



REPORT

Rome, Italy
2-6 May 2011

Standards Committee May 2011

REPORT REVISED 27 SEPTEMBER 2011



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

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

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

CONTENTS

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING.....	7
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	7
1.2 Election of the Rapporteur	7
1.3 Adoption of the Agenda	7
2. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS	7
2.1 Documents List	7
2.2 Participants List.....	7
2.3 Local Information.....	7
3. UPDATES FROM OTHER RELEVANT BODIES	7
3.1 Items arising from CPM-6 (2011).....	7
3.1.1 Reprioritization of topics.....	8
3.1.2 Diagnostic protocols, phytosanitary treatments, and glossary terms: how to present them to the Bureau, the SPTA and the CPM.....	9
3.1.3 Focus group for improving the IPPC standard setting process	10
3.2 Report of the IPPC Standard Setting Group (November 2010-April 2011)	12
3.3 Feedback on processes since the November 2010 SC meeting.....	12
4. STANDARDS COMMITTEE.....	13
4.1 Report of the SC November 2010.....	13
4.2 Update of polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (November 2010-March 2011)	13
5. DRAFT ISPMs FROM EXPERT DRAFTING GROUPS	15
5.1 Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests (draft Annex 4 to ISPM 11:2004) and proposed consequential changes to ISPM 11:2004 (2005-001).....	15
5.2 Revision Annex 1 of ISPM 15:2009 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) (2006-011)	17
5.3 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)	18
5.4 Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly infestations (Tephritidae) (2006-031).....	19
5.5 Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (2005-008).....	19
5.6 Phytosanitary pre-import clearance (2005-003).....	20
5.7 Import of germplasm (2004-001).....	21
5.8 Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004).....	22
5.9 Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (appendix to ISPM 5) (2009-001)	23
6. SELECTION OF THE EQUIVALENT OF FIVE DRAFT ISPMs FOR 2011 MEMBER CONSULTATION	23
7. DRAFT SPECIFICATIONS FOR REVIEW OF MEMBER COMMENTS AND APPROVAL BY THE SC.....	24
7.1 Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly regulated areas in the event of outbreak detection in pest free areas for fruit flies (for inclusion as Annex 1 of ISPM 26:2006) (2009-007).....	24

7.2	International movement of seed (2009-003)	25
7.3	Framework for national phytosanitary inspection procedures (2005-005)	26
7.4	Minimizing the risk of quarantine pests associated with stored products in international trade (2005-006).....	26
7.5	Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities (2008-003).....	27
7.6	Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004).....	27
7.7	Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20:2004 <i>Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system</i>) (2008-006)	27
7.8	Revision of ISPM 4:1995 – Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (2009-002).....	27
7.9	International movement of cut flowers and foliage (2008-005).....	27
7.10	Revision of ISPM 8:1998 – Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005).....	27
7.11	Revision of ISPM 6:1997 – Guidelines for surveillance (2009-004).....	27
7.12	Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood (2008-008).....	27
7.13	Biological control for forest pests (2009-008)	27
8.	REVIEW OF TECHNICAL PANELS.....	28
8.1	Technical panel on diagnostic protocols (TPDP).....	28
8.2	Technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies (TPFF)	29
8.3	Technical panel on phytosanitary treatments (TPPT).....	29
8.4	Technical panel on forest quarantine (TPFQ).....	31
8.5	Technical panel for the Glossary (TPG)	32
9.	List of topics for IPPC standards.....	33
9.1	Update on the List of topics for IPPC standards	33
9.2	Adjustments to stewards.....	33
10.	AGENDA ITEMS DEFERRED TO FUTURE SC MEETINGS	34
11.	REVIEW OF THE STANDARD SETTING CALENDAR.....	34
12.	UPDATE ON 2011 REGIONAL WORKSHOPS.....	34
13.	OTHER BUSINESS	34
13.1	Update and demonstration of the Online Comment System	34
13.2	Update on the Sea Containers Expert Working Group	35
13.3	Update on the IPPC Strategic Framework and the IPPC Standard setting strategic plan.....	35
13.4	How the SC will continue to work in the future.....	35
13.5	Implementation of standards	35
13.6	Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)	35
14.	CLOSE OF THE MEETING.....	36
14.1	Date and venue of the next SC Meeting.....	36
14.2	Evaluation of the meeting process	36
14.3	Adoption of the report	36
14.4	Close.....	36

LIST OF APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1 - Agenda	37
APPENDIX 2 - Documents list.....	45
APPENDIX 3 - Participants list	51
APPENDIX 4 - Priorities for topics as recommended by the SC	59
APPENDIX 5 - Priorities for subjects for diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments.....	65
APPENDIX 6 - Summary of Standards Committee e-decisions.....	71
APPENDIX 7 - List of topics for IPPC standards.....	77
APPENDIX 8 - Standards approved for 2011 member consultation and approved specifications.....	103

Draft amendments to ISPM 5 - *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* (1994-001)

ISPM 11:2004 draft Annex 4 - *Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pest* and proposed consequential changes to ISPM 11:2004 (2005-001)

ISPM 5 draft revision of Supplement No. 1 - *Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of official control in relation to regulated pests and not widely distributed in relation to quarantine pests that are present in an area* (2005-2008)

ISPM 27:2006 draft Annex X - *Trogoderma granarium* (please refer to SC May 2010 report) (2004-006)

ISPM 15:2009 draft revision of Annex 1 - *Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material* (2006-011)

ISPM 28:2007 draft Annex X: *Vapour heat treatment of Cucumis melo var. reticulatus for Bactrocera cucurbitae* (201-) (2006-110)

ISPM 28:2007 draft Annex X: *Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heat* (201-) (2007-114)

Specification 53 - *Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of outbreak detection* (2011)

Specification 54 - *International movement of seed* (2011)

Specification TP1 Rev3 - *Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols* (2011)

[1] **1. OPENING OF THE MEETING**

[2] **1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat**

[3] The Secretariat welcomed the SC and introduced two new members, Mr Nahhal (Lebanon) and Mr Rossel (Australia). The Secretariat noted that Mr Ngatoko (Cook Islands) had been called to replace Mr Tumukon (Vanuatu) but was unable to make arrangements in time to attend this SC meeting. Observers from Poland, Mexico, South Africa, NAPPO and OIRSA introduced themselves. The Chair expressed her appreciation that resources had become available to hold this meeting.

[4] **1.2 Election of the Rapporteur**

[5] The SC elected Ms Awosusi (Nigeria) as Rapporteur.

[6] **1.3 Adoption of the Agenda**

[7] The SC adopted the agenda (Appendix 1).

[8] **2. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

[9] **2.1 Documents List**

[10] The Secretariat presented the list of documents (Appendix 2).

[11] **2.2 Participants List**

[12] 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/>).

[13] **2.3 Local Information**

[14] The Secretariat provided a document on local information¹.

[15] **3. UPDATES FROM OTHER RELEVANT BODIES**

[16] **3.1 Items arising from CPM-6 (2011)**

[17] The Secretariat introduced extracts from the draft report of CPM-6 (2011) which were relevant for the work of the SC².

[18] The Secretariat noted that CPM-6 (2011) had adopted ISPM 7:2011, ISPM 12:2011, Appendix 1 to ISPM 26:2006 and three phytosanitary treatments (annexes to ISPM 28:2007). It was also the first time that the CPM adopted ISPMs in Russian. The Secretariat noted that, for Russian versions of adopted standards to be fully in force, they would have to be adopted by CPM; this raised resource issues. The Secretariat also noted that issues relating to co-publishing agreements for ISPMs would need further discussion by the Bureau in June 2011.

[19] The Secretariat challenged SC members to ensure their IPPC Contact Point posts information related to the implementation of ISPM 15 on the IPP:

(https://www.ippc.int/?id=1110520&no_cache=1&type=ispm).

[20] The Secretariat reported that IPPC Strategic Framework 2011-2019 is under development and the CPM-6 (2011) agreed to four new strategic objectives. Once the IPPC Strategic Framework has been developed, the Secretariat will consult the SC on the development of a strategic plan for standard setting. A Bureau member noted that comments on the IPPC Strategic Framework 2011-2019 had been received from CPM members and were being incorporated in a new draft to be presented to the Bureau.

¹ 2011_SC_May_04

² 2011_SC_May_35

- [21] The four strategic objectives are:
- A. Protect sustainable agriculture and enhance global food security through the prevention of pest spread.
 - B. Protect the environment, forests and biodiversity against plant pests.
 - C. Facilitate economic and trade development through the promotion of harmonized, scientifically-based phytosanitary measures.
 - D. Develop phytosanitary capacity for members to accomplish A, B & C.
- [22] **3.1.1 Reprioritization of topics**
- [23] Topics and priorities had been a major point of discussion at past CPM meetings, and CPM-6 (2011) requested the SC to consider how to reprioritize topics for ISPMs. The Secretariat presented an updated framework for standards³. A working group of SC members discussed the topics on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. Issues related to subjects for diagnostic protocols, phytosanitary treatments and glossary terms were discussed in plenary (see agenda item 3.1.2).
- [24] The Chair reported to the plenary on the outcome of the working group of SC members. The group considered three discussion papers⁴ and developed a conference room paper⁵ which presented topics in two tables: Table 1 of topics for which drafts were recently drafted (i.e. that had already been sent for member consultation in 2010 or still to be reviewed prior to member consultation); and Table 2 of topics at earlier stages of development (i.e. with minimum or no drafting or pending further development). The group considered the two tables separately.
- [25] The group applied the following general principles and criteria when considering the prioritisation of topics:
- The group ranked the topics according to categories of priority 1 to 4 (with 1 being of high priority and 4 being of low priority) and proposed some topics for deletion.
 - The group did not review phytosanitary treatments, diagnostic protocols and glossary terms
 - The group did not propose all pending topics for deletion; for example the SC retained two species-specific topics because it was felt a standard was still achievable on this topic.
 - The group gave a higher priority to topics that had recent drafts (although not all were given the highest priority).
 - Whether another adopted standard partially covers the concept or the topic could be combined into another topic.
 - Whether the CPM had recommended a topic or the Informal working group on strategic planning and technical assistance (SPTA) had recommended the topic as a high priority (although not all were given the highest priority).
- [26] The Chair and the Secretariat, based on documents provided⁴, assigned the most relevant IPPC strategic objective for each topic. The working group of SC members discussed whether the topics relating to more than one strategic objective should be given higher priority. After an initial attempt, the working group decided that only priorities would be discussed, and that the topics and their priorities would be presented under the IPPC strategic objective that was considered the most relevant, with a brief summary of the reasons the SC considered when reprioritizing each topic. The SC did not have time to review and approve these summaries in the meeting. However, SC members were invited to provide their comments which the Secretariat would incorporate. This information is presented in Appendix 4.

³ 2011_SC_May_50

⁴ 2011_SC_May_45, _54, _CRP2

⁵ 2011_SC_May_CRP_03

- [27] The working group of SC members made some proposals for deletion for three main reasons: issues that are national (i.e. issues dealt with by NPPOs and therefore no need for harmonization); topics considered to be more appropriate for technical manuals or guides with capacity development in mind; topics merged into others or already partially covered by other adopted standards.
- [28] The SC discussed how the proposal would be organized, and agreed that the different arguments raised in the working group of SC members should be recorded in this report and made available to the Bureau and SPTA. The list of priorities⁶, resulting from the working group, was presented to the SC.
- [29] The Secretariat observed that the Bureau and SPTA would review the prioritisation proposal and the Secretariat would forward it to the CPM for decision. Priorities might be modified throughout the process. In particular, for topics proposed to be deleted, if there was strong evidence of the importance of retaining an item on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, Bureau members or SPTA participants should take these into account. The Secretariat would present the document, probably for information, at the November 2011 meeting of the SC.
- [30] **3.1.2 Diagnostic protocols, phytosanitary treatments, and glossary terms: how to present them to the Bureau, the SPTA and the CPM**
- [31] The Chair had proposed to accept the Secretariat's analysis of priorities for subjects of diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments⁷. The Chair reminded the SC that many protocols had already been drafted, and this work should not be lost. No attempt was made to prioritize glossary terms.
- [32] One member noted that the need for harmonisation should be an essential reason to maintain a phytosanitary treatment or diagnostic protocol as subject on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. While this is normally fulfilled for phytosanitary treatments, which are generally integrated into phytosanitary import requirements, the need for harmonization for diagnostic protocols is not straightforward. Situations in which diagnostic protocols should be harmonized should be considered. In this regard, the SC should review the criteria developed by the TPDP and reviewed by the SC in November 2007, and partly used by the Secretariat in its prioritisation.
- [33] After discussion, the SC concluded that it would not make recommendations regarding priorities for diagnostic protocols, phytosanitary treatments and glossary terms.
- [34] The SC *decided* that:
- (1) the proposed priorities for topics will be presented to the Bureau and the SPTA (Appendix 4)
 - (2) subjects for phytosanitary treatments, diagnostic protocols and glossary terms will not be presented to the Bureau and the SPTA at this time and:
 - a. the priorities of subjects for phytosanitary treatments⁸ were accepted as presented in Appendix 5
 - b. the glossary terms would not be prioritized at this time
 - c. regarding diagnostic protocols, the Secretariat will use the priorities presented to the SC⁹ as working priorities (see Appendix 5 to this report). Before the SC November meeting, a group (Mr Nordbo (Denmark), the steward of the TPDP and the Secretariat) will review the criteria and the priority listing, and adjust as necessary. The Secretariat will present the outcome to the SC for review.

⁶ 2011_SC_May_CRP04Rev02

⁷ 2011_SC_May_54

⁸ 2011_SC_May_54

⁹ 2011_SC_May_54

[35] **3.1.3 Focus group for improving the IPPC standard setting process**

[36] The Secretariat informed the SC that it is planning to convene a Focus Group for improving the IPPC standard setting process in July 2011. The Secretariat presented the terms of reference¹⁰ to the SC as adopted by CPM-6 (2011). One representative from each region (for Europe, the SC Chair), two consultants to assist the Secretariat, one representative from the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), and a representative from the Codex Alimentarius or the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) will be requested to participate in the Focus Group. The Secretariat requested the SC provide assistance to help find process-improvement consultants to assist the Focus Group.

[37] The Chair noted that the Bureau and SPTA had already considered improvements in the procedures for development of diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments¹¹, which will be part of the consideration of the Focus Group.

[38] The Secretariat suggested that the SC provide recommendations to the Focus Group to be brought forward by the Chair of the SC. SC members raised the following issues in relation to the three tasks of the Focus Group:

[39] ***Task 1. Member Consultation process, in particular member consultation periods***

[40] One member suggested that the 14-day consultation period prior to CPM be cancelled, therefore having only one consultation. If a draft standard changes substantially after the first member consultation and the steward's analysis, there should be some mechanism for NPPOs to raise justified comments.

[41] Several members supported that countries need to have the possibility to express comments on the drafts as redrafted in response to member comments. Views varied on how this could be achieved, but the following possibilities were mentioned: continue the current 14-day prior to CPM consultation; hold a short consultation before the draft standard is presented to CPM (with subsequent adjustments prior to CPM) (the Secretariat noted that this last proposal would be difficult in practice for timing reasons); routinely hold a second full round of consultation.

[42] Several members noted that a radical solution is needed.

[43] One member noted that evening sessions at CPM provided a forum where concerns could be discussed and compromises reached. However many members were of the opinion that CPM should not be involved anymore in redrafting standards during its meetings as experts have been nominated to represent their region on the SC. Evening sessions leave too little time for decisions; often experts, SC members or contracting parties are not able to participate at CPM; evening sessions require intensive interpretation and translation resources; they have effects on the quality of standards as there is not enough time to scrutinize standards and understand the possible implications of changes; decisions are taken under too much pressure for members and stewards, and may not always result in high quality standards. A Bureau member noted that with 600 comments at CPM-6 (2011) the process was almost impossible and that this situation is not sustainable. Interpretation is available during evening sessions, but most of the work on the texts is done in English, which is difficult for CPM members who do not have English as a mother tongue. It does not give non-English speakers sufficient time to consider changes agreed at high speed and their implications.

[44] Several members were of the opinion that the CPM should have the role of "rubber stamping" ISPMs, as in other standard-setting organizations, and that standards should be sent back to the Standards Committee if there are too many issues. The CPM could be used for discussing a few substantial and strategic key points, but not for discussing all comments. One member suggested a threshold of e.g. 100 comments at the 14-day prior to CPM consultation period.

¹⁰ 2011_SC_May_33

¹¹ 2011_SC_May_32

- [45] The SC discussed the possibility of having two rounds of member consultation. Many members agreed that a second round of consultation was necessary in some cases after the SC has considered comments. Some thought that one round of consultation might be sufficient if the standard has not been extensively modified. Regarding a second round of consultation, the following was expressed:
- A second round of member consultation can take place at any time, not necessarily immediately prior to CPM. After the second round of consultation, comments could be examined and the draft modified (e.g. by a subgroup of the SC), and the draft be presented to CPM. If it is not approved, it could then be returned to the SC for further consideration.
 - The SC procedures already allow for a second round of consultation after considering member comments, and the SC should make use of this when needed.
 - Having a second round of consultation would have implications for the workload and the work mode of both the SC and the Secretariat.
 - A second round of consultation may help ensure higher quality standards.
 - Easier standards may need only one consultation (e.g. those with limited amount of redrafting as a result of member consultation).
- [46] ***Task 2. Approval process for draft ISPMs under the special standard setting process and improvement to approval of diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments***
- [47] The Bureau and SPTA had reviewed a document on improvement to the approval of protocols and treatments¹² and the Chair outlined some issues¹³.
- [48] The Chair noted that the SPTA had previously discussed the status of diagnostic protocols and had recommended that they should remain as standards. This view had also been previously expressed by some SC members. The main arguments at the time had been to ensure a level of confidence and have protocols, which present widely-used methods that have been validated.
- [49] The Secretariat noted that new processes have already been approved for diagnostic protocols and for phytosanitary treatments: diagnostic protocols approved by the SC for member consultation are posted on the IPP; in addition, diagnostic protocols will be posted on the IPP at earlier stages of the development before the protocols are presented to the TPDP to solicit comments from experts; submitters wishing to submit phytosanitary treatments would be encouraged to submit experimental plans to be reviewed prior to conducting experiments which provide the supporting data for future phytosanitary submissions.
- [50] Several members welcomed the expert consultation via the IPP at earlier stages of development of diagnostic protocols. One member noted that the Secretariat could compile and posts these comments received through such consultation. The Secretariat informed the SC that the planned system would allow experts to send their comments directly to the author, editorial team and the discipline lead. The SC suggested the use of the online comment system or a forum for comments as options for collecting comments.
- [51] Several members were concerned that draft and adopted diagnostic protocols very rapidly become outdated. Several members supported the suggestion that some or all diagnostic protocols could have a status other than ISPMs, such as a type of technical document. The SC considered it important that they have a status that allows for dynamic updating and at the same time should be recognized internationally. However, an alternative adoption system should be developed, with well-defined procedures but working in a flexible mode. Another member believed that diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments are close to scientific publications; it might be possible to produce them through an expert peer-review system and not adopted by CPM.

¹² 2011_SC_May_32

¹³ 2011_SC_May_43Rev1

- [52] The SC discussed ways to improve the current adoption process for diagnostic protocols. If diagnostic protocols remained as ISPMs, one possibility would be that they remain at a draft stage of development for some years with appropriate systems in place to obtain comments, with the anticipation that once they reached CPM they would simply be endorsed.
- [53] A Bureau member noted that authors of protocols might have more incentive for their work if they get recognition of authorship and can claim publishing rights. He noted that this had been previously discussed and rejected.
- [54] The SC was concerned about resources available to the Secretariat as streamlining the current system will be difficult if appropriate resources are not available. Support for diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments requires more Secretariat involvement than available at present. In addition, in kind-contribution of staff at the current level is not a sustainable solution.
- [55] ***Task 3. Efficiencies and expedited ways of achieving standard setting work.***
- [56] One member expressed concerns about the functioning of the SC. The SC has expanded to 25 members and interpretation in all languages is offered, but some drafts still attracted 600 comments 14-days prior to CPM-6 (2011). It was suggested that SC members, as representatives of their regions, should be more involved within their region during the drafting of member comments to help members provide focused comments, and should answer questions raised by CPM members prior to CPM in order to reduce the number of comments received 14-days prior to CPM.
- [57] The Secretariat stated that, once the SC-7 revised draft standards, these were posted on the IPP and made available to NPPOs and RPPOs. Very few CPM members are reviewing the standards at this stage. This could be encouraged and members could submit comments via their region's SC members.
- [58] One member noted that CPM members compared standards with their specifications when reviewing them during member consultation. Many comments arise regarding how the draft standard does not always follow the specification. However, this is usually due to the fact that the SC gave the EWG new directions that differed or expanded on the specification. He suggested that these new directions from the SC should be included in the background document that accompanies the standard during member consultation. The SC agreed that such changes be detailed in the background documents accompanying drafts during member consultation.
- [59] The SC noted that the number of comments at CPM shows the need for a cultural shift. It reflects that countries do and want to participate, but that commenting does not happen at the best time. In addition, the CPM needs to better recognize and support the work done by its regional experts on the SC.
- [60] One member pointed out that the SC could be more strategic, for example by combining topics.

[61] **3.2 Report of the IPPC Standard Setting Group (November 2010-April 2011)**

- [62] The Standards Officer introduced the report and organizational chart of the IPPC Secretariat's standard setting group¹⁴. He noted that the standard setting group currently had only two permanent FAO staff members (Standards Officer and Documentation Clerk). He warned that the group relies heavily on consultants and in-kind contributions, with fixed contracts expiring at set dates; as these resources are withdrawn, corresponding work will also have to be stopped or be put on hold.

[63] **3.3 Feedback on processes since the November 2010 SC meeting**

- [64] The Chair raised several issues¹⁵ on how to make the SC more effective. Some were linked to reprioritization of topics and to improvements of standard setting, and were considered at other agenda items. She asked the SC to consider whether the SC should raise issues for decision directly to the

¹⁴ 2011_SC_May_39, 2011_SC_May_41

¹⁵ 2011_SC_May_43

CPM. This has not traditionally been done under the current system, as the SC Chair's report is presented to CPM as an information paper rather than a CPM decision paper. The SC agreed that it would be useful for the SC to be able to make recommendations for decision at CPM. This could be done by changing the SC Chair's report from an information document to a decision document. The representative from the Bureau was asked to advise the Bureau of this request.

[65] The SC:

- (1) Invited the Bureau to agree that the SC Chair's report to CPM is changed from an information document (INF) to a decision document (DOC).

[66] **4. STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

[67] **4.1 Report of the SC November 2010¹⁶**

[68] There was no comment on the report. The Secretariat noted that reports (including those of the SC and of expert drafting groups) are no longer posted as SC meeting documents. A link to the relevant page on the IPP was indicated on the agenda.

[69] **4.2 Update of polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (November 2010-March 2011)**

[70] The Standards Officer gave an overview of the e-decisions and the participation by region in the different polls¹⁷. He noted that e-decisions are becoming more indispensable because of reduced Secretariat resources and it allows the standards setting process to continue between SC meetings. Several members noted that no response is considered as an agreement and they do not have time to check on all forums and polls. Several members felt that it was an excellent tool and were comfortable with the response rate.

[71] Members expressed their appreciation of the e-decision system, but noted some possible improvements and issues, including: improving the use of automatic emails to notify members that there are recent contributions to forums or polls; send email warnings of a coming deadline (one day before closing); resolving the lack of stability of the system and the need to login several times; lengthening the duration of consultation as the current two-week deadline is considered too short.

[72] One member suggested that forums and polls should be combined, with a negative opinion in a forum being translated as a "no" for the corresponding poll. The Secretariat noted that the forum is the place to discuss, and possibly change, opinions prior to polling; therefore, the suggestion was not retained.

[73] The SC decided that the combined duration of a forum followed by a poll would be three weeks (two-week forum, one-week poll) and that three weeks would be allowed if a poll was used alone. The SC also agreed that, in exceptional circumstances, this duration could be shortened by the Secretariat in consultation with the Chair. In addition SC members would receive email notice of forums and polls (including the passage from a forum to a poll), and would continue receiving automatic notification emails when members have contributed in a forum or in a poll. The issue of stability would be considered by the IPP team.

[74] The SC discussed two polls which had not been concluded by e-decision.

[75] ***Forum on sulfuranyl fluoride treatment as an annex to ISPM 28:2007 (2007-101)***

[76] Divergent opinions had been expressed in the forum on whether to send this treatment for member consultation or not. The main issue was related to the narrow temperature range at which the application of the treatment is approved (i.e. 15-17.9°C and 30°C and above). One option was to

¹⁶ <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355>

¹⁷ 2011_SC_May_44Rev.1

approve the schedule applying to 30°C and above for member consultation, recognizing that it is only partial. Scientifically it had proved difficult to extrapolate from the accumulated data.

- [77] SC members all agreed that the submitter be requested to continue their research in order to fill the gap of temperature ranges.
- [78] The SC noted the importance to have alternatives to methyl bromide. This treatment is effective for two temperature ranges (i.e. 15-17.9°C and above 30°C) and some SC members felt this should be presented to CPM members. However, a note could be added to the background document for this draft that research is continuing for other temperatures. One member noted that research was also being carried out in his country, and he might be able to provide data. Some SC members felt that sending this phytosanitary treatment for member consultation might motivate the research to fill the gaps in the temperature range; while others had concerns about the applicability of the treatment for the temperature ranges available, on which TPFQ had expressed reservations.
- [79] The SC had divergent views and finally decided not to send this treatment for member consultation. The SC recognized however that the data were scientifically valid but the treatment was not considered practical at the current temperature range. The SC encouraged the submitters to produce a full schedule and the TPPT to be ready to evaluate new data once it becomes available.
- [80] *Forum on selection of the discipline lead for bacteriology for the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols*
- [81] The concern in the SC forum had been that the two candidates were from countries already represented in the TPDP (France and New Zealand). However, the virologist from New Zealand had now resigned from the TPDP and so it was proposed to select the candidate from that country as bacteriologist. The SC agreed to select Mr Taylor (New Zealand) as the TPDP bacteriologist.
- [82] A summary of SC decisions by e-decision since November 2010 is given in Appendix 6.
- [83] The SC:
- (1) *Discussed* and made slight amendments to the current status and operation of the e-decision system (regarding automatic email notifications and duration).
 - (2) *Encouraged* e-decision participation.
 - (3) *Selected* Mr Taylor (New Zealand) as bacteriologist on the TPDP, and reminded SC members to inform the nominees from their regions who were not selected.
 - (4) *Requested* the Secretariat to write a letter to the submitter of the sulfuryl fluoride treatment to encourage them to carry out further research.
- [84] Regarding the use of electronic tools, the Secretariat noted that Adobe Connect is becoming a standard tool within FAO to facilitate distance work. It allows working on documents on screen while being in communication with other participants. Adobe Connect is an online system and does not need installation of software. However it requires a headset and the previous installation of Adobe Flash 10.1 (which can be downloaded from the Internet). The Secretariat had started using Adobe Connect with the sea containers steering group, and will start using it with the TPPT in June 2011. The Secretariat can make specific arrangements with FAO Offices in countries to use Adobe Connect. The SC was open to trying this system, but recalled that installation and use of such electronic tools requires prior approval of their IT services; members would need to know much in advance when use would start. The Secretariat encouraged SC members to obtain permission from their organization now to install the latest version of Adobe Flash (10.2 as of the publishing this report) and to purchase a USB headset¹⁸ in order to be prepared for the use of Adobe Connect.

¹⁸ With headphone and microphone. For more information on the specifications for virtual tools used by the IPPC Secretariat, please visit the IPP at [https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110980&no_cache=1&L=0]

[85] **5. DRAFT ISPMs FROM EXPERT DRAFTING GROUPS**

[86] The Secretariat presented nine draft ISPMs to the SC for consideration prior to member consultation. The SC recognized that it should attempt to review all drafts. However, the SC also acknowledged that its agenda is too large to allow detailed review of all drafts, especially those that need substantial adjustments prior to member consultation. For these drafts, the SC should nevertheless give indications on how further to advance work. Consequently, the SC discussed via working groups of SC members three drafts for which some SC members had fundamental issues in order to provide guidance for their further development. The drafts concerned were: *Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly infestations* (2006-031) (agenda item 5.4), *Import of germplasm* (2004-001) (agenda item 5.7) and *Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade* (2005-004) (agenda item 5.8). The SC discussed the draft ISPMs directly in plenary.

