPOs	2014-03-27
04_SC_2014_May	7.2	Transparency in selecting TP and EWG experts	SC	2014-02-24
05_SC_2014_May	7.2	Consistency in languages	SC	2014-02-24
06_SC_2014_May	4.1	Compiled comments with Steward's responses – Draft specification on International movement of grain (2008-007)	SC	2014-03-12
07_SC_2014_May	9.3	Establishing an editorial team for draft ISPMs	SC	2014-03-27
08_SC_2014_May	4.2	Compiled comments with Steward's responses: **Draft specification for ISPM - Revision of ISPM 6:1997 Guidelines for surveillance**	SC	2014-03-27
09_SC_2014_May	3.2	Review of the sea container survey proposal	SC	2014-03-27
10_SC_2014_May	3.2	Steward's response to the compiled general comments on the preliminary draft standard on Minimizing pest movement by sea containers	SC	2014-03-28
11_SC_2014_May_rev 1	3.1	TPG comments on consistency – Draft ISPM on the international movement of seed (2009-003)	SC	2014-04-23
12_SC_2014_May	3.3	TPG comments on consistency – Draft ISPM on the international movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004)	SC	2014-04-11
13_SC_2014_May	8.2	Proposed ink amendments to ISPM 5	SC	2014-04-11
14_SC_2014_May	8.2	**Consistency across ISPMs: specific proposals related to *phytosanitary status* (2010-004)**	SC	2014-04-11
15_SC_2014_May	8.2	**Consistency across ISPMs: specific proposals related to *trading partners* (2013-009)**	SC	2014-04-11

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
16_SC_2014_May_Rev1	5.1, 5.2	Update from CPM-9 (2014) and review of the *List of topics for IPPC standards*	SC	2014-04-14
17_SC_2014_May	3.2, 4.1, 7.2, 9.1	Update from CPM-9 (2014): agenda items 3.2, 4.1, 7.2 and 9.1	SC	2014-04-11
18_SC_2014_May	7.2	Concept note: purpose, status and content of ISPMs	SC	2014-04-14
19_SC_2014_May	9.3	IPPC Secretariat standard setting group update for 2014 May SC	SC	2014-04-14
20_SC_2014_May	7.2	Initiation of the review of the standard setting procedure	SC	2014-04-17
21_SC_2014_May	8.1	TPPT position paper on acceptance of the phytosanitary treatments based on historical evidence	SC	2014-04-17
22_SC_2014_May	8.1	Update on activities of the TPPT	SC	2014-04-17
23_SC_2014_May	8.3	Update on activities of the TPDP	SC	2014-04-17
24_SC_2014_May	8.4	Update on activities of the TPFF	SC	2014-04-17
25_SC_2014_May	8.5	Update on activities of the TPFQ	SC	2014-04-17
26_SC_2014_May	3.4	Proposed revision of Specification 42, by Ms Julie Aliaga (SC member from USA)	SC	2014-04-17
27_SC_2014_May	7.1	Development of the Framework for IPPC Standards	SC	2014-04-17
28_SC_2014_May	9.3	Replacement of old versions of ISPMs by latest versions of ISPMs and mechanism for the future	SC	2014-04-17
29_SC_2014_May	7.2	Engaging experts in the standard setting process	SC	2014-04-17
30_SC_2014_May	3.4	Concepts linked to Pre-clearance	SC	2014-04-17
31_SC_2014_May	9.3	Draft specification for new topics added to LOT	SC	2014-04-17
32_SC_2014_May_Rev1	8.2	Update on activities of the TPG	SC	2014-04-22
33_SC_2014_May	7.3	Update of polls and forums discussed on e-decision site	SC	2014-04-28
34_SC_2014_May	3.2	Comments on the Review of the sea containers survey proposal (by Mr Ebbe Nordbo)	SC	2014-05-08
35_SC_2014_May	8.2	Information on phytosanitary measures (by Mr John Hedley)	SC	2014-05-13

LINKS:	Agenda item	Content
IPP link to local information IPPC link to Invitation letter	2	FAO Rome meetings: Local information SC Invitation letter
IPP link to specification IPP link to EWG report	3.1	Specification 54 - International movement of seed (2009-003) Expert working group (EWG) Report (1-5 July 2014)

IPP link to specification IPP link to compiled comments	3.2	Specification 51 - Minimizing pest movement by sea containers (2008-001) Compiled general comments on the preliminary draft standard
IPP link to specification IPP link to the EWG report	3.3	Specification 48 - International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004) Expert working group (EWG) Report (27-31 May 2013)
IPP link to specification	3.4	Specification 42 - Phytosanitary pre-import clearance (2005-003)
IPP link to November 2013 SC report	7.1	SC November 2013 meeting report
IPP link to May 2013 SC-7 report	4.2	SC-7 May 2013 meeting report
IPP link to TPPT meeting reports	8.1	• TPPT 2013 July face-to-face meeting report • TPPT 2013 June virtual meeting report • TPPT 2013 September virtual meeting report • TPPT 2014 January virtual meeting report
IPP link to TPG meeting report	8.2, 3.2 and 9.1	TPG 2014 February face-to face meeting report
IPP link to TPDP meeting reports	8.3	• TPDP 2013 June face-to-face meeting report • TPDP 2013 December virtual meeting report • TPDP 2014 February virtual meeting report
IPP link to TPFF page	8.4	Link to TPFF page
IPP link to TPFQ meeting reports	8.5	• TPFQ 2013 June face-to-face meeting report • TPFQ 2013 May virtual meeting report • TPFQ 2013 July virtual meeting report • TPFQ 2013 October virtual meeting report • TPFQ 2013 December virtual meeting report • TPFQ 2014 February virtual meeting report
IPP Link to CPM 2014/INF/05	9.1	CPM 2014/INF/05 on Formal objections to draft ISPMs presented at CPM-9 (2014)
Link to the IPP calendar	12	IPP calendar

Appendix 3 - Participants list

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

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed[54]	Term expires
✓	Africa Member	**Mr Lahcen ABAHA** Regional Directorate of the Sanitary and Food Safety National Office - Souss-Massa Drâa Region - BP 40/S, Agadir 80 000, Riad Essalam **MOROCCO** Tel: (+212) 673 997 855 / 0528 23 7875 Fax: (+212) 528-237874	abahalahcen@yahoo.fr ; lahcen.abaha@onssa.gov.ma	CPM-4 (2009) CPM-7(2012) 2nd term / 3 years (2)	2015
✓	Africa Member	**Ms Ephrance TUMUBOINE** Assistant Commissioner Department of Crop Protection Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries' P.O. Box 102 Entebbe **UGANDA** Tel : (+256) 414 322 458 / 0414320801 Fax: (+256) 414 320642	etumuboine@yahoo.com; ephrancet@gmail.com ;	Replacement member for Ms Olufunke AWOSUSI CPM-6 (2011) 2nd term / 3 years (2)	2014
✓	Africa Member Vice-Chair SC-7	**Ms Ruth WOODE** Deputy Director of Agriculture Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate Ministry of Food and Agriculture P.O.Box M37 Accra **GHANA** Tel: (+233) 244507687	wooderuth@yahoo.com;	CPM-8 (2013) 1st term / 3 years (2)	2016
✓	Africa Member	**Ms Alice Ntoboh Siben NDIKONTAR** Senior plant health officer 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	Replacement member for Mr. Kenneth M'SISKA CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years (2)	2015

[54] The numbers in parenthesis refers to FAO travel funding assistance. (0) No funding; (1) Airfare funding; (2) Airfare and DSA funding.

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed[54]	Term expires
✓	Asia Member	**Mr D.D.K. SHARMA** Joint Director (Plant Quarantine) Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine & Storage - Department of Agriculture & Cooperation Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India, N. H. – IV, Faridabad (Haryana), 121001 **INDIA** Tel: 91 129 2418506 (Office) Fax: 91 129 2412125	ddk.sharma@nic.in;	CPM-8 (2013) 1st term / 3 years (1)	2016
✓	Asia Member SC-7	**Mr Motoi SAKAMURA** Administrator -Operation, Kobe Plant Protection Station, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 1-1,Hatobacho, Chuouku Kobe 6500042 **JAPAN** Tel: (+81) 78 331 0969 Fax: (+81) 78 332 2796	sakamuram@pps.maff.go.jp ;	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) CPM-7 (2012) 3rd term / 3 years (0)	2015
✓	Asia Member	**Mr Lifeng WU** Division Director National Agro-Tech Extension and Service Centre Ministry of Agriculture No.20 Mai Zi Dian Street Chaoyang District, Beijing 100125 **CHINA** Phone: (+86) 10 59194524 Fax: (+86) 10 59194726	wulifeng@agri.gov.cn	Replacement member for Mr Mohammad Ayub HOSSAIN CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2015
✓	Asia Member	**Ms Thanh Huong HA** Deputy Director of Plant Quarantine Division, Plant Protection Department 149 Ho Dac Di Street Dong Da district Hanoi City **VIET NAM** **Tel:** (+844) 35331033 Fax: (+844) 35330043	ppdhuong@yahoo.com; huonght.bvtv@mard.gov.vn	CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years (2)	2015
✓	Europe Member Chair	**Ms Jane CHARD** SASA, Scottish Government Roddinglaw Road Edinburgh EH12 9FJ **UNITED KINGDOM** Tel: (+44) 131 2448863 Fax: (+44) 131 2448940	jane.chard@sasa.gsi.gov.uk ;	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) 2nd term / 3 years (0)	2014

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed[54]	Term expires
✓	Europe Member SC7	**Mr Ebbe NORDBO** Head of Section Danish AgriFish Agency Nyropsgade DK - 1780 Copenhagen V **DENMARK** Tel: (+45) 45 263 891 Fax: (+45) 45 263 613	eno@naturerhverv.dk ;	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) 2nd term / 3 years (0)	2014
✓	Europe Member	**Ms Hilde Kristin PAULSEN** Senior Advisor Norwegian Food Safety Authority, Felles Postmottak P.O.Box 383 N-2381 Brumunddal **NORWAY** Tel: (+47) 64 94 43 46 Fax: (+47) 23 21 68 01	Hilde.paulsen@mattilsynet.no ;	CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2015
✓	Europe Member	**Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK** Wojewodzki Inspektorat Ochrony Roslin I Nasiennictwa w Lublinie ul. Diamentowa 6 20-447 Lublin **POLAND** Tel: (+48) 81 7440326 Fax: (+48) 81 7447363	p.wlodarczyk@piorin.gov.pl ;	CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2015
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	**Mr Guillermo SIBAJA CHINCHILLA** Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado. MAG PO Box 1521-1200 San Jose **COSTA RICA** Tel: + (506)25493663 (Office) Tel: + (506) 8813-2061 (Mobile)	gsibaja@sfe.go.cr; gsibaja@yahoo.com ;	Replacement member for **Ms Maria Soledad CASTRO DOROCHESSI** CPM-5 (2010) CPM-8 (2013) 2nd term / 3 years (1)	2016
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	**Ms Ana Lilia MONTEALEGRE LARA** Jefe de Organismos Internacionales de Protección Fitosanitaria Dirección General de Sanidad Vegetal SENASICA/SAGARPA Guillermo Pérez Valenzuela No. 127, Col. Del Carmen, Coyoacán C.P. 04100 **MEXICO** Tel: (+11) 52-55-5090-3000 ext 51341	ana.montealegre@senasica.gob.mx ;	CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2015

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed[54]	Term expires
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	**Mr Ezequiel FERRO** Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA Av, Paeso Colón 315 C.A. de Buenos Aires **ARGENTINA** Tel/Fax : (+5411) 4121-5091	eferro@senasa.gov.ar;	CPM-8 (2013) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2016
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member SC-7	**Mr Alexandre MOREIRA PALMA** Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supply – Plant Health Department Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D Anexo B, Sala 310 Brasilia DF 70043900 **BRAZIL** Tel: (+55) 61 3218 28 50 Fax: (+55) 61 3224 3874	alexandre.palma@agricultura.gov.br ;	CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2015
✓	Near East Member SC-7	**Mr Gamil Anwar Mohammed RAMADHAN** Head of Plant Quarantine Department (Director) General Department of Plant Protection Department Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation **REPUBLIC OF YEMEN** Tel: 0096701563328 (Office) 00967733802618 (Mobile) 00967770712209 (Mobile)	dr.gamel_ramadan@yahoo.com; Anvar.gamel@mail.ru;	CPM-8(2013) 1st term / 3 years (2)	2016
✓	North America Member	**Ms Julie ALIAGA** Program Director, International Standards Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service U.S. Department of Agriculture 4700 River Road, 5th floor. Riverdale, MD 20737 **USA** Tel: (+1) 301 851 2032 Fax: (+1) 301 734 7639	julie.e.aliaga@aphis.usda.gov;	CPM-4 (2009) CPM-7 (2012) 2nd term / 3 years (0)	2015
✓	North America Member SC7	**Ms Marie-Claude FOREST** National Manager and International Standards Advisor Plant Biosecurity and Forestry Division Import, Export and Technical Standards Section Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 **CANADA** Tel: (+1) 613-773-7235 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7204	marie-claude.forest@inspection.gc.ca ippc-contact@inspection.gc.ca ;	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) 2nd term / 3 years (0)	2014

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed[54]	Term expires
✓	Pacific Member	**Mr John HEDLEY** Principal Adviser International Standards Organizations Policy Branch Ministry for Primary Industries P.O. Box 2526 Wellington **NEW ZEALAND** Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0742	john.hedley@mpi.govt.nz;	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) CPM-7 (2012) 3rd term / 3 years (0)	2015
✓	Pacific Member	**Mr Ngatoko NGATOKO** Director Biosecurity Service, Ministry of Agriculture P.O.Box 96, Rarotonga **COOK ISLANDS** **Telephone:** (+682) 28 711 **Fax:** (+682) 21 881	nngatoko@agriculture.gov.ck ;	CPM-7 (2012) 1st term / 3 years (2)	2015
✓	Pacific Member SC7	**Mr Jan Bart ROSSEL** Director International Plant Health Program Office of the Australian Chief Plant Protection Officer Australian Government Department of Agriculture **AUSTRALIA** Tel: (+61) 2 6272 5056 / 0408625413 Fax: (+61) 2 6272 5835	bart.rossel@daff.gov.au ;	CPM-6 (2011) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2014

Others

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Secretariat Joint FAO/IAEA Division **/** Steward	**Mr Rui CARDOSO PEREIRA** Insect and Pest Control Section Joint FAO/IAEA Division in Food and Agriculture Wagramerstrasse 5 PO Box 100, 1400 Vienna **AUSTRIA** **Tel.:** (+43) 1 260026077 **Fax:** (+43) 1 26000	r.cardoso-pereira@iaea.org	N/A	N/A

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Observer (New Zealand)	**Mr Stephen BUTCHER** Manager Import & Export Plants Standards Branch Plant, Food and Environment Directorate Ministry for Primary Industries Pastoral House 25 The Terrace PO Box 2526 Wellington 6140 **NEW ZEALAND** Tel: (+64) 4 894 0478 Fax: (+ 64) 4 894 0662 Mobile: (+ 64) 29 894 0478	stephen.butcher@mpi.govt.nz	N/A	N/A
✓	Observer (NEPPO)	**Mr Mekki CHOUIBANI** Executive Director Near East Plant Protection Organization (NEPPO) Avenue Hadj Ahmed Cherkaoui, 10090 Rabat, Agdal **MOROCCO** Tel: +212 537 776 598 Cell: +212 661 309 104 Fax: +212 537 776 598	hq.neppo@gmail.com	N/A	N/A
✓	Observer (NAPPO)	**Ms Rebecca LEE** Technical Director North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) 1431 Merivale Rd., 3rd Floor, Room 147 Ottawa, ON K1A 0Y9 **CANADA** Tel:613-773-8176 Fax:613-773-8532	rebecca.lee@nappo.org ; suamena@yahoo.ca	N/A	N/A
✓	IPPC Secretariat	**Mr Brent LARSON** Standards Officer	Brent.Larson@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Adriana MOREIRA** Support	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Celine GERMAIN** Support	Celine.Germain@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	IPPC Secretariat	**Ms MariePierre MIGNAULT** Support	MariePierre.Mignault@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	IPPC Secretariat	**Mr Mirko MONTUORI** Support	Mirko.Montuori@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	IPPC Secretariat	**Mr Artur SHAMILOV** Support	Artur.Shamilov@fao.org	N/A	N/A

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	IPPC Secretariat	**Mr Riccardo MAZZUCCHELLI** Support	Riccardo.Mazzucchelli@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Eva MOLLER** Support	Eva.Moller@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Yosra CHABAANE** Support	Yosra.Chabaane@fao.org	N/A	N/A

Not attending

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
	Near East Member	**Mr Mohammad Reza ASGHARI** Plant Protection Organization, No.2 Plant Protection Organization Charman Highway Yaman Street Tehran **IRAN** Tel.: (+98) -21-23091119; 22402712; 22402046-9 Fax: (+98)-21-22309137 Mobile: (+98)-912-1044851	asghari@ppo.ir; asghari.massoud@gmail.com	CPM-7(2012) / shorten term CPM-8(2013) 2nd term / 3 years (0)	2016
	Near East Member	**Mr Ali Amin KAFU** Researcher Entomologist Biotechnology Research Center P.O. Box.2933, Tripoli **LIBYA** Mobile: (+218) 92 5022980 Phone private: (+218) 21 4903952	benkafu@yahoo.com; benkafu@lycos.com;	Replacement member for **Mr Basim Mustafa KHALIL** CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years (1)	2015
	Near East Member	**Mr Imad NAHHAL** Head of Plant Protection Service Ministry of Agriculture Bir Hassan Embassies Street Beirut **LEBANON** Office Tel: (+961) 1 849639 Mobile:(+961) 3 894679	inahhal@agriculture.gov.lb ; imadnahhal@gmail.com	CPM-6 (2011) 1st term / 3 years (1)	2014

