


January 2012

E

	منظمة الأغذية والزراعة للأمم المتحدة	联合国 粮食及 农业组织	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture	Продовольственная и сельскохозяйственная организация Объединенных Наций	Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Alimentación y la Agricultura
---	--	--------------------	---	---	---	--

# COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

<b>Seventh Session</b>
<b>Rome, 19-23 March 2012</b>
<b>Report by the Standards Committee Chairperson</b>
<b>Agenda item 8.1.1 of the Provisional Agenda</b>

## I. General Introduction

1. I would like to thank Standards Committee (SC) members and the IPPC Secretariat for their work this year. In particular, I would like to point out the significant contributions made by the SC members who have completed their second three year term and are now leaving the SC. Their roles have included steering standards as stewards, detailed consideration of comments as members of the SC-7, and representing the IPPC in workshops and elsewhere. The CPM could not have adopted the range and quality of international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs) over the last six years without their enthusiasm, expertise and dedication.
2. The SC cannot function without the excellent support from the Secretariat and I thank them for their support to me in my role as SC chair. Due to the complex processes involved and the technical nature of many standards, a sustainable level of staffing is essential. The SC was told in November that there had been some progress with recruitment of the P3 post for standard setting and I look forward to an announcement on this in the near future. This post is vital for continuity and stability in the standard setting area and is essential to ensure ISPMs continue to be based on sound science and are relevant to National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs).
3. The decision to fund the SC and SC-7 meetings in May and November meant that some standard setting work could continue. Cancellation of all the technical panel (TP) meetings apart from the TP on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies (TPFF) and a two day meeting of the TP for the glossary (TPG) disrupted the work on technical standards (subjects), the glossary and ISPM 15. 2009. *Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*. Despite long agendas in both May and November, the SC made significant progress thanks to the cooperation of SC members. Reports of the SC and SC-7 meetings are posted on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355>).

*This document is printed in limited numbers to minimize the environmental impact of FAO's processes and contribute to climate neutrality. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and to avoid asking for additional copies. Most FAO meeting documents are available on the Internet at [www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org)*

4. The SC made more electronic decisions (e-decisions) this year, including approval of draft ISPMs under the special process, decisions on membership of expert drafting groups (EDGs) and on the work of TPs. It is essential that the SC works electronically on relatively straightforward issues so that plenary sessions can be used for strategic issues and thorough review of draft ISPMs. E-decision making is, however, dependent on adequate staffing levels in the Secretariat and availability of time by SC members.
5. The recommendations of the focus group (FG) on improving the standard setting process are far reaching and if adopted will affect both the SC and contracting parties. Each November the SC will have to ensure that draft ISPMs are ready for adoption without discussion. Contracting parties may have to communicate more actively with SC members from their region to ensure that SC members are aware of any substantial issues with draft ISPMs so these can be addressed before the drafts are presented to CPM for adoption.
6. The SC welcomed the introduction of the online comment system (OCS) and congratulated the Secretariat on the success of this system. One immediate advantage for the SC was the ability to see collated member comments very quickly after the end of the commenting period, allowing more time to review the comments. I hope this tool will help relieve some pressures on Secretariat resources in the standards setting area.
7. In an attempt to increase cooperation with the other areas of the IPPC, the SC has introduced an agenda item for interaction with other members of the IPPC Secretariat and to receive feedback from them on issues associated with standard setting. This has worked well so far. The SC is committed to taking into account CPM members concerns and ensuring that ISPMs continue to be relevant.

## II. May Meeting

8. In response to the CPM's request to reprioritise topics, the SC reviewed the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and proposed changes (see CPM 2012/05). Proposals by the Secretariat for priorities for phytosanitary treatments (PTs) and glossary terms were accepted by the SC. Working priorities for diagnostic protocols (DPs) were agreed and at the November meeting the SC decided that DPs should be reviewed again by the TP on diagnostic protocols (TPDP) based on slightly modified TPDP criteria.
9. The SC also discussed the tasks for the FG on standard setting and made recommendations. These were taken into account by the FG (see report for full details (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=207776> and CPM 2012/11).
10. The SC considered two new PTs (dielectric heating and sulfuryl fluoride) relevant to ISPM 15:2009 which had been submitted to the SC by the TP on phytosanitary treatments (TPPT) and TP on forest quarantine (TPFQ). After discussion, the SC decided not to send the sulfuryl fluoride treatment for member consultation in 2011 because the data did not support a full range of temperatures for the application of the treatment and, although there were no concerns about the science, there were concerns that the treatment would be difficult to implement in practice at the temperatures recommended in the schedule.
11. As indicated in the report of the May SC meeting (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355>), the SC approved seven draft ISPMs for member consultation in 2011, including two PTs and one DP. For the other draft ISPMs reviewed at the meeting, three (*Protocol to determine host status of fruit and vegetables to fruit fly infestation*; *Phytosanitary pre-import clearance*, *Movement of growing media in association with plant for planting in international trade*) were sent to small SC working groups to be revised by email and for re-submission for the April 2012 meeting. The draft ISPM on *Import of germplasm* will be revised by the steward based on comments from SC members for submission to the April 2012 meeting.

12. Two specifications were approved by the SC: Specification 53. Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly regulated areas in the event of outbreak detection in pest free areas for fruit flies and Specification 54. International movement of seed. These are both available on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=24119>). The TPFF developed a draft ISPM on the former topic at its meeting in August 2011.