[87] **5.1 Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests (draft Annex 4 to ISPM 11:2004) and proposed consequential changes to ISPM 11:2004 (2005-001)**

[88] The steward presented the draft Annex 4 to ISPM 11:2004 on pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests¹⁹, which was prepared by an EWG in May 2009. At its May 2010 meeting, the SC had decided that further work was needed and assigned this to a subgroup of the SC to work on via email. Two rounds of email discussion had been held, the draft annex had been modified and consequential amendments to ISPM 11:2004 proposed. The steward thanked the subgroup of the SC for its contribution since the May 2010 SC meeting.

[89] **Review of the draft Annex 4**

[90] The Secretariat considered why the text had not been integrated into the main text of ISPM 11:2004. The steward noted that the EWG had supported that the text should be a coherent stand-alone annex, rather than including text in different sections of ISPM 11, in order to avoid confusion. He strongly advocated that the text is kept as a single annex. In the future, if ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 11:2004 and ISPM 21:2004 were revised, a new structure and merging of these standards could be considered.

[91] The steward explained that the terminology had been changed from *pest plants* to *plants as pests* to avoid introducing a new term. As a result of further discussions on the draft annex 4 and on the proposed changes to ISPM 11, the term *plants as pests* was incorporated.

[92] Another member suggested adding a definition of *plants as pests* and to clarify cases in which the plant can become a pest. The steward noted that the definition of *pest* already includes plants, and defining a plant as a pest would result from the analysis of all parameters that can make it a pest.

[93] One member expressed concern about the intended use section in the draft. The draft relates to the evaluation of a plant as a pest, and as such should be linked to plants for planting. The steward noted that this point had been discussed by the subgroup. While the text emphasizes the high risk pertaining to plants for planting, the steward noted that it also provides guidance for analysing plants imported for other intended uses. The steward also noted that the risk from other intended uses is already mentioned in ISPM 11:2004.

[94] One member proposed that a note be added to the text to address plants that cause allergies and plants that are hosts of recognized plant pathogens. The steward noted these issues do not relate directly to the PRA for a plant as pest, but they are important and could be considered by relevant organisations outside the NPPO. The SC considered that these issues were already dealt with adequately by the main text of ISPM 11:2004.

¹⁹ 2011_SC_May_2005-001 (background information: _5, _6, _18, _19)

[95] The following changes were made:

- Paragraph 5. The sentence on unintentional introduction was modified to clarify that the text relates mainly to plants that are imported. The steward further noted that, in line with the Specification, unintentional introductions are not covered.
- Paragraph 19. The possible sources of information were broadened to horticultural, agricultural forestry and aquaculture publications.
- Paragraph 25. A reference to ISPM 32:2009 was deleted as ISPM 32:2009 relates to the risk for commodities as pathways to carry pests, but not to plants as pests.
- All cross-references to ISPM 2:2007 will be made general (instead of referring to specific sections) in accordance with the new style for ISPMs. Only internal references to sections in ISPM 11:2004 would be kept specific.

[96] **Review of consequential changes to ISPM 11:2004**

[97] The steward introduced the consequential changes to ISPM 11:2004²⁰ arising from the draft Annex 4 above. He noted that the working group of SC members expressed different viewpoints on the extent of these changes, from keeping as much of the adopted ISPM 11 to deleting text relating to plants as pests in ISPM 11. In any case it is essential to ensure consistency between the new Annex 4 and the core text of ISPM 11. Two solutions had been presented: deleting from ISPM 11 those sections that are now in the new annex, or proposing minimum changes to ISPM 11. The steward proposed that minimal changes should be sent for member consultation, and the SC agreed. One member argued that it would be preferable to remove parts of ISPM 11 that are covered in the new Annex. The Secretariat reminded the SC that revision of the standards on PRA (ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 11:2004 and ISPM 21:2004) had previously been recommended by the TPG for consistency reasons, but had not been added to the list of topics for IPPC standards yet. If the SC deemed that ISPM 11 and other PRA standards should be further modified, it could consider adding their revision to the list of topics for IPPC standards as a priority.

[98] The steward outlined the three main changes of alignments of ISPM 11 with the proposed Annex 4:

- Additional text was added to link the terms plant as pest with weed and *invasive plant species* (i.e. the two terms previously used in ISPM 11), and plant as pest was used in other parts of the text.
- *Plants to be imported* had originally been used in ISPM 11 to mean *plants as pests* but could be understood to cover both plants as pests and plants as pathways. The term was replaced by plants as pests where relevant.
- The use of *unintended habitat* in ISPM 11 had been reviewed, and some instances of *unintended habitat* were changed to *unintended locations* where appropriate. Habitat has a biological meaning whereas location has a geographical meaning. The intent is to evaluate the possible spread of the plant to different locations, whether they relate to the same habitat or not.

[99] The SC reviewed and modified the proposed amendments to ISPM 11. The Secretariat noted that the consequential changes would be submitted for member consultation as a list of changes with a reference to ISPM 11:2004 (and not as the complete text of ISPM 11:2004 with changes).

[100] The Secretariat queried whether a change of title of ISPM 11 was required and noted that this is the first time a revision of this standard would be proposed without a change of title. Several members noted that *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests* would be a better title for ISPM 11. The SC did not support a change in title, but the year of adoption should be modified.

²⁰ 2011_SC_May_19 (background information 2011_SC_May_21)

[101] The SC:

- (1) *Approved* for member consultation the draft Annex 4 to ISPM 11:2004: Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests and the Proposed consequential changes to ISPM 11:2004 as revised during the meeting (Appendix 8).

[102] **5.2 Revision Annex 1 of ISPM 15:2009 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) (2006-011)**

[103] The SC discussed the draft²¹ with the participation of the steward through a conference call and discussed the following:

- The SC had already decided under agenda item 4.2 that the draft sulfuryl fluoride treatment would not be sent for member consultation. This treatment and all references to it were removed from the revision of Annex 1 of ISPM 15:2009.
- Paragraph 12. The SC recognized that the requirement for the heat treatment is to reach 56°C for 30 minutes through the entire wood profile (including its core). The SC added text to explain that there were two main methods to measure the temperature: either by placing temperature sensors in the core of the wood; or by measuring the ambient air temperature (in the latter case, treatment schedules are developed based on test treatments during which the core temperature of the wood at various locations has been measured and correlated to chamber air temperature).
- Paragraph 14, indent 6. The SC added text to emphasize that measurements are made in the piece of wood with the largest dimensions.
- Paragraph 14, 6th indent. One member noted confusion in the use of the word *sensor* and in the number of sensors used for measurements. The text used several terms, such as *sensor*, *temperature sensor* or *measuring device*; the SC decided to use *temperature sensor* consistently throughout the text. In addition, both for conventional steam or kiln-drying, two sensors are used, to allow for possible failure of one. These sensors can be either one dry bulb sensor and one wet bulb sensor, or two dry bulb sensors, depending on how the operator runs its processes.
- Paragraph 15. The steward offered clarification on dielectric heating, which works by creating friction of water molecules to generate heat. The wood core, which has a higher moisture content, is warmed faster than the outer drier wood. Organisms are also killed much faster than with conventional heating, which is the reason for the shorter duration of treatment (1 minute at 60°C). Dielectric heating can be provided by microwave and radiofrequency machines. However, to date, only microwaves techniques can meet the required schedule of 60°C for 1 minute within 30 minutes.
- After Paragraph 15. The steward supplied an explanation of the term dielectric heating and the SC added it to the text.
- Paragraph 18. The SC added an indent regarding record keeping, to be consistent with the heat treatment.
- The SC noted that the modifications made to the dielectric heating treatment would also be made in the ISPM 28 phytosanitary treatment already approved for member consultation by the SC.

[104] Regarding fumigation treatments, the Secretariat noted that some elements of fumigation are common to methyl bromide and sulfuryl fluoride, and could be included in an overarching chapeau on fumigation. The SC preferred not to make such change at this stage but recognized that it would be useful. A common chapeau with fumigation best practices could therefore be added when the sulfuryl fluoride treatment is ready to be integrated into Annex 1.

[105] Regarding methyl bromide fumigation, the SC discussed whether the whole text should be open for comment, or only those parts of text modified as per the topic on the list of topics for IPPC standards (clarification of guidance regarding CT products and consistency within ISPM 15:2009). One member

²¹ 2011_SC_May_2006-011 (background information: _27, _49, _2007-101, _2007-114)

noted that some of the proposed text for the sulfuryl fluoride treatment would be useful if added to the methyl bromide section but the SC agreed that only requested changes should be made at this time. It agreed that only the latter would be open for comment, and this should be clearly indicated at member consultation.

[106] The SC:

- (1) *Approved* for member consultation the modified *Annex 1* to *ISPM 15:2009 - approved treatments associated with wood packaging material* (2006-011) as revised during the meeting (Appendix 8).
- (2) *Requested* the TPFQ and TPPT to consider including in *Annex 1* a common section on fumigation once the sulfuryl fluoride treatment would be ready to be represented to the SC.
- (3) *Agreed* that only specific parts of the *Annex 1* would be open for comment at member consultation.
- (4) *Requested* the Secretariat to align the version of the proposed *Annex 1 to ISPM 28:2007 - Heat treatment of wood packaging using dielectric heat* (2007-114), previously approved by the SC via e-decision, with that of the draft *Annex 1 of ISPM 15:2009*.

[107] **5.3 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)**

[108] The steward presented the draft²² developed by the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) at its October 2010 meeting. The SC deleted the following proposed amendments:

- *domestic regulation* (new definition). Several members noted a lack of clarity in the meaning of “domestic”, which would be translated by “national” at least in Spanish, French and Arabic. The steward noted that “domestic” had been chosen to mean “internal measures”, while “national” regulation could be applied outside the country. Several other members expressed doubt with the term and on the need for a definition. The SC finally agreed to not define *domestic regulation* and proposed that the term be deleted from the list of topics for IPPC standards. The steward advocated for more careful consideration of subjects on the list of topics for IPPC standards; this term had been under discussion in the TPG and the SC since before 2005.
- *electronic phytosanitary certificate* (new definition). Several members deemed the term is covered in the revised definition of *phytosanitary certificate* and is not needed. The SC agreed not to define *electronic phytosanitary certificate* and to delete the term from the list of topics for IPPC standards.
- *re-exported consignment* (revision). For several members, the proposed definition implied that the consignment had to be re-exported as a whole. The SC discussed whether the splitting up of consignments (one part staying in the importing country and the other part being re-exported) should be mentioned in the definition. One member suggested mentioning that the re-exported consignment can be exported in its entirety or in part. The SC could not solve this issue and requested the TPG to reconsider the definition.
- *dose mapping* (deletion). Although recognizing that this is not a phytosanitary term, it is not a dictionary term, nor a common term, and cannot be found easily. The SC decided to retain the term in the Glossary.

[109] The SC:

- (1) *Approved* for member consultation the draft *Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms* as revised during the meeting (Appendix 8).
- (2) Proposed that the following subjects should be deleted from the List of topics for IPPC standards: *electronic phytosanitary certificate*; *domestic regulation*.
- (3) *Requested* the TPG to reconsider the definition of *re-exported consignment*.

²² 2011_SC_May_1994-001 (background information: 2011_SC_May_07, _28)

[110] **5.4 Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly infestations (Tephritidae) (2006-031)**²³

[111] A working group of SC members met to review this standard and provide guidance on the revisions that would be needed before the SC could approve it. The working group discussed the following and reported the discussion highlights to the plenary.

[112] The standard should focus on host species. There was concern that it focused more on the cultivars and physiological stages of the host. However, the working group of SC members agreed that cultivars and physiological stage are very important for the standard.

[113] There is some confusion in the text and flow chart regarding the categories and some deemed these should be in the requirements section rather than in the introduction. The scope and background should be shortened, the outline of requirements should be adjusted and some terminology clarified and harmonized. The chapeau to the lists of elements also needs more content.

[114] The descriptions of categories in the flow chart should be explained more clearly and comprehensively. The prescribed field trials are onerous, but they are very important in that they are often the only method to determine the host status of a fruit. The current draft did not adequately put them in context.

[115] The standard is technically sound but needs input from SC members with experience in drafting standards rather than sending it back to the TPF for additional review. The SC requested the TPF to review the new draft for technical content.

[116] SC invited its members to submit written comments to the steward Mr Cardoso (r.cardoso-pereira@iaea.org), with comments to the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) no later than 31 May 2011. The following SC members volunteered to assist the steward in the redrafting: Ms Aliaga (USA), Ms Chard (UK), Mr Holtzhausen (South Africa), Mr Opatowski (Israel) and Mr Wang (China).

[117] **5.5 Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (2005-008)**

[118] The steward presented the draft²⁴. An EWG developed a draft supplement on *not widely distributed* in 2006, which was subsequently reviewed by the SC-7 and modified by the TPG to integrate it into Supplement 1 to ISPM 5 on official control.

[119] The SC discussed the following elements:

- In response to a suggestion to mention *not widely distributed* before *official control* at several places in the text in order to follow the normal flow of PRA and regulation, the TPG steward favoured that official control should remain the main focus of the document. The SC agreed not to make the change.
- The SC agreed that transient pests are not to be addressed specifically in the draft in relation to *not widely distributed* as they are not expected to establish, but the SC clarified that *official control* would cover transient pests.
- The SC discussed the extent of the area that should be free of the pest for the pest to be *not widely distributed*. The text mentioned that the pest does not occur in all parts of the endangered area. This was misleading as it gave the impression that it could be present in most of the area. The SC changed the wording in several places to reflect that a *not widely distributed* pest is limited to parts of the endangered area. This was also in line with the fact that official control would have to be applied for a quarantine pest that is present and *not widely distributed*, and this would be feasible only for limited parts of a country.

²³ 2011_SC_May_2006-031 (background document: 2011_May_SC_May_08)

²⁴ 2011_SC_May_2005-008 (background information: 2011_SC_May_09, _10, _11, _12)

- The SC raised the issue of the term *categorization of distribution* and its possible confusion with *categorization* as a stage in the PRA. The SC clarified that ISPM 8:1998 also uses *categorization* in relation to distributions, so the SC considered the wording appropriate.
- The Secretariat mentioned that consistency amendments as noted by CPM-5 (2010) will not show in the version going for member consultation. The Secretariat will make it clear that only paragraphs containing new text are open for comment.

[120] The SC:

- (1) Approved for member consultation the draft revision of Supplement No. 1 to ISPM 5: *Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of official control in relation to regulated pests and not widely distributed in relation to quarantine pests that are present in an area* (2005-008), as revised during the meeting (Appendix 8).

[121] **5.6 Phytosanitary pre-import clearance (2005-003)**

[122] The steward presented the draft²⁵, produced by an EWG in 2008 and modified based on previous SC guidance. The text gives guidance on application of a pre-clearance programme and the different elements involved. He noted that the TPG had proposed to modify the term *pre-import clearance* to *pre-export compliance check*. The SC had extensive discussions on the term and its definition and on the draft itself.

[123] **Term and definition**

[124] The SC first acknowledged that the current definition of *pre-clearance* in ISPM 5 needs to be modified, as it wrongly refers to “phytosanitary certification” “performed by or under the supervision of the country of destination”. In a pre-clearance programme, the importing country normally issues certificates granting pre-clearance to the commodity, but these are not phytosanitary certificates. In some pre-clearance programmes, the exporting country may also issue a phytosanitary certificate to accompany the consignment, but this is not the case in all pre-clearance programmes. Most pre-clearance programmes do not require further inspections or checks at the point of entry.

[125] The SC could not agree on the term to be used or its definition. The SC made the following points:

- The EWG had tried to find a way to convey the concept of pre-clearance as done in the phytosanitary world, and had settled on the term *phytosanitary pre-import clearance*. This reflected that pre-clearance is carried out prior to *import* (and part of it might happen in transit) and relates to *phytosanitary* issues (to differentiate it from *pre-clearance* as widely used in the customs domain and under other agreements).
- Several members supported keeping the term *pre-clearance*. This is a well-established term that has been used for decades in numerous operational programmes, regulations and related documentation, and is well understood. One member advocated the impact of changing the term for the many pre-clearance programmes worldwide and countries applying them, including the need to modify numerous regulations.
- The TPG had proposed that the concept would be better reflected by the term *pre-export compliance check*, to reflect the fact that operations are carried out in the country of export. The steward noted that referring to *export* instead of *import* might be appropriate: when operations are applied in transit, they are organized and calibrated in the country of export. In his experience the NPPO of the exporting country would not be involved after departure from the country. Pre-cleared consignments subject to action during voyage would be submitted to checks on arrival.
- Finally, one member noted that the acronym “PIC” as used in the text should not be used as it is the well-established acronym of the Rotterdam Convention’s Prior Informed Consent.

²⁵ 2011_SC_May_2005-003 (background information: 2011_SC_May_13, _31)

[126] The SC agreed that there is a need to revise the current definition used in this standard and reconsider the term once the draft is revised.

[127] *Need for a standard on pre-clearance*

[128] Several members expressed concern about developing a standard and seeking harmonisation for a system implemented through bilateral agreements. The fact that ISPM 20:2004 makes provisions for bilateral agreements in international trade should be sufficient. In addition, the IPPC encourages multilateral agreements. However, the following arguments were expressed in favour of developing a standard on pre-clearance:

- It would provide useful framework and guidance for countries who would like to use a pre-clearance programme, especially in relation to how the programme should be initiated, its duration and its termination.
- The SC also noted there are instances of misuse of pre-clearance, and clarifying the concepts in a standard would help to avoid this.
- One member noted that pre-clearance programmes have helped facilitating trade in some situations.
- Another member noted that, although guidance would be useful, the standard should help to limit the use of pre-clearance as the IPPC relates to NPPOs working in their territories rather than in the territories of other countries, and such programmes should be temporary.
- The SC finally agreed that the standard is intended to facilitate trade, with the understanding that many programmes may be phased out as capacity is developed.

[129] The SC did not have time to discuss the entire draft in detail, so the SC invited its members to submit written comments to the Steward (mikeh@nda.agric.za) with a copy to the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) no later than 31 May 2011. The steward will then set a timeline for the proposed progress. The steward will work virtually with a small working group of SC members composed of Ms Aliaga (USA), Ms Castro (Chile), Ms Forest (Canada), Mr Nordbo (Denmark), Mr Rossi (Argentina) and Mr Sakamura (Japan).

[130] **5.7 Import of germplasm (2004-001)**

[131] A working group of SC members met to review the draft²⁶ and to provide guidance on what revisions would be needed before the SC could approve it. The working group reported to the plenary and suggested the following be considered when revising the draft standard:

- Transfer the text from section 1 to an annex as this is more process driven, or consider inserting guidelines on PRA before the current text in section 1.
- The text should mainly be addressed to NPPOs and should be put into a format and structure like other ISPMs guiding NPPOs.
- Add a list of organizations that provide guidance on the safe import of germplasm as an appendix.
- Include more reference to ISPM 34:2010 and to guidance included in that ISPM.
- Referring to the Reason for the standard in Specification 45, provide appropriate harmonized guidance for safe import of such material without undue risk of introduction and/or spread of plant pests.
- Consider to which extent the topic is already covered in, or related to, ISPM 34:2010, the draft ISPM on plants for planting, the draft ISPM on international movement of seed, ISPM 20:2004 etc., and consider adding the text as an annex to one of these standards.
- Consider whether risk information and information on quantity being imported should be included in this standard.
- Provide guidance on how the risk of the germplasm is different from seed or plants for planting.

²⁶ 2011_SC_May_2004-001

- Consider arrangements where a country with limited capacity sends the germplasm for testing in a laboratory of a third country with capacity to handle germplasm, prior to importing the material.
- Consider all possible types of germplasm (cuttings, for breeding programmes, etc.) and identify the risk level of each.
- Consider whether the terms used in the draft (activities, conditions, programme, compliance agreement, side evaluation, responsible party, etc.) are appropriate.
- Consider whether this draft ISPM should remain an ISPM or become a Technical Manual.

[132] Because the future status of this draft is uncertain, the SC did not assign an intersession working group to revise the draft. The SC invited its members to submit written comments to the Steward (mikeh@nda.agric.za) with a copy to the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) no later than 31 May 2011. The steward would gather, compile and consider the comments, and send the compiled comments and the revised draft to the Secretariat.

[133] **5.8 Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004)²⁷**

[134] A working group of SC members met to review this standard and provide guidance on the revisions that would be needed before the SC could approve it. The working group discussed and reported to plenary the following.

[135] The SC was reminded that it had decided at its May 2007 meeting that the standard should not include bulk soil and contamination. It had also decided that the ISPM would address movement of soil and growing media associated with the intentional movement of plants for planting. At its 2010 June meeting, the EWG proposed a title that did not mention soil because soil is a growing medium. The EWG also considered that growing media should be free from pests when it moves with plants. In addition, the EWG did not want to be too specific on a pest list because it would become too large and cumbersome. Thus, they selected the most important pests, which are listed Appendix 2 of the draft.

[136] One member wondered whether soil should be covered in the draft when referring to growing media. The steward noted that it had been agreed to still consider soil with other growing media, and the draft should cover requirements for the movement of soil associated to plants.

[137] Several members noted that the draft should be an annex to the draft ISPM on plants for planting. Others supported that it should be a separate standard.

[138] One member noted the need for a standard on the movement of growing media in bulk (e.g. peat). The Chair noted that this would have to be proposed in a future call for topics. The SC also noted that this topic had been proposed before, but had not been added to the list of topics for IPPC standards at that stage.

[139] The group decided to only discuss general comments and provided the following guidance for redrafting the standard.

- General comments:
 - . the draft ISPM needs more tangible phytosanitary measures
 - . needs to have globally harmonized categories of growing media.
- Issues with definition of soil:
 - . the definition of soil should be reviewed and revised taking into account guidance from the TPG.
- Issues with Section - Pest Risk Management Options:

²⁷ 2011_SC_May_2005-004 (background documents: 2011_SC_May_16, 2011_SC_May_34)

- . the text should be more specific to growing media and needs more content
- . clarify the text to explain that any measures applied to plants for planting relate to risks associated with growing media.
- Issues with Appendix 2 - Indicative list of pests that may be of concern with respect to the movement of growing media accompanying plants for planting:
 - . the appendix mentions a list of pests, but is not informative - consider whether the appendix should be deleted or expanded.
- Consider adding an annex or modifying the current annex 1 to categorize growing media according to pest risk:
 - . a first attempt could be a table in the form of an annex. There could be two categories: i) growing media, with some additional requirements, presenting no risks; ii) growing media where there would be low risk, some risk, etc.
- Reconsider whether this draft should be presented as an annex to the draft ISPM on plants for planting.

[140] The SC invited its members to submit written comments to the steward (marie-claude.forest@inspection.gc.ca) with a copy to the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) no later than 31 May 2011. The steward will set a timeline for the proposed progress. The steward will work virtually with Ms Awosusi (Nigeria), Ms Castro (Chile), Mr Sakamura (Japan) and Mr Unger (Germany) (Mr Nordbo (Denmark) as backup), and consult with the EWG members for additional input, if necessary.

[141] **5.9 Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (appendix to ISPM 5) (2009-001)²⁸**

[142] The SC did not have sufficient time to review the draft. The SC invited its members to submit written comments to the steward (john.hedley@maf.govt.nz) with copy to the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) no later than 31 May 2011. The steward would gather, compile and consider the comments, revise the draft, and send the compiled comments and the revised draft to the Secretariat.

[143] **6. SELECTION OF THE EQUIVALENT OF FIVE DRAFT ISPMS FOR 2011 MEMBER CONSULTATION**

[144] The Secretariat recalled the standards that the SC has approved for member consultation:

[145] Regular process

- pest risk analysis for quarantine pests (draft annex and consequential changes to ISPM 11:2004) (2005-001)
- revision of annex 1 of ISPM 15:2009 (2006-011)
- amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001)
- not widely distributed (revision of Supplement No. 1 to ISPM 5) (2005-008)

[146] Special process

- diagnostic protocol on *Trogoderma granarium* (2004-006)
- phytosanitary treatment on *heat treatment for wood packaging using dielectric heat* (2007-114)
- phytosanitary treatment on vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera cucurbitae* on *Cucumis melo* var. *reticulatus* (2006-110)

[147] The Secretariat made available the guidelines for choosing the equivalent of five draft ISPMs²⁹. As the new online comment system will soon be in place, the workload of the Secretariat for member

²⁸ 2011_SC_May_2009-001

²⁹ 2011_SC_May_17 Rev1

consultations should be reduced, and will allow more than five draft ISPMs to be sent for member consultation. Consequently all drafts above will be sent for the member consultation beginning 20 June 2011.

[148] **7. DRAFT SPECIFICATIONS FOR REVIEW OF MEMBER COMMENTS AND APPROVAL BY THE SC**

[149] The SC did not have time to discuss all specifications. The SC used the outcome of the proposed reprioritisation (agenda item 3.1.1), and reviewed specifications for topics with the highest priority and for a fruit fly standard (agenda item 7.1) as it is needed for the 2011 TPF meeting. Specifications for topics with priorities 3 and 4 would be worked on at a later date. Finally, specifications for topics proposed for deletion would be put on hold until the proposal has been discussed by the Bureau, SPTA and CPM.

[150] The Chair proposed that the draft specifications for member consultation could be worked on through e-decision (only). The SC agreed to use the system on a case-by-case basis with a fixed number of specifications. The SC decided to work by e-decision on the following two specifications prior to member consultation: revision of ISPM 4:1994 (2009-002) and revision of ISPM 6:1997 (2009-004) (which are the next two topics on the list of priorities under agenda item 3.1.1).

[151] A process similar to the specification for the *International movement of seed* (2009-003) would be used. The SC would send comments to the stewards via email or the Online Comment System. The revised draft produced by the steward would be open for comment in a forum (two weeks) and a poll (one week).

[152] ***Draft Specifications for approval***

[153] **7.1 Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly regulated areas in the event of outbreak detection in pest free areas for fruit flies (for inclusion as Annex 1 of ISPM 26:2006) (2009-007)**

[154] A working group of SC members discussed the draft specification³⁰ to resolve issues raised in plenary, and the TPF steward reported on the outcome. There was a general agreement for the draft specification to proceed with some changes.

[155] Several members had reservations on the use of the term *regulated areas*, which is defined in the glossary with a different meaning. The TPF steward proposed to use the term *quarantine area*. Diverging views were expressed, as some members noted that not all fruit flies that are the target of a PFA would be quarantine pests for that country. However, as a compromise, the SC agreed to use *quarantine area* in this specification. Task 7 of the specification would be to consider the appropriate term.

[156] The working group of SC members was agreeable with presenting the draft as an Annex to ISPM 26:2006, either as part of Annex 1 or as a separate annex; some also suggested the possibility to consider this draft as a Supplement to ISPM 26:2006.

[157] There was a major concern that this specification is going against the guidance in ISPM 26:2006, in reference to stopping all trade when an infestation occurs within a PFA. The working group had reiterated that commodities could no longer be traded as a commodity coming from a PFA, as stated in ISPM 26:2006. The steward clarified that the intent of this annex was to address how to continue trade under a different status after the loss of PFA status, and to provide harmonized guidance on the phytosanitary measures available for the importing countries and for managing commodities within the outbreak area in order to avoid further fruit fly spread into the PFA. This might help trading partners harmonize phytosanitary import requirements, following the change of status of the area.

³⁰ 2011_SC_May_2009-007 Rev 1

[158] The working group had considered that termination of PFA status is covered in ISPM 26:2006, which also gives guidance on corrective actions. Some members considered that it was therefore not necessary to include consideration of termination of the “quarantine area”, and all mention of termination had been deleted. However, one member noted that it should be mentioned as ISPM 26:2006 does not cover termination of all actions performed in the area concerned. Criteria should be defined to terminate a quarantine area within a PFA. There was discussion on whether termination would correspond to reinstating the PFA. As a possible solution, it was envisaged whether the existing guidance on corrective action in ISPM 26:2006 should be merged with the present annex. The SC agreed that the TPF should consider these aspects and should also ensure that there is no inconsistency with the existing text in ISPM 26:2006, and give guidance on how to resolve possible inconsistencies (for example by merging with the existing guidance on corrective action plans).

[159] The SC:

- (1) Approved Specification 53 for *Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of outbreak detection* (2009-007) as revised in the meeting (Appendix 8).

[160] **7.2 International movement of seed (2009-003)**

[161] The SC discussed the draft specification³¹ with the participation of the steward through a conference call. The steward recalled that the specification had been approved for member consultation through e-decision in December 2010. The Secretariat received 76 comments during member consultation. The topic is of great interest to several industry groups and the International Seed Federation (ISF) had provided many comments. Among the comments that were not incorporated were several proposed specific additions in relation to phytosanitary certificates and re-export. The steward noted that these specific issues were covered in ISPM 7:2011 and ISPM 12:2011, and only general guidance could be added to the new standard.