Appendix 4 - List of ISPMs, DPs and PTs approved for member consultation 2014

- *International movement of seed* (2009-003)
- *International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment* (2006-004)
- *Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)* 2014 (1994-001)
- Phytosanitary Treatment on High temperature forced air treatment for *Bactrocera melanotus* and *B. xanthodes* (diptera: tephritidae) on *Carica papaya* (2009-105)
- Vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis* on *Carica papaya* var. solo (2009-109)
- Vapour heat treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Mangifera indica* (2010-106)
- Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus clementina* var. *Clemenules* (2010-102)
- Phytosanitary Treatment on Irradiation for *Ostrinia nubilalis* (2012-009)
- Diagnostic protocol for *Phytoplasmas* (2004-018)
- Diagnostic protocol for *Erwinia amylovora* (2004-009)
- Diagnostic protocol on *Ditylenchus destructor / D. dipsaci* (2004-017)
- Diagnostic protocol on *Genus Anastrepha* spp. (2004-015)
- Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus sinensis* var. *Navel* and *Valencia-late* (2010-103)

Appendix 5 - Draft ISPM International movement of seeds (2009-003)

[1] **Draft ISPM: International movement of seeds (2009-003)**

[2]

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	2014-05-21
Document category	Draft ISPM (priority 1)
Current document stage	To *member consultation*
Major stages	2009-11 SC introduced topic International movement of seed (2009-003) 2010-03 CPM-5 added topic 2010-12 SC approved draft specification for member consultation via e-decision 2011-02 Draft specification sent to member consultation 2011-05 SC revised and approved specification 54 2013-07 Expert Working Group (EWG) met and drafted ISPM 2014-05 SC approved draft ISPM for member consultation 2014-07 member consultation
Steward history	2008-11 SC: Mr Arundel SAKALA (ZM, Lead Steward) 2010-04 SC: Mr David PORRITT (AU, Lead Steward) 2011-05 SC: Mr Marcel BAKAK (CM, Assistant Steward) 2012-04 SC: Ms Soledad CASTRO-DOROCHESSI (CL, Lead Steward) 2012-04 SC: Mr David PORRITT (AU, Assistant Steward) 2012-11 SC: Ms Julie ALIAGA (US, Assistant Steward) 2012-11 SC: Mr Motoi SAKAMURA (JP, Assistant Steward) 2013-11 SC: Ms Julie ALIAGA (US, Lead Steward) 2013-11 SC: Ms Soledad CASTRO-DOROCHESSI (CL, Assistant Steward)
Notes	2011-11 SC added new tasks regarding implementation issues 2011-12 Applied consistency changes in line with the decision made by SC May 2009 2012-11 SC replaced task regarding implementation issues 2013-10 EWG participants reviewed draft ISPM 2013-12 Lead Steward reviewed draft ISPM 2013-12 Edited 2014-04 Lead Steward consulted EWG and revised draft ISPM based on TPG comments on consistency (modifications in track changes) 2014-05 Edited

[3] **Adoption**

[4] [Insert text]

[5] **INTRODUCTION**

[6] **Scope**

[7] This standard provides guidance to assist national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) identify, assess and manage the pest risk associated with the international movement of seeds.

[8] The standard also provides guidance on (1) criteria for the harmonization of phytosanitary import requirements to facilitate the international movement of seeds; (2) criteria for the harmonization of procedures for re-export of seeds; and (3) inspection and testing of seeds.

[9] This standard applies to seed in the botanical sense. The standard covers seeds for laboratory testing or destructive analysis, and seeds for planting under restrictive conditions. This standard does not apply to grain.

[10] **References**

[11] **ISPM 2.** 2007. *Framework for pest risk analysis.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[12] **ISPM 4.** 1995. *Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[13] **ISPM 5.** *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[14] **ISPM 10.** 1999. *Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[15] **ISPM 11.** 2013. *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[16] **ISPM 12.** 2011. *Phytosanitary certificates*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[17] **ISPM 13.** 2001. *Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[18] **ISPM 20.** 2004. *Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[19] **ISPM 21.** 2004. *Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[20] **ISPM 23.** 2005. *Guidelines for inspection.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[21] **ISPM 27.** 2006. *Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[22] **ISPM 31.** 2008. *Methodologies for sampling of consignments.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[23] **ISPM 32.** 2009. *Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[24] **ISPM 34.** 2010. *Design and operation of post-entry quarantine stations for plants*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[25] **Definitions**

[26] Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in the present standard can be found in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*). In addition to definitions in ISPM 5, in this standard the following definitions apply:

[27] **Seed-borne pest:** A pest that can be found on the seed (externally) or within the seed (internally) but may or may not be transmitted to progeny plants resulting in infestation.

[28] **Seed-transmitted pest:** A seed-borne pest that can be transmitted via seed to progeny plants resulting in infestation.

[29] **Outline of Requirements**

[30] Under the IPPC definition, “seeds” is a commodity class used for planting, not for consumption or processing. Like plants for planting, seeds may present a serious risk of introducing quarantine pests as seed-transmitted pests will be introduced to an environment for further growth where it may have a high likelihood of establishing and spreading (see ISPM 32:2009).

[31] As well as movement for commercial trade, seeds are also regularly moved internationally for research purposes. When assessing the pest risk and determining appropriate phytosanitary measures, NPPOs

should therefore consider whether the material is treated in quarantine and whether it is not for release for planting in the importing country.

[32] A pest risk analysis (PRA) should determine if the seed is a pathway for the introduction and spread of regulated pests and may lead to establishment of regulated pests in the PRA area. The PRA should consider the relationship between the intended use of the seeds (e.g. planting, research, testing) and the potential for pests to establish.

[33] This standard identifies and describes specific phytosanitary measures that may be used to reduce the pest risk associated with the international movement of seeds, including phytosanitary measures that may be applied before planting, throughout growth, at seed harvest, post-harvest, during seed processing and on arrival in the country of import. The standard recognizes the importance of applying equivalent phytosanitary measures as an option to meet import requirements.

[34] NPPOs may establish specific requirements for the importation of small seed lots.

[35] **BACKGROUND**

[36] Many seeds (including pelleted and coated seeds) are moved internationally to be planted, primarily for food and ornamental plant production but also for a number of other purposes (e.g. production of biofuels and fibre, forestation, pharmacological uses, pre-commercial uses (research, seed increase)).

[37] Seed companies commonly have breeding and multiplication programmes in many countries, and distribute these seeds to many more countries. The international movement of seeds may involve small quantities (e.g. for breeding and selection) or large quantities (after multiplication).

[38] NPPOs face challenges associated with the international movement of seeds that are distinct from the international movement of other forms of plants for planting. For example, seeds produced in one country and exported to a second country for processing, testing and packing may then be re-exported to numerous other destinations over an extended period of time. At the time of production of the seeds, the destination country and its import requirements may not be known, especially if there are a number of years between production and export to the final destination. Moreover, breeding, selection and evaluation of seeds is conducted internationally to develop new varieties that are adapted to a range of environments and conditions. As a result, seeds moved internationally may be subject to various phytosanitary issues, including:

[39] - movement of seeds into and out of many countries, for which phytosanitary import requirements and diagnostic and inspection methodologies vary

[40] - contradictory phytosanitary measures, unnecessary measures and measures that cannot be fulfilled retrospectively (e.g. field inspections).

[41] This standard should help minimize the risk of the global spread of pests, including those that can be considered plants as pests, and other organisms whose pest risk has not been identified yet.

[42] **IMPACT ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT**

[43] This standard will help manage the pest risk posed by seeds moved internationally, including those pest risks that can be posed by invasive alien species (as defined in the Convention on Biological Diversity).

[44] Harmonized international phytosanitary guidance for seeds will help preserve biodiversity and safeguard the health of stored seeds for future use (e.g. seed banks). The standard will help in the movement and exchange of seeds.

[45] **REQUIREMENTS**

[46] **1. Pest Risk Analysis**

[47] PRAs for seeds should be performed in accordance with ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 11:2013 and ISPM 21:2004. PRAs for seeds should identify the regulated pests potentially associated with seeds moved internationally. The PRA should consider the relationship between the intended use of the seeds (e.g. research, planting, testing) and the potential for quarantine pests to establish. Phytosanitary measures should be applied based

on the results of the PRA.

[48] **1.1 Seeds as pathways**

[49] PRAs for seeds are complicated by the fact that some pests are seed-borne but not seed-transmitted.

[50] A distinction should be made between seed-borne pests and seed-transmitted pests.

[51] Some pests that are not seed-borne may be associated with the seed crop and subsequently be carried with a seed lot as contaminating pests (e.g. sclerotia, seeds of plants as pests).

[52] If it has been determined that the particular seed may carry a potential quarantine pest, care should be taken to determine whether the pest in question can actually establish in the PRA area, so as to avoid any unjustified phytosanitary import requirement.

[53] Many studies have documented cases in which transfer by seed of seed-borne pests occurs under laboratory conditions but then such transferral has never been observed under field conditions, adding to the uncertainty of PRA judgements on seeds as pathways.

[54] Consideration of biological and epidemiological characteristics of specific pest groups aids in determining the likelihood to infest a seed and its potential of introduction. Characteristics of seed-borne and seed-transmitted pest groups are provided in Annex 1 of this standard. This information may be used as guidance when conducting a PRA.

[55] **1.2 Intended use**

[56] The intended use of seeds (e.g. breeding, multiplication, testing, field planting, growing under NPPO control) moved internationally may impact the probability of establishment. Seeds may be moved for purposes other than planting (i.e. trans-shipment) or may be planted under special conditions. The intended use should be considered when conducting the PRA and establishing phytosanitary measures (ISPM 32:2009).

[57] There is a range in the level of pest risk that may be associated with the various intended uses of seeds. While recognizing that the rankings may vary depending on circumstance, the risks can be broadly ranked from lowest pest risk to highest pest risk as follows:

[58] 1. Seeds with no potential to germinate or generate plants.

[59] For example, devitalized seeds imported for testing or destructive analysis.

[60] These seeds are not intended or suitable for planting and will not be released into the environment of the PRA area. For this category, NPPOs should not require phytosanitary measures as there is negligible risk.

[61] 2. Seeds not for planting but retaining viability.

[62] For example, seeds used for destructive biochemical analysis, diagnostic test controls and other forms of laboratory testing.

[63] In some cases, these seeds may be germinated to facilitate testing, but they are not intended for planting and will not be released into the environment of the PRA area. Laboratory or similar confinement is sufficient as a phytosanitary measure.

[64] 3. Seeds for planting under restricted conditions and not for general release.

[65] For example, seeds imported for research or for growth in protected environments (e.g. glasshouses, growth chambers).

[66] These seeds are planted under conditions that prevent their release into the environment of the PRA area. The required conditions should be developed by the NPPO of the importing country.

[67] 4. Seeds for planting under restricted conditions with the intention of release.

[68] These seeds are imported under post-entry quarantine, with treatment as a phytosanitary measure, and are limited to growth in protected environments (e.g. glasshouses, growth chambers) or with field isolation.

Examples include seeds for evaluation and potential release, seeds imported for research, seeds imported for genetic resources/gene banks, and seeds as breeding material.

[69] These seeds are planted under conditions that limit or prevent the introduction of regulated pests into the environment of the PRA area. The required conditions should be developed by the NPPO of the importing country.

[70] 5. Seeds for planting.

[71] This class of seeds includes seeds imported with the intent of planting them in the broader environment.

[72] Because these seeds are generally intended for unrestricted release into the environment of the PRA area, this class of seeds presents the highest potential pest risk. The need for suitable phytosanitary measures should be considered.

[73] **2. Phytosanitary Measures**

[74] Phytosanitary measures should be used to prevent the introduction of quarantine pests identified during the PRA and in accordance with the requirements outlined in section 1 of this standard.

[75] **2.1 Seed certification schemes**

[76] Certain elements of a seed certification scheme may already include measures that may be recognized as phytosanitary measures, including testing for the presence of weed seeds.

[77] **2.2 Resistant varieties**

[78] Modern breeding programmes result in plant varieties with multiple resistance to pests, which may include resistance to regulated pests. When confirmed resistance to a regulated pest exists, importing countries should consider this resistance in the PRA for the importation of seeds.

[79] A plant variety's level of resistance to different regulated pests may vary depending on the resistance genes present. Resistance genes may be effective against all or some races or biotypes of the targeted pest but the emergence of new races or biotypes may impact the level of resistance. Therefore, the use of pest resistance as a phytosanitary measure must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Pest resistance may be a useful measure when used in combination with other phytosanitary measures in an integrated pest management approach.

[80] Appendix 1 of this standard lists some references on the use of resistant varieties.

[81] **2.3 Pest free areas, pest free places of production and pest free production sites**

[82] Pest free areas, pest free places of production and pest free production sites should be recognized, established and maintained in accordance with ISPM 4:1995 and ISPM 10:1999.

[83] **2.4 Treatments**

[84] Seed treatments include a variety of techniques that may involve, but are not limited to, heat, hot water, fungicides, insecticides, nematicides and chemical disinfectants.

[85] Some seed treatments may be used as phytosanitary measures.

[86] Appendix 2 of this standard provides an overview of available treatments for each pest category.

[87] **2.5 Packaging**

[88] Seeds should be packed in a way that prevents exposure to pests and prevents tampering.

[89] **2.6 Measures for seed production**

[90] Measures used for seed production could also be applied for pest risk management of seed production. These measures should be implemented bearing in mind the specific crop–pest combination and they should

cover all stages of seed production. The measures should ensure full traceability.

[91] A phytosanitary measure approved by the NPPO of the exporting country after consultation with the importing country may be included in pest risk management and hygiene protocols based on best practices. The NPPO of the exporting country should monitor the correct use and implementation of such approved protocols.

[92] Measures that may be recognized, and for which the NPPO may develop specific requirements, may include:

[93] - Pre-planting:

[94] • use of tested, healthy planting material

[95] • crop rotation

[96] • field selection use of resistant or less susceptible varieties

[97] • soil treatment

[98] - Pre-harvest:

[99] • hygiene measures (e.g. disinfection of workers' hands or shoes)

[100] • field inspection

[101] • sanitation (e.g. rogueing of infected or suspicious plants, weeds, plant debris)

[102] • parent plant testing

[103] • crop treatment

[104] • protected conditions

[105] - Harvest and post-harvest handling:

[106] • hygiene measures (e.g. disinfection of workers' hands or shoes)

[107] • use of disinfectants during seed extraction

[108] • seed cleaning

[109] • seed storage

[110] • seed treatment

[111] • seed packaging

[112] • sanitation (e.g. removing plant debris or rogueing of infected plants)

[113] - Transportation and distribution:

[114] • Packaging (e.g. pest proof packaging material)

[115] • maintaining phytosanitary security of the consignment.

[116] **2.7 Post-entry quarantine**

[117] NPPOs may apply post-entry quarantine to seeds considered to pose a high risk of introducing quarantine pests. Guidance on post-entry quarantine stations is provided in ISPM 34:2010.

[118] The NPPO of the importing country may consider, based on the findings of a PRA, that the risk of a regulated pest introduction can be sufficiently managed by requiring the imported seeds to be planted in a designated planting area. The planting area should provide isolation from other host plants, and weed control and hygiene measures for people, machinery and tools should be used as needed.

[119] Isolation may be considered, for example, for importation of a large amount of high risk seeds (requiring post-entry quarantine) from an area with limited pest incidence. Regulated pests for which isolation may be appropriate include symptomatic viruses that are not known to be vectored by insects. Isolation may not be appropriate for symptomless pathogens or pathogens with insect vectors capable of spreading from the isolation area.

[120] **2.8 Prohibition**

[121] NPPOs may prohibit importation of seeds of certain species or origins considered high risk if they have no suitable phytosanitary measures. Further guidance on prohibition can be found in ISPM 20:2004. The decision to prohibit import should be based on a PRA.

[122] Guidance on prohibition as an emergency measure is given in ISPM 13:2001.

[123] Importers may request the NPPO of the importing country to permit seeds for research or specialized commercial purposes. The NPPO may allow the entry of such seeds under a permit, which should include specific conditions to prevent the introduction and spread of regulated pests. When a PRA determines that the seeds pose a high risk of becoming plants as pests, prohibition may be considered as a phytosanitary measure.

[124] **3. Equivalence of Phytosanitary Measures**

[125] Equivalence of phytosanitary measures is particularly important for the international movement of seeds because of the global aspects of the seed trade with frequent re-export from the same seed lot.

[126] For seeds, an example of an equivalent phytosanitary measure is substituting a requirement for field inspection of plants for a target pest in the country of origin with an appropriate seed test or an effective seed treatment for the target pest.

[127] **4. Specific Requirements**

[128] **4.1 Inspection**

[129] Inspection may be conducted on the seed lot or as field inspection of the growing crop. ISPM 23:2005 and ISPM 31:2008 provide further guidance on inspection and sampling.

[130] **4.1.1 Inspection of seeds**

[131] Seed lots can be examined for the presence of weed seeds and seeds can be examined for signs or symptoms of regulated pests or regulated articles (e.g. sclerotia, soil). This is an effective method where seeds are known to display characteristic symptoms such as discoloration or shrivelling. For example, infection from *Cercospora kikuchii* in soybean seeds causes purple seed stain. *Phomopsis longicolla* of soybean and *Arachis hypogeae* and *Cylindrocladium parasiticum* in peanut can discolour and shrivel seeds.