### III. SC-7 Meeting

13. In May 2011, the SC-7 considered draft ISPMs that had been sent for member consultation in 2010. The draft ISPMs revised by the SC-7 on *Integrated measures for plants for planting* and *Systems approaches for fruit flies* were posted on the IPP in the SC restricted work area where CPM members could log into the IPP to view them. These draft standards were therefore made available for CPM members to consider prior to the November SC meeting.

14. The SC requested the international forestry quarantine research group (IFQRG) and the TPFQ and TPPT to consider issues associated with the draft Annex to ISPM 15:2009 on *Criteria for ISPM 15 treatments*.

### IV. November Meeting

15. The SC reviewed the recommendations from the FG on standards setting and the adjustments proposed by the informal group on strategic planning and technical assistance (SPTA) and made some further recommendations to take into account practical issues for SC members (Report of the meeting is posted on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355>)).

16. The SC learned from the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) officer that a questionnaire had been sent to NPPOs on implementation of ISPM 6. 1997. *Guidelines for surveillance* and workshops on surveillance will be held in 2012. The SC considers these will be helpful for the redraft of ISPM 6:1997, but were rather surprised to hear that plans for the workshops were already well advanced with no involvement of SC members. The SC is willing to work with the IRSS officer in the future to help develop questionnaires or prepare for workshops.

17. The SC was briefed on the developments with e-certification. The SC agrees with the recommendation from the workshop on e-certification that it would be inappropriate to include technical requirements for computer coding in an ISPM, especially as such requirements are liable to require changing at short notice to meet other international standards. Such information could be held on a web site and referred to in an ISPM. The SC, however, considers that there should be some general guidance for NPPOs on implementing e-certification in the Appendix to ISPM 12. 2011. *Phytosanitary certificates*. Given the positive feedback by members of the workshop on e-certification, it seems likely that guidelines may be able to be developed relatively quickly. As the CPM gave this topic high priority, the SC hopes that a draft Appendix can be completed and sent for member consultation in the near future.

18. The SC discussed concerns regarding the practical implementation of an ISPM 15:2009 treatment using dielectric heating and is seeking guidance from the CPM on how to proceed. The SC also requests that relevant parties provide guidance relevant to the use of dielectric heating on a large scale. This issue is covered in CPM 2012/05.

19. The SC agreed in May 2011 that a new task be added to all specifications requiring experts to consider issues associated with implementation of the standard when drafting new ISPMs. The wording for this task was agreed at the November 2011 meeting and will be added to all specifications that do not yet have a draft ISPM developed.

20. The SC had long and difficult discussions on the draft ISPM on *Integrated measures for production of plants for planting in international trade*. The SC took into account all the issues raised in member comments and concerns raised by SC members during the meeting. The SC made all possible efforts to ensure they were addressed. The SC acknowledges that parts of the draft have been rearranged and wording readjusted to ensure responsibilities are clarified, but major concepts have not changed. The SC could not take the draft any further and did not see there would be any benefit in sending it for another 100 day consultation. The draft ISPM on *Systems approaches for fruit flies* also resulted in much discussion and further changes. In contrast to the draft ISPM on *Integrated measures for production of plants for planting in international trade*, this draft did not contain detailed guidance for NPPOs, which might have been beneficial. However, the SC did not consider it appropriate to revise the draft further and recommends it for adoption by the CPM.

21. After the November meeting, a small steering group for the topic *Minimising pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in the international trade* met and informed the SC, via e-decision, of the progress to date. The SC considered that this is a complex issue and the standard should be developed in a phased approach, based on discussions with industry. The SC also felt that scope of the initial standard should be restricted (excluding conveyances and initially only dealing with empty containers). The SC continues to discuss the best ways to develop guidance on this topic and will consider this further at their April 2012 meeting. The Secretariat has arranged for the expert working group to meet in late May 2012.

## V. Development with Technical Panels

22. The SC had a detailed review of the work of TPs at its May 2011 meeting and agreed that two TPs had nearly completed their work, but needed to work virtually in order to provide support to the SC and Secretariat on draft fruit fly ISPMs (TPFF) and on issues associated with ISPM 15:2009 (TPFQ). In contrast, the SC considered that the TPG, TPDP and TPPT should continue to work for the foreseeable future. The SC therefore adjusted the work programme of the TPFQ so that it focuses on providing guidance relevant to ISPM 15:2009 (see May and November SC reports (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355>)).

23. The work on technical standards was disrupted this year because meetings were cancelled. Given the technical nature of TPs it is difficult for them to work electronically. The TPPT has initiated small-scale virtual meetings, but they are resource intensive and can only discuss a limited number of issues in detail. Scheduling of the meetings is already difficult because of the various time zones of members and relies on the goodwill of TPPT members; longer meetings would be impossible to arrange without reducing the input from some experts. It is essential for these panels to meet face-to-face regularly in order to maintain momentum and to aid decision making.

24. As the terms of membership of many experts in TPs will finish in 2013, the SC agreed that there should be a process for renewal and replacement of experts. In November 2011, the SC reviewed the membership of the panels and the Secretariat will make a call for new experts so that the new members will have a 1 year overlap with existing members.

25. The SC was grateful for all the work done by technical panel members and acknowledged the expertise they have contributed to this work and commitment they have shown (see CPM 2012/05).

## VI. The Future

26. It is good that funding has been made available for meetings of the TPDP, TPG and TPPT in 2012, so that work in these key areas can continue. I look forward to working with new colleagues from April onwards and I also look forward to the challenge of implementing decisions from the FG meeting on standard setting.