[162] The steward noted that three comments remained for discussion in the SC (comments 33, 34 and 68). The SC considered these comments and the SC modified the specification. The main points of discussion were as follows:

[163] Organisations in *Task 1* would be reordered and grouped according to their nature (international, industry etc.)

[164] It had been requested that weediness be added to the text, but the steward considered that the draft Annex 4 of ISPM 11:2004 on plants as quarantine pests already covered this issue. One member noted that the draft Annex 4 focuses on intentional movement of plants into an area, and not to the non-intentional introduction of plants, for example weed seeds as contaminants of grain. Plants as pests were added as an example of factors to be considered in task 2.

[165] The specification requested the EWG consider some major pest groups or types according to their pest risks. The steward clarified that this was considered as a possible task, but that the EWG would have to consider whether this is feasible or what form this should take.

[166] *Task 2*. There was a discussion on how information related to risk factors would be used in commodity standards, given that there were already standards on PRA. Several members noted that factors or specific issues associated to the commodity should be mentioned in a commodity-specific standard. One member noted that a model specification for commodity standards would be useful, as some tasks were common to all these EWGs.

[167] One member noted that task 4 related to identifying phytosanitary measures, and that some elements listed were not phytosanitary measures but risk factors (e.g. production methods, harvest methods). The SC agreed, but thought that the EWG should still consider which of these elements are

³¹ 2011_SC_May_2009-003 Rev 1 (background information: 2011_SC_May_20, _29)

appropriate, either as phytosanitary measures under task 4, or as factors of risk under task 2. The SC agreed to maintain the list as presented, as examples that the EWG could consider.

- [168] Consideration of forest tree seeds was added to the specification because the SC had proposed that the specific topic “international movement of forest tree seeds” should be deleted from the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. A reference was also added to guidelines from the Technical Panel on Forestry in relation to forest tree seeds.
- [169] In relation to the members of the EWG, it was clarified that a representative of ISTA would be member of the group, and that ISF would be invited to nominate a representative to be considered by the SC as an invited expert.
- [170] One comment was a proposal to add a task to provide guidance on implementation of the standard. The steward advised that this was a broader issue applying to all standards. He suggested that such recommendations would not be a part of the drafted ISPMs, but could be provided by separate guidance for other IPPC activities dealing with implementation of ISPMs.
- [171] The SC agreed that consideration of elements on implementation of standards would support implementation and capacity-building, and would be essential to maintain the relevance and applicability of ISPMs. Experts participating in expert drafting groups would most likely have the expertise required to identify important elements in relation to implementation. In addition, one member remarked that expert drafting groups should always check that the ISPM can be put into practice and properly implemented.
- [172] The SC agreed that each specification should contain a task in relation to implementation of the standard. It was not intended that the recommendations from expert drafting groups would take the form of full communication plans or implementation plans. Neither would they be part of the drafted ISPM. The expert drafting groups should give recommendations on ways to implement the standard, which would then be transmitted to the IPPC Implementation Officer for her action.
- [173] The SC was not in a position to formulate a task relating to implementation during the meeting. A discussion document, containing a proposal for a task, would be prepared for the SC November 2011 meeting by Mr Hedley (New Zealand) in consultation with Mr Bakak (Cameroon), Ms Castro (Chile), Mr Rossel (Australia) and the IPPC Secretariat’s Implementation Officer. Specifications that have not yet been worked on could then be revised to include the task once developed. This issue should also be discussed by other IPPC bodies, such as the Bureau and the SPTA.

[174] The SC:

- (1) *Approved* the specification 54 for *International movement of seed* (2009-003) as revised in the meeting (Appendix 8).
- (2) *Decided* that a task to provide guidance on implementation of standards should be developed (see process above) to be integrated in all specifications, and that this issue should be raised in the Bureau and SPTA.

[175] **7.3 Framework for national phytosanitary inspection procedures (2005-005)**

[176] The topic is proposed for deletion from the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (see agenda item 3.1.1), and this specification is put on hold.³²

[177] **7.4 Minimizing the risk of quarantine pests associated with stored products in international trade (2005-006)**

[178] The topic is proposed for deletion from the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (see agenda item 3.1.1), and this specification is put on hold.³³

³² 2011_SC_May_2005-005

³³ 2011_SC_May_2005-006

[179] **7.5 Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities (2008-003)**

[180] The topic is proposed for deletion from the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (see agenda item 3.1.1), and this specification is put on hold.³⁴

[181] **7.6 Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004)**

[182] The SC invited its members to submit written comments to the Steward Mr Rossel (Australia) (bart.rossel@aqis.gov.au; bart.rossel@daff.gov.au) with copy to the Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) no later than 31 May 2011.³⁵

[183] **Draft Specifications for approval for Member Consultation**

[184] **7.7 Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20:2004 Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006)**

[185] The topic is proposed for deletion from the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (see agenda item 3.1.1), and this specification is put on hold.³⁶

[186] **7.8 Revision of ISPM 4:1995 – Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (2009-002)**

[187] The topic was given a priority 2 in the prioritization exercise (see agenda item 3.1.1). The specification will further be developed for member consultation through e-decision (see under agenda item 7).³⁷

[188] **7.9 International movement of cut flowers and foliage (2008-005)**

[189] The topic was given a priority 4 in the prioritization exercise (see agenda item 3.1.1), and will be worked on at a later date.³⁸

[190] **7.10 Revision of ISPM 8:1998 – Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005)**

[191] The topic was given a priority 3 in the prioritization exercise, and will be worked on at a later date.³⁹

[192] **7.11 Revision of ISPM 6:1997 – Guidelines for surveillance (2009-004)**

[193] The topic was given a priority 2 in the prioritization exercise (see agenda item 3.1.1). The specification will be further developed for member consultation through e-decision (see under agenda item 7).⁴⁰

[194] **7.12 Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood (2008-008)**

[195] No draft specification was presented. The topic was given a priority 4 in the prioritization exercise (see agenda item 3.1.1), and will be worked on at a later date.

[196] **7.13 Biological control for forest pests (2009-008)**

[197] As no steward had been assigned, no draft specification was presented. The topic is proposed for deletion from the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (see agenda item 3.1.1), and this specification is put on hold.

³⁴ 2011_SC_May_2008-003

³⁵ 2011_SC_May_2008-004

³⁶ 2011_SC_May_2008-006

³⁷ 2011_SC_May_2009-002

³⁸ 2011_SC_May_2008-005

³⁹ 2011_SC_May_2009-005

⁴⁰ 2011_SC_May_2009-004

[198] 8. REVIEW OF TECHNICAL PANELS

[199] The Secretariat leads would presented on the activities of their Technical Panels (TP). Recommendations originally presented in the TP reports have, in some cases, been updated or modified based on activities that have taken place since the meeting. The modified recommendations are presented in the Technical Panel update documents. Reports of TPs were posted on the IPP and the SC should consider the recommendations based on information presented in the TP reports. The Secretariat noted that the CPM had asked the SC to provide increased supervision of the work of TPs, and hoped that presentations highlighting points of the update documents would help to achieve this.

[200] One member noted that the CPM had established the TPs with the assumption that they would be re-evaluated; they were not meant to be permanent standing bodies. It could be that some TPs could be terminated and their work carried out by EWGs or in other fora. The SC is responsible for overseeing TPs and should make recommendations on the future of TPs to CPM. This should be considered each time TP activities are reviewed. One member noted that the future of the TPDP and TPPT were dependent on the outcome of the Focus Group for improving the IPPC standard setting process (see agenda item 3.1).

[201] The Secretariat noted that the terms of many TP members were ending in 2013. After discussion on individual TPs, the SC noted that TPs fell in two categories. Two TPs (TPFF and TPFQ) were close to completing the items on their work programme (although they might need to continue work virtually or some topics might need to be assigned to EWGs). The three other TPs (TPPT, TPDP and TPG) are expected to continue in the long term and it was agreed that some TP members should be replaced while renewing the terms of some TP members in order to ensure continuity.

[202] The SC noted that it always agreed to the selection of new members of expert drafting groups, but discussed whether renewals could be agreed only by the TP steward and the Secretariat. It was concluded that the SC is responsible for overseeing TPs, including the renewal of members. All proposals for the selection as well as renewal of experts would be subject to the SC e-decision.

[203] The SC:

- (1) *Thanked* members of all TPs for the excellent work they have done over the years.
- (2) *Requested* all TPs to review their medium term plans annually.

[204] 8.1 Technical panel on diagnostic protocols (TPDP)

[205] The Secretariat lead presented the activities of the TPDP⁴¹. One recommendation was to note the *Criteria for the prioritization of diagnostic protocols*, but it had been decided under agenda item 3.1.2 that these criteria would be reviewed prior to being represented to the SC. Regarding membership, the terms of four (out of eight) TP members were expiring in 2013. The Secretariat proposed to consult the four experts concerned, attempt to renew two of them to ensure continuity, and make a call for two new experts. Regarding the medium term plan, the main objective was to finalize the diagnostic protocols on the list of topics for IPPC standards. The medium term plan would also be influenced by discussion in the Focus Group for improving the IPPC standard setting process.

[206] The SC:

- (1) *Approved* the revised specification for the TPDP (Appendix 8).
- (2) *Noted* the revised *TPDP working procedure* (Annex 5 of the 2010 TPDP report).
- (3) *Noted* the revised *Instructions for authors* (Annex 6 of the 2010 TPDP report).
- (4) *Noted* the Checklist for discipline leads and referees (Annex 7 of the 2010 TPDP report).
- (5) *Noted* that the scope of the protocol on Tephritidae - Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques (2006-028) will be narrowed and the new scope will be proposed in due course.

⁴¹ https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=tpdp&no_cache=1&L=0;2011_SC_May_46

- (6) *Noted* the discussion on barcoding and that work will start for one genus of Tephritidae.
- (7) *Noted* other actions points identified by the TPDP in its report.
- (8) *Agreed* that the Secretariat should not attempt to contact authors of diagnostic protocols for which the work has not started and push for work to start, but should wait for the outcome of the discussion on reprioritisation of the IPPC standard setting topics.
- (9) *Agreed* that the TPDP steward and Secretariat prepare a proposal to the SC for renewal of some members whose terms expire in 2013.
- (10) *Noted* the resignation of Mr Clover (New Zealand).

[207] **8.2 Technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies (TPFF)**

[208] The Secretariat lead presented the activities of the TPFF⁴². Regarding membership, all terms were finishing by 2013 and some expertise would need to be maintained after that date to respond to SC and member comments (possibly some TP members and a couple of additional experts). The work on draft standards would be done virtually after the 2011 TPFF meeting. Regarding the medium term plan, after adoption of the standards on the list of topics for IPPC standards, it was suggested to rearrange the adopted standards on fruit flies. The Secretariat noted that this implied that cross-references could be put in different standards to better link them, but no revision of ISPMs was planned.

[209] In relation to the topic on *Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area upon outbreak detection* (2009-007), one member noted that it would be preferable that each draft has a steward from the SC, in order to align the draft and to attend appropriate meetings. However there could also be a technical steward from outside the SC. This was agreed.

[210] The SC:

- (1) *Noted* the work programme for the TPFF for 2010 – 2011 (Appendix 4 of 2010 TPFF report).
- (2) *Noted* that the TPFF recommends a new organization for fruit fly standards and that a discussion paper describing the reasons for this proposal will be forthcoming.
- (3) *Noted* the projected completion dates for work of the Panel (Appendix 5 of 2010 TPFF report).
- (4) *Noted* that the expert member from Chile, Mr Gonzalez, has resigned from the TPFF.
- (5) *Noted* the TPFF recommendation that there is no need to replace Mr Gonzalez or Mr Enkerlin (previous TPFF members), given that the TPFF considers that there is sufficient expertise to continue to develop and provide comments on pending draft standards and specifications.
- (6) *Agreed* that Mr Hoffman be an invited expert in the next TPFF meeting in relation to the draft on *Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly regulated areas upon outbreak detection in pest free areas* (2009-007).
- (7) *Noted* the recommendation that the draft *Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) Management* (2005-010) be an annex to ISPM 26:2006.

[211] In addition, it was envisaged that the joint Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)/ International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) division would be developing technical documents to support implementation of fruit fly standards. This would be done outside of the IPPC standard setting programme, but the joint division would try to consult the IPPC Secretariat (capacity development team) on these implementation activities. This would not be part of the TPFF work plan, even if some of the experts might be involved in this activity.

[212] **8.3 Technical panel on phytosanitary treatments (TPPT)**

[213] The Secretariat lead presented the activities of the TPPT⁴³. Some recommendations had been made in order to improve interaction with submitters and the quality of the submissions. Regarding the membership, the terms of seven members were expiring in 2013, and some continuity was needed. The

⁴² https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=tpff&no_cache=1&L=0; 2011_SC_May_52

⁴³ https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110739&no_cache=1&L=0; 2011_SC_May_51

medium term plan related to following-up with the topics and subjects on the list of topics for IPPC standards, including calls for treatments. The SC agreed that no new calls should be made at this time.

- [214] One member noted that the TPPT had pointed to a problem with treatment submissions, and she supported the notion that mechanisms should be fine-tuned to avoid such issues. The Secretariat clarified that the current proposal is that when a call is made, treatment submitters would be offered the option to submit their experimental design to the TPDP prior to initiating the experiments to collect data. This would help ensure that treatment submitters collect the correct data in a method acceptable to the TPPT and would possibly eliminate repeated requests for additional information. Once the exchange was completed, submitters would follow the normal submission process.
- [215] Regarding renewal or extension of members, the Secretariat noted that the extension of some terms and a number of new members would be needed. The expertise needed for evaluating treatments should also be considered.
- [216] It was noted that the IAEA had started a coordinated project on irradiation treatments, which might provide data for treatment submission, and results would be available in three years.
- [217] The SC:
- (1) *Noted* the work done on surrogate/substitute species.
 - (2) *Noted* that the documents on calculation of the CT value were sent to the TPFQ. The TPPT worked with the TPFQ on fumigation and aligned the text and the schedule regarding *methyl bromide fumigation*.
 - (3) *Noted* the discussion on use of historical information to validate efficacy of treatments as detailed in the 2010 TPPT report, and the Secretariat was requested to ensure that the TPFQ and TPFQ were made aware of this. *Noted* also that the TPPT will request that the TPFQ produce a practical example of a data set of historical use information for consideration by the TPPT.
 - (4) *Noted* that the SC will be asked to approve TPPT responses to member comments on fruit fly cold treatments and the revised draft treatments for CPM-7 (2012) by e-decision.
 - (5) *Noted* the progress made with the evaluation of fruit fly heat treatments.
 - (6) *Noted* that the TPPT intends to produce a discussion document on guidance for submitters for treatments for soil and growing medium associated with plants.
 - (7) *Noted* that the TPPT will develop guidance material for NPPOs on the application of treatments for fruit fly cold, heat via forced air, vapour heat, and hot water for consideration by the TPPT.
 - (8) *Noted* the medium term plan developed by the TPPT (Annexes 9 in the 2010 TPPT report), agreed that the TPPT should work virtually during 2011, but did not agree to any new calls.
 - (9) *Noted* that the TPPT will produce a document on the criteria that have been used to evaluate treatments.
 - (10) *Noted* that the Secretariat sent letters to treatment submitters requesting additional information with a due date of 1 August 2011.
 - (11) *Noted* that the TPPT closed five submissions that did not receive responses from the submitters to IPPC letters sent in at the beginning of 2010, although two of these may need to be reconsidered in light of decisions on fruit fly cold treatments if information is provided by the submitter.
 - (12) *Noted* that treatment submissions for which there was no response to IPPC letters sent to the submitter in 2009 will be deleted if there is still no response to a final registered letter which was sent by the Secretariat at the beginning of 2011.
 - (13) *Noted* that the TPPT closed three submissions that were either not a treatment (a laboratory procedure) or were duplicate submissions.
 - (14) *Requested* the TPPT to put in place a process to allow the evaluation of experimental design prior to submitters collecting data to support a treatment submission.
 - (15) Thanked the Government of Japan for hosting and partially funding the 2010 meeting.

- (16) *Agreed* that the TPPT steward and Secretariat prepare a proposal to the SC for renewal of some members whose terms expire in 2013.
- (17) *Noted* the resignation of Mr Mizobuchi (Japan).

[218] **8.4 Technical panel on forest quarantine (TPFQ)**

- [219] The Secretariat presented the activities of the TPFQ⁴⁴. There is no Secretariat lead for this TP as the in-kind contribution of Mr Sela to the Secretariat has ended. The activities of this TP will be put on hold until sufficient support resources are found. Regarding membership, most terms were expiring in 2013. Support will be needed after that date to consider ongoing work on revisions to ISPM 15.
- [220] It was noted that the expertise on the TPFQ should not be lost. The items remaining on the TPFQ work programme are three standards (*Revision of Annex 1 of ISPM 15:2009* (2006-011), *Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade* (2006-010) and *Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood* (2006-029)) and review of the practicality of phytosanitary treatments to be included in ISPM 15. The SC recognized that the TPFQ is needed for this work, and should continue until the work is completed. Most other topics on the TPFQ programme have been proposed for deletion. The topic of *Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood* (2008-008) had been classified as a priority 4 (see agenda item 3.1.1) and the SC decided that this topic might be better addressed by an EWG. On some issues, the TPFQ could operate virtually. The TPFQ steward noted that the topic *International movement of forest tree seeds* (2006-032) had been proposed for deletion because it was added to the draft standard on *International movement of seed* (2009-003). According to the draft specification for that standard, the guidance already prepared by the TPFQ on forest tree seeds would be referenced.
- [221] The SC agreed that there should be no new members, and the terms of existing TPFQ members should be extended until the panel has completed the work.
- [222] One member had concerns about the TPFQ's opinion that phytosanitary treatment for sulfuryl fluoride along with the existing use of heat treatment for wood packaging material may exacerbate the issue of emissions of greenhouse gases. The SC was not provided with indications of calculations of effect, nor how the use of sulfuryl fluoride would develop in relation to methyl bromide, so the SC did not agree with the TPFQ. The Secretariat noted that the TPFQ had been asked to obtain some information, and information obtained through the submitter and IFQRG is that sulfuryl fluoride is a greenhouse gas, but that heat treatment may also contribute to emissions.
- [223] The SC:
- (1) *Noted* the joint work programme with the IPPC Secretariat and IFQRG to support the work of the TPFQ.
 - (2) *Noted* that the TPFQ agreed that the draft ISPM *Sulfuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material* (2007-101) should not be put forward for further consideration until a wider treatment regime has been established.
 - (3) *Noted* that the TPFQ agreed that the draft ISPM *Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heat* (2007-114) should be put forward to the SC for further consideration.
 - (4) *Noted* that the TPFQ provided input into the development of an ISPM 15:2009 explanatory document.
 - (5) *Noted* that the TPFQ worked on the development of a draft ISPM *International movement of forest tree seeds* (2006-032).
 - (6) *Noted* that the TPFQ worked on the development of a draft ISPM on *Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood* (2006-029) and that further work would continue via electronic means.

⁴⁴ https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=tpfq&no_cache=1&L=0; 2011_SC_May_53

- (7) *Noted* that TPFQ felt that the proposed draft ISPM *International movement of seed* (2009-003) may address concerns related to tree seed.
- (8) *Noted* the TPFQ work programme, recognizing that bamboo is not on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and reminded the panel that only work on approved topics should be initiated.
- (9) *Agreed* that the terms of TPFQ members would be extended until work is completed.
- (10) *Thanked* Canada for their in kind contribution by providing an IPPC Secretariat lead for the TPFQ for the last two years.

[224] **8.5 Technical panel for the Glossary (TPG)**

[225] The Secretariat presented the activities of the TPG⁴⁵. Regarding membership, the terms of three members were expiring in 2013, and it was proposed that the terms of one or two “first generation” members be extended for an additional term. The steward of the TPG noted that the TPG has two new members but it is especially complicated to get them involved in the absence of a meeting.

[226] The SC:

- (1) Approved the following additions of subjects to the List of topics for IPPC standards: suppression (2011-002), eradication (2011-003) and containment (2011-004) (and the draft definition on exclusion); control (2011-005); identity 2011-001).
- (2) Approved the following deletions of subjects from the List of topics for IPPC standards: area-wide control; efficacy; effectiveness; conditional hosts; host susceptibility; and related terms.
- (3) Requested the TPG to consider the need to review the durations for record keeping indicated in ISPMs in order to determine whether these durations should be made consistent in all ISPMs, and consider the need to make recommendations in this respect (agenda item 3.3 of the 2010 TPG report).
- (4) Noted the General rules and process applied for the consistency analysis (Annex 13 of the 2010 TPG report).
- (5) Noted that the following adopted ISPMs previously identified for the consistency analysis remain to be reviewed: 9, 16, 17, 20, 23, 25 and Supplement 2 to ISPM 5 (Review of the following ISPMs: 5 (Sup 2), 9, 16, 17, 20, 23, 25 (and minor modifications to ISPMs resulting from the review (2006-012)). Because the revision of ISPM 8:1998 is on the list of topics for IPPC standards, it will not be reviewed for consistency.
- (6) Noted the General recommendations on consistency (Annex 14 of the 2010 TPG report) and noted the suggestion that they be included in the IPPC Procedural Manual and IPPC Style Guide for ISPMs.
- (7) Noted that the General recommendations on consistency will be regularly reviewed and consolidated by the TPG.
- (8) Noted that the review for consistency will continue standard by standard, but changes across standards might be proposed in the future.
- (9) Reviewed and approved the 2010-2011 TPG work plan (Annex 15 of the 2010 TPG report, all tables).
- (10) Discussed the review of the TPG work programme and medium term plan (Annex 16 of the 2010 TPG report).
- (11) Agreed that the TPG develop brief guidance on the use of “should”, “shall”, “must” and “may” for the IPPC Style Guide for ISPMs.
- (12) Agreed that the TPG steward and Secretariat prepare a proposal to the SC for renewal of some members whose terms expire in 2013.

⁴⁵ https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=tpg&no_cache=1&L=0;2011_SC_May_47

[227] **9. List of topics for IPPC standards**

[228] **9.1 Update on the List of topics for IPPC standards**

[229] The Secretariat introduced the update⁴⁶. One member noted that some subjects of phytosanitary treatments were repeated in the list of topics for IPPC standards. The Chair noted that this reflected that several submissions had been made on the same subject. The SC advised the Secretariat to add more details to the title to ensure differentiation of subjects and avoid confusion.

[230] One member wondered whether it was appropriate to add more treatments as requested by the TPPT. The Secretariat continued that the subjects for phytosanitary treatments depend on responses to calls for submissions, and are added to the list of topics for IPPC standards after a review by the TPPT that the submissions are appropriate. The treatments requested by the TPPT to be added had already been submitted and reviewed, and should consequently be added to the list of topics for IPPC standards.

[231] The Secretariat noted that two subjects for fruit fly treatments should be deleted (Cold treatment for *Bactrocera zonata* on *Citrus* spp., *Psidium* spp. and *Mangifera indica* (2010-108); Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus* spp., *Psidium* spp. and *Mangifera indica* (2010-109)). Submitters had been contacted at several occasions in the past two years, and they had not responded.

[232] The SC:

- (1) *Noted* the addition of the following three phytosanitary treatments (subjects) to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* under the TPPT topic of fruit fly treatments:
 - a. Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus paradisi* (2010-101)
 - b. Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus reticulata* and their hybrids (2010-102)
 - c. Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus sinensis* (2010-103)
- (2) *Noted* the addition of the following term (subject) to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* under the TPG topic of Amendments to ISPM 5, as added by the CPM-6 (2011):
 - a. *identity* (2011-001)
- (3) *Noted* the deletion of the following two phytosanitary treatments (subjects) to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* under the TPPT topic of fruit fly treatments:
 - a. Cold treatment for *Bactrocera zonata* on *Citrus* spp., *Psidium* spp. and *Mangifera indica* (2010-108)
 - b. Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Citrus* spp., *Psidium* spp. and *Mangifera indica* (2010-109).

[234] **9.2 Adjustments to stewards**

[235] The SC reviewed and made modifications to some stewards for draft ISPMs. The discussion focused on the drafts needing a steward immediately. Others would be discussed at the SC November together with replacement of stewards leaving the SC in 2012.

[236] Stewards were nominated for the following topics: *Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages* and *Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly quarantine area in the event of outbreak detection*. Backup stewards were nominated for *International movement of seed* and *Revision of ISPM 15 criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade* and a technical steward was assigned to *Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly quarantine area in the event of outbreak detection*.

[237] The updates on topics and assigned stewards are reflected in the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (Appendix 7).

⁴⁶ 2011_SC_May_36_rev1

[238] **10. AGENDA ITEMS DEFERRED TO FUTURE SC MEETINGS**

[239] All agenda items were discussed apart from some specifications, which were either deferred to future SC meetings or put on hold, pending the outcome of the reprioritisation exercise. Details are given under agenda item 7.

[240] **11. REVIEW OF THE STANDARD SETTING CALENDAR**

[241] The Secretariat presented the draft standard setting calendar for 2011 and 2012⁴⁷.

[242] **12. UPDATE ON 2011 REGIONAL WORKSHOPS**

[243] The IRSS Officer gave an update on the regional workshops for the review of draft ISPMs planned for 2011 and presented standardized organizational arrangements for organisers of regional workshops⁴⁸. Workshops will be held in seven regions. The workshops for the Near East and the Caribbean regions were tentative. For the first time, the Secretariat will not provide funding for any of the workshops. Stewards of drafts for member consultation were asked to prepare presentations on the draft ISPMs and send these to the Secretariat by 15 June 2011. He encouraged Bureau members and SC members to contact the Implementation Officer (ana.peralta@fao.org) if they had an interest in taking part in the workshops.

[244] The regional workshop for Africa was planned to start on 27 June. Concerns were expressed that, given that member consultation starts on 20 June, it would not leave sufficient time to have national consultations prior to the workshop. The Secretariat noted that the choice of dates was the responsibility of the organizers and that they had been informed of the possible difficulties of planning their workshop so early.

[245] **13. OTHER BUSINESS**

[246] **13.1 Update and demonstration of the Online Comment System**

[247] To streamline the process of compiling member comments, the Secretariat has been developing the IPPC Online Comment System (OCS), which is now in its final stages of development⁴⁹. External Field Testing for a selected group of Contact Points occurred 18-22 April 2011 and the Secretariat staff is working with the FAO programmers to finalize the OCS based on the feedback received from the External Field Testing. The system will go live on 15 May 2011.

[248] As discussed under agenda item 7, the Secretariat will consider using the OCS for SC members to provide comments to steward on the two draft specifications prior to member consultation (revisions of ISPM 4:1995 and ISPM 6:1997).

[249] In addition, the OCS would be use for the first time for the 2011 100-day member consultation. Draft ISPMs will be uploaded on the IPP before 20 June 2011, the beginning date of the 100-day member consultation period.

[250] The Secretariat is also planning on using the OCS during the 2011 regional workshops for the review of draft ISPMs for demonstration purposes. The main objectives were to encourage workshop participants to use the system when they return to their country and to simplify the sharing process and submission of comments to the IPPC Secretariat.

[251] The IPPC Secretariat invited all SC members to encourage their contact point to use the OCS during the 2011 100-day member consultation on draft ISPMs.

⁴⁷ 2010_SC_Apr_48

⁴⁸ 2011_SC_May_42

⁴⁹ 2011_SC_May_37

[252] The Secretariat gave a short presentation and demonstration of the OCS. Several SC members were very interested in the system and looked forward to using the system during the 2011 member consultation period.

[253] The SC:

(1) *Noted* the current status of the IPPC Online Comment System (OCS).

[254] **Classification of comments on IPPC standards in member consultation**

[255] It was noted that CPM-6 had requested the Secretariat to reinstate the category of “technical” comments. A document had been developed to give guidance to explain the different categories of comments and these categories had been used in the online comment system⁵⁰. One member requested that the translation category be reinstated and the SC agreed. A few other changes were agreed. The Secretariat will further adjust and edit the document before it is used for member consultation.

[256] **13.2 Update on the Sea Containers Expert Working Group**

[257] The Secretariat reported that the steering committee had made progress. A forum was being developed to collect comments and opinions, as well as guidance to NPPOs and RPPOs to liaise with national organisations dealing with container organisations and shipping industry. He encouraged SC members to contact relevant national organizations to make them aware of the development of the standard. The IPPC Secretariat will also send an email on these matters to the NPPO and RPPO Contact Points. The Secretariat also discussed the need to involve the World Customs Organization. Finally he noted that the meeting may be postponed (date yet to be determined).

[258] The SC:

(1) *Approved* that the World Customs Organization will be invited to submit a representative to be a member of the EWG.