[132] Visual examination can be done manually or using devices that automatically sort seeds based on visual physical characteristics. Visual examination should be combined with other testing methods if screening for asymptomatic or unreliably symptomatic regulated pests is required. Visual examination can be useful for small seed lots but may need to be combined with other methods for larger lots.

[133] Certain pests (e.g. nematodes) are not detectable by simple inspection and may require a more specialized laboratory examination.

[134] Inspection of coated seeds may not be appropriate because the coating material reduces the ability to see the seed or symptoms of the pest on the seed.

[135] The NPPO of the importing country may request the NPPO of the exporting country to provide a sample of the seeds before coating, to assess the pest risk and in order to determine if import requirements will be

necessary.

[136] **4.1.2 Field inspection**

[137] Inspection of plants in the field may be a useful phytosanitary measure for quarantine pests known to produce visible symptoms. The use of this measure requires staff trained to recognize the pests of concern as well as identify the appropriate time to monitor for the pests during crop growth.

[138] **4.2 Sampling**

[139] Because it is difficult to inspect a seed consignment, inspection for the detection of pests is usually based on some type of sampling. Sampling for inspection may be statistically based or dictated by operational feasibility. Sampling implies a threshold for the level of detection of infestation, infection or contamination.

[140] Guidance on sampling of consignments for inspection is given in ISPM 31:2008.

[141] **4.2.1 Sampling of small lots**

[142] Testing of samples taken from small lots when statistically valid samples are required as per ISPM 31:2008 may result in the destruction of an unacceptably large proportion of the lot. In such cases, equivalent means of meeting phytosanitary import requirements should be explored. Some examples are:

[143] 1. fixed proportion samples (e.g. 10% of the seed lot)

[144] 2. reduced sample size

[145] 4. testing plant material from mother plants (e.g. plant tissue).

[146] **4.2.2 Sampling of seeds in sealed containers**

[147] NPPOs should consider the phytosanitary security of the consignment when designing sampling protocols (e.g. minimizing the number of sealed (air-tight) bags opened to obtain the required samples).

[148] **4.3 Detection**

[149] In certain cases, inspection may not be sufficient to determine if a pest is present and other forms of detection may be needed; for example, laboratory testing. Pests such as viruses, bacteria, fungi and some nematodes may not be detected by inspection of seeds. These pests may instead be detected by specific laboratory tests developed and validated for regulated pests in seeds.

[150] For detecting pests in or on seeds, particular attention should be paid to the performance criteria (sensitivity, specificity, repeatability and reproducibility) of the diagnostic protocols used. These criteria may be affected by, for example, low titre (the lowest concentration of an organism that can be detected in the test) of the pest in the seed or inhibition by seed components or seed microflora. In order to guarantee performance of the diagnostic protocols, NPPOs are encouraged to apply protocols that have been reviewed by experts or validated.

[151] Further information on available validated and reviewed diagnostic protocols can be found in Appendix 1 of this standard. The general principles of diagnostic protocols are described in ISPM 27:2006.

[152] **4.3.1 Serological and molecular diagnostic protocols**

[153] Serological and molecular diagnostic tests are considered indirect protocols. They detect specific pest components that may be present even when pests are no longer viable. Consequently, when testing seeds with these methods, results should be interpreted carefully. Because positive results can occur even when no viable pests are present, confirmatory direct tests or additional indirect tests may be required, provided the performance criteria are equivalent.

[154] **4.3.2 Treated seeds**

[155] Ideally, treatment efficacy for inactivating a pest is determined using a detection method that detects only viable pests so that a negative test result indicates the treatment has been successful. Examples of such detection methods are techniques for the detection of fungi where the mycelium will grow on the substrate

(i.e. media or blotters), and techniques for the detection of bacteria and fungi where the seeds are sown and symptoms observed on plantlets (i.e. grow-out).

[156] Test results of treated seeds should be interpreted carefully because treatments may interact with diagnostic tests in several ways:

[157] - The treatment inactivates the pest but the detection method detects the viable and non-viable pests, which happens with some indirect tests or tests in which detection is based on morphological identification of pests or pest structures that may remain even after treatment (e.g. nematodes, spores). In such cases, determination of the efficacy of the treatment may be inconclusive.

[158] - The treatment adversely affects the detection method; for example, a method detects only pests present externally but the pest remains present internally after treatment and is not detected. In these situations, other detection methods able to detect internal infection should be used (e.g. *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *campestris* after disinfection is not detected after seeds are soaked but may still be detected after seeds are ground).

[159] - The treatment may physically or chemically inhibit the detection method (e.g. some detection methods for bacteria are affected by fungicide treatments).

[160] - The treatment causes false positive, false negative or unreadable results (in serological or molecular detection methods). For false negative and unreadable results, detection methods should be applied to an untreated sample (where the treatment is not aimed at suppressing or inactivating the target pest), or spiked positive controls (i.e. a pure culture with the target pest added to the seed extract) should be tested by the detection method.

[161] **4.4 Importation of small seed lots**

[162] The NPPO of the importing country may establish specific procedures for the importation of small seed lots (e.g. individual packets of seed) taking into account the intended use, size of the lot, production history and origin of the seeds.

[163] **5. Phytosanitary Certification**

[164] **5.1 General considerations**

[165] The global and temporal nature of the seed trade (i.e. long-term storage, re-export to many destinations) presents phytosanitary certification challenges distinct from those of the international movement of other more perishable commodities.

[166] Additional official phytosanitary information, which is not required by the first country of import, attesting to freedom from pests may be included on the phytosanitary certificate when requested by the exporter to facilitate future re-export to other countries. This information should be separated from the additional declaration required by the first country of import, in accordance with ISPM 12:2011.

[167] In some cases, the phytosanitary import requirement for a field inspection is not known at the time of production. NPPOs of the exporting country should consider additional field inspections on the request of the producer to allow future re-export. NPPOs of the importing country should consider equivalent phytosanitary measures as options to fulfil phytosanitary import requirements when seed is already harvested.

[168] “Origin” refers to the place(s) where the seeds were grown. If seeds are stored or moved, the pest risk may change over a period of time as a result of their new location. In such cases, the new location should be added to the place of origin in addition to the country of production, in accordance with ISPM 12:2011. If different lots within a consignment originate from different countries, all countries should be indicated.

[169] **5.2 Mixing and blending of seeds**

[170] Mixing and blending of seeds may occur for various reasons.

[171] - Mixing of seeds combines different species, varieties or cultivars of seeds into a single lot (e.g. grasses, ornamentals).

[172] - Blending of seeds combines different seed lots of the same variety.

[173] Seeds from the same country of origin may be mixed and blended, as may seeds from various origins.

[174] Traceability for export and re-export of all original seed lots comprising the mixture or blend should be guaranteed to meet the requirements of the importing country.

[175] All countries of origin must be listed on the phytosanitary certificate, in accordance with ISPM 12:2011.

[176] In the case of a phytosanitary certificate for re-export, validated copies of the original phytosanitary certificates of the components of the mixture or blend should be attached to the re-export certificate.

[177] **6. Record Keeping**

[178] Because seeds may be stored for many years before being exported or re-exported, records on origin, phytosanitary procedures applied and international movements should be retained for at least five years and made available to the NPPO of the importing country upon request.

[179] This annex is a prescriptive part of the standard

[180] **ANNEX 1: Guidance on the likelihood for pest groups to be present in the seed pathway and their potential to establish and spread**

[181] **1. Pest Groups**

[182] Pests associated with seeds can be grouped based on information regarding their likelihood to be present in the seed pathway and their potential to establish and spread via this pathway. This information may be useful in conducting a pest risk analysis (PRA).

[183] **1.1 Insects in the field**

[184] Insects in the field are pests that feed on the seed or within the seed during the plant growth and seed development period, before harvest.

[185] Insects in the field that are unlikely to be present in the seed pathway:

[186]
- External feeders: insects that feed on external parts of seeds are not attached to the seed and will be dislodged during harvesting and cleaning.

[187]
- Internal feeders causing seed abortion: insects that feed on internal parts of seeds causing this damage will cause seed to fall before maturity and harvest.

[188] Insects in the field that may be present in the seed pathway:

[189]
- Internal feeders of the mature seed: Insects found internally in mature seeds may be present during harvest and collected with healthy seeds. Further consideration would be needed to determine whether these insects would be visibly obvious during quality grading or quarantine inspection and whether they would survive storage environments and durations (e.g. Bruchidae spp. in certain host species).

[190] **1.2 Stored product insects**

[191] Stored product insects, while they are dependent on opportunistic storage conditions and are unlikely to be present, can infest seeds after harvest, particularly if the seeds are stored under poor conditions. Given the high value of seeds for planting, it is unlikely that commercial seeds would be stored in a manner that would provide stored product insects with an opportunity to infest the seeds.

[192] Stored product insects that are unlikely to be present in the seed pathway:

[193]
- External feeders: insects that feed on external parts of seeds will destroy the seed and pose a risk only as contaminants. External feeders are not attached to the seed. Secondary pests (e.g. *Mycetophagus* spp., *Acarus* spp., *Liposcelis* spp.) may also be present if there is poor sanitation causing excessive extraneous matter.

[194] Stored product insects that may be present in the seed pathway:

[195]
- Internal feeders: insects that feed on internal parts of seeds can infest seeds if the seeds are left exposed for a period before packaging. Consideration should be given as to the likelihood of poor storage conditions, whether infested seeds would be detectable and whether the insect would survive the transport environment.

[196] **1.3 Pests other than insects**

[197] There is limited, and at times conflicting, information available in the published literature regarding the seed transmissibility of pathogens (e.g. *Hop latent viroid* in tomato). In addition, a pathogen that has been proven to be seed-transmissible in one host is not necessarily seed-transmissible in all known hosts. This issue is complicated by several determining factors, such as the capability of the host to support transmission and the level of host infection.

[198] National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) should consider in the wider determination of pathogen–host interaction that experimental hosts may not be true hosts. The interaction may be purely artificial and not demonstrative that infection would occur in the natural environment.

[199] **1.3.1 Fungi**

[200] Fungal species can be associated with seeds both superficially and internally, though many are not considered to be pathogenic. However, there are species that can cause seed rot, necrosis, reduced germination and disease in resultant seedlings. Seed fungal pathogens can be grouped as field pathogens and storage pathogens. Fungi may be present on the surface of seeds or mixed with seeds as contaminants, and can be introduced and spread to the host crop or to other crops (e.g. by soil contamination). Fungi can also be present in the teguments or in the internal part of the seed and be introduced and spread to the host crop in this way.

[201] **1.3.2 Bacteria**

[202] Bacteria can be found on seeds as either external or internal infections. Not all bacteria are seed-transmitted. Bacteria associated with seeds are not capable of establishment without seed transmission.

[203] **1.3.3 Viruses**

[204] Viruses as a general rule are only seed-transmissible if the seed embryo is infected, although there are exceptions in the *Tobamovirus* genus. Not all viruses are seed-transmitted.

[205] **1.3.4 Viroids**

[206] Seed transmission has been demonstrated for many viroids but there are also those for which it has not been demonstrated. Not all viroids are seed-transmitted.

[207] **1.3.5 Phytoplasmas**

[208] Phytoplasmas are primarily known to be spread by infected vegetative propagation material and insect vectors. The seed transmissibility for phytoplasmas has not been demonstrated.

[209] **1.3.6 Nematodes**

[210] The majority of nematodes are known to be internal or external root parasites, though there are some species known to attack above-ground plant parts such as seeds (e.g. *Ditylenchus dipsaci* (Kuehn) Filipjev and *Anguina tritici* (Steinbuch) Chitwood). Nematode species identified as seed-transmissible quarantine pests belong to species that are known to be endoparasites (internal feeders of above-ground plant parts). But other species are ectoparasites (e.g. *Aphelenchoides besseyi* Christie) and have dormant stages in the seed or on plant debris around seeds.

[211] **1.3.7 Plants as pests**

[212] Weed seeds may be introduced into a country when moving seeds for planting internationally.

[213] **2. Possible Outcomes When Evaluating Whether Seed Can Be a Pathway**

[214]
- Phytosanitary measures may be considered when:

[215]
- plant species is a host, and seeds can be a pathway for entry and can lead to establishment of the pest

[216]
- plant species is not a host, but seeds can be a pathway for entry (contaminating pest) and can lead to establishment of the pest.

[217]
- Phytosanitary measures should not be considered when:

[218]
- plant species is a host, but seeds are not a pathway for pest introduction

[219]
- plant species is a host and seeds can be a pathway for entry but cannot lead to establishment of

the pest

[220]

- plant species is not a host, but seeds can be a pathway for entry (contaminating pest) but cannot lead to establishment

[221]

- plant species is not a host, and seeds are not a pathway for entry.

[222] PRA (see ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 11:2013 and ISPM 21:2004) provides a basis for determining the potential of seeds being a pest risk.

[223] This annex is a prescriptive part of the standard

[224] **ANNEX 2: Forest tree seeds**

[225] *[Note: This annex is currently under development.]*

[226] This appendix is for reference purposes only and is not a prescriptive part of the standard

[227] **APPENDIX 1: Bibliography**

[228] The references included in this appendix are easily accessible and generally recognized as authoritative. The list is neither comprehensive nor static.

[229] **Seed as a pathway, and seed-borne and seed-transmitted diseases**

[230] **Cram, M.M. & Fraedrich, S.W.** Seed diseases and seedborne pathogens of North America (forest trees). *Tree Planters' Notes,* 53(2): 35–44. Available at http://naldc.nal.usda.gov/download/41643/PDF

[231] **Johansen, E., Edwards, M.C & Hampton, R.O.** 1994. Seed transmission of viruses: Current perspectives. *Annual Review of Phytopathology,* 32: 363–386. Available at http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.py.32.090194.002051

[232] **Mink, G.I.** 1993. Pollen- and seed-transmitted viruses and viroids. *Annual Review of Phytopathology,* 31: 375–402. Available at http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.py.31.090193.002111

[233] **Richardson, M.J.** 1990. *An annotated list of seed-borne diseases,* 4th edn. Bassersdorf, Switzerland, International Seed Testing Association (ISTA). Available at http://www.seedtest.org/en/productdetail---0--0--0--32.html

[234] Note: Update of the International Seed Testing Association (ISTA) "List of seed-borne diseases" is in progress as part of the TESTA project on the basis of a full literature review with expert analysis of scientific papers. It will take the form of a database on the ISTA website (http://services.prismanet.ch/SeedDiseasesDb).

[235] **Sastry, K.S.** 2013. *Seed-borne plant virus diseases.* New Delhi, Springer Publishing.

[236] Note: An International Seed Federation (ISF) pest list is available on the ISF website (http://www.worldseed.org/isf/pest_lists.html).

[237] **Seed health testing and sampling protocols**

[238] **Agarwal, P.C., Mortensen, C.N. & Mathur, S.B.** 1989. *Seed-borne diseases and seed health testing of rice.* Copenhagen, Danish Government Institute of Seed Pathology for Developing Countries and Kew, CAB International Mycological Institute.

[239] **Albrechtsen, S.E.** 2005. *Testing methods for seed-transmitted viruses: Principles and protocols.* Oxford, UK, Oxford University Press.

[240] **CABI** (CAB International). 2006. *Testing methods for seed-transmitted viruses: Principles and protocols.* Wallingford, UK, CABI Publishing.

[241] **Chahal, S.S., Thakur, R.P. & Mathur, S.B.** 1994. *Seed-borne diseases and seed health testing of pearl millet.* Copenhagen, Danish Government Institute of Seed Pathology for Developing Countries.

[242] **EPPO** (European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization). *Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests.* Paris, EPPO. Available at http://archives.eppo.int/EPPOStandards/diagnostics.htm (accessed December 2013).

[243] **ISHI** (International Seed Health Initiative). *Manual of seed health testing methods.* Nyon, Switzerland, International Seed Federation (ISF). Available at http://www.worldseed.org/isf/ishi_vegetable.html (accessed July 2013).

[244] **ISTA** (International Seed Testing Association). 2012. *International rules for seed testing. Seed health testing methods.* Bassersdorf, Switzerland, ISTA. Available at http://www.seedtest.org/en/download-ista-seed-health-testing-methods-_content---1--1132--746.html (accessed May 2014).

[245] **Mathur, S.B. & Cunfer, B.M.**, eds. 1993. *Seed-borne diseases and seed health testing of wheat.* Copenhagen, Danish Government Institute of Seed Pathology for Developing Countries.

[246] **NSHS** (National Seed Health System). *Diagnostic protocols for seed health testing.* Ames, IA, NSHS-USDA. Available at http://www.nshs.iastate.edu/Method_Stand.html (accessed January 2014).

[247] **Palacio-Bielsa, A., Cambra, M.A. & López, M.M.** 2009. PCR detection and identification of plant-pathogenic bacteria: Updated review of protocols (1989–2007). *Journal of Plant Pathology,* 91(2): 249–297.

[248] **Use of resistant varieties**

[249] **ISF** (International Seed Federation). *Plant diseases and resistance.* Nyon, Switzerland, ISF. Available at http://www.worldseed.org/isf/diseases_resistance.html (accessed December 2013).

[250] **Other**

[251] **USDA-APHIS/Iowa State University Seed Science Center.** *National seed health system.* Ames, IA, NSHS-USDA. Available at http://www.nshs.iastate.edu/#nogo (accessed May 2014).

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

[253] **APPENDIX 2: General classification of seed treatments**

[254] **1. Pesticides**

[255] Pesticides are generally used against fungi and insect pests and occasionally against bacteria and nematodes. The use of pesticides as seed treatment is regulated by national legislation and therefore authorization, formulations and concentration differ among countries and may also change over time.

[256] **2. Disinfectants**

[257] Disinfectants are generally used against bacteria and viruses. Disinfection may take place during various steps in seed processing (e.g. seed extraction, seed priming[1] or during a dedicated disinfection process. Seed disinfection can eradicate or inactivate micro-organism infestation and infection, depending on the process and the biocide applied.

[258] **3. Physical treatments**

[259] Dry heat, steam, hot water, irradiation, (ultraviolet) light, high pressure, deep-freezing and other physical treatments are used to control bacteria, viruses, fungi and nematodes.

[260] **4. Biological treatments**

[261] Biological treatments are based on different modes of action, such as antagonism, competition and induced resistance. The pest may actually be on the seed at the time of planting but establishment is not possible or strongly reduced when the biological treatment is activated during germination. Biological treatments may also be used against soil-borne pests (e.g. nematodes) to create a space free from pests around the germinating seed and the root zone of the plant.

[262] **Footnote 1:** Seed priming is the pre-treatment of seeds by various methods in order to improve the seed germination rate, the percentage of germination and the uniformity of seedling emergence.

Appendix 6 - Draft ISPM International movement of used vechicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004)

[1] **Draft ISPM: International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004)**

[2]

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	2014-05-22
Document category	Draft ISPM (priority 3)
Current document stage	*To* member consultation
Major stages	2006-04 CPM-1 added topic Guidelines for the movement of used machinery and equipment (2006-004) 2007-11 SC approved draft specification for member consultation 2007-12 Draft specification submitted to member consultation 2009-05 SC approved specification 48 2013-05 Expert Working Group (EWG) met and drafted ISPM 2014-05 SC approved draft ISPM for member consultation 2014-07 member consultation
Steward history	2007-05 SC: Mr Gabriel ADEJARE (NG, Lead Steward) 2007-11 SC: Mr Robert KARYEIJA (UG, Lead Steward) 2009-05 SC: Mr Guillermo ROSSI (AR, Lead Steward) 2012-11 SC: Mr Alexandre PALMA (BR, Assistant Steward) 2012-11 SC: Mr Ngatoko NGATOKO (CK, Lead Steward)
Notes	2011-11 Specification reformatted 2011-12 Applied consistency changes to Specification in line with the decision made by SC May 2009 2012-11 SC replaced task regarding implementation issues 2013-10 Edited 2014-04 Lead Steward and Assistant Steward revised draft ISPM based on TPG comments on consistency (modifications in track changes) 2014-05 Lead Steward revised draft ISPM 2014-05 Edited

[3] **Adoption**

[4] [Insert text]

[5] **INTRODUCTION**

[6] **Scope**

[7] This standard identifies and categorizes pest risks associated with the international movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment. It describes phytosanitary measures that may be applied to used vehicles, machinery and equipment utilized in agriculture, forestry, horticulture, earth moving, surface mining and waste management and to used military vehicles, machinery and equipment.

[8] This standard does not cover vehicles or other conveyances moving under their own motive power over international borders.

[9] **References**

[10] **IPPC.** 1997. International Plant Protection Convention. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[11] **ISPM 2.** 2007. *Framework for pest risk analysis.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[12] **ISPM 5.** *Glossary of phytosanitary terms.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[13] **ISPM 11.** 2013. *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[14] **ISPM 13.** 2001. *Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[15] **ISPM 15.** 2009. *Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[16] **ISPM 20.** 2004. *Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[17] **Recommendation CPM-3/2008.** *Replacement or reduction of the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[18] **Definitions**

[19] Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5.

[20] **Outline of Requirements**

[21] This standard describes measures that may be applied to used vehicles, machinery and equipment. After applying those measures, used vehicles, machinery and equipment should be considered clean; that is, as free as practically possible from soil, pests, plant debris, seeds and plants for planting. Used agricultural, forestry and horticultural vehicles, machinery and equipment are particularly likely to carry contaminating pests. Used earth moving machinery, surface mining equipment and waste management vehicles are also more likely to be contaminated.

[22] This standard describes three main groups of measures:

[23] 1. general treatments and contamination controls

[24] 2. facilities and waste disposal requirements

[25] 3. verification and checking procedures.

[26] The standard also provides guidance to national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) working with the military on phytosanitary measures applicable to the deployment and redeployment of used military vehicles, machinery and equipment (Appendix 1).

[27] **BACKGROUND**

[28] Used vehicles, machinery and equipment are regulated articles frequently traded or otherwise moved between countries. They may have been used in agriculture, forestry and horticulture, as well as for construction, industrial purposes, mining and waste management. They can also be used military vehicles, machinery and equipment. Depending on their use before export, they may have become contaminated with pests. When moved internationally as either a traded commodity or an operational relocation (e.g. in the case of custom harvesters) the used vehicles, machinery and equipment can carry soil, pests, plant debris, and seeds and plants as pests, and they may therefore present a pest risk to the importing country. Depending on their use in the country of import, they may introduce quarantine pests to agricultural, forested, wilderness or other areas.

[29] Examples of pests that may be associated with the movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment are found in Appendix 2.

[30] Specific guidance is needed for NPPOs regarding the pest risks associated with the movement of used

vehicles, machinery and equipment and the phytosanitary measures that may be required in order to facilitate their safe movement.

[31] **IMPACT ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT**

[32] The cleaning or disinfection of used vehicles, machinery and equipment may also provide a means to prevent the entry into new areas of organisms other than pests. These could include organisms relevant to biodiversity (invasive alien species), human health and animal health.

[33] **REQUIREMENTS**

[34] **1. Pest Risks**

[35] The main pest risk associated with used vehicles, machinery and equipment is contamination with soil, pests, plant debris, and seeds and plants for planting. Seeds and other plants for planting may be of concern because the plant itself can be a pest. Pests that have a resistant or dormant life stage allowing them to survive transport to endangered areas are a specific concern.

[36] **1.1 Elements of risk categorization**

[37] Pest risk analysis (PRA) for used vehicles, machinery and equipment should be performed in accordance with ISPM 2:2007 and ISPM 11:2013 to technically justify any requirements for phytosanitary measures. The PRA should take into account the following elements that may affect the level of pest risk:

[38] - type: more complex machines, for example, have more areas that may carry pests or contamination

[39] - prior use: use of the used vehicles, machinery and equipment on farms, in crop fields, in forests, in close proximity to vegetation or for carrying organic material means they may carry pests or contamination

[40] - storage: used vehicles, machinery and equipment stored outdoors and in close proximity to vegetation may carry pests or contamination

[41] - intended use: pests may establish in endangered areas if they are transported on used vehicles, machinery and equipment that will be used in agricultural areas, in forests or in close proximity to vegetation

[42] - Origin: area of use before export.

[43] Examples of used vehicles, machinery and equipment are ranked in order of decreasing pest risk, and provided in Appendix 3 together with possible phytosanitary measures.

[44] **2. Measures**

[45] This standard describes three main groups of measures:

[46] 1. general treatments and contamination controls

[47] 2. facilities and waste disposal requirements

[48] 3. verification procedures.

[49] NPPOs may authorize entities involved in the implementation of these measures.

[50] NPPOs are encouraged to work with military authorities to follow the requirements included in Appendix 1 of this standard.

[51] **2.1 Treatments and contamination controls**

[52] **2.1.1 Cleaning and treatments**

[53] Cleaning methods include:

[54] • abrasive blasting

[55] • emptying water reservoirs, removing debris

[56] • pressure washing

[57] • steam cleaning

[58] • sweeping and vacuuming.

[59] Treatments may be used in addition to cleaning:

[60] • chemical treatment (e.g. fumigation, disinfection)

[61] • cold treatment

[62] • heat treatment.

[63] Partial or full dismantling of the used vehicles, machinery and equipment may be necessary for effective cleaning or treatment.

[64] **2.1.2 Contamination controls**

[65] After cleaning, where used vehicles, machinery and equipment are moved to a storage area, packing area or port of loading or when they are transiting through another country measures should be taken to avoid contamination. These include, as appropriate:

[66] • Used vehicles, machinery and equipment should be stored at an appropriate distance from pest habitats (the distance will depend on the pest) and in areas free of risk from contamination by vegetation, soil, free standing water or contaminated cargo.

[67] • Used vehicles, machinery and equipment should be stored or handled on fully sealed surfaces.

[68] • Vegetation around port areas should be kept short by mowing or the use of weed controls to reduce the risk of contamination by airborne seeds. Consideration should also be given to the erection of barriers to stop seed movement around loading and storage areas.

[69] During seasonal pest emergence periods or occasional pest outbreaks, special consideration should be given to measures that prevent pests being attracted to the area (e.g. restricting the use of artificial lights).

[70] **2.2 Facilities and waste disposal**

[71] The type of equipment and nature of facilities necessary for phytosanitary decontamination or disinfection of used vehicles, machinery and equipment depend on where the decontamination or disinfection takes place. Facilities can be separated into those in the exporting country and those in the importing country. A facility in the exporting country may not need an elaborate solid waste and water management system as the contamination may be of local origin.

[72] Facilities that may be required for the inspection or checking, cleaning and treatment of used vehicles, machinery and equipment may include:

[73] • sealed areas for inspection or checking and cleaning, with, if appropriate, soil traps and wastewater management systems

[74] • heat treatment facilities

[75] • fumigation facilities (operated by an authorized fumigator[1]).

[76] Disposal of soil and contaminated washing water should be in accordance with national or local regulations. Containment and disposal methods in the importing country should be sufficient to prevent the spread of

pests and may include:

[77]
- bagging

[78]
- incineration

[79]
- deep burial

[80]
- treatment.

[81] **2.3 Verification procedures**

[82] Requirements for documentation, to help demonstrate consignments have been cleaned (e.g. an importer declaration, a cleaning declaration, a treatment certificate, photographic evidence or a phytosanitary certificate), should be determined by the NPPO of the importing country in relation to the identified pest risks.

[83] An NPPO may conduct import inspections to verify that cleaning of used vehicles, machinery and equipment has occurred. Import inspections may include partial or full dismantling of used vehicles, machinery and equipment, and in some cases, collection of specimens for identification. Verification of cleanliness may involve inspection, as well as probing and flushing of hidden areas (e.g. by using water under high pressure or compressed air).

[84] The NPPO of an exporting country may authorize cleaning and treatment facilities for used vehicles, machinery and equipment. If an authorization system is in place, the NPPO of the importing country may verify compliance through import inspections at a reduced frequency.

[85] Where the risks associated with used vehicles, machinery and equipment affect animal and human health and biodiversity, NPPOs should coordinate with relevant agencies as necessary.

[86] Cleaning of used military vehicles, machinery and equipment may be verified by military authorities.

[87] **3. Non-compliance and Emergency Actions**

[88] Where non-compliance occurs, the importing country may take phytosanitary action as outlined in ISPM 13:2001 and in ISPM 20:2004.

[89] Emergency actions should be limited to – as far as possible – detention, treatment or reshipment of the used vehicles, machinery and equipment found to be contaminated. Where contaminated used vehicles, machinery or equipment need to be transported to another location for treatment, NPPOs should ensure that contamination is suitably contained (e.g. containerized).

[90] This appendix is for reference purposes only and is not a prescriptive part of the standard **APPENDIX 1: Guidance for the international movement of used military vehicles, machinery and equipment**

[91] **Background**

[92] The international movement of used military vehicles, machinery and equipment may represent a risk for the introduction of soil, pests, plant debris, and seeds and plants as pests to the countries of both deployment and redeployment. Pests that have been associated with the international movement of used military vehicles, machinery and equipment include quarantine pests such as *Achatina fulica* (Giant African snail) and *Lymantria dispar* (Gypsy moth). Military operations occur continually around the world and encompass many different forms of transport and cargo storage conditions. National operational forces may operate independently or in multinational forces.

[93] The international movement of used military vehicles, machinery and equipment may present a practical problem to national plant protection organizations (NPPOs), whose main responsibilities are described in the IPPC. In many countries NPPOs have no or limited access to the military due to security issues. For this reason, the approach taken in managing pest risks related to commercial and private shippers of used vehicles, machinery and equipment cannot be applied to the military. Due to the sensitive nature of military missions and equipment, it is imperative to have strategies in place that will facilitate mission fulfilment while minimizing pest risks. Consequently, it is proposed that military authorities commit to using this Guidance,

thus implementing IPPC requirements internally.

[94] **Objective**

[95] Used military vehicles, machinery and equipment are free from pests and soil before movement, as specified by the NPPO.

[96] Examples of military movements and transports are:

[97] • independent forces training and deployment

[98] • joint forces training and deployment

[99] • repositioning

[100] • mission demobilization

[101] • conflict deployment

[102] • peacekeeping missions

[103] • multinational training and missions

[104] • humanitarian relief missions.

[105] **Requirements**

[106] Military authorities should ensure that used vehicles, machinery and equipment are cleaned according to requirements developed by their NPPO. Cleaning methods may consist of:

[107] • pressure washing

[108] • steam cleaning

[109] • emptying water reservoirs, removing debris.

[110] These cleaning methods may need to be carried out in combination with partial or full dismantling of the used vehicles, machinery and equipment to ensure they are cleaned to a high standard.

[111] Additional treatments may be required, such as chemical treatment (e.g. fumigation, disinfection).

[112] Wood packaging material associated with used military vehicles, machinery and equipment should be compliant with ISPM 15:2009. If it is not, the wood packaging material or dunnage should be treated or destroyed.

[113] Military authorities are encouraged to liaise with their respective NPPOs. Military authorities are also encouraged to liaise with the NPPO in the country of deployment where practical. For detailed contact information for NPPOs, refer to the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP): https://www.ippc.int.

[114] Verification procedures should be implemented by military authorities to check used vehicles, machinery and equipment to ensure the appropriate cleaning or treatment has been carried out before deployment. Military authorities could use the following to help with verification: military preventive units, military co-operator training programmes with the NPPO, Military Customs Inspection (MCI) and inspections conducted by NPPO officials.

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

[116] **APPENDIX 2: Examples of pests that may be associated with the movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment**

[117] • *Beet necrotic yellow vein virus*, transmitted through soil via spores of its vector *Polymyxa betae*

[118] • *Clavibacter michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* (bacterial ring rot of potato), in plant residues

[119] • *Lymantria dispar* (gypsy moth), as diapausing egg masses

[120] • *Orgyia thyellina* (white spotted tussock moth), as diapausing pupae

[121] • *Halyomorpha halys* (brown marmorated stink bug), as overwintering adults

[122] • *Phytophthora ramorum* (sudden oak death), in soil

[123] • *Tilletia indica* (Karnal bunt), as spores in soil and on wheat seed residues

[124] • *Achatina fulica* (giant African snail), as aestivating adults

[125] • *Miconia calvescens*, as seeds in soil

[126] • *Chromolaena odorata* (Siam weed), as trapped seeds in used vehicles, machinery and equipment or in soil

[127] • *Globodera* spp. (potato cyst nematodes), in soil.