[259] **13.3 Update on the IPPC Strategic Framework and the IPPC Standard setting strategic plan**

[260] The Secretariat and a Bureau member provided the SC with an update on the IPPC Strategic Framework and the IPPC Standard setting strategic plan. Details are given under agenda item 3.1.

[261] **13.4 How the SC will continue to work in the future⁵¹**

[262] The Chair suggested that the SC could consider the following at a future meeting: that stewards, when working with small working groups by electronic means, could gather comments and send them all to the Secretariat at the same time as the new draft, but this was not agreed.

[263] **13.5 Implementation of standards**

[264] The implementation review and support system (IRSS) officer spoke on behalf of the implementation officer and described a feedback mechanism being put into the IRSS, which will be used to identify implementation challenges. This feedback will be provided to the SC to prevent that the issues identified do not repeat in the future.

[265] **13.6 Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)**

[266] The IRSS Officer presented an overview of the IRSS⁵². The IRSS would involve the three main components of the IPPC Secretariat activities: standard setting, information exchange and capacity development. It would provide a report to CPM members on a triennial basis, in order to provide a better understanding of the implementation of the Convention itself and of the ISPMs. The EU had provided partial funding for one year, with no guarantee of further support.

⁵⁰ 2011_SC_May_38

⁵¹ 2011_SC_May_43

⁵² 2011_SC_May_40

- [267] He asked the SC how it could input into the implementation process. The SC could for example prioritize a few items that could be included in the IRSS list of topics for IPPC standards this year, such as: identification of indicators to monitor ISPM implementation; analysing the feedback mechanism to bring attention of the SC to current and possible implementation difficulties with existing and draft standards; a general survey on a featured topic relating to one or more approved standards; a specific survey on a targeted topic relating to an approved standard.
- [268] The SC was not in a position to identify specific topics, but looked forward to receiving a report at its November 2011 meeting on the outcome of the second meeting of the expert group on capacity building. Coordination and appropriate collaboration could then be considered.
- [269] The SC Chair informed the IRSS Officer of the suggestion on implementation made by the SC under agenda item 7.2 in relation to the seed standards.
- [270] The Acting Coordinator noted that the implementation process would be developed by topic, with input from the different areas of activity, and that standard setting would participate in this process. Recommendations such as proposed for the standard on seeds would be part of the process. A Bureau member noted that the document outlining how to develop an implementation plan proposed by the Implementation Officer in relation to the planned standard on sea containers was formalistic and time and resource consuming. He was unsure on whether this type of approach was needed.
- [271] It was noted that two specifications for revision of ISPM 4:1995 and ISPM 6:1997 would soon be sent for member consultation and this might be an opportunity to ask for input from the expert working group on capacity development or from other sources on implementation in relation to these standards.

[272] **14. CLOSE OF THE MEETING**

[273] **14.1 Date and venue of the next SC Meeting**

- [274] The next meeting of the SC is scheduled on 7-11 November 2011, Rome, Italy, but the SC members were reminded to check the calendar on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110636&L=0>).

[275] **14.2 Evaluation of the meeting process**

- [276] The following suggestions were made:

- The list of recommendations from TPs should be modified by the Secretariat just prior to the discussions in the plenary, to reflect decisions already taken by the SC, e.g. by deleting decisions that are no longer relevant.
- Reports of side sessions be cleared with stewards or Chairs before presenting them with clear recommendations to the SC.
- The agenda should be reduced with fewer items in order to have more in depth discussions. In particular for the May meeting, the draft standards with highest profile or more “ready” could be included on the agenda.
- The November meeting will discuss how to improve the May meeting, especially with regards to the selection of draft ISPMs to be selected for discussion.
- The SC would also discuss at a future meeting the possible production of a template for commodity-related specifications.

[277] **14.3 Adoption of the report**

- [278] The SC *adopted* the report.

[279] **14.4 Close**

- [280] The Chair thanked SC members, observers, stewards, the IPPC Secretariat, interpreters and the many FAO staff who had contributed to the success of the meeting. On behalf of the SC, one member thanked the Chair for her kind and efficient guidance throughout the meeting.

APPENDIX 1 - Agenda**COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES****STANDARDS COMMITTEE****2-6 May 2011****German Room C-269, FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy**

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

Daily Schedule:

Monday 10:00-13:00 and 14:30-17:30 and the rest of the week 09:00-12:00 and 14:00-17:00

Coffee: Monday welcome coffee 9:30, rest of the week am at 10:30 and pm at 15:30

Proposed working groups on draft ISPMs: Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday 12:30-13:30

Proposed working group on preparation for focus group: Tuesday 17:00-19:00

Monday **Cocktail** 18:00, Wednesday **SC Tour and Dinner** 18:30 (meeting point: outside reception, A-building). Thursday **Online Comment System presentation** 17:00 (German Room)**AGENDA**

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	---	LARSON
1.2 Election of the Rapporteur	---	CHARD
1.3 Adoption of the Agenda	2011_SC_May_01	CHARD
2. Administrative Matters		
2.1 Documents List	2011_SC_May_02	LARSON
2.2 Participants List	2011_SC_May_03	LARSON
2.3 Local Information	2011_SC_May_04	LARSON
3. Updates from other relevant bodies		
3.1 Items arising from CPM-6 (2011)	2011_SC_May_35	LARSON
❖ Reprioritization of topics		
○ Framework for standards, recommendations and procedures of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures	2011_SC_May_50	LARSON
○ Reprioritization of topics for IPPC standards	2011_SC_May_54	LARSON
○ Proposed priorities for topics for ISPMs	2011_SC_May_45	CHARD
	2011_SC_May_CRP 03, 2011_SC_May_CRP 04 rev 2 and 2011_SC_May_CRP 02_rev1 (Nordbo)	

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Focus group on improving the standard setting process ○ Terms of Reference ○ Proposed improvements for the approval of Diagnostic Protocols (DP) and Phytosanitary Treatments (PT) 	2011_SC_May_33	LARSON
3.2 Report of the IPPC Standard Setting Group (November 2010-April 2011)	2011_SC_May_39	LARSON
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Organizational chart of the Standard setting group 	2011_SC_May_41	LARSON
3.3 Feedback on processes since the November 2010 SC meeting	2011_SC_May_43	CHARD
4. Standards Committee		
4.1 Report of the SC November 2010	https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355	CHARD
4.2 Update of polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (November 2010-March 2011)	2011_SC_May_44rev1	LARSON
5. Draft ISPMs from expert drafting groups		
5.1 Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests (2005-001) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Ebbe NORDBO, high priority - ICPM-7 (2005) added to the Work Programme; May 2007 SC approved Specification 44; May 2009 EWG drafted ISPM; April 2010 SC could not agree on textual changes, returned to steward ❖ Specification 44 (Rev 1): Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests ❖ EWG Meeting Report May 2009, Paris ❖ ISPM 11 Proposed Text Changes for Review by the SC ❖ ISPM 11 Proposed Text Changes Excerpt (to accompany the Draft Annex during Member Consultation) ❖ Steward's explanation to major changes with draft of 29 November 2010, following work (by e-mail) in an SC Subgroup 	2011_SC_May_2005-001	NORDBO
5.2 Revision Annex 1 of ISPM 15:2009 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) (2006-011) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Fuixang WANG (TP Lead Thomas Schroder), high priority - CPM-1 (2006) added to the work programme; Nov 2004 SC approved Specification 31; Jun 2006, Jul 2007, Revision of ISPM 15:2009 adopted but Guidelines for heat treatment remained on the work programme for correction of inconsistency between text and Annex for MeBr, Jul 2009 TPFQ Drafted and revised draft ISPM; TPFQ submitted to SC for approval for Member Consultation; Nov 2010 SC returned draft ISPM to TPFQ for redraft 	2011_SC_May_2006-011	SCHRODER via conference call / WANG

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Specification 31: Revision of ISPM 15 (Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade) (2006-011) ❖ Background document for revision of Annex 1 to ISPM 15:2009 and the addition of sulfuryl fluoride (2007-101) and microwave irradiation (2007-114) treatments ❖ PT: Sulfuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material (2007-101) ❖ PT: Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heat (2007-114) 	<p>2011_SC_May_27</p> <p>2011_SC_May_49</p> <p>2011_SC_May_2007-101</p> <p>2011_SC_May_2007-114</p>	
<p>5.3 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: John HEDLEY, high priority - CEPM (1994) added to the Work Programme; Work Ongoing ❖ Specification 1: Review and updating of the glossary of phytosanitary terms ❖ Specification TP5: Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) ❖ TPG Meeting Report October 2010, Rome 	<p>2011_SC_May_1994-001</p> <p>2011_SC_May_07</p> <p>2011_SC_May_28</p> <p>See SC May 2011 agenda 8.5</p>	HEDLEY
<p>5.4 Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly infestations (Tephritidae) (2006-031)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TP Lead: Rui CARDOSO-PEREIRA, high priority - Nov 2006 SC added to the work programme; May 2009 SC approved draft Spec for MC; Sect sent draft Spec for MC in Dec 2009; April 2010 SC approved Specification 50; Oct 2010 TPGF Drafted ISPM ❖ Specification 50: Protocol to determine host status of fruits to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation ❖ TP Meeting Report October 2010 Section 4.2.3 of the TPG Meeting Report October 2010, Rome 	<p>2011_SC_May_2006-031</p> <p>2011_SC_May_08</p> <p>See SC May 2011 agenda 8.5</p>	CARDOSO-PEREIRA
<p>5.5 Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (2005-008)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Julie ALIAGA, high priority - ICPM-7 (2005) added to the Work Programme; May 2007 SC deferred to May 2008 SC-7; May 2008 SC-7 returned to TPG; May 2010 SC for approval for member consultation, deferred to a future meeting; May 2011 SC for approval for member consultation ❖ Specification 33: Supplement to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) - Guidelines for the interpretation and application of the phrase <i>not widely distributed</i> in relation to quarantine pests ❖ EWG Meeting Report November 2006, Copenhagen ❖ Extracts of TPG Meeting Report October 2009, Rome 	<p>2011_SC_May_2005-008</p> <p>2011_SC_May_09</p> <p>2011_SC_May_10</p> <p>2011_SC_May_11</p>	ALIAGA

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
❖ Extracts of relevant SC and SC-7 Meetings	2011_SC_May_12	
5.6 Phytosanitary pre-import clearance (2005-003) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Mike HOLTZHAUSEN, normal priority - ICPM-7 (2005) added to the Work Programme; Nov 2006 SC approved Specification 42; Sep 2008 EWG drafted text; May 2009 SC for approval for member consultation, provided comments; Nov 2009 SC agreed that EWG meet electronically to discuss the comments; EWG electronically; May 2011 SC for approval for member consultation. 	2011_SC_May_2005-003	HOLTZHAUSEN
❖ Specification 42: Pre-clearance for regulated articles	2011_SC_May_13	
❖ EWG Meeting Report September 2008 Lusaka, Zambia	2011_SC_May_31	
❖ Comments on definitions: see section 4.2.2 of TPG Meeting Report October 2010, Rome	See SC May 2011 agenda 8.5	
5.7 Import of Germplasm (2004-001) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Mike HOLTZHAUSEN, normal priority - ICPM-6 (2004) added to Work Programme; Nov 2007 SC approved Specification 45; Feb 2010 EWG drafted ISPM 	2011_SC_May_2004-001	HOLTZHAUSEN
❖ Specification 45: Import of plant breeding material for scientific research, education or other specific use	2011_SC_May_14	
❖ EWG Meeting Report February 2010, Amsterdam	2011_SC_May_15	
5.8 Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Marie-Claude FOREST, normal priority - ICPM-7 (2005) added to Work Programme; May 2007 SC approved Specification 43; Jun 2010 EWG drafted ISPM 	2011_SC_May_2005-004	FOREST
❖ Specification 43 (Rev 1): Movement of soil and growing media in association with plants in international trade	2011_SC_May_16	
❖ EWG Meeting Report June 2010, Ottawa	2011_SC_May_34	
5.9 Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (appendix to ISPM 5) (2009-001) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: John HEDLEY, normal priority - CPM-4 (2009) added to the Work Programme; Oct 2009 TPG discussed; Apr 2010 SC requested Sect to consult with Ozone Secretariat; Oct 2010 TPG revised text, submitted to SC for MC 	2011_SC_May_2009-001	HEDLEY
❖ TPG Meeting Report October 2010, Rome	See SC May 2011 agenda 8.5	
6. Selection of the equivalent of five draft ISPMs for 2011 Member Consultation		
6.1 Guidelines for choosing the equivalent of five draft ISPMs	2011_SC_May_17 Rev2	LARSON

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
<p>6.2 Draft ISPMs queued for Member Consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DP: <i>Trogoderma granarium</i> (2004-006) (25 pages) - PT: Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heat (2007-114) - PT: Vapour heat treatment of <i>Cucumis melo</i> var. <i>reticulatus</i> for <i>Bactrocerca cucurbitae</i> (2006-110) 	<p>https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110769 (Login is necessary)</p> <p>2011_SC_May_2007-114</p> <p>https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110769 (Login is necessary)</p>	LARSON
7. Draft specifications for review of member comments and approval by the SC		
<p>7.1 Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly regulated areas in the event of outbreak detection in pest free areas for fruit flies (for inclusion as Annex 1 of ISPM 26) (2009-007) (Note: needed for 2011 TPF meeting)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TP Lead: Jaime GONZALEZ, normal priority - Nov 2009 SC added to the Work Programme; Nov 2010 SC approved for Member Consultation ❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's responses) 	<p>2011_SC_May_2009-007 Rev 1</p> <p>2011_SC_May_30</p>	ALIAGA
<p>7.2 International movement of seed (2009-003)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Vacant, high priority - Nov 2009 SC added to the Work Programme; Nov 2010 SC approved for Member Consultation 1 TPFQ consideration of Specification 47 (International movement of forest tree seeds (2006-032), in light of proposed standard on International movement of seed (2009-003) ❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's responses) 	<p>2011_SC_May_2009-003 Rev 1</p> <p>2011_SC_May_20</p> <p>2011_SC_May_29</p>	Vacant
<p>7.3 Framework for national phytosanitary inspection procedures (2005-005)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Julie ALIAGA, high priority - ICPM-7 (2005) added to the Work Programme; May 2009 SC approved for Member Consultation; December 2009 sent for Member Consultation; Deferred from 2010 April and November SC Meetings ❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response) ❖ Notes from the Steward for consideration by the SC 	<p>2011_SC_May_2005-005</p> <p>2011_SC_May_22</p> <p>2011_SC_May_23</p>	ALIAGA
<p>7.4 Minimizing the risk of quarantine pests associated with stored products in international trade (2005-006)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Vacant, normal priority - ICPM-7 (2005) added to the Work Programme; Nov 2009 SC approved for Member Consultation; Dec 2009 sent for Member Consultation; Deferred from Apr and Nov 2010 SC Meetings ❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response) 	<p>2011_SC_May_2005-006</p> <p>2011_SC_May_24</p>	Vacant

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
<p>7.5 Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities (2008-003)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Marie-Claude FOREST, normal priority - CPM-3 (2008) added to the Work Programme; Jun 2010 sent for Member consultation; Nov 2010 SC deferred ❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response) 	<p>2011_SC_May_2008-003</p> <p>2011_SC_May_25</p>	FOREST
<p>7.6 Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Vacant, normal priority - CPM-3 (2008) added to the Work Programme; Jun 2010 sent for Member Consultation; Nov 2010 SC deferred ❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response) 	<p>2011_SC_May_2008-004</p> <p>2011_SC_May_26</p>	Vacant
Draft Specifications for approval for Member Consultation		
<p>7.7 Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Timothy TUMUKON, normal priority - CPM-3 (2008) added to the Work Programme; Deferred from April and November 2010 SC 	2011_SC_May_2008-006	Vacant
<p>7.8 Revision of ISPM 4 – Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (2009-002)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Olufunke AWOSUSI, high priority - Nov 2009 SC added to the Work Programme; Nov 2010 SC deferred 	2011_SC_May_2009-002	OLUSOLA-AWOSUSI
<p>7.9 International movement of cut flowers and foliage (2008-005)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Magda GONZALEZ, normal priority - CPM-3 (2008) added to the Work Programme; Deferred from Apr and Nov 2010 SC Meetings 	2011_SC_May_2008-005	GONZALEZ
<p>7.10 Revision of ISPM 8 – Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Beatriz MELCHO, normal priority - Nov 2009 SC added to the Work Programme; Nov 2010 SC deferred 	2011_SC_May_2009-005	MELCHO
<p>7.11 Revision of ISPM 6 – Guidelines for surveillance (2009-004)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: John HEDLEY, normal priority - Nov 2009 SC added to the Work Programme; Nov 2010 SC deferred 	2011_SC_May_2009-004	HEDLEY
<p>7.12 Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood (2008-008)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Vacant, normal priority - CPM-3 (2008) added to the Work Programme; Nov 2010 SC deferred 	No draft presented	Vacant

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
7.13 Biological control for forest pests (2009-008) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Vacant-TPFQ Member, normal priority - Nov 2009 SC added to the Work Programme; Nov 2010 SC deferred 	No draft presented	Vacant
8. Review of Technical Panels		
8.1 Technical panel to develop diagnostic protocols for specific pests (TPDP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ TPDP meeting report July 2010, Washington ❖ Update on activities of the TPDP 	https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=tpdp&no_cache=1&L=0	GROUSSET/ CHARD
	2011_SC_May_46	GROUSSET
8.2 Technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies (TPFF) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ TPFF meeting report October 2010, Vienna ❖ Update on activities of the TPFF 	https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=tpff&no_cache=1&L=0	CARDOSO- PEREIRA / ALIAGA
	2011_SC_May_52	
8.3 Technical panel on phytosanitary treatments (TPPT) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ TPPT meeting report July 2010, Kyoto, Japan ❖ Update on activities of the TPPT 	https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110739&no_cache=1&L=0	ZETTLER
	2011_SC_May_51	
8.4 Technical panel on forest quarantine (TPFQ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ TPFQ meeting report September 2010, Rome, ❖ Update on activities of the TPFQ 	https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=tpfq&no_cache=1&L=0	LARSON/ WANG
	2011_SC_May_53	
8.5 Technical panel for the Glossary (TPG) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ TPG Meeting Report October 2010, Rome ❖ Update on activities of the TPG 	https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=tpg&no_cache=1&L=0	GOUSSET/ HEDLEY
	2011_SC_May_47	
9. Topics and priorities for IPPC standards		
9.1 Update on the topics and priorities for IPPC standards	2011_SC_May_36_rev1	DUBON
9.2 Adjustments to stewards	See 2011_SC_May_36_rev1	CHARD
10. Agenda items deferred to future SC Meetings		
	---	CHARD
11. Review of the standard setting calendar		
	2011_SC_May_48	MOLLER
12. Update on 2011 Regional Workshops		
	2011_SC_May_42	SOSA
13. Other business		
13.1 Update and demonstration of the Online Comment System	2011_SC_May_37	DUBON
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Classification of comments on IPPC documents in country consultation 	2011_SC_May_38	DUBON
13.2 Update on Sea Containers Expert Working Group	--	LARSON / HEDLEY / ASHBY

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
13.3 Update on the IPPC Strategic Framework and the IPPC Standard setting strategic plan	--	LARSON / HEDLEY
13.4 How the SC will continue to work in the future	--	CHARD
13.5 Implementation of standards	--	SOSA
13.6 Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)	2011_SC_May_40	SOSA
14. Close of the meeting		
14.1 Date and venue of the next SC Meeting	--	LARSON
14.2 Evaluation of the meeting process	--	CHARD
14.3 Adoption of the report	--	CHARD
14.4 Close	--	LARSON

APPENDIX 2 - Documents list

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

STANDARDS COMMITTEE

2-6 MAY 2011

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
Draft ISPMs				
2011_SC_May_19 94-001	5.3	Draft ISPM: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001) (HEDLEY)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	2 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 04-001	5.7	Draft ISPM: Import of Germplasm (2004-001) (HOLTZHAUSEN)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	16 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 05-001	5.1	Draft ISPM: Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests (2005-001) (NORDBO)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 05-003	5.6	Draft ISPM: Phytosanitary pre-import clearance (2005-003) (HOLTZHAUSEN)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	2 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 05-004	5.8	Draft ISPM: Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004) (FOREST)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	2 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 05-008	5.5	Draft ISPM: Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (2005-008) (HEDLEY)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	15 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 06-011	5.2	Draft ISPM: Revision of ISPM 15:2009 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) (2006-011) (SCHRODER)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	2 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 06-031	5.4	Draft ISPM: Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly infestations (Tephritidae) (2006-031) (CARDOSO-PEREIRA)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	2 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 07-101	5.2	Draft ISPM 28:20-- Annex X: Sulfuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material	CPs, RPPOs and SC	29 April 2011
2011_SC_May_20 07-114	5.2	Draft ISPM 28:20-- Annex X: Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heat	CPs, RPPOs and SC	29 April 2011
2011_SC_May_20 09-001	5.9	Draft ISPM: Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (appendix to ISPM 5) (2009-001) (HEDLEY)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	2 March 2011
Draft Specifications				
2011_SC_May_20 09-003rev.1	7.2	Draft Specification: International movement of seed (2009-003) (PORRITT)	SC Only	14 March 2011

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
2011_SC_May_20 05-005	7.3	Draft Specification: Framework for national phytosanitary inspection procedures (2005-005) (ALIAGA)	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 05-006	7.4	Draft Specification: Minimizing the risk of quarantine pests associated with stored products in international trade (2005-006) (VACANT)	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 08-003	7.5	Draft Specification: Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities (2008-003) (FOREST)	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 08-004	7.6	Draft Specification: Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004) (PORRITT)	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 08-006	7.7	Draft Specification: Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006) (TEMUKON)	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 09-002	7.8	Draft Specification: Revision of ISPM 4 - Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (2009-002) (OLUSOLA-AWOSUSI)	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 08-005	7.9	Draft Specification: International movement of cut flowers and foliage (2008-005) (GONZALEZ)	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 09-005	7.10	Draft Specification: Revision of ISPM 8 - Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005) (MELCHO)	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 09-004	7.11	Draft Specification: Revision of ISPM 6 - Guidelines for surveillance (2009-004) (HEDLEY)	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20 09-007 rev.1	7.1	Draft Specification: Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly regulated areas in the event of outbreak detection in pest free areas for fruit flies (for inclusion as Annex 1 of ISPM 26) (2009-007) (GONZALEZ)	SC Only	14 March 2011
Other Documents				
2011_SC_May_01	1.3	Provisional Agenda (dated when posted) (LARSON)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	21 April 2011
2011_SC_May_02	2.1	Documents List (LARSON)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	9 May 2011
2011_SC_May_03	2.2	Participants List (dated when posted) (LARSON)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	9 May 2011
2011_SC_May_04	2.3	Local Information (LARSON)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	8 March 2011

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
2011_SC_May_05	5.1	Specification 44 (Rev 1): Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests (NORDBO)	PUBLIC	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_06	5.1	EWG Meeting Report Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests May 2009, Paris (NORDBO)	PUBLIC	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_07	5.3	Specification 1: Review and updating of the glossary of phytosanitary terms (HEDLEY)	PUBLIC	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_08	5.4	Specification 50: Protocol to determine host status of fruits to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (CARDOSO-PEREIRA)	PUBLIC	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_09	5.5	Specification 33: Supplement to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) - Guidelines for the interpretation and application of the phrase not widely distributed in relation to quarantine pests (HEDLEY)	PUBLIC	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_10	5.5	EWG Meeting Report Not widely distributed November 2006, Copenhagen (HEDLEY)	PUBLIC	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_11	5.5	Extracts of TPG Meeting Report regarding Not widely distributed October 2009, Rome (HEDLEY)	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_12	5.5	Extracts of relevant SC and SC-7 Meetings regarding Not widely distributed (HEDLEY)	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_13	5.6	Specification 42: Pre-clearance for regulated articles (HOLTZHAUSEN)	PUBLIC	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_14	5.7	Specification 45: Import of plant breeding material for scientific research, education or other specific use (HOLTZHAUSEN)	PUBLIC	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_15	5.7	EWG Meeting Report Import of Germplasm February 2010, Amsterdam (HOLTZHAUSEN)	PUBLIC	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_16	5.8	Specification 43 (Rev 1): Movement of soil and growing media in association with plants in international trade (FOREST)	PUBLIC	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_17 rev. 2	6.1	Guidelines for choosing the equivalent of five draft ISPMs (CHARD/DUBON)	SC Only	12 April 2011
2011_SC_May_18	5.1	ISPM 11 Proposed Text Changes for Review by the SC	SC Only	11 March 2011
2011_SC_May_19	5.1	ISPM 11 Proposed Text Changes Excerpt (to accompany the Draft Annex during Member Consultation)	SC Only	11 March 2011
2011_SC_May_20	7.2	TPFQ consideration of Specification 47 (International movement of forest tree seeds (2006-032), in light of proposed standard on International movement of seed (2009-003) (Vacant)	SC Only	8 March 2011

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
2011_SC_May_21	5.1	Steward's explanation to major changes with draft of 29 November 2010, following work (by e-mail) in an SC Subgroup	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_22	7.3	Compiled comments (including Steward's response): Framework for national phytosanitary inspection procedures (2005-005) (ALIAGA)	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_23	7.3	Notes from the Steward for consideration by the SC: Framework for national phytosanitary inspection procedures (2005-005) (ALIAGA)	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_24	7.4	Compiled comments (including Steward's response): Minimizing the risk of quarantine pests associated with stored products in international trade (2005-006) (VACANT)	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_25	7.5	Compiled comments (including Steward's response): Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities (2008-003) (FOREST)	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_26	7.6	Compiled comments (including Steward's response): Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004) (PORRITT)	SC Only	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_27	5.2	Specification 31: Revision of ISPM 15 (Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade) (2006-011) (SCHRODER)	PUBLIC	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_28	5.3	Specification TP5: Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) (1994-001) (HEDLEY)	PUBLIC	8 March 2011
2011_SC_May_29	7.2	Compiled comments (including Steward's response): International movement of seed	SC Only	30 March 2011
2011_SC_May_30	7.1	Compiled comments (including Steward's response): Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly regulated areas in the event of outbreak detection in pest free areas for fruit flies	SC Only	30 March 2011
2011_SC_May_31	5.6	Report of the EWG on preclearance for regulated articles, 1-5 Sept. 2008, Lusaka, Zambia	PUBLIC	5 April 2011
2011_SC_May_32	3.1	Proposed improvements for the approval of Diagnostic Protocols (DP) and Phytosanitary Treatments (PT)	SC Only	5 April 2011
2011_SC_May_33	3.1	Terms of Reference for Focus Group for improving the IPPC Standard Setting Process (approved by CPM-6, 2011)	SC Only	5 April 2011
2011_SC_May_34	5.8	Report of the meeting of the Expert Working Group <i>Movement of soil and growing media in association with plants in international trade</i>	PUBLIC	5 April 2011

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
2011_SC_May_35	3.1	Items related to the Standards Committee arising from the Sixth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (Secretariat)	SC Only	5 April 2011
2011_SC_May_36rev1	9.1	Update on the topics and priorities for IPPC standards (Dubon)	SC Only	11 April 2011
2011_SC_May_37	13.1	Update and demonstration of the Online Comment System (Dubon)	SC Only	7 April 2011
2011_SC_May_38	13.1	Classification of comments on IPPC documents in country consultation (Unger)	SC Only	7 April 2011
2011_SC_May_39	3.2	Report of the IPPC Standard Setting Group (November 2010-April 2011) (Larson)	SC Only	7 April 2011
2011_SC_May_40	13.6	Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) (Sosa)	PUBLIC	15 April 2011
2011_SC_May_41	3.2	Organizational Chart of the Standard Setting Group (Larson)	SC Only	15 April 2011
2011_SC_May_42	12	Update on 2011 Regional Workshops (Sosa)	SC Only	20 April 2010
2011_SC_May_43	3.3	Feedback on processes since the November 2010 SC meeting (Chard)	SC Only	29 April 2010
2011_SC_May_44 Rev1	4.2	Update of polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (November 2010-March 2011) (Larson)	SC Only	29 April 2011
2011_SC_May_45	3.1	Proposed priorities for topics for ISPMs (Chard, Hedley, Ashby)	SC Only	21 April 2011
2011_SC_May_46	8.1	Update on activities of the TPDP (Grousset)	SC Only	21 April 2011
2011_SC_May_47	8.5	Update on activities of the Technical Panel for the Glossary from October 2010 to April 2011 (Grousset)	SC Only	21 April 2011
2011_SC_May_48	11	IPPC Standard Setting meeting and action calendar for 2011-2012 (Secretariat)	SC Only	21 April 2011
2011_SC_May_49	5.2	Background document for revision of Annex 1 to ISPM 15:2009 and the addition of sulfur dioxide (2007-101) and microwave irradiation (2007-114) treatments	SC Only	26 April 2011
2011_SC_May_50	3.1	Framework for standards, recommendations and procedures of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (Secretariat / Hedley)	SC Only	27 April 2011
2011_SC_May_51	8.3	Update on activities of the TPPT (Zettler, Dubon, Dikin)	SC Only	29 April 2011
2011_SC_May_52	8.2	Update on activities of the TPFF (Erikson, Cardoso-Pereira)	SC Only	29 April 2011
2011_SC_May_53	8.4	Update on activities of the TPFQ (Secretariat)	SC Only	29 April 2011
2011_SC_May_54	3.1	Reprioritization of topics for IPPC standards	SC Only	29 April 2011

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
2011_SC_May_CR P01	5.3	Amendments to ISPM 5: Original Definitions	SC Only	3 May 2011
2011_SC_May_CR P02 rev 1	3.1	Reflections on ISPMs: Status, value and quality	SC Only	4 May 2011
2011_SC_May_CR P03	3.1	Proposed priorities for topics for ISPMs	SC Only	4 May 2011
2011_SC_May_CR P04 rev2	3.1	Proposed priorities for topics for ISPMs	SC Only	9 May 2011

APPENDIX 3 - Participants list**COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES****STANDARDS COMMITTEE****2-6 May 2011****German Room C-269, FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy****PARTICIPANTS LIST**

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

Members not attending have been taken off the list.