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

[129] **APPENDIX 3: Examples of used vehicles, machinery and equipment, ranked in order of decreasing pest risk together with possible phytosanitary measures**

[130]

Category	Notes	Examples of measures	Possible verification procedures
Agricultural, forestry and horticultural used vehicles, machinery and equipment, such as: - combine harvesters - sawmill machinery - logging trucks - animal transport vehicles - compost and manure trailers - tools. Reconditioned or field-tested used vehicles, machinery and equipment are included.	Contaminants: - soil - pests - plant debris - seeds and plants as pests. High risk is inherent in this category.	Abrasive blasting Chemical treatment (e.g. fumigation, disinfection) Cold treatment Heat treatment Emptying water reservoirs, removing debris Pressure washing Steam cleaning Sweeping and vacuuming	Cleaning declaration Treatment certificate Photographic evidence Importer declaration Import inspection (inspection may include dismantling and testing) Accreditation and audit
Earth moving used vehicles, machinery and equipment, such as: - bulldozers - graders - surface mining equipment. Reconditioned or field-tested used vehicles,	Soil is the main contaminant; pests, plant debris, and seeds and plants as pests can also be contaminants. Risk is variable, but high levels of contamination may	Abrasive blasting Chemical treatment (e.g. fumigation, disinfection) Emptying water reservoirs, removing debris Pressure washing	Cleaning declaration Treatment certificate Photographic evidence Importer declaration Import inspection (inspection may include dismantling and testing) Accreditation and audit

machinery and equipment are included.	occur in this category.	Steam cleaning Sweeping and vacuuming	
Used military vehicles, machinery and equipment, such as: - trucks - tanks - personnel carriers - rolling stock.	Contaminants: - soil - pests - plant debris - seeds and plants as pests. Risk is variable, but used military vehicles, machinery and equipment are often used off-road and stored outdoors, leading to a higher risk of contamination.	Chemical treatment (e.g. fumigation, disinfection) Emptying water reservoirs, removing debris Pressure washing Steam cleaning	Military (Appendix 1)
Waste management used vehicles, machinery and equipment, such as rubbish trucks and waste sorting equipment. Reconditioned used vehicles, machinery and equipment are included. Bulldozers used in landfills are considered under earth moving machinery.	Organic waste debris is the main contaminant, containing: - soil - pests - plant debris.	Abrasive blasting Chemical treatment (e.g. fumigation, disinfection) Emptying water reservoirs, removing debrisPressure washing Steam cleaning Sweeping and vacuuming	Cleaning declaration Treatment certificate Photographic evidence Importer declaration Import inspection (inspection may include dismantling and testing) Accreditation and audit
Deep mining used vehicles, machinery and equipment	The most likely contaminants are soil and pests. Generally, risks are low unless used vehicles, machinery and equipment are contaminated with surface soil. But note that it can be difficult to determine the prior use and whether or not used vehicles, machinery and equipment were used for surface mining.	Abrasive blasting Emptying water reservoirs, removing debris Pressure washing Steam cleaning	Cleaning declaration Photographic evidence Importer declaration Import inspection (inspection may include dismantling and testing) Quality assurance system
Industrial used vehicles, machinery and equipment used outdoors, such as: - cranes	Risk is variable, but generally low unless used vehicles, machinery and equipment are	Abrasive blasting Emptying water reservoirs, removing debris Pressure washing	Cleaning declaration Photographic evidence Importer declaration Import inspection

- forklifts.	proximity to vegetation or are contaminated with soil.	Steam cleaning	
Used vehicles, including: - cars, vans, trucks, buses - off-road vehicles (e.g. motorbikes, quad bikes, four-wheel drives) - locomotives and engines - used parts - trailers - attached tyres.	Contaminants: - soil - pests - plant debris - seeds and plants as pests. Extremely variable risk, with some used vehicles at high risk but many at low risk. Note the high volume of used vehicles of this category traded.	Abrasive blasting Chemical treatment (e.g. fumigation, disinfection) Heat treatment Emptying water reservoirs, removing debris Pressure washing Steam cleaning Sweeping and vacuuming	Cleaning declaration Treatment certificate Importer declaration Import inspection (inspection may include dismantling and testing) Quality assurance system
Rimless tyres (not attached to vehicles)	The main risk is to human health (mosquitoes carrying human diseases can live in pooled water inside tyres) but rimless tyres can also carry pests dependant on storage conditions. Risk management is different from other used vehicles, machinery and equipment in this standard.	Chemical treatment (e.g. fumigation, disinfection) Pressure washing Steam cleaning	Cleaning declaration Treatment certificate Importer declaration Import inspection Quality assurance system
Industrial used vehicles, machinery and equipment used indoors and not for agriculture or forestry	A this category may contain pests, but are no more likely to than many other imported commodities.	Not applicable	Not applicable
Reconditioned parts	Used vehicles, machinery and equipment in this category may contain pests, but are no more likely to than many other imported commodities.	Not applicable	Not applicable

[131] **Footnote 1:** Footnote 1: Methyl bromide use should comply with the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) recommendation CPM-3/2008

Appendix 7 - Draft Amendments to ISPM 5 (2014): *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* (1994-001)

Date of this document	2014-05-12
Document category	*Amendments to ISPM 5* (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) 2014 (1994-001)
Current document stage	2014-05 approved for member consultation
Major stages	CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms 2006-05 SC approved specification TP5 2012-10 TPG revised specification 2012-11 SC revised and approved revised specification, revoking Specification 1 2014-02 TPG reviewed draft amendments to ISPM 5 (2014) 2014-05 SC reviewed and approved for member consultation
Notes	2014-05 SC withdrew: identity (of a consignment) (2011-001), kiln-drying (2013-006) phytosanitary security (of a consignment) (2013-008) and integrity (of a consignment) 2014-05-19 edited by Secretariat

Members are asked to consider the following proposals for additions and revisions to ISPM 5 *(Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms)*. A brief explanation is given for each proposal. For revision of terms and definitions, only the proposed changes are open for comment. For full details on the discussions related to the specific terms, please refer to the meeting reports on the IPP.

1. ADDITIONS

1.1 BARK (AS A COMMODITY)

The discussions on the revision of the definitions for *bark* (2013-005) and *wood* (2013-011) (see section 2.5) in the TPG in February 2014 led to the proposal that *bark* (2013-005) did not need to be revised, but that it would be useful to define bark as a commodity. The TPG proposed a definition for *isolated bark (as a commodity))*. However, the SC in May 2014, when reviewing the term and definition, did not agree with this proposal because it was not found that *isolated* provided any additional clarification to the term. The SC agreed instead to define *bark (as a commodity)*. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition (cf. also *wood*, section 2.5).

- *Bark* is currently defined in the Glossary in its biological sense, specifying how the term should be understood in the IPPC context. Such a definition is needed, in particular, with regards to ISPM 15:2009 *(Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade)* in relation to debarking; definitions in ISPM 5 that mention bark; and the draft ISPM on *Management of pest risks associated with international movement of wood* (2006-029), which uses this term extensively.

- Also, a definition for *bark* as a commodity would be useful. Bark is dealt with as a commodity in the draft ISPM on *Management of pest risks associated with international movement of wood* (2006-029) (in its sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.8). It was proposed to describe the commodity in a sufficiently broad manner (i.e. avoiding *bark chips*, used only once in that draft ISPM, because it may not be appropriate for all bark commodities).

Proposed addition

bark (as a **commodity**)	**Bark** separated from wood

2. REVISIONS

2.1 *additional declaration* (2010-006)

The term *additional declaration* was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in November 2010, as there was an inconsistency between the definition in ISPM 5 and ISPM 12:2011 *(Phytosanitary certificates)*, which provides that soil may be the subject of additional declarations. The issue was discussed by the TPG in February 2013 and the SC November 2013 to consider whether *soil* only or *regulated articles* should be added to the definition. The SC requested the definition be modified to cover *regulated articles*. A definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2014. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition.

- ISPM 12:2011 provides that soil may also be the subject of additional declarations. Freedom from soil is a common requirement for additional declarations.
- Other items may be subject to additional declarations, such as growing media or the packaging in which the commodity is held. In order to cover such cases, the definition was broadened to regulated articles.

Original definition

additional declaration	A statement that is required by an importing country to be entered on a **phytosanitary certificate** and which provides specific additional information on a **consignment** in relation to **regulated pests** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2005]

Proposed revision

additional declaration	A statement that is required by an importing country to be entered on a **phytosanitary certificate** and which provides specific additional information on a **consignment** in relation to **regulated pests** or **regulated articles**

2.2 *grain* (2013-018), *seeds*

Background

The term *grain* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in November 2013 when reviewing the draft specification on *International movement of grain* (2008-007). A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014, taking account of the views expressed by three strategic experts at the SC meeting. The revised definition was reviewed by the SC in May 2014. A consequential revision to the definition of *seeds* was also proposed. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition.

- Grain is currently described using the word "seeds", which is confusing as *seeds* are defined in ISPM 5 to be for planting.
- When defining grain as a commodity class, the word seed (in the botanical sense) cannot be avoided. However, in the definitions for *grain* and *seed*, it is indicated, for clarity, that the word seed is used in its botanical sense.

- The three strategic experts had proposed to focus the definition of *grain* on "cereals, oilseeds and pulses". One reason was to address the scope of the future ISPM on international movement of grain. Another was because, in English, grain is commonly understood to cover "cereals, oilseeds and pulses" but not, for example, coffee beans, coconuts, cloves, nuts, poppy seed. (which are nevertheless all covered by the current definition). However, that understanding of grain is not valid in other languages. For example, in Spanish, grain is commonly understood to cover also coffee beans. In French, grain would mostly be understood in relation to cereals only. In Chinese, it may be understood to cover potato tubers. Because of these differences in understanding and because definitions are not developed for a single standard, it was felt that the definition of grain should be kept more general rather than only relating to "cereals, oilseeds and pulses"
- "but" is added to clarify the intended uses that are excluded from the definition, thus emphasizing the contrast to *seeds.*
- It was considered whether the commodity class should become *seed* (in singular) to be consistent with *grain*. However, it is suggested to remain as *seeds* (in plural), which is the term used in the definitions of "plant" in the IPPC itself.
- Cross-references between the two definitions are unnecessary and confusing and were therefore deleted. Finally "processing or consumption" is used consistently in both definitions.

Original definitions

grain	A **commodity class** for **seeds** intended for processing or consumption and not for **planting** (see **seeds**) [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]
seeds	A **commodity class** for seeds for **planting** or intended for planting and not for consumption or processing (see **grain**) [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]

Proposed revision

grain (as a **commodity class**)	~~A **commodity class** for **seeds**~~ Seeds (in the botanical sense) ~~intended~~ for processing or consumption, but ~~and~~ not for **planting** ~~(see **seeds**)~~
seeds (as a **commodity class)**	~~A **commodity class** for seeds~~ Seeds (in the botanical sense) for **planting** ~~or intended for planting~~, but ~~and~~ not for processing or consumption ~~or processing~~ ~~(see **grain**)~~

2.3 *mark* (2013-007)

The term *mark* was added to the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in May 2013, based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2014. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition.

- As agreed in the *General recommendations on consistency*, the use of *phytosanitary status* needs to be avoided as it is ambiguous and creates problems for the understanding of ISPMs.
- *Phytosanitary status* in the definition of *mark* is understood to relate to the fact that phytosanitary procedures were applied. The changes proposed make the definition explicit and precise. *Phytosanitary procedures* was preferred to *phytosanitary measures* (as procedures are applied, and measures complied with).
- At the moment, the term is used only in ISPM 15:2009. However, it is kept broad as *mark* could be used in the future for other purposes.

Original definition

mark	An **official** stamp or brand, internationally recognized, applied to a **regulated article** to attest its phytosanitary status [ISPM 15:2002]

Proposed revision

mark	An **official** stamp or brand, internationally recognized, applied to a **regulated article** to attest ~~its phytosanitary status~~ that certain **phytosanitary procedures** have been applied.

2.4 *visual examination* (2013-010)

The term was added by the SC May 2013 to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2014. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the definition.

- The definition should describe the process of visual examination, but not its purpose (as in the original defition - to detect pests and contaminants). The purpose is covered in the definition of *inspection*. Both definitions are needed with *Visual examination* simply describing the process, whilst *inspection* describes its application in the phytosanitary context (i.e. it is *official* and *to determine if pests are present or to determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations*). The original wording in the definition of visual examination was also not correct (as *contamination* covers both "pests" and "other regulated articles").
- In general, processing is part of testing, and it does not need to be mentioned separately.

Original definition

visual examination	The physical examination of **plants**, **plant products**, or other **regulated articles** using the unaided eye, lens, stereoscope or microscope to detect **pests** or **contaminants** without **testing** or processing [ISPM 23:2005]

Revised definition

visual examination	The physical examination of **plants**, **plant products**, or other **regulated articles** using the unaided eye, lens, stereoscope or microscope, ~~to detect pests or contaminants ,~~ without **testing** ~~or processing~~

2.5 *wood* (2013-011)

The SC May 2013 added *wood* to *List of topics for IPPC standards*, based on a TPG proposal. A revised definition for *wood* was proposed by the TPG in February 2014 and reviewed by the SC in May 2014. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposed definition.

- The current definition for *wood* as a commodity class is too restrictive considering the wide varieties of wood commodities that need to be covered.
- The commodity class proposed here does not provide an exhaustive list of commodities in the definition, partly because it would be difficult to find terms for broad categories, which would be agreed internationally. It was therefore considered appropriate to list examples that reflect the main broad categories of wood commodities. The examples could not be limited to the wood

commodities defined in ISPM 5 (*round wood*, *sawn wood*, now *bark (as a commodity)* see section 1.1), which represent only a few types of commodities. The examples of *wood chips* and *wood waste* were added.

- The term *wood waste* is straightforward and can be understood to cover commodities that are residues from the processing of wood (such as wood shavings, sawdust). *Wood chips*, which was in the original definition, is a widely used term for a widely traded commodity. It is listed separately from wood waste as it may be produced for itself (and is not necessarily a by-product of wood processing). Other commodities that would fall under this commodity class according to this definition would be, for example, furniture made of non-processed wood.

- Definitions do not normally mention what they exclude. However, because the proposed definition only gives examples, it is clearer to indicate which commodities are excluded (because they otherwise may be thoughtto be covered by the definition). Items excluded are: *wood packaging material* (defined separately and subject to the requirements of ISPM 15:2009) and *processed wood material* (defined separately and not capable of being infested with quarantine pests according to ISPM 32:2009).

- *Dunnage* was deleted from the original definition because it is a type of wood packaging material.

- It is not considered useful that *wood* be defined in the biological sense as it has no specific IPPC meaning (unlike *bark* – see section 1.1).

Original definition

wood	A **commodity class** for **round wood**, **sawn wood**, wood chips or **dunnage**, with or without bark [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]

Proposed revision

wood (as a **commodity class**)	~~A commodity class for~~ **Commodities** such as **round wood**, **sawn wood**, wood chips~~ or dunnage~~ and wood waste, with or without **bark**, excluding **wood packaging material** and **processed wood material**.

Appendix 8 - International movement of grain

SPECIFICATION 60

International movement of grain

(2014)

Title

International movement of grain.

Reason for the standard

International trade in grain to be used for human consumption, animal feed or further processing (e.g. milling, oilseed crushing, biofuel production) is important to the economies of both grain-exporting and grain-importing countries. A stable grain trade is critical for feeding the world's growing population and it plays a major role in global food security. Grain has been traded in large volumes for centuries and has been considered a commodity of inherently low risk as it is primarily infested by storage pests that are cosmopolitan. Presently, the international grain trade is well developed and highly globalized, and it uses sophisticated infrastructure. Phytosanitary measures applied to the international movement of grain help reduce the risk of introduction and spread of quarantine pests into new geographical areas. These measures should be technically justified and not more restrictive to trade than required.

Although a number of general ISPMs (e.g. on pest risk analysis (PRA) and pest free areas) provide relevant guidance for the phytosanitary aspects of the international movement of grain, there is currently no adopted ISPM that focuses specifically on phytosanitary measures for the international movement of grain. This has resulted in a lack of harmonized approaches for managing pest risks associated with grain. Many national organizations and trading partners have developed guidelines and quality specifications, including grade standards, applicable to the international movement of grain. While many of these address only grain quality and/or food safety, some may have a significant effect on mitigating pest risk. It is important that national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) focus on phytosanitary measures to prevent the introduction of quarantine pests. Grain-exporting and grain-importing countries may benefit from guidance on the assessment of pest risks related to grain as a pathway for quarantine pests and on technically justified phytosanitary measures to manage such pest risks. Phytosanitary measures applied

before export, during transport, on arrival, and during handling and processing in the importing country can be effective in pest risk mitigation and thereby help to improve food security and the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, but international guidance is needed to ensure such measures are technically justified, commensurate with the level of risk, and not more restrictive to trade than required.

Purpose

The standard may facilitate the safe international movement of grain through harmonized guidance and criteria for the establishment of phytosanitary import requirements to be used by NPPOs. The application of this standard may help minimize the spread of pests due to the international movement of grain.

Scope

The standard applies to grain consignments of cereals, oilseeds and pulses intended for processing or consumption moved internationally. It provides more specific guidance than other ISPMs provide (in particular ISPM 11:2013) to assist NPPOs in identifying, assessing and managing the pest risks associated with the international movement of grain. The standard should identify and describe specific phytosanitary measures that could be used to reduce pest risk before export, during transport, on arrival, and during handling and processing in the importing country. The standard does not apply to seeds and does not specifically address issues related to living modified organisms (LMOs), food safety, climate change, and quality.

Tasks

The expert working group (EWG) should:

(1) Identify and analyse existing international guidance such as standards or industry guidelines and practices (including commercial contract specifications) dealing with the international movement of grain and consider the extent to which these address phytosanitary issues and are relevant to the development and application of phytosanitary measures under the provisions of the IPPC. The frequency of interceptions and types of pests that have been introduced via the grain trade and which may be of quarantine concern should be considered.

(2) Provide guidance for NPPOs when performing PRA for determining the potential of grain moving in international trade to be a pathway for quarantine pests. The pest risk should be specified for the intended use and the pest group (e.g. distinguishing between risks from insects and from viruses and contamination by weed seeds). Guidance should also be provided on assessing the likelihood of establishment of quarantine pests.

(3) Identify phytosanitary import requirements most commonly used by NPPOs in relation to imported grain.

(4) Identify and provide guidance for NPPOs on appropriate phytosanitary measures and their technical justifications and limitations, including consideration of, for example:

   a) climatic factors (including those related to treatments)

   b) the specific conditions for grain production, packaging, storage, transport and handling, in particular:

      i. the relevance and limitations of applying the concepts of pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence and pest free places of production, taking into account common and current practices and operational limitations

      ii. the application of one or more pest risk mitigation measures, which may reduce the pest risk to a level that provides an appropriate level of protection to importing countries, while considering the intended use of the product

iii. any common practices that affect pest risk where specific guidance could be included
iv. sampling methods in relation to the pest of concern

c) practices in grain production and trade that may affect pest risk mitigation measures, including:

v. secure storage, processing, packaging or confinement of grain before, during shipping and transfer
vi. treatments of grain
vii. situations at and after import such as the processing of grain at destination (e.g. milling, oilseed crushing, malting, biofuel production, pelleting, and cleaning and packaging/repackaging for retail sale)
viii. confinement and appropriate disposal or treatment of screenings and residues derived from cleaning the grain before processing, packaging or consumption
ix. conveyances.

(5) Consider the need for guidance on specific situations (e.g. sampling or inspection protocols for pest detection that are, for example, appropriate to the consignment size and packaging) that could be included in annexes or appendixes to the ISPM.

(6) 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.

(7) 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.

(8) Recommend, where appropriate, the development of supplementary material to aid implementation by contracting parties.

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.

Collaborator

To be determined.

Steward

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

Expertise

Eight to ten phytosanitary experts with collective expertise in the following areas: development or implementation of phytosanitary measures to manage pest risks associated with the international movement of grain; PRA; grain inspection, testing or storage; and existing international guidance for the international movement of grain or other plant products. Expertise in exporting and importing countries' needs should be equally represented.

In addition to these experts, two or three experts from the grain industry (producing, packaging, storage, trading, transport, handling or processing) or from relevant international organizations may be invited to participate at the EWG meeting(s) or part of a meeting as invited experts.

Participants

To be determined.

References

The IPPC, relevant ISPMs and other national, regional and international standards and agreements as may be applicable to the tasks, discussion papers submitted in relation to this work, and guidance provided from the Open-Ended Workshop on the International Movement of Grain (Vancouver, December 2011).

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

2008-03 CPM-5 added topic *International movement of grain* (2008-007)

2011-12 Open-ended workshop to collect, consider and discuss information on phytosanitary issues related to the international movement of grain

2012-04 SC reviewed draft and approved for MC

2012-09 Steward reviewed countries' comments and redrafted text

2012-11 SC revised draft specification to reflect responses from member consultation and SC discussions. SC has not approved the draft specification.

2013-03 CPM discussed topic and requested contracting parties to submit comments on strategic issues to the SC members from their region

2013-11 SC reviewed draft

2013-12 Member consultation on draft specification

2014-05 SC revised and approved the specification

Specification 60. 2014. *International movement of grain*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

Publication history last updated: 2014-05

Appendix 9 - Revision of ISPM 6:1997 (*Guidelines for surveillance*)

SPECIFICATION 61

Revision of ISPM 6:1997 (*Guidelines for surveillance*)

(2014)

Title

Revision of ISPM 6:1997 (*Guidelines for surveillance*).

Reason for the revision of the standard

ISPM 6:1997 describes the components of survey and monitoring systems for the purpose of pest detection and information for use in pest risk analyses, the establishment of pest free areas and, where appropriate, the preparation of pest lists.

A revision was requested by members to take into account the greater knowledge of surveillance methodologies that is now available as well as experiences with implementation of the standard. The revision should also include:

- more guidance on the surveillance methodologies available for different purposes and their reliability
- more information on surveillance of pests that have environmental consequences or cause a reduction in biodiversity.

Purpose

The standard should facilitate the establishment of continuing, dynamic and efficient pest surveillance systems in order to enable the development of actions to be taken by a national plant protection organization for the prevention of pest introduction and spread, pest management and pest reporting.

Scope

This standard describes requirements for surveillance, including the range of methodologies available for different purposes and for specific groups of pests, including pests of wild flora. Technical requirements

regarding the reliability of results and the use of new diagnostic techniques and reporting procedures within countries need to be included.

Tasks

The Expert Working Group (EWG) should review information on systems or methodologies of surveillance, including information on related operations and technical support provided by national plant protection organizations (NPPOs).

The EWG should consider whether the use of ISPM 6:1997 over the years since its adoption, the findings from the IPPC's Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) questionnaire, and the issues discussed at the Global Symposium on Plant Pest Surveillance indicate a need to change the format and content of this standard.

The EWG should consider including the following in the revised ISPM 6:

(1) guidance on surveillance methodologies used for different purposes (e.g. early detection, delimiting survey) and for specific groups of pests

(2) more detail on general surveillance procedures, including guidance on:
   a. application and scope of general surveillance compared with pest-specific surveillance
   b. when to use general surveillance (e.g. to which pests general surveillance is more applicable)
   c. design of general surveillance in order to obtain reliable records on pest presence or absence
   d. how to use general surveillance to support pest-specific surveillance

(3) information on procedures for specific surveys (detection, delimiting and monitoring surveys), such as sampling to meet the defined reliability requirements in glasshouse, forest and field situations (including pest and commodity or host surveys), and the tools and methodologies to determine reliability

(4) good surveillance practices (section 3, ISPM 6:1997) including, if appropriate:
   a. requirements for staff training on the surveillance system
   b. priority setting for surveillance programmes
   c. information management systems for easy data entry, retrieval and analysis
   d. auditing by NPPOs (e.g. of a survey delivery provider)
   e. verification of the technical validity of methodologies used
   f. collection, preservation and storage of specimen material for laboratory submission or reference material

(5) information on the tools available for surveillance systems, including diagnostic methodologies, sampling procedures, reporting procedures within a country, accreditation of diagnostic laboratories, online diagnostic services and pictorial diagnostic manuals, and when they might be effectively used – this standard would mention these elements but they would be described elsewhere, for example under ISPM 27:2006

(6) information on ways that NPPOs can cooperate with each other on surveillance; for example, on diagnostic protocols, data banks and surveillance methodologies

(7) whether harmonized survey protocols should be developed for specific pest groups

(8) a section that describes components of successful surveillance methodologies, including legislation and policy development; financial mechanisms for funding such methodologies (including information on agreements with stakeholders); training of staff; and advocacy, awareness-raising and communications (particularly with stakeholders and between agencies when more than one agency is involved)

(9) information on 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) consideration of the implementation of the standard by contracting parties and identification of potential operational and technical implementation issues, and provision of 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.

Collaborator

To be determined.

Steward

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

Expertise

An EWG of five to eight phytosanitary experts who among them have practical expertise in designing and undertaking surveillance programmes for quarantine pests; experience with different surveillance methodologies; statistical knowledge of reliability associated with surveillance strategies; and experience in management of surveillance programmes.

Participants

To be determined.

References

The IPPC, relevant ISPMs and other national, regional and international standards and agreements as may be applicable to the tasks, the reports of the IRSS study "Implementation challenges and best practices of ISPM 6", and discussion papers submitted in relation to this work.

Discussion papers

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

Publication history

This is not an official part of the specification

2009-11 SC introduced topic – Revision of ISPM 6:1997 (*Guidelines for surveillance*) (2009-004)

2010-03 CPM-5 added topic to the list of topics for IPPC standards

2011-05 SC considered draft (no e-decision due to lack of resources)

2012-04 SC considered draft

2013-10-21 Revised by steward

2013-11 SC revised draft

2013-12 Member consultation on draft specification

2014-03 Draft amended by steward following member comments

2014-05 SC revised and approved the specification

Specification 61. 2014. Revision of ISPM 6:1997 (*Guidelines for surveillance*). Rome, IPPC, FAO.

Publication history last updated: 2014-05

Appendix 10 - Terms of Reference for the development of the Framework for IPPC Standards

Background

A Task Force on the Framework for IPPC standards met in Ottawa in September 2013 and the report[55] of this meeting was presented to the SPG and SC. The November 2013 SC established a subgroup of the SC to continue work on the development of the Framework for IPPC standards and a gap analysis. The SC was urged by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) at CPM-9 (2014) to finalize the Framework for IPPC standards gap analysis and present it to the CPM once finalized. The SC in May 2014 revised the Terms of Reference for the development of the Framework for IPPC standards and a gap analysis and approved them.

Process

A small group of experts *will* meet and complete the tasks outlined below. The report of this meeting will be presented to the CPM Bureau and SPG who will provide written input to the SC. The SC will make recommendations to the CPM considering the input from both the Bureau and SPG.

Tasks

The experts will:

- review, analyse and modify the proposed *Framework for IPPC standards* as needed (as presented in appendix 4 of the Task Force on the Framework for IPPC standards 2013meeting report)
- consider and develop proposals for other possible presentations for different purposes e.g. by IPPC strategic objectives if appropriate
- perform a gap analysis for standards by reviewing both adopted standards and topics on the IPPC List of Topics for standards (LOT) and make suggestions for priorities for the development or revision of standards
- consider how gaps should be brought to the next call for topics and review of the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, or processed as supporting documents
- consider how the *Framework for IPPC standards* could be introduced in the overall prioritization process
- review, analyse and modify the following Task Force recommendations: 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15 (with recommendations 5 and 9 to be combined) which are listed below:
  - 5. The Framework for IPPC standards should be used for achieving the Convention objectives which is in Appendix 4 of the 2014-09 Task Force report.
  - 8. Further gap analysis should be conducted for existing standards and the SC should consider how the gaps are to be addressed.
  - 9. A process to proactively identify emerging issues where harmonized guidance would be beneficial should be developed.
  - 10. The Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) should make efforts to continue discussions on concepts in standards with the reference to achieving Convention objectives through appropriate and effective harmonization.
  - 12. The Framework for IPPC standards should be applied to identify issues of common interest to the "three sisters" (IPPC, Codex Alimentarius and World Organization for Animal Health (OIE)).

[55] Task Force Report: https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/framework-for-standards-task-force

- 13. The Framework for IPPC standards should be used to help identify areas where specific standards, like ISPM 15:2009 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*), could be developed and implemented for global benefit.
- 14. Take into account the results of Implementation and Review Support System (IRSS) general surveys that shows trade standards (especially those related to exports) are generally well implemented; more collective effort should be given to prioritize support to Contracting Parties to implement the standards underpinning protection of plants and trade of plants and plant products, e.g. surveillance, pest status, pest management, diagnostics, infrastructure.
- 15. The criteria for prioritizing topics for standards may need to be reviewed to be in line with the policies and principles underpinning the framework.

The following experts, as determined by the SC in November 2013 will be invited to meet to continue the work on the development of the Framework for IPPC standards:

SC members:

- Ms Jane CHARD (United Kingdom), Chair of the Standards Committee,
- Ms Marie-Claude FOREST (Canada)
- Mr John HEDLEY (New Zealand)
- Mr Imad NAHHAL (Lebanon)
- Mr Bart ROSSEL (Australia)
- Mr Motoi SAKAMURA (Japan)
- Mr Guillermo SIBAJA CHINCHILLA (Costa Rica)

Others:

- Ms Magda GONZÁLEZ ARROYO (Costa Rica), as former SC member and meeting host
- Chair of the National Reporting Obligations Advisory Group
- Chair of the Capacity Development Committee

The work of this group will be supported by the IPPC Secretariat.

Funding

The IPPC Secretariat will use extra-budgetary resources for this meeting and will consider providing funding assistance for participants who request it. Costa Rica has offered to host this meeting scheduled for 25-29 August 201

Appendix 11 - Summary of Standards Committee E-Decisions (Update December 2013 To May 2014)

1. Summary of the outcome of forums and polls

This paper provides a summary of the outcome of the forums and polls that the Standards Committee (SC) has discussed on the e-decision website since its last meeting in November 2013.

Table 1: SC e-decisions presented between December 2013 and May 2014

		SC members commenting in the forum	Polls Yes/No
2014_eSC_May_01	SC approval of the background document on *Concepts linked to pre-clearance*	6	No
2014_eSC_May_02	SC approval of the draft Phytosanitary Treatment on High temperature forced air treatment for *Bactrocera melanotus* and *B. xanthodes* (diptera: tephritidae) on *Carica papaya* (2009-105) for member consultation	8	5/0
2014_eSC_May_03	SC approval of the draft Phytosanitary Treatments on Vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis* on *Carica papaya* var. solo (2009-109) for member consultation	9	No
2014_eSC_May_04	SC approval of the draft Phytosanitary Treatment on Vapour heat treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Mangifera indica* (2010-106) for member consultation	8	5/0
2014_eSC_May_05	SC approval of the draft Phytosanitary Treatment on Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus clementina* var. *Clemenules* (2010-102) for member consultation	7	5/0
2014_eSC_May_06	SC approval of the Phytosanitary Treatment on Irradiation for *Ostrinia nubilalis* (2012-009) for member consultation	7	5/0
2014_eSC_May_07	SC approval of International Standards as annex to ISPM 27:2006 - Diagnostic protocol for *Phytoplasmas* (2004-018) for member consultation	7	No
2014_eSC_May_08	SC approval of International Standards as annex to ISPM 27:2006 - Diagnostic protocol for *Erwinia amylovora* (2004-009) for member consultation	10	No
2014_eSC_May_09	SC review of the explanatory document for ISPM 15:2009 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade)*	10	No
2014_eSC_May_10	SC guidance on how to proceed on the issue of definitions in draft ISPM Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) (2006-031)	7	No
2014_eSC_May_11	SC Approval of the draft diagnostic protocol on *Ditylenchus destructor / D. dipsaci* (2004-017) for member consultation	9	No
2014_eSC_May_12	SC approval of the draft diagnostic protocol on *Genus Anastrepha* spp. (2004-015) for member consultation	9	No
2014_eSC_May_13	SC approval of the summary of the nominations and	14	12/0

	recommendations from IPPC Secretariat, Steward and Assistant Steward for the Expert working group (EWG) on *International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood* (2008-008)		
2014_eSC_May_14	SC approval of the phytosanitary treatment on Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus sinensis* var. *Navel* and *Valencia-late* (2010-103) for member consultation	9	No
2014_eSC_May_15	SC guidance on formal objections received prior CPM-9 (2014) for three draft cold treatments	No	1/6
2014_eSC_May_16	Approval of the draft diagnostic protocol on *Xhantomonas citri subsp. citri* (2004-011) for adoption	7	3/1

For more background information on SC e-decisions, please consult the e-decision site on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) (https://www.ippc.int/work-area-pages/electronic-decisions-sc) and the support documents (https://www.ippc.int/work-area-pages/background-e-decisions)

2014_eSC_May_01: SC approval of the Background document on Concepts linked to pre-clearance

The forum was open from discussion from 20 December 2013 to 17 January 2014. Six SC members commented in the forum.

SC decision

No consensus was reached during the forum. The comments were sent to the lead steward and assistant stewards for their consideration. This issue will be discussed under agenda item 3.4 (*Phytosanitary pre-import clearance* (2005-003)) of the 2014 May SC agenda (30_SC_2014_May).

2014_eSC_May_02: SC approval of the SC approval of the draft Phytosanitary Treatment on High temperature forced air treatment for *Bactrocera melanotus* and *B. xanthodes* (diptera: tephritidae) on *Carica papaya* (2009-105) for member consultation

The Secretariat opened this recommendation for discussion from 10 to 24 February 2014. Eight SC members commented on it and all agreed with the recommendation. One member suggested the quotation to the references in the reference list should be provided in the main text and questioned whether the reference Merino *et al.*, 1985 from the background document also should be quoted.

The Secretariat forwarded comments received during the E-decision forum to the treatment lead for the consideration. The updated version of the draft phytosanitary treatment was presented to the SC for one-week poll from 20 to 27 March 2014. Five SC members answered to the poll and agreed to the recommendation.

SC decision

Based on the poll results, the SC approved the draft phytosanitary treatment on High temperature forced air treatment for *Bactrocera melanotus* and *B. xanthodes* (Diptera: Tephritidae) on *Carica papaya* (2009-105) to be sent to member consultation.

2014_eSC_May_03: SC approval of the draft Phytosanitary Treatment on Vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis* on *Carica papaya* var. solo (2009-109) for member consultation

The forum was open from 10 to 24 February 2014. Nine SC members commented on it and reached a consensus, agreeing with the recommendation.

SC decision

Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the draft Vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis* on *Carica papaya* var. Solo (2009-109) for the 2014 member consultation.

2014_eSC_May_04: SC approval of the draft Phytosanitary Treatment on Vapour heat treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Mangifera indica* (2010-106) for member consultation

The Secretariat opened the recommendation for discussion from 10 to 24 February 2014. Eight SC members commented in the forum agreeing with the recommendation. One member questioned whether the reference Heather, N.W., Corcoran, R.J., Heard, T., Jacobi, K. & Coates, L. 1993. "*Heat disinfestation of mangoes against fruit fly with "hot air" as vapour heat"* from the background document also should be quoted.

The Secretariat forwarded comments received during the E-decision forum to the treatment lead for the consideration. The updated version of the draft phytosanitary treatment was presented to the SC for one-week poll from 20 to 27 March 2014. Five SC members answered to the poll and agreed to the recommendation.

SC decision

According to the poll results, the SC approved the draft phytosanitary treatment on Vapour heat treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Mangifera indica* (2010-106) for member consultation.

2014_eSC_May_05: SC approval of the draft Phytosanitary Treatment on Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus clementina* var. *Clemenules* (2010-102) for member consultation

The forum was open from 10 to 24 February 2014. Seven SC members commented in the forum agreeing with the recommendation. One member suggested a modification to the "Other relevant information**"** section of the draft phytosanitary treatment. In addition it was commented that there are 6 references in the draft phytosanitary treatment text on citrus taxonomy which are not referred to in the text and which do not seem relevant to the treatment. It was proposed that these are removed prior to member consultation (there is a footnote on the first page indicating the source of citrus taxonomy for IPPC treatments). If they are necessary there should be text explaining why they are referred to.

The Secretariat forwarded comments received during the E-decision forum to the treatment lead for the consideration. The updated version of the draft phytosanitary treatment was presented to the SC for one-week poll from 20 to 27 March 2014. Five SC members answered to the poll and agreed to the recommendation.

SC decision

According to the poll results, the SC approved the draft phytosanitary treatment on Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus Clementina* var. clemenules (2010-102) to be sent to member consultation.

2014_eSC_May_06: SC approval of the Phytosanitary Treatment on Irradiation for *Ostrinia nubilalis* (2012-009) to be sent for member consultation

The forum was open from 10 to 24 February 2014. Seven SC members commented in the forum agreeing with the recommendation. Two members suggested deleting repletion of phrase "Treatment should be applied in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 18:2003" It was also noticed that there are a number of references that are not referred to in the text and this should be done for clarity otherwise CPs will not know why they are included. There were comments regarding the supporting document (Attachment 2 TPPT Position paper on the presence of live adult insects emergence after irradiation). Several SC Members recommended providing this paper as background information with the draft phytosanitary treatment during member consultation. One SC member suggested modification in the background paper for consistency with ISPM 28:2007 *Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*.