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Africa Member	Ms Olufunke Olusola AWOSUSI Head, Post Entry Quarantine Inspection and Surveillance Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service Moor Plantation, P.M.B. 5672 Ibadan NIGERIA Tel: +234 805 9608494	awosusifunke@yahoo.com	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) 2nd term / 3 years	2014
✓	Africa Member	Mr Marcel BAKAK Head, Plant Quarantine Ministry of Agriculture Minader, Yaounde CAMEROON Tel: +23799961337 FAX: + 23722310268	Mandjek4@yahoo.fr	CPM-5 (2010) 1st term / 3 years	2013
✓	Africa Member SC7	Mr Mike HOLTZHAUSEN Deputy Director Agricultural Products Inspection Services Private Bag X258 Pretoria 0001 SOUTH AFRICA Tel: (+27) 12 309 8703 Fax: (+27) 12 309 8775	mikeh@nda.agric.za; netmike@absamail.co.za	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Asia Member	Mr Antarjo DIKIN Director, Institute of Applied Research on Agricultural Quarantine Method and Technology Indonesian Agricultural Quarantine Agency Ministry of Agriculture Jl Raya Kampung Utan – Setu, Desa Mekar Wangi Kec. Cikarang Barat Kab. Bekasi 17520, West Java INDONESIA Tel/Fax:(+6221) 82618923	antario_dikin@yahoo.com; buttmkp@deptan.go.id	CPM-5 (2010) 1st term / 3 years	2013
✓	Asia Member Vice-Chair	Mr Motoi SAKAMURA Director, Operation Department, Kobe Plant Protection Station, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 1-1, Hatobacho, Chuouku, Kobe 6500042 JAPAN Tel: (+81) 78 331 3430 Fax: (+81) 78 391 1757	sakamuram@pps.maff.go.jp; ippc_contact@nm.maff.go.jp	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012
✓	Asia Member	Mr Udorn UNAHAWUTTI Senior Expert in Plant Quarantine Department of Agriculture 50 Phaholyothin Road, Chatuchak Bangkok 10900 THAILAND Tel:(+66) 2579 8516; Cell: (+66) 9892 2415 Fax:(+66) 2579 4129	unahawut@yahoo.com; unahawut@doa.go.th	Replacement for Mr Prabhakar CHANDURKAR CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012
✓	Asia Member SC7	Mr Fuxiang WANG Director Plant Quarantine Division National Agro-Technical Extension and Service Center Ministry of Agriculture No 20 Mai Zi Dian Street, Chaoyang District 100026 Beijing CHINA Tel: (+86) 10 5919 4524 Fax: (+86) 10 5919 4726	wangfuxiang@agri.gov.cn	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	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	2014
✓	Europe Member SC7	Mr Ebbe NORDBO Head of Section Danish Plant Directorate Skovbrynet 20 DK - 2800 Lyngby DENMARK Tel: (+45) 45 263 891 Fax: (+45) 45 263 613	eno@pdir.dk; spp@pdir.dk	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) 2nd term / 3 years	2014
✓	Europe Member	Mr David OPATOWSKI Head Plant Biosecurity Plant Protection and Inspection Services (PPIS) P.O. Box 78 Bet Dagan 50250 ISRAEL Tel: (+972) 3 968 1585; 506 241 745 Fax: (+972) 3 968 1571	davido@moag.gov.il	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	Ms María Soledad CASTRO DOROCHESSI Coordinador Convención Internacional da Protección Fitosanitaria Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal Av. Bulnes 140, Piso 3 Santiago, CHILE Tel: (+562) 3451454; (+ 569) 84497464 Fax: (+56 2) 3451203	soledad.castro@sag.gob.cl	CPM-5 (2010) 1st term / 3 years	2013

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member SC7	Ms Magda GONZÁLEZ ARROYO Directora del Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado Ministry of Agriculture Apartado 1521-1200 San José, Costa Rica Centro America COSTA RICA Tel:+ (506) 2549-3565 Fax:+ (506) 2549-3599	mgonzalez@sfe.go.cr; direccion@sfe.go.cr	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	Ms Beatriz MELCHO Sub-Director, Plant Protection Division Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries General Direction of Agricultural Services Plant Protection Division Avda. Millan 4703 CP 12900 Montevideo URUGUAY Tel: (+598) 2 308 3094 Fax: (+598) 2 308 3094	bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy; bemelcho@hotmail.com	CPM-2 (2007) CPM-5 (2010) 2nd term / 3 years	2013
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	Mr Guillermo Luis ROSSI Director de Certificación Fitosanitaria, DNPV - Senasa Paseo Colón 315 4º piso A Capital Federal (C1063ACD) ARGENTINA Tel: +54 11 41215097 Fax: +54 11 41215179	grossi@senasa.gov.ar; ffgrossi@gmail.com	CPM-4 (2009) 1st term / 3 years	2012
✓	Near East Member SC7	Mr Abdullah AL-SAYANI Director General of Plant Protection General Directorate of Plant Protection Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation P.O. Box 26, Zaied Street Saná YEMEN Telephone:(+967) 1 250956 Fax:(+967) 1 228064	plant-protection@yemen.net.ye	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Near East Member	Mr Abdul Hakim MOHAMMAD Plant Protection Directorate Al Abed Street Damascus SYRIA Tel: +963(11) 222 0187 Fax:(+963) 11 44675950 Mob: +963 944 369 075	wekayaham@yahoo.com; dppsyria@aloola.sy	CPM-4 (2009) 1st term / 3 years	2012
✓	Near East Member	Mr Khidir GIBRIL MUSA General Manager Plant Protection Directorate P.O. Box 14 Khartoum North SUDAN Tel: (+249) 1 8533 8242/9121 38939 Fax: (+249) 1 8533 9423	khidirgme@yahoo.com	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012
✓	Near East Member	Mr Imad NAHHAL Ministry of Agriculture Bir Hassan Embassies Street Beirut LEBANON Tel: +961 3 894679	imadn@terra.net.lb; inahhal@agriculture.gov.lb	CPM-6 (2011) 1st term / 3 years	2014
✓	North America Member SC7	Ms Julie ALIAGA Program Director, International Standards Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service U.S. Department of Agriculture 4700 River Road, Unit 140 Riverdale, MD 20737 USA Tel: (+1) 301 734 0763 Fax: (+1) 301 734 7639	julie.e.aliaga@aphis.usda.gov	CPM-4 (2009) 1st term / 3 years	2012
✓	North America Member	Ms Marie-Claude FOREST International Standards Advisor Office of Chief Plant Health Officer Export and Technical Standards Section Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 CANADA Tel:(001) 613-773-7235 Fax:(001) 613-773-7204	marie-claude.forest@inspection.gc.ca; ippc-contact@inspection.gc.ca	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) 2nd term / 3 years	2014

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Pacific Member SC7	Mr John HEDLEY Principal Adviser International Coordination Biosecurity New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry P.O. Box 2526 Wellington NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0733	john.hedley@maf.govt.nz	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012
✓	Pacific Member	Mr Jan Bart ROSSEL International Capacity Building & Plant Health Surveillance Program Office of the Chief Plant Protection Officer, Biosecurity Services Group Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry AUSTRALIA Tel:+61 2 6272 5056 / 0408625413 Fax:+61 2 6272 5835	bart.rossel@aqis.gov.au; bart.rossel@daff.gov.au	CPM-6 (2011) 1st term / 3 years	2014

Non attending

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership confirmed	Term Expires
	Pacific Member	Mr Nagatoko NGATOLO Director Biosecurity Service, Ministry of Agriculture P.O.Box 96, Rarotonga COOK ISLANDS	nngatoko@agriculture.gov.ck; cimoa@oyster.net.ck	Replacement for Mr Timothy TEMUKON CPM-4 (2009) 1st term / 3 years	XX2012
	Europe Member	Mr Jens-Georg UNGER Head Federal Research Institute on Cultivated Plants Julius Kuehn Institute Messeweg 11/12 38104 Braunschweig GERMANY Tel: (+49) 531 299 3370 Fax: (+49) 531 299 3007	jens- georg.unger@jki.bund.de;	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012

	Africa Member	Mr Lahcen ABAHA Regional Directorate of the Sanitary and Food Safety National Office - Souss-Massa Drâa Region - BP 1808, Nouveau Port d'Agadir MOROCCO Tel: (00212) 673 997 855 / 673 997 889 Fax:(00212) 528-828 660	lahcen.abaha@onssa.gov.ma; abahalahcen@yahoo.fr	CPM-4 (2009) 1st term / 3 years	2012
--	---------------	--	--	------------------------------------	------

Others

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership confirmed	Term Expires
✓	Observer from Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA)	Mr Guillermo Alvarado DOWNING Director Ejecutivo, OIRSA Calle Ramón Beliosa, final Pasaje Isolda Colonia Escalón, Adpo, Postal (01) 61, San Salvador EL SALVADOR	galvarado@oirsa.org	N/A	N/A
✓	Observer from Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC)	Mr Jean- Baptise BAHAMA Senior Scientific Officer – Phytopathology P.O.Box. 4170 – Nlongkak Yaoundé CAMEROON Tel: (237) 22211969 / (237) 94192422 Fax: (237) 22 21 19 67	Au-cpi@au-appo.org; jbbaham2002@yahoo.fr	N/A	N/A
✓	CPM Bureau	Mr Stephen ASHBY Deputy Head, Plant Health Policy Team, Policy Programme Food and Environment Research Agency Sand Hutton, York, YO41 1LZ, UNITED KINGDOM Tel: +44 1 904 465633	steve.ashby@fera.gsi.gov.uk	N/A	N/A
✓	Observer from Poland	Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK Main Inspectorate of Plant Health and Seed Inspection Al. Jana Pawla II 11, 00-828 Warsaw POLAND	p.wlodarczyk@piorin.gov.pl	N/A	N/A
✓	Observer from Mexico	Ms Ana Lilia Montealegre LARA Jefe del Dpto. de Organismos Internacionales de Protección Fitosanitaria Dirección de Regulación Fitosanitaria Dirección General de Sanidad Vegetal SENASICA-SAGARPA Guillermo Pérez Valenzuela No. 127 Col. Del Carmen, Coyoacán, C. P. 01480 MÉXICO, D. F. Tel: +52 5905-1000 Ext. 51341	ana.montealegre@senasica.gob.mx	N/A	N/A

✓	Observer from North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)	Ms Rebecca LEE Technical Director North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) 1431 Merivale Road, 3rd. Floor, Room 140, Ottawa, ON K1A 0Y9 - Canada	suamena@yahoo.ca; rebecca.lee@nappo.ca	N/A	N/A
✓	Observer from South Africa	Mr Mashudu Silimela SILIMELA Dept. of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Private Bag X14, Pretoria 0031 Republic of South Africa	MashuduS@daff.gov.za	N/A	N/A

✓	Secretariat	Mr Brent LARSON Standards Officer	Brent.Larson@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	Secretariat	Ms Stephanie DUBON APO	Stephanie.Dubon@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	Secretariat Joint FAO/IAEA Division	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
✓	Secretariat	Ms Fabienne GROUSSET Support	Fabienne.Grousset@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	Secretariat	Mr Larry ZETTLER Support	Larry.Zettler@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	Secretariat	Ms Antonella ALBERIGHI Administrative support staff	Antonella.Alberighi@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	Secretariat	Ms Sayuri INAFUKU Visiting scientist	Sayuri.Inafuku@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	Secretariat	Ms Eva MOLLER Administrative support staff	Eva.Moller@fao.org	N/A	N/A

APPENDIX 4 - Priorities for topics as recommended by the SC

Rows are sorted by projected years of adoption and Priority and are numbered for reference purposes only. Current titles are working titles only and may further evolve during the development of the specification and ISPM.

The SC invited its members to submit comments on the priorities. One member recommended changing the *Strategic objective most affected* as indicated in brackets.

Key

	Draft been for MC in 2010
	Draft for 2011 or 2012
	New or pending topic

Table 1: Recently drafted ISPMs

Row number	Topic number	Current title	Priority	Strategic Objective Most Affected	Reasons
Strategic Objective B: Environmental Protection					
1	2005-002	Integrated measures approach for plants for planting in international trade (3 EWGs)	1	B (C)	SC considered this is an important topic in an advanced stage of drafting.
2	2006-011	Revision of Annex 1 to ISPM 15 (2009) (<i>Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade</i>) specifically: -Guidelines for heat treatment (3 TPFQ) -Correction of inconsistency on MeBr between text and annex (1 TPFQ) -Addition of sulfuryl fluoride and microwave irradiation treatments	1	B	Import guidance for an important standard and provides an alternative to MeBr
3	2005-004	Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade	1	B (C)	The SC discussed whether to give priority 1 or 3. It was pointed out that this topic is related with plants for planting (2005-002) but not absolutely linked. This argument was taken in consideration and priority 1 was given
4	2006-029	Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood (2+1 TPFQ)	1	B (C)	The SC noted that there is a problem with a table in the current draft, and for this reason some SC members gave priority 4, but some others gave priority 1 because of the importance of the topic for international trade. The SC agreed on priority 1.
5	2005-001	Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests (1 EWG)	2	B	Not a critical topic, so therefore not considered priority 1

Row	Topic number	Current title	Priority	Strategic Objective Most Affected	Reasons
6	2006-010	Revision of ISPM 15 (<i>Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade</i>) specifically: - Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (3 TPFQ)	2	B	The SC noted that there are some problems with statistics and probit 9. The SC discussed whether to allocate priority 2 or 3. Priority 2 was finally agreed because the standard is important and we need more treatments.
7	2004-001	Import of germplasm	4	B	This topic is covered by other ISPMs, and could be a topic that could be developed into a technical manual. For these reasons, the SC decided priority 4. The SC also noted that the Nagoya protocol was recently agreed to.
8	2009-001	Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (appendix to ISPM 5) (1 TPG)	4	B	The SC agreed on priority 4 because there is no urgent need for this topic.
Strategic Objective C: Trade Facilitation					
9	2004-022	Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies (1 consultant, 2 TPFQ)	1	C	SC considered this is an important topic in an advanced stage of drafting.
10	2006-031	Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (<i>Tephritidae</i>) infestation	1	C	The SC considered priorities 1 and 2. However, the SC considered this topic as necessary to clarify other approved fruit fly standards.
11	2005-010	Phytosanitary procedures for fruit flies (<i>Tephritidae</i>) management	2	C	Consensus that this was an important topic but not as urgent as the other fruit fly topics (see 2006-031).
12	2005-008	Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1 EWG, 1 TPG)	2	C	This topic is not essential (i.e. priority 1) but may help clarify the term Not Widely Distributed.
13	2005-003	Phytosanitary pre-import clearance, Annex 1 to ISPM 20 (1 EWG)	3	C	SC discussed whether it should be priority 2 or 3. SC decided on priority 3 because it relates to bilateral agreements.

Table 2: Minimum or no drafting has begun

Row number	Topic number	Current title	Priority	Strategic Objective Most Affected	Reasons
Strategic Object A: Food Security					
14	2009-003	International movement of seed	1	A	An important topic and high priority by the CPM.
15	2008-007	International movement of grain	1	A	The SC discussed whether this should be a manual. Some SC members gave priority 2. Due to the strong support by the CPM-5 was decided priority 1.
16	2005-006	Minimizing the risk of quarantine pests associated with stored products in international trade	Delete	A	The SC recommended deletion and proposed this topic as a technical manual under IPPC Capacity Development or as an FAO guide (similar to the forestry guide)
Strategic Objective B: Environmental Protection					
17	2008-001	Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade	1	B	An important topic and high priority by the CPM.
18	2008-002	Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircraft	1	B	Some SC members considered this topic was less important than Sea Containers (2008-001). However, this topic is considered a high priority by the CPM. Therefore the SC decided at the end to be priority 1.
19	2008-004	Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages.	3	B	The SC noted that this topic is already regulated by animal health in some cases. Therefore the SC decided on priority 3.
20	2006-004	Guidelines for the movement of used machinery and equipment	3	B	The SC considered priorities 3 or 4 and decided priority 3 because it was an important issue for some developing countries.
21	2008-008	Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood	4	B (C)	The SC proposed deletion or priority 4. The SC agreed that it should not be deleted because it is important for some developing countries. The SC decided priority 4
22	2006-032	International movement of forest tree seeds (1 TPFQ)	Delete	B (C)	The SC proposed deletion and incorporated this topic into topic 2009-003.
Strategic Objective C: Trade Facilitation					
23	2006-003	Revision of ISPM 12 – Phytosanitary certificates (1 EWG); Appendix on Electronic certification, information on standard XML schemes and exchange mechanisms	1	C	Several aspects were discussed: (1) If not developed as part of ISPM 12 the countries will develop the own documents that later need to be harmonized; (2) if it should be an appendix or an annex. Some argue for priority 2, other for 3, mainly because is an appendix. At the end and due to the importance was maintained as appendix but with priority 1
24	2009-002	Revision of ISPM 4 Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas	2	C	There was a discussion on this and the other two revisions in the list (ISPM 4, 6, and 8). There was some divergence on the priorities that should be given to all revisions and specifically this one (between priority 2 and 3). The SC decided priority 2 for the revisions of ISPMs 4 and 6, and priority 3 for revision of ISPM 8

Row number	Topic number	Current title	Priority	Strategic Objective Most Affected	Reasons
25	2009-004	Revision of ISPM 6 Guidelines for surveillance	2	C	See topic 2009-002
26	2009-005	Revision of ISPM 8 Determination of pest status in an area	3	C	See topic 2009-002
27	2009-007	Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly regulated areas in the event of outbreak detection in pest free areas for fruit flies (for inclusion as Annex 1 of ISPM 26)	3	C	The SC noted this topic compliments the adopted fruit fly standards decided on priority 3.
28	2008-005	International movement of cut flowers and foliage	4	C	Some members recommended deletion because the topic is covered by other standards. However, others were against deletion because there had been a request to harmonize import requirements. For this reason was given priority 4.
29	2001-001	Efficacy of measures (2 EWGs)	4	C	The SC recommended as priority 4 because it is an important conceptual topic. The SC proposed to delete the linkage with "Appropriate Level of Protection" 2005-007
30	2002-001	Surveillance for citrus canker (<i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i>) (1 EWG)	4	C	Currently pending. This relates to 2003-001 and the SC recommends it be reviewed in two years
31	2003-001	Systems approach for management of citrus canker (<i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i>) (2 EWGs)	4	C	Currently pending. This is the first pest-specific topic and therefore the SC recommends it be reviewed in two years
32	2009-008	Biological control for forest pests	Delete	C	The SC wasn't convinced that harmonized guidance was needed
33	2006-030	Forest pest surveys for determination of pest status	Delete ⁵³	C	The SC recommended deletion and proposes it be considered in the Revision of ISPM 6 (2009-004)
34	2005-007	Appropriate level of protection (1 EWG)	Delete	C	The SC considered this topic impossible to agree to.
Strategic Objective D: Capacity Development					
35	2005-005	Framework for national phytosanitary inspection procedures	Delete	D	The SC considered this topic related to national procedures and did not need to be harmonized in an ISPM Proposed for deletion and suggested to develop a technical manual under IPPC Capacity Development.
36	2008-003	Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities	Delete	D	The SC considered this topic related to national procedures and did not need to be harmonized in an ISPM. The SC recommended deletion and proposed this topic as a technical manual under IPPC Capacity Development

⁵³ Considered in Revision of ISPM 6

Row number	Topic number	Current title	Priority	Strategic Objective Most Affected	Reasons
37	2008-006	Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20: <i>Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system</i>)	Delete	D	The SC considered this topic related to national procedures and did not need to be harmonized in an ISPM The SC recommended deletion and proposed this topic as a technical manual under IPPC Capacity Development
38	2010-031	Revision of ISPM 7 - Phytosanitary certification system (1 EWG); Appendix on Guidelines for public officers issuing phytosanitary certificates	Delete	D	The SC considered this topic related to national procedures and did not need to be harmonized in an ISPM The SC recommended deletion and proposed this topic as a technical manual under IPPC Capacity Development

APPENDIX 5 - Priorities for subjects for diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments

Table: Proposed prioritization of Diagnostic Protocols

Row	Topic number	Topic: -Subject	Added to the list of Topics and Priorities for IPPC Standards	Current stage of development	Strategic Objective most affected	Proposed Priority
2006-005 Bacteria:						
1	2004-009	- <i>Erwinia amylovora</i>	SC Nov. 2004	Text in draft form, has been seen by TPDP 2006, 2008, 2010. Work reactivated recently	B,C	1
2	2004-011	- <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i>	SC Nov. 2004	Text in draft form, has been seen by TPDP 2006, 2007, 2008	B,C	1
3	2004-024	- <i>Xyllela fastidiosa</i>	SC Nov. 2004	Authors selected but no contact. Currently no discipline lead	B,C	2
4	2004-010	- <i>Liberibacter</i> spp. / <i>Liberobacter</i> spp.	SC Nov. 2004	Text in draft form, has been seen by TPDP 2006, 2007	B,C	3
5	2004-012	- <i>Xanthomonas fragariae</i>	SC Nov. 2004	Text in draft form, has been seen by TPDP 2006, 2008	B,C	4
2006-006 Fungi and fungus-like organisms:						
6	2004-014	- <i>Tilletia indica</i> / <i>T. controversa</i>	SC Nov. 2004	Stage of advancement: Draft ready in April 2011 for SC prior to member consultation	A,B,C	1
7	2004-023	- <i>Guignardia citricarpa</i>	SC Nov. 2004	Stage of advancement: Draft ready in April 2011 for SC prior to member consultation	B,C	1
8	2006-021	- <i>Fusarium moniliformis</i> / <i>moniforme</i> syn. <i>F. circinatum</i>	SC May 2006	Authors selected, drafting not started (or just started)	B,C	2
9	2006-018	- <i>Puccinia psidii</i>	SC May 2006	Authors selected, drafting not started or just started (initially difficulties to establish contact)	B,C	2
10	2004-013	- <i>Phytophthora ramorum</i>	SC Nov. 2004	Text in draft form, has been seen by TPDP 2006, 2007, 2010.	B,C	3
11	2004-008	- <i>Gymnosporangium</i> spp.	SC Nov. 2004	First draft in preparation, not yet seen by TPDP	B,C	4
2006-007 Insects and mites:						

Row	Topic number	Topic: -Subject	Added to the list of Topics and Priorities for IPPC Standards	Current stage of development	Strategic Objective most affected	Proposed Priority
12	2004-006	- <i>Trogoderma granarium</i>	SC Nov. 2004	Stage of development: draft already approved for member consultation	A,B,C	1
13	2004-015	- <i>Anastrepha</i> spp.	SC Nov. 2004	Text in draft form, has been seen by TPDP 2007, 2008, 2010	B,C	1
14	2006-028	- Tephritidae: Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques	SC November 2006	First draft in preparation, not yet seen by TPDP Reorganization proposed, will be used as model for barcoding in DPs. Needs to be same priority as <i>Anastrepha</i> .	B,C	1
15	2006-017	- <i>Liriomyza</i> spp.	SC May 2006	First draft in preparation, not yet seen by TPDP	A,B,C	1
16	2006-026	- <i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i> complex	SC May 2006	First draft in preparation, not yet seen by TPDP	B,C	2
17	2006-019	- <i>Dendroctonus ponderosae</i> syn. <i>Scolytus scolytus</i>	SC May 2006	Authors selected, drafting not started (difficulties to establish contact with editorial team)	B,C	3
18	2004-020	- <i>Anoplophora</i> spp.	SC Nov. 2004	First draft in preparation, not yet seen by TPDP	B,C	3
19	2006-020	- <i>Ips</i> spp.	SC May 2006	Authors selected, drafting not started (difficulties to establish contact with editorial team)	B,C	4
2006-008		Nematodes:				
20	2006-025	- <i>Aphelenchoides besseyi</i> , <i>A. ritzemabosi</i> and <i>A. fragariae</i>	SC May 2006	Authors selected, drafting not started	A,B,C	1
21	2004-017	- <i>Ditylenchus destructor</i> / <i>D. dipsaci</i>	SC Nov. 2004	Text in draft form, has been seen by TPDP 2010.	A,B,C	1
22	2004-016	- <i>Bursaphelenchus xylophilus</i>	SC Nov. 2004	Text in draft form, has been seen by TPDP 2007, 2008	B,C	2
23	2004-025	- <i>Xiphinema americanum</i>	SC Nov. 2004	Text in draft form, has been seen by TPDP 2005	B,C	4
2007-001		Plants:				
24	2006-027	- <i>Sorghum halepense</i>	SC November 2006	Text in draft form, has been seen by TPDP 2010	A,B,C	1
25	2008-009	- <i>Striga</i> spp.	CPM-3 92008)	Authors selected, drafting not started. Difficulties for the discipline lead to establish contacts with author and team	A,B,C	1

Row	Topic number	Topic: -Subject	Added to the list of Topics and Priorities for IPPC Standards	Current stage of development	Strategic Objective most affected	Proposed Priority
2006-009		Viruses and phytoplasmas:				
26	2004-007	- Plum pox virus	SC Nov. 2004	Sent for member consultation in 2010	B,C	1
27	2006-022	- Potato spindle tuber viroid	SC May 2006	First draft in preparation, not yet seen by TPDP	A,B,C	1
28	2004-019	- Tospoviruses (TSWV, INSV, WSMV)	SC Nov. 2004	Text in draft form, has been seen by TPDP 2005	B,C	1
29	2006-023	- Viruses transmitted by <i>Bemisia tabaci</i>	SC May 2006	Authors selected, drafting just started, scope of protocol planned to be discussed at next TPDP meeting	B,C	2
30	2004-021	- Citrus tristeza virus	SC Nov. 2004	First draft in preparation, not yet seen by TPDP	B,C	3
31	2004-018	- Phytoplasmas (general)	SC Nov. 2004	First draft in preparation, not yet seen by TPDP	B,C	4

Table 2: Proposed prioritization of Phytosanitary Treatments

Row	Topic number	Topic: -Subject	Added to the list of Topics and Priorities for IPPC Standards	Current stage of development	Strategic Objective most affected	Proposed Priority
2006-015		Wood packaging material				
32	2007-101	Sulfuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material	SC Nov 2010	Draft ISPM to SC for Member B,C Consultation		1
33	2007-102	Methyl isothiocyanate and sulfuryl fluoride (Ecotwin mixture) fumigation for <i>Bursaphelenchus xylophilus</i> , Coleoptera: Cerambycidae, and Coleoptera: Scolytinae of wood packaging material	SC Nov 2010	Additional data requested from submitter	B,C	3
34	2007-103	HCN treatment of wood packaging material	SC Nov 2010	Additional data requested from submitter	B,C	4
35	2007-114	Microwave irradiation of wood packaging material	SC Nov 2010	Draft ISPM to SC for Member B,C Consultation		1
36	2007-116	Methyl Iodide fumigation for <i>Bursaphelenchus xylophilus</i> and Coleoptera: Cerambycidae of wood packaging material	SC Nov 2010	Additional data requested from submitter	B,C	3
2006-024		Fruit fly				
37	2006-110	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera cucurbitae</i> on <i>Cucumis melo</i> var. <i>reticulatus</i>	SC Nov 2010	Draft ISPM to SC for Member A,C Consultation		1
38	2006-132	Vapour heat treatment for fruit flies on <i>Mangifera indica</i>	SC Nov 2010	Additional data requested from submitter	A,C	3
39	2007-206F	Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Citrus reticulata</i> and <i>C. reticulata</i> x <i>C. sinensis</i>	CPM-3 (2008); SC November 2008	Draft ISPM with TPPT comments to SC	A,C	1
40	2007-206A	Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i>	CPM-3 (2008); SC November 2008	Draft ISPM with TPPT comments to SC	A,C	1
41	2007-206B	Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus reticulata</i> and <i>C. reticulata</i> x <i>C. sinensis</i>	CPM-3 (2008); SC November 2008	Draft ISPM with TPPT comments to SC	A,C	1
42	2007-206C	Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus limon</i>	CPM-3 (2008); SC November 2008	Draft ISPM with TPPT comments to SC	A,C	1

Row	Topic number	Topic: -Subject	Added to the list of Topics and Priorities for IPPC Standards	Current stage of development	Strategic Objective most affected	Proposed Priority
43	2007-206E	Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i>	CPM-3 (2008); SC November 2008	Draft ISPM with TPPT comments to SC	A,C	1
44	2007-206G	Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Citrus limon</i>	CPM-3 (2008); SC November 2008	Draft ISPM with TPPT comments to SC	A,C	1
45	2007-210	Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus paradisi</i>	CPM-3 (2008); SC November 2008	Additional data requested from submitter	A,C	1
46	2007-212	Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus reticulata</i> cultivars and hybrids	CPM-3 (2008); SC November 2008	Draft ISPM with TPPT comments to SC	A,C	1
47	2009-101	Heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera cucumis</i> on <i>Cucurbita pepo</i>	SC Nov 2010	Additional data requested from submitter	A,C	2
48	2009-104	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Lycopersicon esculentum</i>	SC Nov 2010	Additional data requested from submitter	A,C	2
49	2009-105	High temperature forced air treatment for selected fruit fly species (Diptera: Tephritidae) on fruit	SC Nov 2010	Additional data requested from submitter	A,C	2
50	2009-108	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Mangifera indica</i> var. Manila Super	SC Nov 2010	Additional data requested from submitter	A,C	2
51	2009-109	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Carica papaya</i> var. Solo	SC Nov 2010	Additional data requested from submitter	A,C	2
52	2010-101	Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus paradisi</i>	SC May 2011 to add to the Topics and Priorities	Additional data requested from submitter	A,C	2
53	2010-102	Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus reticulata</i> and their hybrids	SC May 2011 to add to the Topics and Priorities	Additional data requested from submitter	A,C	2
54	2010-103	Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i>	SC May 2011 to add to the Topics and Priorities	Additional data requested from submitter		1
55	2010-106	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Mangifera indica</i>	SC Nov 2010	Additional data requested from submitter		2

Row	Topic number	Topic: -Subject	Added to the list of Topics and Priorities for IPPC Standards	Current stage of development	Strategic Objective most affected	Proposed Priority
56	2010-107	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Mangifera indica</i>	SC Nov 2010	Additional data requested from submitter		2
2006-014 Irradiation						
57	2007-105	Generic irradiation treatment for all insects (Arthropoda: Insecta) except lepidopteran pupae and adults (Insecta: Lepidoptera) in any host commodity	SC Nov 2010	Additional data requested from submitter	A,C	3

APPENDIX 6 - Summary of Standards Committee e-decisions

This appendix summarizes the decisions that the Standards Committee (SC) approved at its May 2011 meeting regarding the e-decision process. The SC May 2011 meeting document 2011_SC_May_44 rev 1 supplied the details of e-forums and polls that the Secretariat conducted from November 2010 to May 2011.