The Secretariat forwarded comments received during the E-decision forum to the treatment lead for the consideration. The updated version of the draft phytosanitary treatments with updated supporting document was presented to the SC for one-week poll from 20 to 27 March 2014. Five SC members answered to the poll and agreed to the recommendation.

SC decision

According to the poll results, the SC approved the draft phytosanitary treatment on Irradiation for *Ostrinia nubilalis* (2012-009) to be sent to member consultation.

2014_eSC_May_07: SC approval of the of International Standards as annex to ISPM 27:2006 - Diagnostic protocol for *Phytoplasmas* (2004-018) to be sent to member consultation

The forum was open from 10 to 24 February 2014. Seven SC members commented in the forum and reached a consensus, agreeing with the recommendation. One member suggested some editorial adjustments to the draft diagnostic protocol and attached a revised version to the comment provided.

SC decision

Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the draft diagnostic protocol on *Phytoplasmas* (2004-018), to be submitted to the 2014 member consultation**.**

2014_eSC_May_08: SC approval of the International Standards as annex to ISPM 27:2006 - Diagnostic protocol for *Erwinia amylovora* (2004-009) to be sent to member consultation

The forum was open from 10 to 24 February 2014. Ten SC members commented in the forum and reached a consensus, agreeing with the recommendation.

SC decision

Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the draft diagnostic protocol on *Erwinia amylovora* (2004-009), to be submitted to the 2014 member consultation.

2014_eSC_May_09: SC review of the explanatory document for ISPM 15:2009 *(Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade)*

The forum was open from 10 February to 3 March 2014. Ten SC members commented in the forum. They all indicated the explanatory document for ISPM for ISPM 15:2009 is comprehensive and provides very useful information for countries to understand and implement the standard. Five (5) SC members attached to their comments suggestions in track changes for modifications to the draft explanatory document.

The IPPC Secretariat has forwarded all SC members' detailed comments and suggestions for text changes to the authors for their consideration.

2014_eSC_May_10: SC guidance on how to proceed on the issue of definitions in draft ISPM Determination of *host status of fruit to fruit flies* (Tephritidae) (2006-031)

Following the comments that were made by the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) during their 2014 February meeting, the Secretariat opened a discussion forum from 06 to 13 March 2014 to seek guidance on how to proceed on the issue of definitions in the draft ISPM *Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)* (2006-031) which was presented to CPM-9 (2014) for adoption. Seven SC members commented in the forum.

However, the draft ISPM on *Determination of host status of fruit to fruit fly (Tephritidae)* (2006-031) received a formal objection 14 days-prior to CPM-9 (2014) (document CPM 2014/INF/05). This issue, together with the TPG comments, will be discussed under agenda item 9.1 (Items arising from CPM-9 (2014)) of the 2014 May SC agenda (17_SC_2014_May).

2014_eSC_May_11: SC Approval of the draft diagnostic protocol on *Ditylenchus destructor / D. dipsaci* (2004-017) for member consultation

The forum was open from 10 March to 24 March 2014. Nine SC members commented in the forum and reached a consensus, agreeing with the recommendation. One member suggested that more information on the "Consultation on technical level" could be included, as for instance for the North American DP that was considered to develop this draft DP. This suggestion will be forwarded to the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols to include the organization's name.

SC decision

Based on the forum discussion the SC approved the draft diagnostic protocol on *Ditylenchus destructor / D. dipsaci* (2004-017) to be submitted to the 2014 member consultation.

2014_eSC_May_12: SC approval of the draft diagnostic protocol on Genus *Anastrepha* spp. (2004-015) for member consultation

The forum was open from 10 March to 24 March 2014. Nine SC members commented in the forum and reached a consensus, agreeing with the recommendation. Some members provided editorial comments which will be considered by the editor. Another member proposed an editorial change in paragraph 92 (Table 2, Biological stage column) from "Larva" to "Third instar larvae", which will be forwarded to the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols as this change may affect the outcome of the draft DP. One member recommended that the information on "future project findings" to not be indicated in this version of the draft DP but may be incorporated during revision of the protocol. The Secretariat indicated that, information of research projects described in section "4. Identification" is to demonstrate that, despite the molecular findings up to now, this draft DP describes identification methods are morphological characters based.

SC decision

Based on the forum discussion the SC approved the draft diagnostic protocol for Genus *Anastrepha* spp. (2004-015) to be submitted to the 2014 member consultation.

2014_eSC_May_13: SC approval of the Summary of the nominations and recommendations from IPPC Secretariat, Steward and Assistant Steward for the Expert working group (EWG) on *International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood* (2008-008)

The forum was open from 10 March to 24 March 2014. Fourteen SC members commented in the forum. Thirteen members agreed with the recommendations from the IPPC Secretariat, Steward and Assistant Steward and approved the six experts listed to take part in the EWG on *International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood* (2008-008). However, one SC member did not agree to recommend one of the six experts listed as her expertise was considered very general compared to the others' experience which was specific to the commodity specified in the standard.

As the SC did not reach consensus, the Secretariat opened a one-week poll from 10 to 17 April 2014. Twelve SC members entered their opinion in the poll and all agreed with the recommendations from the IPPC Secretariat, Steward and Assistant Steward.

SC decision

According to the poll results, the SC agreed that the six following experts be placed on the Expert working group (EWG) on *International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood* (2008-008) as members:

Ms Jessica SIBLEY	AUSTRALIA
Mr Shane SELA	CANADA
Mr Lucio MONTECCHIO	ITALY
Mr Avhafarei Enos DABISHA	SOUTH AFRICA
Mr John T. JONES	USA
Ms Laura MALY	ARGENTINA

2014_eSC_May_14: SC approval of the phytosanitary treatment on Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus sinensis* var. *Navel* and *Valencia-late* (2010-103) for member consultation

The forum was open from 10 March to 24 March 2014. Nine SC members commented in the forum and reached a consensus, agreeing with the recommendation. One member noticed small typo to the draft text of phytosanitary treatment and attached a revised version. Minor edit was made in the draft treatment text.

SC decision

Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the draft Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus sinensis* var. Navel and Valencia-late" (2010-103) for the 2014 member consultation.

2014_eSC_May_15: SC guidance on formal objections received prior CPM-9 (2014) for three draft cold treatments

Several draft phytosanitary treatments (PTs) received formal objections 14 days prior CPM-9 (2014) (CPM 2014/INF/05). Three of these had also received formal objections prior to CPM-7 (2012). The IPPC Secretariat, in consultation with the SC Chairperson and FAO Legal division, decided to request guidance from the SC on how to proceed for these 3 PTs. The SC was requested to answer to the question:

> "Having considered the issues raised by the formal objections, do you wish to put forward, for adoption via a CPM vote, the following three draft phytosanitary treatments, to be included as annexes to ISPM 28:2007 (Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests)
>
> - Cold treatment for Bactrocera tryoni on Citrus sinensis (2007-206E)

- Cold treatment for Bactrocera tryoni on Citrus reticulata x C. sinensis (2007-206F)
- Cold treatment for Ceratitis capitata on Citrus paradisi (2007-210)"

Due to the urgent nature of this issue only a poll was opened from 21 March to 26 March 2014. Seven SC members replied to the poll: only one SC member agreed to put forward these three draft cold treatments for adoption via a CPM vote and 6 other members disagreed.

SC decision

Based on the poll results, the SC did not agree to put forward, for adoption via a CPM vote, the three draft cold treatments listed above. This issue will be discussed under agenda item 9.1 (Items arising from CPM-9 (2014)) of the 2014 May SC agenda (17_SC_2014_May).

2014_eSC_May_16: Approval of the draft diagnostic protocol on *Xhantomonas citri subsp. citri* (2004-011) for adoption

The forum was open from 10 to 24 April 2014. Seven SC members commented in the forum and they all agreed to approve the diagnostic protocol for *X. citri* subsp. *citri* (2004-011), as an annex to ISPM 27: 2006, to be submitted to the 45-days notification period.

However, one SC member queried about the use of morphological characterisation as a diagnostic method to identify *X. citri* subsp. *citri*, and indicated that change to the text in paragraphs 21, 97 and 98 was needed for better clarity for the minimum requirements for identification. Another SC member provided explanations in this regard and proposed an adjustment to the text in paragraph 97 as follows: "Techniques in addition to ~~include~~ observing morphological characteristics on nutrient media~~,~~ include serological testing, molecular testing, bioassay of leaf discs or detached leaves, and pathogenicity testing."

Another SC member proposed some minor editorial changes in the figures 5 and 6 (paragraphs 212 and 214) where in the "Identification Tests" box should read: "Positive results from PCR using two different sets of PCR primer pairs and ELISA/IF test followed by pathogenicity tests. Additional tests can be done such as MLSA - see section 4.5." to reflect the test immunofluorescence ("IF") as described in section 3.1.3.

A modified version of the draft diagnostic protocol for *Xhantomonas citri* subsp. *citri* (2004-011), taking into account these comments, was presented to the SC for final approval via a one-week poll. The poll was closed on Friday 2 May 2014. Four SC members replied to the poll. While three members agreed to approve the draft diagnostic protocol, one SC member disagreed and thought the proposed editorial changes mentioned above about ELISA and IF should be checked with the discipline lead.

SC decision

Based on the poll results, there was no consensus and the SC did not approve the draft diagnostic protocol on *Xhantomonas citri subsp. citri* (2004-011) for adoption. The draft diagnostic protocol will be sent back to the discipline lead and the TPDP for review, before being presented again to a SC poll at a later stage.

Appendix 12 - Proposed ink amendments for replacement of *phytosanitary status*

Tables A.1- A.6: Proposed ink amendments for replacement of phytosanitary status

The ink amendments proposed in this section can be summarized as follows (details are given in each case in the tables below).

Summary table of the proposed ink amendments

	Phytosanitary status used in existing ISPMs in relation to	Phytosanitary status can be replaced by
A.1	Pest	Pest risk
A.2	Pest detection	Pest status
A.3	Host plants	Pest risk
A.4	Area	Status of the pest in the area, pest status
A.5	Countries	Pest status
A.6	Commodities	Compliance with phytosanitary import requirements, phytosanitary security, inspection or not necessary/text can be deleted

A.1. Pertaining to *pest*

It appears that the intended meaning of the phytosanitary status of a pest is: the intrinsic ability of a pest to establish, spread and cause economic impact. It is proposed to substitute *phytosanitary status* to the defined term *pest risk*, as follows:

Table A.1 - Pertaining to *pest*

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
11	2.1.1.1	2	The taxonomic unit for the pest is generally species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species, this should include evidence demonstrating that factors such as differences in virulence, host range or vector relationships are significant enough to affect phytosanitary status.	The taxonomic unit for the pest is generally species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species, this should include evidence demonstrating that factors such as differences in virulence, host range or vector relationships are significant enough to affect ~~phytosanitary status~~ pest risk.
21	3.1.1.1	2	For the pest, the taxonomic unit is generally the species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by a scientifically sound rationale. In the case	For the pest, the taxonomic unit is generally the species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by a scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species (e.g. race), this should include evidence demonstrating that

			of levels below the species (e.g. race), this should include evidence demonstrating that factors such as difference in virulence, host range or vector relationships are significant enough to affect the phytosanitary status.	factors such as difference in virulence, host range or vector relationships are significant enough to affect the ~~phytosanitary status~~ pest risk.

A.2. Pertaining to *detection of a pest*

The intended meaning of phytosanitary status of the detection of a pest as used in ISPM 26, Annex 1 (2011) (*Fruit fly trapping)* seems to refer to pest status. It is proposed to substitute in ISPM 26: Annex 1 *phytosanitary status* by the defined term *pest status*, as follows:

Table A.2 - Pertaining to *detection of a pest*

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
26	Annex 1		Actions to apply the corrective action plan (1) *Determination of the phytosanitary status of the detection (actionable or non-actionable)* (1.1) If the detection is a transient non-actionable occurrence (ISPM 8:1998), no further action is required. (1.2) If the detection of a target pest may be actionable, a delimiting survey, which includes additional traps, and usually fruit sampling as well as an increased trap inspection rate, should be implemented immediately after the detection to assess whether the detection represents an outbreak, which will determine necessary responsive actions. If a population is present, this action is also used to determine the size of the affected area.	Actions to apply the corrective action plan (1) *Determination of the ~~phytosanitary~~ pest status of the detection (actionable or non-actionable)* (1.1) If the detection is a transient non-actionable occurrence (ISPM 8:1998), no further action is required. (1.2) If the detection of a target pest may be actionable, a delimiting survey, which includes additional traps, and usually fruit sampling as well as an increased trap inspection rate, should be implemented immediately after the detection to assess whether the detection represents an outbreak, which will determine necessary responsive actions. If a population is present, this action is also used to determine the size of the affected area.

A.3. Pertaining to *host plants*

It appears the intended meaning of phytosanitary status of host plants is: *the intrinsic characteristics of the host plant that determines its suitability as a host and the damage that a pest could confer to that plant*. It is proposed to substitute *phytosanitary status* to the defined term *pest risk.*

Table A.3 - Pertaining to *host plants*

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
21	3.1.1.1	3	Also for the host, the taxonomic unit is generally the species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by a scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species (e.g. variety), there should be evidence demonstrating that factors such as difference in host susceptibility or resistance are significant enough to affect the phytosanitary status.	Also for the host, the taxonomic unit is generally the species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by a scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species (e.g. variety), there should be evidence demonstrating that factors such as difference in host susceptibility or resistance are significant enough to affect the ~~phytosanitary status~~ pest risk. Taxa for plants for planting above the species level (genera) or unidentified species of known genera should not be used unless all species in the genus are being evaluated for the same

			Taxa for plants for planting above the species level (genera) or unidentified species of known genera should not be used unless all species in the genus are being evaluated for the same intended use.	intended use.

A.4. Pertaining to an *area*

It appears the intended meaning of *phytosanitary status* for area is in respect of the status of a pest in that area or, in one instance, of the actual pest incidence and distribution. It is proposed to substitute in two cases *phytosanitary status* by *status of the relevant pest in the area*, and in one case by *pest status*.

Table A.4 - Pertaining to *area*

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text	Proposed text
29	Outline	1	Recognition of pest free areas (PFAs) and areas of low pest prevalence (ALPPs) is a technical and administrative process to achieve acceptance of the phytosanitary status of a delimited area. Technical requirements for establishment of PFAs and ALPPs, as well as certain elements relating to recognition, are addressed in other International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). In addition, many principles of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) are relevant.	Recognition of pest free areas (PFAs) and areas of low pest prevalence (ALPPs) is a technical and administrative process to achieve acceptance of the status of the relevant pest in ~~phytosanitary status of~~ a delimited area. Technical requirements for establishment of PFAs and ALPPs, as well as certain elements relating to recognition, are addressed in other International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). In addition, many principles of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) are relevant.
30	2.2.1	4	The presence and distribution of fruit fly hosts should be recorded separately identifying commercial and non-commercial hosts. This information will help in planning the trapping and host sampling activities and may help in anticipating the potential ease or difficulty of establishing and maintaining the phytosanitary status of the area.	The presence and distribution of fruit fly hosts should be recorded separately identifying commercial and non-commercial hosts. This information will help in planning the trapping and host sampling activities and may help in anticipating the potential ease or difficulty of establishing and maintaining the status of the relevant pest in~~phytosanitary status of~~ the area.
30	Annex 2 (2)	Title	(2) *Determination of the phytosanitary status* Immediately after detecting a population level higher than the specified level of low pest prevalence, a delimiting survey (which may include the deployment of additional traps, fruit sampling of host fruits and increased trap inspection frequency) should be implemented to determine the size of the affected area and more precisely gauge the level of the fruit fly prevalence.	(2) *Determination of the ~~phytosanitary~~ pest status* Immediately after detecting a population level higher than the specified level of low pest prevalence, a delimiting survey (which may include the deployment of additional traps, fruit sampling of host fruits and increased trap inspection frequency) should be implemented to determine the size of the affected area and more precisely gauge the level of the fruit fly prevalence.

A.5. Pertaining to *countries*

It appears the intended meaning of *phytosanitary status* for countries is in respect of the actual status of the pest. That meaning could be conferred by substituting *phytosanitary status* to phrases referring to the status of the pest.