Decision 1 - The duration of forums and polls

The SC decided that the combined duration of a forum followed by a poll would be three weeks (two-week forum, one-week poll) and that three weeks would be allowed if a poll was used alone. The SC also agreed that, in exceptional circumstances, this duration could be shortened by the Secretariat in consultation with the Chair. In addition, SC members would receive email notice of forums and polls (including the passage from a forum to a poll), and would continue receiving automatic notification emails when members have contributed in a forum or in a poll.

Decision 2 – Sulfuryl fluoride fumigation treatment as an annex to ISPM 28

The Secretariat conducted this forum and poll from the 1 to 21 April 2011. The SC did not reach consensus via e-decision, so the group discussed the draft treatment during its May 2011 meeting. The SC agreed that further research should continue in order to fill the gap of treatment temperature range. The SC did not approve the draft treatment and returned it to the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) to review any new data provided by the submitter.

Decision 3 – Selection of the bacteriologist for TPDP

The SC did not reach consensus via e-decision, so the group discussed the draft treatment during its May 2011 meeting. The SC agreed to select Mr Taylor (New Zealand) as the TPDP bacteriologist.

Decision 4 – Encouraging SC participation via e-decision

The SC encouraged e-decision participation the use of Adobe Connect for SC e-decisions. The Secretariat encouraged SC members to obtain permission from their organization now to install the latest version of Adobe Flash (10.2 as of the publishing this report) and to purchase a USB headset in order to be prepared for the use of Adobe Connect.

Below lists the decisions that the Standards Committee (SC) has taken electronically since its last meeting in November 2010. Note that Poll 4 was an unresolved issue that the SC discussed electronically but was not able to bring to a resolution via e-decision (see Decision 2 above).

1. POLL: Approval of the draft specification on the International movement of seed to be sent for member consultation. (December 2010)

Background information

Given the importance of this ISPM, the Chairperson proposed that the draft specification for International movement of seed be sent for member consultation at the same time as the fruit fly specification (agenda item 4.6). She proposed that SC members send comments to the steward before 12 November 2010 (copying the Secretariat), that the steward considers comments by 19 November 2010, and that an electronic decision process is notified on 22 November 2010 and close on 26 November 2010 (The SC agreed to waive the normal three-week duration for electronic decisions). The steward of the ISPM would then consider comments and the two specifications would be sent for member consultation.

Question: Do you approve the draft specification, International movement of seed, for member consultation?

Poll summary- 15 December 2010: The Secretariat reviewed responses and there are no objections to approving this specification for member consultation. Therefore this specification will be sent out for member consultation in mid-December 2010.

2. POLL: SC decision regarding experts to participate in the EWG on “Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade (January 2011)”

Background information

Please refer to the information contained on the IPP.

- Specification No.51 is posted on the IPP, click the following link to view the specifications (<http://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=24119>).
- The CVs and summaries are posted on the IPP at the following link in the restricted work area (<http://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=207854>), you will be required to log into the IPP as an SC member before accessing the link.

If you have difficulty in retrieving the above documents, please contact the IPPC Secretariat.

The Secretariat, in consultation with the two stewards (John Hedley (New Zealand) and Steve Ashby (UK)), has reviewed the nominations for the above EWG is recommending the following experts:

- (1) Hartmut KRTSCHIL (Australia)
- (2) Wayne TERPSTRA (Australia)
- (3) Sebastião Roberto BRESSAN (Brazil)
- (4) Unidentified expert (China)
- (5) Mohammad Reza ASGHARI (Iran)
- (6) JaeSeung LEE (Korea, Republic of)
- (7) Nico HORN (Netherlands)
- (8) Grant WESTON (New Zealand)
- (9) Seboko Salamina MAELANE (South Africa)
- (10) Frank J. SALANTRI (USA)
- (11) Representative from Container Owners Association (COA) - as stated in the specification
- (12) Representative from the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) - as stated in the specification
- (13) Representative from the International Maritime Organization (IMO) - as stated in the specification.

Question: SC Members were asked to indicate if they concurred with these recommendations by close of business Monday 7 February 2011.

Poll summary- 10 February 2011 The Secretariat has reviewed the SC member responses and currently there is no consensus on the selection of experts to participate in the EWG on "Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade". Several SC members expressed their opinions and the Secretariat, in consultation with the Steward and SC Chair, is in the process of trying to determine a new composition of experts. A new e-decision will be used to collect SC views on this new composition in the next few days.

3. POLL: Second round: SC approval of nominated experts to participate in the EWG on “Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade”. (10 February 2011)

Background information

Please refer to the information contained on the IPP.

- Specification No.51 is posted on the IPP, click the following link to view the specifications (<http://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=24119>).
- The CVs and summaries are posted on the IPP at the following link in the restricted work area (<http://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=207854>), you will be required to log into the IPP as an SC member before accessing the link. If you have difficulty in retrieving the above documents, please contact the IPPC Secretariat.

Several SC members expressed concerns regarding the number of experts recommended for selection and other SC members recommended experts from specific countries. In view of the importance of this topic, the EWG should reflect the broadest possible range of views, but it should also be a practical size for good discussions and exchanges of views. In order to try to obtain SC agreement and to be in line with the specification as much as possible, the Chair of the SC, in discussions with the stewards and Secretariat, propose the following:

- Remove Hartmut KRTSCHIL (Australia)
- Remove Grant WESTON (New Zealand)
- No new members will be added.

The following is the revised list of experts and representatives recommended for the Sea containers EWG:

- (1) Wayne TERPSTRA (Australia) – currently working on issues with sea container hygiene and biosecurity risks
- (2) Sebastião Roberto BRESSAN (Brazil) – has unique expertise working in a border control agency
- (3) Guanghao GU (China) – can provide expertise on high volumes of containers coming out of China
- (4) Mohammad Reza ASGHARI (Iran) – to ensure developing country representation
- (5) JaeSeung LEE (Korea, Republic of) – practical experience and active in the development of both a similar regional standard and national guidance
- (6) Nico HORN (Netherlands) – practical experience of logistics and trade in containers in Europe and authorising systems
- (7) Seboko Salamina MAELANE (South Africa) – to ensure developing country representation
- (8) Frank J. SALANTRI (USA) – has unique expertise with cold storage.

Representatives from international organizations (as stated in the specification):

- (9) Representative from Container Owners Association (COA) - as stated in the specification
- (10) Representative from the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) - as stated in the specification
- (11) Representative from the International Maritime Organization (IMO) - as stated in the specification.

Question: You are asked to indicate if you concur with these recommendations by close of business Friday, 18 February 2011.

Poll summary- 7 March 2011 The Secretariat has reviewed the SC member responses to this e-decision and there were no objections on the selection of the following experts to participate in the EWG on "Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade":

- (1) Wayne TERPSTRA (Australia)
- (2) Sebastião Roberto BRESSAN (Brazil)
- (3) Guanghao GU (China)
- (4) Mohammad Reza ASGHARI (Iran)
- (5) JaeSeung LEE (Korea, Republic of)
- (6) Nico HORN (Netherlands)
- (7) Seboko Salamina MAELANE (South Africa)
- (8) Frank J. SALANTRI (USA)
- (9) Representative from Container Owners Association (COA)
- (10) Representative from the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) 11. Representative from the International Maritime Organization (IMO).

In addition a representative from the organizer and host country will also be invited to participate in the work of this EWG.

The Secretariat will now inform experts that they have now been selected and send invitations to the identified international organizations to request them to submit the names of their representatives.

SC members are reminded to please inform the experts from their regions who were nominated but not selected.

4. POLL: SC approval of the draft ISPM Annex XX to ISPM 28:201- Sulfuryl flouride fumigation of wood packaging material for member consultation (14 April 2011)

Background information

The Secretariat opened this treatment for discussion for two weeks using the SC-restricted work area E-decision forum on the IPP. Based on the forum discussions, the Secretariat is sending this treatment for E-Decision with the proposed changes (in tracked changes) in the draft ISPM document (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110877>).

For a background history of this treatment please see the Background Document (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110877>).

Question: The members of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) request the SC to review the revised draft treatment Sulfuryl flouride fumigation of wood packaging material and recommend the treatment for member consultation.

Poll summary- 29 April 2011: The Secretariat has reviewed the responses and concluded that the SC could not come to a consensus. The SC Chair decided to add this as an agenda item in the SC May 2011 meeting for further discussion.

5. POLL: SC approval of the draft ISPM Annex XX to ISPM 28:201- Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heat for member consultation (14 April 2011)

Background information

The Secretariat opened this treatment for discussion for two weeks using the SC-restricted work area E-decision forum on the IPP. Based on the forum discussions, the Secretariat is sending this treatment for E-Decision with the proposed changes (in tracked changes) in the draft ISPM document (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110877>).

For a background history of this treatment please see the Background Document (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110877>).

Question: The members of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) request the SC to review the revised draft *Heat treatment using dielectric heat* and recommend the treatment for member consultation.

Poll summary - 29 April 2011 The Secretariat has reviewed responses and there are no objections to approving this Draft ISPM for member consultation. This draft ISPM will be sent to the SC May 2011 Meeting to be approved for the June 2010 Member Consultation.

APPENDIX 7 - List of topics for IPPC standards

Rows are sorted by projected years of adoption and status. Rows are numbered for reference purposes only. Titles given are working titles only and may further evolve during the development of the specification and ISPM. Bracketed text indicates if the draft was developed by an expert working group (EWG), technical panel (TP) or consultant, and the number of meetings held.

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
1	2005-002	Regular process	2012	High	Integrated measures approach for plants for planting in international trade (3 EWGs)	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	20. Draft ISPM with SC-7 comments to SC	Opatowski, David (Israel, SC Apr 2005)	34
2	2005-001	Regular process	2013	High	Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests (1 EWG)	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	17. Draft ISPM to MC (June 2011)	Nordbo, Ebbe (Denmark, SC Nove 2008)	44:Rev1
3	2004-001	Regular process	2013	Normal	Import of germplasm	EWG	ICPM-6 (2004)	13. Draft ISPM being reviewed by steward	Holtzhausen, Mike (South Africa, SC Nov 2007)	45:Rev1
4	2005-004	Regular process	2013	Normal	Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	13. Draft ISPM being reviewed by steward	Forest, Marie-Claude (Canada, SC Nov 2008)	43:Rev1
5	2005-003	Regular process	2013	Normal	Phytosanitary pre-import clearance (1 EWG)	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	13. Draft ISPM being reviewed by steward	Vacant (Backup, Holtzhausen, Mike)	42

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
6	2006-003	Regular process	2013	High	Appendix to ISPM 12 on Electronic certification, information on standard XML schemes and exchange mechanisms	EWG	CPM-1 (2006)	11. Draft ISPM drafted	Sakamura, Motoi (Japan, SC Nov 2006)	38
7	2006-004	Regular process	2016	Normal	Guidelines for the movement of used machinery and equipment	EWG	CPM-1 (2006)	10. Experts selected	Rossi, Guillermo (Argentina, SC May 2009)	48
8	2008-001	Regular process	2015	High	Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	10. Experts selected	Hedley, John (New Zealand, SC Nov 2010); (Backup: Ashby, Steve (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010))	51
9	2009-003	Regular process	Unknown	High	International movement of seed	EWG	SC Nov 2009; CPM (2010)	08. Specification approved by SC	Porritt, David (Australia, SC Apr 2010) (backup Bakak, Marcel (Cameroon, SC May 2011))	Draft
10	2008-002	Regular process	2014	High	Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	08. Specification approved by SC	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	52
11	2008-004	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	05. Specification with stewards comments to SC	Rossel, Bart (Australia, SC May 2011)	Draft

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
12	2008-005	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	International movement of cut flowers and foliage	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	04. Draft Specificatio n to SC for Member Consultatio n	Gonzalez, Magda (Costa Rica, SC Nov 2008)	Draft
13	2009-002	Regular Process	Unknown	High	Revision of ISPM 4 Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas	EWG	SC Nov 2009; CPM (2010)	04. Draft Specificatio n to SC for Member Consultatio n	Awosusi, Olufunke Olusola (Nigeria, SC Nov 2009)	Draft
14	2009-004	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	Revision of ISPM 6 Guidelines for surveillance	EWG	SC Nov 2009; CPM (2010)	04. Draft Specificatio n to SC for Member Consultatio n	Hedley, John (New Zealand, SC Nov 2009)	Draft
15	2009-005	Regular Process	Unknown	Normal	Revision of ISPM 8 Determination of pest status in an area	EWG	SC Nov 2009; CPM (2010)	04. Draft Specificatio n to SC for Member Consultatio n	Melcho, Beatriz (Uruguay, SC Nov 2009)	Draft

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
16	2008-007	Regular process	Pending	Normal	International movement of grain	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	0. Pending: Steward assigned, pending results of open-ended workshop on the international movement of grain	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	
17	2010-031	Regular process	2013	High	Appendix to ISPM 7 Guidelines for public officers issuing phytosanitary certificates	EWG	SC Nov 2010	0. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	Sakamura, Motoi (Japan, SC Nov 2006)	38
18	2005-007	Regular process	Pending	High	Appropriate level of protection (1 EWG)	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	0. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	-No action	36
19	2005-005	Regular process	Unknown	High	Framework for national phytosanitary inspection procedures	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	0. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	Aliaga, Julie (United States, SC Nov 2007)	Draft
20	2005-006	Regular process	Pending	Normal	Minimizing the risk of quarantine pests associated with stored products in international trade	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	0. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	Vacant (link with "International movement of grain") No action	Draft

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
21	2008-003	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	0. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	Forest, Marie-Claude (Canada, SC Nov 2008)	Draft
22	2008-006	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20: <i>Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system</i>)	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	0. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	Vacant – no action	Draft
23	2002-001	Regular process	Pending	High	Surveillance for citrus canker (<i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i>) (1 EWG)	EWG	ICPM-4 (2002)	0. Pending: Draft ISPM drafted, pending outcome of the standard on systems approach for citrus canker	-Vacant	23
24	2001-001	Regular process	Pending	High	Efficacy of measures (2 EWGs)	EWG	ICPM-3 (2001)	0. Pending: Draft ISPM drafted, pending outcome of supplement to Glossary on appropriate level of protection	-Vacant	8 REV.1

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
25	2003-001	Regular process	Pending	Normal	Systems approach for management of citrus canker (<i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i>) (2 EWGs)	EWG	ICPM-5 (2003)	0. Pending: Draft ISPM drafted, pending consensus on a technical issue.	-Vacant	15 REV.1
26	2004-002	-	Technical panel	High	Technical panel to develop diagnostic protocols for specific pests	TPDP	ICPM-6 (2004)	-	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	TP1Rev2
27	2006-005	Special process	Topic	Normal	Bacteria	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
28	2004-010	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Liberibacter</i> spp. / <i>Liberobacter</i> spp. Topic under technical area: Bacteria	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
29	2004-011	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i> Topic under technical area: Bacteria	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
30	2004-012	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Xanthomonas fragariae</i> Topic under technical area: Bacteria	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
31	2004-009	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Erwinia amylovora</i> Topic under technical area: Bacteria	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
32	2004-024	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Xylella fastidiosa</i> Topic under technical area: Bacteria	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	03. Authors selected	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
33	2006-006	Special process	Topic	Normal	Fungi and fungus-like organisms	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
34	2004-013	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Phytophthora ramorum</i> Topic under technical area: Fungi and fungus-like organisms	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
35	2004-014	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Tilletia indica</i> / <i>T. controversa</i> Topic under technical area: Fungi and fungus-like organisms	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
36	2004-023	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Guignardia citricarpa</i> Topic under technical area: Fungi and fungus-like organisms	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006);	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
37	2004-008	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Gymnosporangium</i> spp. Topic under technical area: Fungi and fungus-like organisms	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
38	2006-021	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Fusarium moniliformis</i> / <i>moniforme</i> syn. <i>F. circinatum</i> Topic under technical area: Fungi and fungus-like organisms	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	03. Authors selected	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
39	2006-018	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Puccinia psidi</i> Topic under technical area: Fungi and fungus-like organisms	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	03. Authors selected	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
40	2006-007	Special process	Topic	Normal	Insects and mites	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
41	2004-006	Special process	2013	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Trogoderma granarium</i> Topic under technical area: Insects and mites	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	17. Draft ISPM to MC (June 2011)	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
42	2004-015	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Anastrepha</i> spp. Topic under technical area: Insects and mites	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
43	2006-028	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for Tephritidae: Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques Topic under technical area: Insects and mites	TPDP	SC Nov 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	06. Draft being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
44	2004-020	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Anoplophora</i> spp. Topic under technical area: Insects and mites	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
45	2006-026	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i> complex Topic under technical area: Insects and mites	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
46	2006-017	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Liriomyza</i> spp. Topic under technical area: Insects and mites	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
47	2006-019	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Dendroctonus ponderosae</i> syn. <i>Scolytus scolytus</i> Topic under technical area: Insects and mites	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	03. Authors selected	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
48	2006-020	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Ips</i> spp. Topic under technical area: Insects and mites	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	03. Authors selected	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
49	2006-008	Special process	Topic	Normal	Nematodes	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
50	2004-016	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Bursaphelenchus xylophilus</i> Topic under technical area: Nematodes	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
51	2004-017	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Ditylenchus destructor</i> / <i>D. dipsaci</i> Topic under technical area: Nematodes	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
52	2004-025	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Xiphinema americanum</i> Topic under technical area: Nematodes	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
53	2006-025	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Aphelenchoides besseyi</i> , <i>A. ritzemabosi</i> and <i>A. fragariae</i> Topic under technical area: Nematodes	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	03. Authors selected	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
54	2007-001	Special process	Topic	Normal	Plants	TPDP	CPM-2 (2007)	Work ongoing	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
55	2006-027	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Sorghum halepense</i> Topic under technical area: Plants	TPDP	SC Nov 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
56	2008-009	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Striga</i> spp. Topic under technical area: Plants	TPDP	CPM-3(2008)	03. Authors selected	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
57	2006-009	Special process	Topic	Normal	Viruses and phytoplasmas	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
58	2004-007	Special process	2012	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for Plum pox virus Topic under technical area: Viruses and phytoplasmas	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	10. Draft ISPM Member comments being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
59	2004-019	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for Tospoviruses (TSWV, INSV, WSMV) Topic under technical area: Virus and phytoplasmas	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
60	2004-021	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Citrus tristeza</i> virus Topic under technical area: Viruses and phytoplasmas	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
61	2004-018	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for Phytoplasmas (general)Topic under technical area: Virus and phytoplasmas	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
62	2006-022	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for Potato spindle tuber viroidTopic under technical area: Viruses and phytoplasmas	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
63	2006-023	Special process	Unknown	Normal	Diagnostic protocol for viruses transmitted by <i>Bemisia tabaci</i> Topic under technical area: Viruses and phytoplasmas	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	
64	2004-003	-	Technical panel	High	Technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies	TPFF	ICPM-6 (2004)	-	Aliaga, Julie (USA, SC, Apr 2009)	TP2Rev2
65	2009-007	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly regulated areas in the event of outbreak detection in pest free areas for fruit flies (for inclusion as Annex 1 of ISPM 26)	TPFF	SC Nov 2009; CPM-5 (2010)	8. Spec approved by SC	EWG Steward Gonzalez, Jaime (IAEA, SC Nov 2009); SC Steward: Rossel, Bart (Australia, SC May 2011)	Draft

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
66	2004-022	Regular process	2012	Normal	Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies (1 consultant, 2 TPFQ)	TPFF	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	20. Draft ISPM with SC-7 comments to SC	Gonzalez, Magda (Costa Rica, SC Nov 2008); (Backup: Holtzhausen, Mike (South Africa, SC Nov 2008))	29
67	2006-031	Regular process	2014	High	Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly infestations (Tephritidae)	TPFF	SC Nov 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	13. Draft ISPM being reviewed by steward	Cardoso, Rui Pereira (IAEA, SC Apr 2010)	50
68	2005-010	Regular process	2013	High	Phytosanitary Procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) Management	TPFF	SC Nov 2005; CPM-1 (2006)	12. Draft ISPM being reviewed by drafting group	Opatowski, David (Israel, SC Nov 2008); (Backup: Musa, Khidir (Sudan, SC Nov 2008))	39
69	2004-004	-	Technical panel	High	Technical panel on forest quarantine	TPFQ	ICPM-6 (2004)	-	Wang, Fuxiang (China, SC Nov 2008)	TP4Rev2
70	2006-010	Regular process	2012	High	Revision of ISPM 15 (<i>Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade</i>) specifically:- Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (3 TPFQ)	TPFQ	CPM-1 (2006)	19. Draft ISPM with steward's comments to SC-7	Wolff, Greg (Canada, SC May 2006); Backup Wang, Fuxiang (China, SC May 2011)	31

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
71	2006-011	Regular process	2013	High	Revision of ISPM 15 (<i>Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade</i>) specifically:- Guidelines for heat treatment (2 TPFQ)- Correction of two titles on MeBr between text and ISPM 15:2009, Annex 1 TPFQ)- Addition of Sulfuryl flouride and microwave irradiation treatments	TPFQ	CPM-1 (2006)	17. Draft ISPM to MC (June 2011)	Schroder, Thomas (Germany, SC Apr 2010)	31
72	2006-029	Regular process	2013	High	Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood (2+1 TPFQ)	TPFQ	SC Nov 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	15. Draft ISPM to SC for Member Consultation	Forest, Marie Claude (Canada, SC via mail 2008), Wolff, Greg (Canada, SC May 2006)	46
73	2008-008	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood	TPFQ	CPM-3 (2008)	02. Steward assigned	Musa, Khidir Gibril (Sudan, SC Apr 2010)	
74	2009-008	Regular process	Unknown	Normal	Biological control for forest pests	TPFQ	SC Nov 2009; CPM-5 (2010)	0. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	TPFQ member (SC Nov 2009)	
75	2006-030	Regular process	2016	Normal	Forest pest surveys for determination of pest status	TPFQ	SC Nov 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	0. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	Aliaga, Julie (United States, SC Nov 2008)	49

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
76	2006-032	Regular process	2015	High	International movement of forest tree seeds (1 TPFQ)	TPFQ	SC Nov 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	0. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	Wang, Fuxiang (China, SC Nov 2008)	47:Rev1
77	2006-013	-	Technical panel	High	Technical panel on the <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>	TPG	CPM-1 (2006)	-	Hedley, John (New Zealand, SC Nov 2005)	TP5
78	1994-001	Regular process	Topic	High	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	CEPM (1994)	17. Draft ISPM to MC (June 2011)	Hedley, John (New Zealand, SC Nov 2009)	TP5
79	2005-008	Regular process	2013 (Topic)	High	Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1 EWG, 1 TPG)	TPG	ICPM-7 (2005)	17. Draft ISPM to MC (June 2011)	Aliaga, Julie (USA, SC Nov 2007)	33
80	2009-001	Regular process	2013	Normal	Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (appendix to ISPM 5) (1 TPG)	TPG	CPM-4 (2009)	13. Draft ISPM being reviewed by steward	Hedley, John (New Zealand, TPG will consider)	
81	2006-012	Regular process	2014 (Topic)	High	Review of the following ISPMs: 5 (Sup 2), 9, 16, 17, 20, 23, 25 (and minor modifications to ISPMs resulting from the review) (1 consultant, 2 TPG)	TPG	CPM-1 (2006)	12. Draft ISPM being reviewed by drafting group	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	32

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
82	2010-030	Regular process	Unknown	-	Review of the use of and/or in adopted ISPMs Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	12. Draft ISPM being reviewed by drafting group	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
83	2006-016	Regular process	Pending	High	Country of origin Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	CPM-1 (2006) (special process)	02. Steward assigned	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	37
84	2010-006	Regular process	Pending		additional declaration Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC Nov 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
85	2010-015	Regular process	Unknown	-	Certificate Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
86	2010-012	Regular process	Unknown	-	Confinement Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
87	2011-004	Regular process	Unknown		Containment Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC May 2011	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley	

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
88	2011-005	Regular process	Unknown		Control Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC May 2011	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley	
89	2011-003	Regular process	Unknown		Eradication Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC May 2011	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley	
90	2010-008	Regular process	Unknown	-	Exclusion Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
91	2010-018	Regular process	Unknown	-	Gray Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
92	2010-017	Regular process	Unknown	-	Hitch hiker Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
93	2011-001	Regular process	Unknown	-	Identity Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	CPM-6 (2011)	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
94	2010-019	Regular process	Unknown	-	Legislation Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
95	2010-023	Regular process	Unknown	-	Naturally occurring Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
96	2010-026	Regular process	Unknown	-	Occurrence Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
97	2010-021	Regular process	Unknown	-	Organism Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
98	2010-003	Regular process	Pending		pest freedom Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC Nov 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
99	2010-022	Regular process	Unknown	-	Pest Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
100	2010-016	Regular process	Unknown	-	Phytosanitary certificate Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
101	2010-004	Regular process	Pending		phytosanitary status Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC Nov 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
102	2010-020	Regular process	Unknown	-	Plant pest Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
103	2010-025	Regular process	Unknown	-	Presence Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
104	2010-013	Regular process	Unknown	-	Quarantine station Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
105	2010-024	Regular process	Unknown	-	Re-export (of a consignment) Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
106	2010-027	Regular process	Unknown	-	Restriction Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
107	2010-005	Regular process	Pending		Revision of point of entry Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC Nov 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
108	2010-002	Regular process	Pending		Revision of systems approach Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC Nov 2010	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
109	2011-002	Regular process	Unknown		Suppression Topic under technical area: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	TPG	SC May 2011	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley	
110	2004-005	-	Technical panel	High	Technical panel on phytosanitary treatments	TPPT	ICPM-6 (2004)	-	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	TP3Rev1
111	2006-024	Special process	Topic	High	Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Work ongoing	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-
112	2006-110	Special process	2012	High	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera cucurbitae</i> on <i>Cucumis melo</i> var. <i>reticulatus</i> Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	17. Draft ISPM to MC (June 2011)	Wang, Yuejin (China, TPPT Dec 2006)	-