Table A.5 - Pertaining to *countries*				
ISPM	**Section**	**Para**	**Current text**	**Proposed text**
1	1.7	1	Contracting parties should, in accordance with the IPPC, apply phytosanitary measures without discrimination between contracting parties if contracting parties can demonstrate that they have the same phytosanitary status and apply identical or equivalent phytosanitary measures.	Contracting parties should, in accordance with the IPPC, apply phytosanitary measures without discrimination between contracting parties if contracting parties can demonstrate that ~~they have the same phytosanitary status and~~ the status of the relevant pest is the same and that they apply identical or equivalent phytosanitary measures.
11	3.4	1	Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in reducing the probability of introduction of the pest. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the phytosanitary principles of ISPM 1:1993:….[5th indent:] - *Principle of "non-discrimination":* If the pest under consideration is established in the PRA area but of limited distribution and under official control, the phytosanitary measures in relation to import should not be more stringent than those applied within the PRA area. Likewise, phytosanitary measures should not discriminate between exporting countries of the same phytosanitary status.	Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in reducing the probability of introduction of the pest. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the phytosanitary principles of ISPM 1:1993:….[5th indent:] *Principle of "non-discrimination":* If the pest under consideration is established in the PRA area but of limited distribution and under official control, the phytosanitary measures in relation to import should not be more stringent than those applied within the PRA area. Likewise, phytosanitary measures should not discriminate between exporting countries ~~of the same phytosanitary status~~ where the status of the relevant pest is the same.
21	4.3	1	Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in limiting the economic impact of the pest on the intended use of the plants for planting. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade (ISPM 1:1993): …[5th indent:] *Principle of "non-discrimination".* Phytosanitary measures should not discriminate between exporting countries of the same phytosanitary status.	Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in limiting the economic impact of the pest on the intended use of the plants for planting. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade (ISPM 1:1993): …[5th indent:] *Principle of "non-discrimination".* Phytosanitary measures should not discriminate between exporting countries ~~of the same phytosanitary status~~ where the status of the relevant pest is the same.
24	2.4	1+2	The principle of non-discrimination requires that when equivalence of phytosanitary measures is granted for one exporting contracting party, this should also apply to contracting parties with the same phytosanitary status and similar conditions for the same commodity or commodity class and/or pest. Therefore, an importing contracting party which recognizes the equivalence of alternative phytosanitary measures of an exporting contracting party should ensure that it acts in a non-discriminatory manner. This applies both to applications	The principle of non-discrimination requires that when equivalence of phytosanitary measures is granted for one exporting contracting party, this should also apply to contracting parties ~~with the same phytosanitary status~~ where the status of the relevant pest is the same and similar conditions for the same commodity or commodity class and/or pest. Therefore, an importing contracting party which recognizes the equivalence of alternative phytosanitary measures of an exporting contracting party should ensure that it acts in a non-discriminatory manner. This applies both to applications from third countries for recognition of the equivalence of the same or similar measures, and to the equivalence of any domestic measures.

			from third countries for recognition of the equivalence of the same or similar measures, and to the equivalence of any domestic measures. It should be recognized that equivalence of phytosanitary measures does not, however, mean that when a specific measure is granted equivalence for one exporting contracting party, this applies automatically to another contracting party for the same commodity or commodity class or pest. Phytosanitary measures should always be considered in the context of the pest status and phytosanitary regulatory system of the exporting contracting party, including the policies and procedures.	It should be recognized that equivalence of phytosanitary measures does not, however, mean that when a specific measure is granted equivalence for one exporting contracting party, this applies automatically to another contracting party for the same commodity or commodity class or pest. Phytosanitary measures should always be considered in the context of the pest status and phytosanitary regulatory system of the exporting contracting party, including the policies and procedures.

A.6. Pertaining to *consignment*

It appears the intended meaning of *phytosanitary status* for consignments varies. In some cases, it appears to relate to compliance with phytosanitary import requirements, phytosanitary security or inspection. In other cases, the words *phytosanitary security* appear unnecessary (ISPM 23, section 2.5; ISPM 12, section 5, sub-section on Certifying statement).

A few other cases where *phytosanitary status* is used in relation to consignments are not clear and would require extensive rewriting to replace these words. These are presented in Table B.2, and the TPG is still considering the possibility to define *phytosanitary status (of a consignment)* in this context.

Table A.6 - Pertaining to *consignment*

ISPM	Section	Para	Current text
7	2.2	Indent 6	The NPPO should have the capability to undertake the following functions: document and maintain the information regarding the phytosanitary import requirements where needed for phytosanitary certification and provide appropriate work instructions to personnel perform inspection, sampling and testing of plants, plant products and other regulated articles for purposes related to phytosanitary certification detect and identify pests identify plants, plant products and other regulated articles perform, supervise or audit the required phytosanitary treatments perform surveys and monitoring and control activities to confirm ~~the phytosanitary status~~compliance with the phytosanitary import requirements to be attested in phytosanitary certificates
12	Outline	6	Phytosanitary certificates may have a limited duration of validity ~~as the phytosanitary status of consignments may change after issuance of phytosanitary certificates~~. The NPPO of the exporting country or the importing country may make relevant stipulations. Justification: this change is proposed for internal consistency within the standard. The same text appears in section 1.6, for which an ink amendment is proposed below. As this is only the outline of requirements, it is proposed that the end of the sentence could be deleted. If this is

			not acceptable as considered beyond consistency, similar wording as in 1.6 could be used, i.e.: "Phytosanitary certificates may have a limited duration of validity as the ~~phytosanitary status~~phytosanitary security of consignments may be lost~~change~~ after issuance of phytosanitary certificates. The NPPO of the exporting country or the importing country may make relevant stipulations."
12	1.2	2	A phytosanitary certificate for export is usually issued by the NPPO of the country of origin. A phytosanitary certificate for export describes the consignment and, through a certifying statement, additional declarations and treatment records, declares that ~~the phytosanitary status of~~ the consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements. A phytosanitary certificate for export may also be issued in certain re-export situations for plants, plant products and other regulated articles originating in countries other than the country of re-export if ~~the phytosanitary status of the consignment~~ compliance with the phytosanitary import requirements can be attested~~determined~~ by the country of re-export (e.g. by inspection). Note to the SC: *phytosanitary status* in paragraph 3 of the same section could not be replaced by ink amendment, and is in Table B.2.
12	1.6	1	The phytosanitary security ~~phytosanitary status~~ of consignments may be lost~~change~~ after issuance of phytosanitary certificates and therefore the NPPO of the exporting or re-exporting country may decide to restrict the duration of the validity of phytosanitary certificates after issuance and prior to export.
12	5 (l) Certifying statement	4	In instances where phytosanitary import requirements are not specific, the NPPO of the exporting country may certify the general status~~phytosanitary status~~ of the consignment for any pests believed by it to be of phytosanitary concern.
22	3.1.4.3	1	In cases where an ALPP is established for a regulated pest, phytosanitary measures may be required to reduce the risk of entry of the specified pests into the ALPP (ISPM 20:2004). These may include: regulation of the pathways and of the articles that require control to maintain the ALPP. All pathways into and out of the ALPP should be identified. This may include the designation of points of entry, and requirements for documentation, treatment, inspection or sampling before or at entry into the area. verification of documents and ~~of the phytosanitary status~~ inspection of consignments including identification of intercepted specimens of specified pest and maintenance of sampling records confirmation of the application and effectiveness of required treatments documentation of any other phytosanitary procedures
23	2.5	3	In many cases, pests or signs of pests that have been detected may require identification or a specialized analysis in a laboratory or by a specialist ~~before a determination can be made on the phytosanitary status of the consignment~~. It may be decided that emergency measures are needed where new or previously unknown pests are found. A system for properly documenting and maintaining samples and/or specimens should be in place to ensure trace-back to the relevant consignment and to facilitate later review of the results if necessary. Justification: the requirement is well covered in the first part of the sentence and the use of phytosanitary status here is confusing.

Appendix 13 - Proposed ink amendments to correct inconsistencies in the use of terms - ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*)

The rationale for the changes proposed is the same throughout the table, i.e. to transfer the descriptive element to the term.

(Prepared by the Technical Panel for the Glossary; Approved by the SC May 2014 for presentation to CPM for noting)

A.0	Term	Existing text (ISPM 5)		Proposed new text (ISPM 5)
1.	**bulbs and tubers**	A **commodity class** for dormant underground parts of **plants** intended for **planting** (includes corms and rhizomes) [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]	**bulbs and tubers** (as a **commodity class**)	~~A **commodity class** for d~~D~~ormant underground parts of **plants** intended for **planting** (includes corms and rhizomes) [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]
2.	**cut flowers and branches***	A **commodity class** for fresh parts of **plants** intended for decorative use and not for **planting** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]	**cut flowers and branches** (as a **commodity class**)	~~A **commodity class** for f~~F~~resh parts of **plants** intended for decorative use and not for **planting** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]
3.	**fruits and vegetables**	A **commodity class** for **fresh** parts of **plants** intended for consumption or processing and not for **planting** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]	**fruits and vegetables** (as a **commodity class**)	~~A **commodity class** for f~~**Fresh** parts of **plants** intended for consumption or processing and not for **planting** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]
4.	**grain***	A **commodity class** for **seeds** intended for processing or consumption and not for **planting** (see **seeds**) [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]	**grain** (as a **commodity class**)	~~A **commodity class** for s~~**Seeds** intended for processing or consumption and not for **planting** (see **seeds**) [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]
5.	**plants *in vitro***	A **commodity class** for **plants** growing in an aseptic medium in a closed container [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1999; ICPM, 2002; formerly plants in tissue culture]	**plants *in vitro*** (as a **commodity class**)	~~A **commodity class** for p~~**Plants** growing in an aseptic medium in a closed container [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1999; ICPM, 2002; formerly plants in tissue culture]
6.	**seeds***	A **commodity class** for seeds for **planting** or intended for planting and not for consumption or processing (see **grain**) [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]	**seeds** (as a **commodity class**)	~~A **commodity class** for s~~S~~eeds for **planting** or intended for planting and not for consumption or processing (see **grain**) [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]
7.	**wood***	A **commodity class** for **round wood**, **sawn wood**, wood chips or **dunnage**, with or without **bark** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]	**wood** (as a **commodity class**)	~~A **commodity class** for r~~**Round wood**, **sawn wood**, wood chips or **dunnage**, with or without **bark** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]

* these definitions are currently identified for more extensive revisio

Appendix 14 - Action points arising from the May 2014 SC meeting

	Action	Item	Responsible	Deadline
1.	Discuss after the substantial concerns commenting period the recommendations from the Seed EWG on potential implementation issues	3.1	SC	Future SC
2.	Draft terms of reference for the new EWG on *Minimizing pest movement by sea containers* (2008-001) for the SC to review and approve.	3.2	John Hedley	SC November 2014
3.	Revise the draft standard on *Phytosanitary pre-import clearance* (2005-003) based on the understanding of the concept agreed by the SC, and present it to the SC.	3.4	**Marie-Claude FOREST (lead)**, Stephen BUTCHER, Ana Lilia MONTEALEGRE, Ezequiel FERRO	Future SC
4.	Discuss the deletion of the term *pre-clearance* from ISPM 5 *Glossary of Phytosanitary terms*	3.4	SC	Future SC
5.	Review the definitions of *identity (of a consignment)* (2011-001), *integrity (of a consignment) and phytosanitary security (of a consignment)* (2013-008) taking into account section 6.1 of ISPM 12:2011 and propose revised definitions of the terms and possible consistency changes to section 6.1 of ISPM 12:2011.	3.5	TPG	TPG Dec. 2014
6.	Review *kiln-drying* (2013-006).	3.5	TPG	TPG Dec. 2014
7.	Submit written comments to the TPPT Steward Bart ROSSEL and the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) on the draft specification *Requirements for the use of phytosanitary treatments as phytosanitary measures* (2014-008).	6.2	All SC members	31 May 2014
8.	Revise the draft specification *Requirements for the use of phytosanitary treatments as phytosanitary measures* (2014-008) taking into account SC members' comments.	6.2	TPPT Steward Bart ROSSEL	25 July 2014
9.	Submit written comments to the Steward Ezequiel FERRO and the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) on the draft specification on *Guidance on pest risk management* (2014-001)	6.2	All SC members	31 May 2014
10.	Revise the draft specification on *Guidance on pest risk management* (2014-001) taking into account SC members' comments.	6.2	Steward Ezequiel FERRO	23 June 2014
11.	Submit written comments to the Steward Marie-Claude FOREST and the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) on the draft specification on *Authorization of non-NPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002)	6.2	All SC members	31 May 2014
12.	Revise the draft specification on *Authorization of non-NPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002) taking into account SC members' comments.	6.2	Steward Marie-Claude FOREST	23 June 2014
13.	Present the paper on the *Purpose, status and content of ISPMs* to the CPM Bureau with the request that the SPG review it.	7.2	Secretariat	Bureau June 2014
14.	Invite the FAO Legal service to review the paper on the *Purpose, status and content of ISPMs* to determine the legal implications it may have.	7.2	Secretariat	SPG October 2014

	Action	Item	Responsible	Deadline
15.	Submit written comments to the small SC group (**Piotr WLODARCZYK (lead)**, Jane CHARD, Julie ALIAGA, Alexandre MOREIRA-PALMA and Motoi SAKAMURA) and the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) on the review of the standard setting procedure and the establishment of an editorial team	7.2	All SC members	15 August 2014.
16.	Present a new discussion paper on the review of the standard setting procedure to the SC	7.2	**Piotr WLODARCZYK (lead),** Jane CHARD, Julie ALIAGA, Alexandre MOREIRA-PALMA and Motoi SAKAMURA)	SC November 2014
17.	Present to the CPM Bureau a proposal on an IPPC Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) survey on the implementation of ISPM 18:2003 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*).	8.1	Secretariat	Bureau June 2014
18.	Add a task on taking into account any relevant results from IRSS activities when revising the specification for the Revision of ISPM 18:2003.	8.1	TPPT Steward Bart ROSSEL	25 July 2014
19.	Review section 3.1 of the Working TPPT criteria for treatment evaluation and revise it to be in line with ISPM 28:2007 if needed..	8.1	TPPT	TPPT June 2014
20.	Emphasize to contracting parties the availability the Working TPPT criteria for treatment evaluation within the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting	8.1	Secretariat	31 December 2014
21.	Ask a TPPT member to act as liaison with the Phytosanitary Temperature Treatments Expert Group to exchange information on the research of temperature treatments to help support the development of international phytosanitary treatments	8.1	TPPT	TPPT June 2014
22.	Submit comments on the TPPT position paper on acceptance of experience or historical based phytosanitary treatments to the Secretariat (IPPC@fao.org) and the TPPT Steward Bart ROSSEL	8.1	All SC members	31 August 2014
23.	Revise the TPPT position paper on acceptance of experience or historical based phytosanitary treatments and present it back to the SC.	8.1	Bart ROSSEL	Future SC
24.	Discuss the meaning of *phytosanitary measure* taking into consideration the TPG analysis, and report back to the SC November 2014.	8.2	**Alexandre MOREIRA-PALMA (lead),** Stephen BUCTHER John HEDLEY, Ebbe NORDBO,Bart ROSSEL, D.D.K. SHARMA, Lifeng WU	SC November 2014
25.	[161] withdrawn from the Amendments to the Glossary (2013) proposed revisions of the terms: exclusion (2010-008), suppression (2011-002), eradication (2011-003), containment (2011-004), control (2011-005)	8.2	Secretariat	

	Action	Item	Responsible	Deadline
26.	Rediscuss *contaminating pest* and *contamination* at its next meeting (also taking account of member comments made at the 2013 MC on contaminating pest) and make a proposal to the SC May 2015.	8.2	TPG	TPG December 2014
27.	*[161]* review and modify the explanation added to the draft *Amendments to the Glossary 2013* before the SCCP, in order to inform CPM members in a transparent manner.	8.2	*SC-7*	
28.	Archive for future revision the proposal that ISPM 25:2006 be modified at revision with regards to phytosanitary security and the escape of pests from consignments in transit, (Appendix 8 of the TPG report).	8.2	Secretariat	1 July 2014
29.	Archive until revision the changes to be made to ISPMs for consistency in relation to *visual inspection* at revision, (Appendix 8 of TPG February 2014 report).	8.2	Secretariat	1 July 2014
30.	Discuss *effective dose* (2013-017), envisaging the options proposed by the TPG.	8.2	TPPT	TPPT December 2014
31.	Transfer the ink amendments not accepted by CPM-8 (2013) to Tables B and archive them for future consideration when the standards concerned are revised.	8.2	Secretariat	1 July 2014
32.	Archive changes proposed in Tables B (specific proposals related to *phytosanitary status*) for future consideration when revising the ISPMs concerned.	8.2	Secretariat	1 July 2014
33.	Review again the proposed ink amendments for the term *trading partners* (2013-009).	8.2	TPG	TPG December 2014
34.	Review the revised draft ISPM on *Determination of host status of fruit to fruit fly (Tephritidae)* (2006-031) in relation to the concept *host under the conditions specified in this standard* only and provide their opinion on whether the proposed revision was appropriate, or make minor adjustments for consistency. If not present a revised proposal, taking into account the SC's discussion.	9.1	TPFF	SC November 2014
35.	Address technical issues and prepare a response in relation to the formal objections received before CPM-9 (2014) on seven cold treatments and identify issues that are philosophical and require further discussion by the SC	9.1	TPPT	SC November 2014
36.	Submit comments to the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) and to the small group (Jane CHARD (lead), John HEDLEY, Thanh Huong HA, Rebecca LEE) on the proposal presented in relation to the replacement of older versions of ISPMs by latest versions of ISPMs.	9.3	All SC members	15 August 2014
37.	Prepare a discussion paper for the SC and a draft CPM paper on the replacement of older versions of ISPMs by latest versions of ISPMs.	9.3	**Jane CHARD (lead),** John HEDLEY, Thanh Huong HA, Rebecca LEE	SC November 2014
38.	Issue call for experts (TPPT, EWGs) as needed	8.1	Secretariat	Cont.
39.	Submit e-decisions as planned	13.1	Secretariat	Cont.
40.	Discuss the issue of Supporting documentation	11.0	SC	Future SC

	Action	Item	Responsible	Deadline
41.	Discuss the issue of Consistency in languages	11.0	SC	Future SC
42.	Discuss the issue of Engaging experts in the standard setting process	11.0	SC	Future SC
43.	Discuss the issue of Transparency in selecting TP and EWG experts	11.0	SC	Future SC