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
113	2007-206G	Special process	2012	High	Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Citrus limon</i> Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC Nov 2008	09. Draft ISPM with TPPT comments to SC	Wang, Yuejin (China, TPPT Dec 2006)	
114	2007-206F	Special process	2012	High	Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Citrus reticulata</i> and <i>C. reticulata</i> x <i>C. sinensis</i> Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC Nov 2008	09. Draft ISPM with TPPT comments to SC	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	
115	2007-206E	Special process	2012	High	Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i> Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC Nov 2008	09. Draft ISPM with TPPT comments to SC	Baxter, Alice (South Africa, TPPT Dec 2006)	
116	2007-206C	Special process	2012	High	Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus limon</i> Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC Nov 2008	09. Draft ISPM with TPPT comments to SC	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	
117	2007-206B	Special process	2012	High	Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus reticulata</i> and <i>C. reticulata</i> x <i>C. sinensis</i> Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC Nov 2008	09. Draft ISPM with TPPT comments to SC	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
118	2007-212	Special process	2012	High	Cold treatment at 2°C for 23 days for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus reticulata</i> cultivars and hybrids Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC Nov 2008	09. Draft ISPM with TPPT comments to SC	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	
119	2007-206A	Special process	2012	High	Cold treatment at 2°C for 18 days, 3°C for 20 days and 2°C for 21 days for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i> Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC Nov 2008	09. Draft ISPM with TPPT comments to SC	Baxter, Alice (South Africa, TPPT Dec 2007)	
120	2007-210	Special process	2013	High	Cold treatment at .2° C for 19 days and at 3° C for 23 days for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus paradisi</i> Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC Nov 2008	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	
121	2010-101	Special process	2014	High	Cold treatment at .05° C for 12 days for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus paradise</i> Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	SC May 2011	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Baxter, Alice (TPPT 2010)	
122	2010-102	Special process	2014	High	Cold treatment at 2°C for 16 days for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus reticulata</i> and their hybrids Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	SC May 2011	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
123	2010-103	Special process	2014	High	Cold treatment at 2°C for 16 days for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i> Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	SC May 2011	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	
124	2009-101	Special process	2014	High	Heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera cucumis</i> on <i>Cucurbita pepo</i> Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Wood, Scott (USA, TPPT 2009)	-
125	2009-105	Special process	2014	High	High temperature forced air treatment for selected fruit fly species (Diptera: Tephritidae) on fruit. Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Jessup, Andrew (TPPT 2009)	-
126	2009-104	Special process	2014	High	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Lycopersicon esculentum</i> Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Park Min-Goo (TPPT 2009)	-
127	2010-107	Special process	2014	High	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Mangifera indica</i> Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Park, Min-Goo (Korea, TPPT July 2010)	-

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
128	2009-109	Special process	2014	High	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Carica papaya</i> var. SoloTopic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Baxter, Alice (South Africa, TPPT 2009)	-
129	2010-106	Special process	2014	High	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Mangifera indica</i> Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Wood, Scott (USA, TPPT July 2010)	-
130	2006-132	Special process	2013	High	Vapour heat treatment for fruit flies on <i>Mangifera indica</i> Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Cannon, Ray (UK, TPPT July 2010)	-
131	2009-108	Special process	2014	High	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Mangifera indica</i> var. Manila Super Topic under technical area: Fruit fly treatments	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-
132	2006-014	Special process	Topic	High	Irradiation treatments	TPPT	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
133	2007-105	Special process	2013	High	Generic irradiation treatment for all insects (Arthropoda: Insecta) except lepidopteran pupae and adults (Insecta: Lepidoptera) in any host commodity. Topic under technical area: Irradiation treatments	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Cannon, Ray (UK, TPPT Dec 2006)	-
134	2009-006	Special process	Topic	Normal	Soil and growing media in association with plants: treatments	TPPT	SC Nov 2009; CPM (2010)	No specification	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-
135	2006-015	Special process	Topic	High	Wood packaging material treatments	TPPT (TPFQ)	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-
136	2007-114	Special process	2013	High	Microwave irradiation of wood packaging material Topic under technical area: Wood packaging material treatments	TPPT (TPFQ)	SC Nov 2010	07. Draft ISPM to MC (June 2011)	Ormsby, Mike (New Zealand, TPPT Dec 2006)	-
137	2007-101	Special process	2013	High	Sulfuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material Topic under technical area: Wood packaging material treatments	TPPT (TPFQ)	SC Nov 2010	04. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPPT	Ormsby, Mike (New Zealand, TPPT Dec 2006)	-

	Topic No.	Regular / Special	Projected adoption	Priority	Current title	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
138	2007-103	Special process	2013	High	HCN treatment of wood packaging material Topic under technical area: Wood packaging material treatments	TPPT (TPFQ)	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Jessup, Andrew (Australia/IAEA, TPPT Jan 2009)	-
139	2007-116	Special process	2014	High	Methyl Iodide fumigation for <i>Bursaphelenchus xylophilus</i> and Coleoptera: Cerambycidae of wood packaging material Topic under technical area: Wood packaging material treatments	TPPT (TPFQ)	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Ormsby, Michael (New Zealand, TPPT Dec 2006)	-
140	2007-102	Special process	2013	High	Methyl isothiocyanate and sulfuryl fluoride (Ecotwin mixture) fumigation for <i>Bursaphelenchus xylophilus</i> , Coleoptera: Cerambycidae, and Coleoptera: Scolytinae of wood packaging material Topic under technical area: Wood packaging material treatments	TPPT (TPFQ)	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Wood, Scott (USA, TPPT Dec 2006)	-

APPENDIX 8 - Standards approved for 2011 member consultation and approved specifications

The following standards were approved by the SC for member consultation 2011 and are attached to this appendix:

- Draft amendments to ISPM 5 - *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* (1994-001)
- ISPM 11:2004 draft Annex 4 - *Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pest* and proposed consequential changes to ISPM 11:2004 (2005-001)
- ISPM 5 draft revision of Supplement No. 1 - *Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of official control in relation to regulated pests and not widely distributed in relation to quarantine pests that are present in an area* (2005-2008)
- ISPM 27:2006 draft Annex X - *Trogoderma granarium* (please refer to SC May 2010 report) (2004-006)
- ISPM 15:2009 draft revision of Annex 1 - *Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material* (2006-011)
- ISPM 28:2007 draft Annex X: *Vapour heat treatment of Cucumis melo var. reticulatus for Bactrocera cucurbitae* (201-) (2006-110)
- ISPM 28:2007 draft Annex X: *Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heat* (201-) (2007-114)

The following specifications were approved the SC and are attached to this appendix:

- Specification 53 - *Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of outbreak detection* (2011)
- Specification 54 - *International movement of seed* (2011)
- Specification TP1 Rev3 - *Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols* (2011)

DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO ISPM 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS)

Date of this document	6 May 2011
Document category	Amendments to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>)
Current document stage	SC May 2011 approved draft for member consultation 2011
Origin	Work programme topic: Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) CEPM (1994)
Major stages	Specification TP5. Draft for member consultation, SC May 2011
Notes	12 February 2011: developed by the IPPC TPG at its October 2010 meeting. 27 February 2011: edited. Formatted for SC May 2011 on 1 March 2011. Copy edited after SC May 2011 on 6 May 2011.

Members are asked to consider the following proposals for additions, revisions and deletions in ISPM 5. Brief explanations are given for each proposal.

1. Additions

1.1 Confinement

Background. The term *confinement* was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on the TPG proposal to develop a definition for *confinement* in relation to ISPM 3:2005 (*Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms*) and ISPM 34:2010 (*Design and operation of post-entry quarantine stations for plants*). A draft definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011. The following points may be considered:

- *Confinement* is now the term used in ISPM 34:2010. When the draft of that ISPM had been sent for member consultation, some member comments had suggested using *containment*. However, it was recommended that there was a need for two terms as used in the IPPC context with their current meaning, i.e. *containment* in relation to areas and *confinement* in relation to a facility.
- As in the definition of *containment*, it is the process of *confinement* that is described, not the result.
- Measures are not *phytosanitary measures*. Confinement might have a wider use than for regulated pests. It might also be used as a preventive measure, with no specific pest being directly targeted.
- *Confinement* is used to retain a pest in a quarantine facility or a regulated area, while *containment* aims at keeping it out of an area.
- It is recommended to not mention *regulated pests* or *quarantine* as confinement might have a broader use.

Proposed addition

confinement	Application of official measures to a regulated article to prevent the escape of pests
--------------------	---

1.2 Exclusion

Background. In 2009, the Technical Panel for Fruit Flies (TPFF) developed a proposal for a definition for *exclusion* in the draft ISPM on phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly management. The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. The TPFF definition was reviewed and modified by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011. The following points may be considered:

- The definition should be broad as the term has a wider application than only fruit fly management. It is useful to have a definition of this term, in a similar way as there are definitions for *eradication* and *suppression*.
- It is recommended to use *phytosanitary* and not *official* measures. Although *official* might have been more appropriate for such measures applied against pests within a country, the definitions of *eradication* and *suppression* use *phytosanitary measures*, and it is not desirable to introduce inconsistency between the three definitions.
- The term *introduction* (i.e. *entry* and *establishment*) is used and not *entry*. A package of exclusion measures might include measures to prevent *establishment* in cases of transience or incursion.
- As the definition of *introduction* already refers to an area, it is recommended to not refer to an area in the definition.

Proposed addition

exclusion	Application of phytosanitary measures to prevent the introduction of a pest
------------------	--

2. REVISIONS

For revised terms and definitions, explanations of the changes made to the last approved definition are also given. It is suggested that any member comments should relate only to the changes proposed.

2.1 Absorbed dose

Background. The October 2010 TPG identified this revision when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. This change is not considered a consistency change as described in the report of CPM-4 (2009) so it is proposed as an amendment to the Glossary. The following points may be considered:

- *Absorbed dose* is a physical term with no specific IPPC meaning, which normally would not be part of ISPM 5. It is however recommended to retain it, as it is not easily understood and is of great importance in relation to ISPM 18:2003 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) and to treatments in ISPM 28:2007 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*).
- The modification corrects a technical error. Gray is the quantity of radiating energy absorbed per unit of mass, i.e. the unit applies to the entire definition and not to “radiating energy” as in the old definition (the unit of radiating energy is joule).
- It is recommended to retain the unit gray in the definition, although this is not normal practice in a definition. This is a special case as users might not be familiar with it.

Original definition

absorbed dose	Quantity of radiating energy (in gray) absorbed per unit of mass of a specified target [ISPM No. 18, 2003]
----------------------	--

Proposed revision

absorbed dose	Quantity of radiating energy absorbed per unit of mass of a specified target (in gray)
----------------------	--

2.2 Consignment in transit

Background. The revised definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2010, with the purpose of ensuring consistency with the proposed revision of *re-exported consignment* and with the rules for developing definitions. The following points may be considered:

- The proposal brings consistency with the revision of *re-exported consignment* (see 2.5) (the change from *which* to *that* is a simple editorial and is in line with the usual English style in ISPMs).
- The second part of the current definition (*and that may be subject to phytosanitary measures*) expresses requirements. This is not appropriate for a definition, and requirements are explained in ISPM 25:2006 (*Consignments in transit*).

Original definition

consignment in transit	A consignment which passes through a country without being imported, and that may be subject to phytosanitary measures [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1996; CEPM 1999; ICPM, 2002; ISPM No. 25, 2006; formerly country of transit]
-------------------------------	---

Proposed revision

consignment in transit	A consignment that passes through a country without being imported.
-------------------------------	--

2.3 Phytosanitary certificate

Background. The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011. The following points may be considered:

- The current terms *certificate* and *phytosanitary certificate* are interrelated in the Glossary, *certificate* being used in the definition of *phytosanitary certificate*.
- *Phytosanitary certificate* is the term of specific IPPC relevance and its definition currently lacks its specific IPPC meaning (currently expressed in the definition for *certificate*), i.e. that it attests that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements. It was therefore proposed to merge and further adjust *certificate* into *phytosanitary certificate* (deletion of *certificate* is proposed under 3.2).
- The proposed revision covers phytosanitary certificates in paper form and in electronic form and uses wording consistent with ISPM 12:2011 (*Phytosanitary certificates*). The original wording had to be adjusted as *document* (in the original definition of *certificate*) does not cover electronic phytosanitary certificates. The word *official* is used in both cases to indicate NPPO control.
- Rewording of the last part reflects that the consignment is subject to phytosanitary import requirements and uses wording in line with ISPM 12:2011.

Original definition

Phytosanitary Certificate	Certificate patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC [FAO, 1990]
----------------------------------	---

Proposed revision

phytosanitary certificate	An official paper document or its official electronic equivalent, patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC , attesting that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements
----------------------------------	--

2.4 Quarantine station

Background: Revision was proposed by the TPG (June 2009) and by the SC (November 2009). The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011. The following points may be considered:

- The current definition is too restrictive as quarantine stations might be used to hold in quarantine not only plants or plant products, but also other regulated articles including beneficial organisms. Mention of other regulated articles and of beneficial organisms was added.
- It is recommended to specifically mention beneficial organisms, as it is important in relation to ISPM 3:2005 (*Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms*). It should be noted that ISPM 3:2005 currently uses the words quarantine facilities to refer to the concept of quarantine stations. For consistency in the use of terms, once the revised definition is adopted, ISPM 3:2005 could be adjusted for consistency to use quarantine station.

Original definition

quarantine station	Official station for holding plants or plant products in quarantine [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; formerly quarantine station or facility]
---------------------------	---

Proposed revision

quarantine station	Official station for holding plants, plants products or other regulated articles , including beneficial organisms, in quarantine
---------------------------	--

3. DELETIONS

3.1 Certificate

Background. The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011.

The current definition of *certificate* limits it to the IPPC context, but *certificate* and *certification* on their own have other meanings that need to be used in ISPMs (e.g. *CITES certificate* in ISPM 12:2011; *treatment documents/certificates*, *certificate of origin* in ISPM 23:2005; *certification of facilities* in ISPM 18:2003). Deletion of the term and definition is therefore proposed so as to not limit the use of the term. The proposed revision of the definition of *phytosanitary certificate* (see 2.3) ensures that the term of specific IPPC relevance is defined.

Proposed for deletion

certificate	An official document which attests to the phytosanitary status of any consignment affected by phytosanitary regulations [FAO, 1990]
--------------------	--

3.2 Gray (Gy)

Background: The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011.

The term “*gray (Gy)*” appears in the (incorrect) Glossary definition of *absorbed dose* (see 2.X), in ISPM 18:2003 and in ISPM 28:2007 (all annexes). *Gray* as the unit of absorbed dose is defined in the International System of Units (i.e. an SI-unit) and therefore need not be defined in the Glossary.

Proposed for deletion

gray (Gy)	Unit of absorbed dose where 1 Gy is equivalent to the absorption of 1 joule per kilogram (1 Gy = 1 J.kg ⁻¹) [ISPM No. 18, 2003]
------------------	--

3.3 Hitch-hiker pest

Background: The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011.

The current definition (“See contaminating pest”) simply states that *hitch-hiker pest* should be understood as identical to *contaminating pest*. The term *hitch-hiker pest* does not appear in the IPPC or ISPMs. The term is not easily understood by non-native English speakers and difficult to translate in a meaningful way. It need not be defined in the Glossary.

Proposed for deletion

hitch-hiker pest	See contaminating pest
-------------------------	-------------------------------

3.4 Legislation

Background: The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011.

The term *legislation* appears in the Convention Article II.1 in the definition of *phytosanitary measures*, in the definition of *phytosanitary legislation*, and in ISPMs 3:2005, 5, 12:2011, 18:2003, 19:2003, 20:2004 and 25:2006. Whereas the Glossary terms *phytosanitary legislation*, *phytosanitary measures* and *phytosanitary regulation* are defined with a particular meaning pertaining to the IPPC domain, the term *legislation* is a broadly used and understood term without any specific usage in the ISPMs. It need not be defined in the Glossary.

Proposed for deletion:

legislation	Any act, law, regulation, guideline or other administrative order promulgated by a government [ISPM No. 3, 1996]
--------------------	--

3.5 Plant pest

Background: The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011.

The current definition (“See pest”) states that *plant pest* should be understood as identical to the term *pest*, which is defined in the Convention itself. The term *plant pest* appears in the Convention Articles I.4, VII.5 and VIII.1(a). It also appears in ISPMs 2:2007, 3:2005, 5, 6:1997, 11:2004, 15:2009 and 17:2002. In all cases, the term is correctly used as synonymous to *pest*. *Plant pest* could be substituted by *pest* during revisions of ISPMs for consistency or revision. The use of two synonymous terms should be avoided, and only the term defined in the IPPC used.

Proposed for deletion

plant pest	See pest
-------------------	-----------------

Note on other deletions

Deletions proposed in 3.6 to 3.11 below were identified when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. These deletions are not considered consistency changes as described in the report of CPM-4 (2009) so they are proposed as amendments to the Glossary.

3.6 Antagonist

Background: The October 2010 TPG identified these deletions when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. The following may be considered:

- This term and definition do not have a specific meaning in the IPPC context, and are not needed in the Glossary.

Proposed for deletion

antagonist	An organism (usually pathogen) which does no significant damage to the host but its colonization of the host protects the host from significant subsequent damage by a pest [ISPM No. 3, 1996]
-------------------	--

3.7 Competitor

Background. The October 2010 TPG identified this deletion when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. The following may be considered:

- This term and definition do not have a specific meaning in the IPPC context, and are not needed in the Glossary.
- In addition the term is used in ISPM 3:2005 and ISPM 11:2004 with a different meaning.

Proposed for deletion

competitor	An organism which competes with pests for essential elements (e.g. food, shelter) in the environment [ISPM No. 3, 1996]
-------------------	---

3.8 Control point

Background. The October 2010 TPG identified these deletions when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. The following may be considered:

- This term and definition do not have a specific meaning in the IPPC context, and are not needed in the Glossary.
- In addition control points are explained in ISPM 14:2002 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*).

Proposed for deletion:

control point	A step in a system where specific procedures can be applied to achieve a defined effect and can be measured, monitored, controlled and corrected [ISPM No. 14, 2002]
----------------------	--

3.9 Dosimeter and dosimetry

Background. The October 2010 TPG identified these deletions when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. The following may be considered:

- These terms and definitions do not have a specific meaning in the IPPC context, and are not needed in the Glossary.
- The terms are well-known words of physics and not used in any particular or different way in ISPM 18:2003 and ISPM 28:2007.

Proposed for deletion:

dosimeter	A device that, when irradiated, exhibits a quantifiable change in some property of the device which can be related to absorbed dose in a given material using appropriate analytical instrumentation and techniques [ISPM No. 18, 2003]
dosimetry	A system used for determining absorbed dose, consisting of dosimeters, measurement instruments and their associated reference standards, and procedures for the system's use [ISPM No. 18, 2003]

3.10 Ionizing radiation

Background. The October 2010 TPG identified this deletion when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. The following points may be considered:

- This is a definition from physics that has no specific meaning for the IPPC, and is not needed in the Glossary.

Proposed for deletion:

ionizing radiation	Charged particles and electromagnetic waves that as a result of physical interaction create ions by either primary or secondary processes [ISPM No. 18, 2003]
---------------------------	---

This document contains two parts:

Part 1: Proposed draft Annex 4 (*Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests*) to ISPM 11:2004

Part 2: Proposed consequential changes to ISPM 11:2004, *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms*

PART 1: PROPOSED DRAFT ANNEX 4 TO ISPM 11:2004 PEST RISK ANALYSIS FOR PLANTS AS QUARANTINE PESTS

Note: Part 1 of the current document results in a need to make consequential changes to ISPM 11:2004 which are proposed in Part 2. In Part 1, all references to annexes or appendixes refer to ISPM 11:2004, Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms (unless otherwise indicated).

Date of this document	2011-05-12
Document category	Draft Annex 4 to ISPM 11:2004
Current document stage	SC 2011-05 approved for member consultation
Origin	ICPM-7 (2005) added work programme topic 2005-001: Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests
Major stages	Specification No. 44 rev. 1, approved SC 2007-05; EWG 2009-05 drafted revision; revised SC 2009-05 and SC 2010-04; Steward revised ISPM based on comments. SC 2011-05 approved for MC
Notes	2011-01-31: Document formatted for editor. 2011-02-08: edited. 2011-03-02: Formatted for SC 2011-05. Draft revised by SC 2011-05. 2011-05-11: Formatted for editor and OCS; editorial check 2011-05-12.

This annex was adopted by the [Xth] Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in [Month Year].

The annex is a prescriptive part of the standard.

ANNEX 4: Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests

Introduction

This annex provides guidance for conducting pest risk analysis (PRA) to determine if a plant is a pest of cultivated plants or wild flora, whether it should be regulated, and to identify appropriate phytosanitary measures. It focuses primarily on plants proposed for import and does not cover the unintentional introduction of plants as contaminants in commodities or conveyances.

The number and diversity of plants being moved between and in countries is increasing as opportunities for trade increase and markets develop for new plants. The risk of introducing new pests with plants as a pathway has long been recognized and widely regulated. However, pest risk posed by the plant species themselves or pest risk for plants in natural and semi-natural habitats requires specific consideration.

Plants as pests

Plants as pests may affect other plants through competition for limited resources, such as space, light, nutrients and water, or through parasitism or allelopathy. Plants new to an area may also

become pests by hybridizing with cultivated plants or plants in the wild flora.

Thus, the protection of plants as pursued through the IPPC may include considering certain plant species as pests, and taking measures to prevent their introduction and spread. Determining which species should be deemed pests is context-specific and may vary with geography, habitat, land use, time and the perceived value of the natural resources in the endangered area. PRA should form the basis of such determination and subsequent decisions regarding possible regulation of the plant species. It should be noted that plants having undergone such analysis may also require analysis of their potential to be pathways for other pests.

The IPPC has recognized the importance of plants as pests by underscoring that the definition of “pest” includes weeds (ICPM, 2001), and by specifically including “plants that are invasive alien species” in a range of recommendations for action for those invasive alien species that are pests of plants (ICPM, 2005).

The IPPC is concerned with pests injurious to cultivated as well as wild plants (see Annex 1 of this standard), and therefore weeds and invasive alien plants that are injurious to other plants should be considered pests in the IPPC context. Henceforth in this annex, the terms “weed” and “invasive alien plants” are not used, but only the single term “plants as pests”⁵⁴.

The remainder of the text generally follows the sequence of ISPM 11:2004 with the corresponding sections of the standard indicated in parentheses. In each section, guidance is provided regarding analytical aspects particular to plants as pests.

Stage 1: Initiation

Pre-selection

ISPM 2:2007 describes, as part of the initiation stage, a pre-selection step intended for determining whether or not an organism is a pest, and provides some indicators that a plant may be a pest. Particular attention is needed for plants that have proven to be pests elsewhere or having intrinsic traits such as strong competition or propagule dispersal abilities. In most cases, consideration of these factors in Stage 1 of PRA may not be sufficient to terminate the process; however, in cases where the plant is clearly only suited to a specific type of habitat that does not exist in the PRA area, it may be concluded that the plant cannot become a pest in that area and the PRA process may stop at that point.

Stage 2: Pest risk assessment

Identity of the plant (refer to section 2.1.1)

The taxonomic level considered in PRA is usually the species. However, in the case of cultivated plants, higher or lower taxonomic levels may be used. The taxonomic level appropriate for conducting the PRA for a particular plant as pest should be determined by the NPPO.

Some particular considerations regarding plants as pests may include the following:

- The taxonomic identity of the plant may be unclear because it has been obscured by breeding or hybridization. This is particularly relevant for plants in the horticultural trade. The NPPO should acquire the best possible information about the identity and parentage of the plant from various sources (e.g. the prospective importer, plant breeders, scientific literature).
- The use of taxonomic levels below the species (i.e. subspecies, variety, cultivar) may be justified if there is evidence demonstrating that differences in traits are stable and significantly affect phytosanitary status. Examples may include differences in adaptability to environmental conditions, ability to exploit resources, ability to defend against herbivory or grazing/browsing, and methods of reproduction or propagule dispersal.
- The evaluation of a hybrid should be based on information specific to that taxon where available. In the absence of such information, PRA may be conducted on the parent species to determine their pest risk. If either parent is determined to be a pest and the associated risk is deemed unacceptable, this information may form the basis of regulatory decisions.

Presence or absence in PRA area (refer to section 2.1.1.2)

Determination of presence or absence in the PRA area is a particular challenge for NPPOs when plants are proposed for import because the plants may already be present in locations (e.g. botanical gardens, home gardens) that are not reported in the scientific literature. Additional sources of information to be consulted may include horticultural, agricultural, forestry and aquaculture publications.

Intended use

The PRA should be conducted considering the intended use of the plants as this may affect the probability of establishment, spread and economic consequences. However, it should also be recognized that plants, once entered, may escape or be diverted from the use for which they were originally intended.

Plants for planting are generally considered of the highest risk. Examples of uses, broadly in the order of decreasing risk, are:

- planting in the open landscape without further management (e.g. for soil erosion control, waste water treatment, aquatic plants in ponds)
- planting in the open landscape with management (e.g. in forestry, agriculture including for biofuel, horticulture)
- planting outdoors in urban areas (e.g. for amenity purposes in roadsides, parks and gardens)
- planting indoors only.

Other intended uses may be considered, including human consumption or animal feed, processing or combustion for energy production. For example, spillage of grain intended for processing may lead to unintended growth of plants as pests.

Habitats and intended locations

Plants imported for planting may be destined for a particular planting location (which may be termed as the “intended location”). However, the probability that the plants may spread to and establish in other unintended locations in the PRA area of the same or another habitat type should be assessed. The assessment should consider the suitability of all habitat types in the entire PRA area, and the extent of suitable habitats be determined in order to identify the endangered area.

The analysis of suitable habitats is analogous to the analysis of host plants (in the rare case of parasite plants, both host and habitat need to be considered). The guidance provided in section

2.2.2 (and its subsections) of this standard can generally be used, substituting the term “host” or “host range” for “suitable habitat”.

If the plant already occurs in parts of the PRA area, the locations and types of habitats where it occurs should be described, noting whether the locations are intended or unintended.

Probability of entry (refer to section 2.2.1)

For imported plants, the probability of entry need not be assessed. However, to assess the likelihood of unintended establishment and spread and to identify possible risk management options, an estimation of the volume, frequency and destinations of prospective imports may be needed.

Historical evidence of pest behaviour

The most reliable predictor of establishment, spread and potential economic consequence is the history of pest behaviour in other areas with similar habitats. Where a history of pest behaviour is documented the assessment should use this information, noting whether the habitat and climate conditions are sufficiently similar in the PRA area. However, a plant may never have been moved out of its native range where it may be controlled by naturally occurring pests. In such cases, no historical evidence exists of establishment, spread or consequences.

Probability of establishment (refer to section 2.2.2)

In all cases, the assessment of the probability of establishment, should, as for other pests, consider the suitability of the climate, other abiotic and biotic factors (see section 2.2.2.2) and cultural practices (see section 2.2.2.3) in habitats within the PRA area based on habitats in which the plant currently occurs. Subject to information availability, the following may be incorporated:

- *climate*: suitability of current and future projected climates
- *other abiotic factors*: soil characteristics, topography, hydrology, fire regime etc.
- *biotic factors*: current vegetation, degree of disturbance, presence or absence of natural enemies and competitors
- *cultural practices in crops/managed plant communities*: herbicide usage, harvesting, soil cultivation, fire etc., including side-effects such as aerial deposition of nitrogen or pesticides.

The assessment should also consider intrinsic traits of the plant that may predict establishment and spread (refer to section 2.2.2.4). This is particularly important where history of pest behaviour is not well documented. Traits to be considered may include:

- *reproductive traits*: sexual and asexual mechanisms, dioecism, self-compatibility, reproduction frequency, generation time
- *adaptive potential (of individuals and populations)*: genotypic or phenotypic plasticity, hybridization potential
- *propagule attributes*: volume and viability, dormancy
- *tolerance/resistance*: response to herbicides, grazing and other actual cultural practices, drought, salinity.

Many plants as pests are opportunists with a strong potential to become established in disturbed habitats. Plants with a robust dormancy combined with a prolific reproductive ability are particularly suited for such opportunistic strategy. Disturbed habitats are common; therefore plants with such adaptations will encounter relatively more opportunities for establishment and spread.

Probability of spread (refer to section 2.2.3)

The likelihood and extent of spread from intended to unintended locations depends on natural and human-mediated factors. These factors include:

- intrinsic traits of the plant species (in particular regarding reproduction, adaptation and propagule dispersal)
- existence of natural vectors (birds and other animals, water)
- existence and spatial pattern of suitable habitats and dispersal corridors connecting them.

Human-mediated factors may be intentional or unintentional. The probability of intentional spread by human agency depends mainly on:

- intended use of the plants
- desirability and economic value of the plants
- ease of transport of the plants
- public awareness about the risk associated with plants as pests.

The probability of unintentional spread by human agency depends mainly on:

- probability that propagules will adhere to clothing, vehicles, machinery, tools, equipment
- probability that propagules will be a contaminant of other products or material.

There are often long time lags between an initial plant introduction and its later spread. As a consequence, even in the cases where establishment may be well documented, the potential for later spread may be less known. Possible reasons for the time lag include:

- changes in climate (such as warmer climate or changes in precipitation patterns)
- changes in other abiotic factors (e.g. an increase in aerial deposition of nitrogen or sulphur)
- changes in the genetic profile of the plant species (through natural selection, genetic drift etc.)
- emergence of novel uses for the plant
- relatively rare dispersal events that move propagules from suboptimal to optimal habitats
- changes in land use or disturbance pattern.

Assessment of potential economic consequences (refer section 2.3)

Plants as pests, like other pests, can have a variety of direct and indirect economic consequences, including environmental consequences. These may include yield losses or reduction of biodiversity and effects on other ecosystem components. Plants as pests may have broad agricultural, environmental and social consequences that may be non-specific and not readily apparent (e.g. changes of nutrient concentration in the soil). For this reason, evaluation of consequences of plants as pests may be inherently difficult because it requires consideration of consequences that are not easily quantified. It is important to consider the long-term consequences for all locations in the PRA area, including where the plants were intentionally planted.

As for establishment and spread, the most reliable predictor of potential consequences is evidence of consequences elsewhere, particularly in areas with similar habitats. However, in some cases, plants have never been moved out of their native ranges and therefore not had an opportunity to express any potential consequences. In the absence of evidence of consequences elsewhere, consideration may be given to whether or not the plant possesses intrinsic traits that predict pest potential, such as those discussed above and in section 2.2.2.4 related to

establishment and spread.

As for any type of organism, if the risk assessment determines the plant species represents an unacceptable risk, the PRA may continue with the analysis of risk management (Stage 3).

Stage 3: Pest risk management (refer to section 3.4)

Plants for planting will usually be introduced into environments suitable for their growth and establishment. In such cases, most risk management options would be counterproductive to the intended use. In general, for plants for planting that have the characteristics of quarantine pests, the most effective risk management option may be prohibition (refer to section 3.4.6). However, those plants as a commodity may at the same time have a perceived benefit that may be considered in the decision process following the PRA.

For specific situations, other pest risk management options may be pursued, including:

- requirements for growing of plants under confinement
- requirements for harvesting of plants at a certain stage or specified time to prevent opportunities for reproduction
- restriction of plants to particular localities, such as those that are marginally suitable
- restrictions on the disposal of excess or waste plant material
- other restrictions on sale, holding, transport or planting

codes of conduct for sale, holding, transport or planting, e.g. in the form of internal rules within the plant industry to refrain from or restrict the selling of particular plants.

For plants imported for consumption or processing, risk management options may include restrictions on transport, storage, locations, sale, seasonality and requirements regarding the processing or treatments.

In identifying risk management options, the suitability of control measures, ease of access to the plants, time needed for effective control and difficulty of containment should be considered. For example, plants in highly managed systems such as cropping systems are more easily controlled than plants in natural or semi-natural habitats, or in private gardens. Many of the factors considered under “establishment” and “spread” also influence a plant’s response to control measures and thus the feasibility of control.

Irrespective of risk management options, where the import of a plant is allowed, it may be appropriate to develop post-import systems such as surveillance in the PRA area, contingency plans and systems to report new occurrences.

Aspects common to all PRA stages

Risk communication (refer to ISPM 2:2007)

Plants intentionally introduced for planting may not be perceived as a threat by the public, or by particular stakeholders, who may perceive plants as purely beneficial. Furthermore, in some countries differing legislation or authorities may be involved in regulating various plants as pests. Therefore, risk communication may be particularly important in relation to plants as pests.

Risk communication may include for example:

- consultation with importers and other governmental and non-governmental organizations (e.g. environmental protection agencies, parks departments, nurseries, landscapers) to exchange information on plants as potential pests
- publication of lists of plants as regulated pests
- labelling of plants in commerce, e.g. explaining the pest risk the plants may pose and under which conditions the pest risk may occur.

PART 2: PROPOSED CONSEQUENTIAL CHANGES TO ISPM 11:2004

In Part 2, all references refer to ISPM 11:2004 (unless otherwise indicated) and references to Annex 4 refer to Part 1 (proposed Annex 4).

Date of this document	2011-05-12
Document category	Revision of ISPM 11:2004 (consequential changes)
Current document stage	Draft revised by SC 2011-05
Origin	
Major stages	SC 2011-05 SC revised text (consequential changes due to the proposed Annex 4) and approved for member consultation 2011.
Notes	Formatted for OCS 2011-05-11; editorial check 2011-05-12

ISPM 11: Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms

1. *In* ENDORSEMENT, add at the bottom as new paragraph:

Annex 4 on pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests, together with associated changes in the core text of the standard, was adopted by the [Xth] Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in [Month, Year].

2. *In* SCOPE, add at the bottom as new paragraph:

More detailed guidance on PRA for plants as pests is provided in Annex 4.

3. *IN* REFERENCES, add **following references**:

ISPM 2. 2007. Framework for pest risk analysis. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

ICPM. 2001. Report of the Third Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome, 2-6 April 2001. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

ICPM. 2005. Report of the Seventh Interim commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Rome 4-7 April 2005. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

4. *In* Section 1.4 Conclusion of initiation, *add at the bottom as new paragraph*:

More detailed guidance on PRA for plants as pests is provided in Annex 4.

5. *In* Section 1.1 Initiation points, paragraph 2, sentence 5, *modify as follows*:

In addition, many organisms indirectly affecting plants also satisfy this definition (such as ~~weeds/invasive~~ weeds/invasive plants as pests, e.g. weeds, invasive alien plants).

6. *In* Section 2 Stage 2: Pest Risk Assessment, *add at the bottom as new paragraph*:

More detailed guidance on pre-selection of plants as pests is provided in Annex 4.

7. *In* Section 2.1.1.1 Identity of pest, after paragraph 2, *add as new paragraph*:

More detailed guidance on the consideration of identity of plants as pests is provided in

Annex 4.**8. In Section 2.1.1.2 Presence or absence in PRA area, after paragraph 1, add as new paragraph:**

More detailed guidance on the consideration of presence or absence of plants as pests is provided in Annex 4.

9. In Section 2.2 Assessment of the probability of introduction and spread, paragraphs 4–7, modify as follows:

SI With respect to a plant being assessed as a pest with indirect effects, wherever a reference is made to a host or a host range, this should be understood to refer instead to a suitable habitat⁵⁵ ~~(that is a place where the plant can grow)~~ in the PRA area.

~~*SI* The intended habitat is the place where the plants are intended to grow and the unintended habitat is the place where the plants are not intended to grow.~~

SI In the case of plants ~~as pests to be imported~~, the concepts of entry, establishment and spread may have to be considered differently.

~~*SI* For pPlants for planting that are proposed for imported will enter and then, the probability of entry need not be assessed. Following import, the plants may be planted and maintained in an intended habitat location, probably in substantial numbers and for an indeterminate period. Accordingly, Section 2.2.1 on Entry does not apply. The risk arises because of the probability possibility that the plant may spread from the intended habitat location to unintended habitats locations within the PRA area, and then establish in those habitats there. Accordingly, section 2.2.3 may be considered before section 2.2.2. Unintended habitats may occur in the vicinity of the intended habitat in the PRA area.~~

SI Imported plants not intended to be planted may be used for different purposes (e.g. used as bird seed, as fodder, or for processing). The pest risk of plants as pests proposed for import for intended uses other than planting arises because of the probability that the plants may escape or be diverted from the intended use to an unintended location habitat and establish there.

More detailed guidance on the consideration of habitats and unintended locations for plants as pests is provided in Annex 4.

10. In Section 2.2.1 Probability of entry of a pest, paragraph 3, modify as follows:

~~*SI* The probability of entry need not be assessed for plants that are proposed for import. In the case of plants to be imported, the plants will enter and an assessment of probability of entry will not be required. Therefore this section does not apply. However, the probability of entry needs to be assessed for this section does apply to pests that may be carried by such plants (e.g. contaminating weed-seeds carried with seeds imported for planting).~~

More detailed guidance on the probability of entry for plants as pests is provided in Annex 4.

11. In Section 2.2.2 Probability of establishment, paragraph 3, modify as follows:

SI In the case of plants ~~to be imported as pests~~, the assessment of the probability of establishment concerns the establishment in unintended locations ~~unintended habitats~~.

⁵⁵ In the case of organisms that affect plants indirectly, through effects on other organisms, the terms host/habitat will extend also to those other organisms.

More detailed guidance on the probability of establishment, including considerations on the intended use, of plants as pests is provided in Annex 4.

12. In Section 2.2.3 Probability of spread after establishment, paragraph 2, modify as follows:

S1 In the case of plants ~~to be imported as pests~~, the assessment of spread concerns spread from the intended ~~location habitat~~ or the intended use to ~~an unintended locations habitat~~, where the ~~plant pest~~ may establish. Further spread may then occur to other unintended ~~habitats locations~~.

More detailed guidance on probability of spread after establishment, including considerations on the intended use, of plants as pests is provided in Annex 4.

13. In Section 2.3 Assessment of potential economic consequences, after paragraph 2 add as new paragraph:

More detailed guidance on potential economic impact of plants as pests is provided in Annex 4.

14. In Section 2.3.1 Pest effects, paragraph 2, modify as follows:

S1 The basic method for estimating the potential economic importance of pests in this section also applies to:

- pests affecting uncultivated/unmanaged plants
- ~~weeds and/or invasive plants as pests and~~
- pests affecting plants through effects on other organisms.

In Section 2.3.1 Pest effects, paragraph 4, modify as follows:

S1 In the case of plants ~~for planting to be imported for planting~~ that may be pests, the long-term consequences ~~even~~ for the intended ~~location habitat~~ may be included in the assessment. Planting may affect further use or have a harmful effect on ~~the intended that habitat location~~.

15. In Section 2.3.1 Pest effects, paragraph 5, sentence 3, modify as follows:

For example, a ~~minor weed~~ plant that is a ~~minor pest~~ may be significantly allergenic for humans or a minor plant pathogen may produce toxins that seriously affect livestock.

16. In Section 3. Stage 3: Pest Risk Management, add at the bottom as new paragraph:

More detailed guidance on pest risk management for plants as pests is provided in Annex 4.

17. In Section 3.4 Identification and selection of appropriate risk management options, paragraph 2, indent 2, modify as follows:

- ~~weeds and/or invasive plants as pests and~~

18. In Section 3.4.1 Options for consignments, paragraph 3, modify as follows:

S1 The concept of consignments of pests may be applied to the import of plants ~~considered to be as~~ pests. ~~These consignments~~ Import may be restricted to species or varieties posing less risk.

19. In Section 3.4.5 Options within the importing country, paragraph 2, modify as follows:

S1 For plants ~~to be imported as pests~~, where there is a high level of uncertainty regarding pest risk, it may be decided not to take phytosanitary measures at import, but only to apply surveillance or other procedures after entry (e.g. by or under the supervision of the NPPO).

20. In Section 3.6 Conclusion of pest risk management, add at the bottom as new paragraph:

More detailed guidance on risk communication for plants as pests is provided in Annex 4.

21. In Annex 1 Comments on the scope of the IPPC in regard to environmental risks, paragraph 1, sentence 2, modify as follows:

The coverage of the IPPC definition of plant pests includes ~~weeds~~ plants as pests, and other species that have indirect effects on plants, and the Convention applies to the protection of wild flora.

22. In Annex 1 Comments on the scope of the IPPC in regard to environmental risks, paragraph 1, indent 2 (“indirectly affect plants”) commentary, modify as follows:

In addition to pests that directly affect host plants, there are those like most ~~weeds/invasive plants~~ as pests, which affect plants primarily by other processes such as competition (e.g. for cultivated plants: Canada thistle (*Cirsium arvense*) [~~weed of agricultural crops~~], or for uncultivated/unmanaged plants: Purple loosestrife (*Lythrum salicaria*)). [~~competitor in natural and semi-natural habitats~~].

¹ Invasive alien plants, in the CBD sense, are plants introduced by human agency and threatening biodiversity (see ISPM 5, Appendix 1 (2009)). Weed usually refers to pests of cultivated plants. However, some countries use the term “weed” irrespective of whether cultivated plants or wild flora are at risk, whereas other countries use the term “noxious weed”, “landscape weed”, “environmental weed” or similar terms to distinguish from weeds affecting crops only.

**DRAFT REVISION TO ISPM 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS) -
SUPPLEMENT NO. 1:
GUIDELINES ON THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF THE
CONCEPTS OF OFFICIAL CONTROL ~~FOR~~ IN RELATION TO REGULATED
PESTS AND NOT WIDELY DISTRIBUTED IN RELATION TO QUARANTINE
PESTS THAT ARE PRESENT IN AN AREA**

Date of this document	2011-05-10
Document category	Draft revision of Supplement 1 to ISPM 5
Current document stage	Edited and formatted in template of 2010-02. Revised in 2010-03 to incorporate consistency ink amendments noted by CPM-5. Draft for SC 2011-05. SC 2011-05 revised text
Origin	Work programme topic: Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM No. 5: <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>), ICPM-7 (2005)
Major stages	Specification No. 33, approved SC 2006-05. Reviewed by SC-7 2008-05. Approved for member consultation SC 2011-05.
Notes to this document	<p>For the purpose of visibility of the new text on not widely distributed, and in order to not reopen the discussion on the official control text (as requested by the SC), the text is marked as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – original text on official control incorporating the consistency ink amendments noted by CPM-5 in 2010 (as additions or deletions to the original text on official control) Grey <u>black underlined</u> – new text on not widely distributed in black and strikethrough. – original text on official control deleted for the purpose of integrating both texts <p>Note that renumbering of sections does not show as changes.</p> <p>Deletions do not intend to change the content of the official control supplement, but some deletion was necessary: for example, essential changes to integrate both texts, updates to current glossary or IPPC terminology (e.g. “phytosanitary import requirements”, “contracting party”), consistency with the structure of recent ISPMs (e.g. sections on adoption, background), updates to ISPM references, editorials.</p> <p>2011-01-31: Formatting for Editor; 2011-02-12 and 2011-03-10: editorial checks; 10 March 2011: Formatting for SC 2011-05. 2011-05-10: editorial checks.</p>

Adoption

This supplement was first adopted by the Third Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (2001) as a supplement to ISPM 5:2001, *Supplement No. 1: Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests*. The first revision was adopted by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in 20-- as the present Supplement No. 1 to ISPM 5.

INTRODUCTION

Scope

This guidelines supplement refers only to provides guidance on the official control of regulated pests and, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest, determination of

when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed. For the purposes of this guideline supplement, the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.

References

ISPM 1. 2006. *Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

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

ISPM 6. 1997. *Guidelines for surveillance*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

ISPM 8. 1998. *Determination of pest status in an area*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

ISPM 11. 2004. *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

Report of the ICPM open-ended working group on official control, 22–24 March 2000, Bordeaux, France, IPPC Secretariat, FAO, Rome, IPPC, FAO.

Definition

Official control is defined as:

The active enforcement of mandatory phytosanitary regulations and the application of mandatory phytosanitary procedures with the objective of eradication or containment of quarantine pests or for the management of regulated non-quarantine pests.

Purpose-BACKGROUND

The words “present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled” express ~~an~~ essential concepts in the definition of ~~a~~-quarantine pest. According to that definition, a quarantine pest must always be of potential economic importance to an endangered area. In addition, it must either meet the criterion of not being present in that area or it must meet the combined criteria of being not widely distributed and subject to official control.

The *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* defines official as “established, authorized or performed by an NPPO” and control as “suppression, containment or eradication of a pest population”. However, for phytosanitary purposes, the concept of *official control* is not adequately expressed by the combination of these two definitions.

The purpose of this guideline is to describe more precisely the interpretation of:

the concept of official control and its application in practice for quarantine pests that are present in an area as well as for regulated non-quarantine pests, and

“present but not widely distributed” in relation to official control for quarantine pests.

A national plant protection organization (NPPO) may choose whether or not to officially control a pest that is of potential economic importance and that is present but is not widely distributed, taking into account other relevant factors from pest risk analysis (PRA), for example the costs and benefits of regulating the specific pest.

REQUIREMENTS

1. General Requirements

Official control is subject to ISPM 1:2006, in particular the principles of non-discrimination, transparency, equivalence of phytosanitary measures and pest risk analysis.

“Not widely distributed” is a concept referring to a pest’s geographic occurrence within an area. Any pest may be categorized as widely distributed in an area, or not widely distributed, or

absent. Transient occurrences of pests in an area are not expected to lead to establishment and therefore are not relevant.

In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s). When a pest is considered not widely distributed this means that the pest is limited to parts of the endangered area, i.e. it has reached only a limited part of its potential distribution within the endangered area or has been eradicated from parts of that area. Thus, when a pest is not widely distributed in an area, there are unaffected parts of the area at risk from further introduction or spread. An endangered area need not be continuous but may consist of several distinct parts of any size. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and quantification of the parts of the endangered area at risk should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.

The area for which the NPPO is investigating whether or not the pest is widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact is being analysed and which is considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution and placing the endangered area under official control, is typically made by an NPPO with respect to an entire country. However, in some instances it may be more appropriate to decide if a pest is a quarantine pest with respect to parts of a country rather than the whole country. In that case, it is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in deciding phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest distribution and establishment.

Official control includes:

eradication and/or containment in the infested area(s)

surveillance in the endangered area(s)

restrictions related to the movement into and within the protected area(s) including phytosanitary measures applied at import.

All official control programmes have elements that are mandatory. At minimum, programme evaluation and pest surveillance are required in official control programmes to determine the need for and effect of control to justify phytosanitary measures applied at import for the same purpose. Phytosanitary measures applied at import should be consistent with the principle of non-discrimination (see section 2.1 below).

For quarantine pests, eradication and containment may have an element of suppression. For regulated non-quarantine pests, suppression may be used to avoid unacceptable economic impact as it applies to the intended use of plants for planting.

2. Specific Requirements

2.1 Non-discrimination

The principle of non-discrimination between domestic requirements and phytosanitary import requirements is fundamental. In particular, requirements for imports should not be more stringent than the effect of official control in an importing country. There should therefore be consistency between domestic requirements and phytosanitary import requirements for a defined pest:

Import requirements should not be more stringent than domestic requirements.

Domestic and import requirements should be the same or have an equivalent effect.

Mandatory elements of domestic and import requirements should be the same.

The intensity of inspection of imported consignments should be the same as equivalent processes in domestic control programmes.

In the case of non-compliance, the same or equivalent phytosanitary action should be taken on imported consignments as are taken domestically.

If a tolerance level is applied within a national programme, the same tolerance level should be applied to equivalent imported material. In particular, if no action is taken in the national official control programme because the pest incidence does not exceed the tolerance level concerned, then no action should be taken for an imported consignment if the pest incidence does not exceed that same tolerance level. Compliance with import tolerance levels is generally determined by inspection or testing at entry, whereas compliance with the tolerance level for domestic consignments should be determined at the last point where official control is applied.

~~if~~ downgrading or reclassifying is permitted within an ~~national~~ official control programme, similar options should be available for imported consignments.

2.2 Transparency

Domestic requirements for official control and the phytosanitary import requirements should be documented and made available, on request.

2.3 Technical justification

Domestic requirements and phytosanitary import requirements should be technically justified and result in non-discriminatory phytosanitary measures.

2.4 Pest risk analysis

Application of the definition of a quarantine pest requires knowledge of potential economic importance, potential distribution and official control (ISPM 2:2007). The categorization of a pest as present and widely distributed or present but not widely distributed is determined in relation to its potential distribution. This potential distribution represents the areas where the pest could become established if given the opportunity, i.e. its hosts are present and environmental factors such as climate and soil are favourable. ISPM 11:2004 provides guidance on the factors to be considered in assessing the probability of establishment and spread. In the case of a pest that is present but not widely distributed, the assessment of potential economic importance should relate to the areas where the pest is not established.

2.5 Enforcement

The domestic enforcement of official control programmes should be equivalent to the enforcement of phytosanitary import requirements. Enforcement should include:

- a legal basis
- operational implementation
- evaluation and review
- phytosanitary action in the case of non-compliance.

2.6 Mandatory nature of official control

Official control is mandatory in the sense that all persons involved are legally bound to perform the actions required. The scope of official control programmes for quarantine pests is completely mandatory (e.g. procedures for eradication campaigns), whereas the scope for regulated non-quarantine pests is mandatory only in certain circumstances (e.g. official certification programmes).

2.7 Area of application

An official control programme can be applied at national, subnational or local area level. The area of application of official control measures should be specified. Any phytosanitary import requirements should have the same effect as the domestic requirements for official control.

Surveillance should be used to determine the distribution of a pest in an area and whether it is not widely distributed.

ISPM 6:1997 describes the components of survey and monitoring systems, and includes provisions on transparency. Biological factors such as pest life cycle, means of dispersal and rate of reproduction may influence the design of surveillance programmes, the interpretation of survey data and the level of confidence in the categorization of a pest as not widely distributed. The distribution of a pest in an area is not a static condition. Changing conditions or new information may necessitate a review of whether a pest is not widely distributed.

“Not widely distributed” is not a description of pest status listed in ISPM 8:1998. Rather it encompasses a number of pest situations described therein. Depending on its distribution relative to the endangered area, the status of a pest that is not widely distributed may be described using one or more of the examples provided in ISPM 8:1998.

2.8 NPPO authority and involvement in official control

Official control should:

- be established or recognized by the contracting party or the NPPO under appropriate legislative authority
- be performed, managed, supervised or, at minimum, audited/reviewed by the NPPO
- have enforcement assured by the contracting party or the NPPO
- be modified, terminated or lose official recognition by the contracting party or the NPPO.

Responsibility and accountability for official control programmes rests with the contracting party. Agencies other than the NPPO may be responsible for aspects of official control programmes, and certain aspects of official control programmes may be the responsibility of subnational authorities or the private sector. The NPPO should be fully aware of all aspects of official control programmes in its country.

ISPM 15:2009 DRAFT REVISION OF ANNEX 1: APPROVED TREATMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH WOOD PACKAGING MATERIAL

Date of this document	2011-05-10
Document category	Revision of Annex 1 to ISPM 15:2009
Current document stage	SC 2011-05 revised and approved for MC
Origin	Work programme topic, added by CPM-1 (2006): Revision of ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) (2006-011-02). Related work programme submissions: <i>Sulfuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material</i> (2007-101) added by SC 2010-11; <i>Microwave irradiation of wood packaging material</i> (2007-114) added by SC 2010-11
Major stages	<p>2003-03 ICPM-4 adopted ISPM 15:2002 and requested that methyl bromide was to be reviewed</p> <p>SC 2004-11 approved Specification 31</p> <p>2005-02 TPFQ requested Annex 1 to ISPM 15 to be modified based on recommendation by IFQRG</p> <p>2005-04 SC approved revised Annex 1 to ISPM 15 for MC under fast track process</p> <p>2005-11 SC-7 recommended Annex 1 to ISPM 15 to go to the SC without modifications (no formal objections received)</p> <p>2005-11 SC recommended Annex 1 to ISPM 15 to go to CPM.</p> <p>CPM-1 (2006) adopted modifications to Annex 1 to ISPM 15 with modifications but requested that CPM members submit technical data to further revise and added revision of ISPM 15:2002 to the work programme</p> <p>2006-06 TPFQ revised ISPM 15</p> <p>2007-07 TPFQ revised ISPM 15</p> <p>2008-05 SC-7 (acting as SC) approved ISPM 15 for MC</p> <p>2008-11 SC recommended ISPM 15 to go to CPM</p> <p>CPM-4 (2009) adopted ISPM 15:2009 but retained the following subtopics on the work programme 1) criteria for treatments, which needed further research and 2) further guidance on fumigation in Annex 1</p> <p>2009-06 TPFQ revised Annex 1 to ISPM 15</p> <p>2010-09 TPFQ revised Annex 1 to ISPM 15 considering dielectric heat and sulfuryl fluoride treatments</p> <p>2011-05 SC approved revision of Annex 1 to ISPM 15 to go for MC</p>
Notes	<p>Formatted in template of 2011-02; edited 2011-02-27. Formatted for SC 2011-05 on 2011-03-01; copy edited after SC 2011-05 on 2011-05-07. Sent to translation 2011-05-17.</p> <p>Grey text is original paragraphs which have not been changed. Commenting is not open for paragraphs. Changes proposed for member consultation are marked with underline (additions) or strikethrough (deletions).</p>

This annex was adopted by the ~~Interim~~ Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in [Month Year].

The annex is a prescriptive part of ~~the standard~~ ISPM 15:2009.

ANNEX 1: Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material

Use of debarked wood

Irrespective of the type of treatment applied, wood packaging material must be made of debarked wood. For this standard, any number of visually separate and clearly distinct small pieces of bark may remain if they are:

- less than 3 cm in width (regardless of the length) or
- greater than 3 cm in width, with the total surface area of an individual piece of bark less than 50 square cm.

For methyl bromide treatment, the removal of bark must be carried out before treatment ~~as because~~ the presence of bark on the wood ~~may~~ affects the efficacy of the methyl bromide treatment efficacy. For heat treatments, the removal of bark ~~can~~ may be carried out before or after treatment.

Heat treatments

Various energy sources or processes may be suitable to achieve the required treatment parameters. For example, kiln-drying, heat-enabled chemical pressure impregnation, dielectric radiation (microwave, radio frequency etc.) or other treatments may all be considered heat treatments provided they meet the heat treatment parameters specified in this standard.

NPPOs shall ensure that the treatment temperatures are monitored at a location likely to be the coldest to ensure that the target temperature is maintained for the duration of treatment. The coldest part of the wood may differ depending on the energy sources or processes applied. When using microwaves as a heating source, the coldest part of the wood is the surface.

Heat treatment using a conventional steam or dry kiln heat chamber (treatment code for the mark: HT)

When using conventional heat chamber technology, the basic requirement is to achieve Wood packaging material must be heated in accordance with a specific time temperature schedule that achieves a minimum temperature of 56 °C for a minimum duration of 30 continuous minutes throughout the entire profile of the wood (including at its core). Various energy sources or processes may be suitable to achieve these parameters. For example, kiln drying, heat-enabled chemical pressure impregnation, microwave or other treatments may all be considered heat treatments provided that they meet the treatment parameters specified in this standard.

This temperature can be measured by placing temperature sensors in the core of the wood. Alternatively, treatment schedules may be developed based on a series of test treatments during which the core temperature of the wood at various locations in the heat chamber has been measured and correlated with chamber air temperature to prove that a minimum temperature of

56 °C for a minimum duration of 30 continuous minutes throughout the entire profile of the wood is achieved. Treatment schedules should be specified or approved by the NPPO.

When approving and auditing a heat treatment provider, the NPPO shall ensure that the following factors are appropriately addressed by those involved in treatment:

- (1) Heat chambers are sealed and well insulated, including insulation in the floor.
- (2) Heat chambers are designed in a manner that permits uniform flow of air around and through the wood stack. Wood to be treated is loaded in a manner that maximizes air flow around and through the wood stack.
- (3) Air deflectors in the chamber area and spacers between wooden units are used as required to maximize air flow.
- (4) Fans are used to circulate air during treatment.
- (5) The coldest location within the chamber is identified and temperature sensors placed at this location.
- (6) Where the treatment is determined based upon temperature sensors inserted into the wood, at least two temperature sensors are used. These temperature sensors should be suitable for measuring wood core temperatures. The use of multiple temperature sensors ensures that any failure of a temperature sensor is detected during the treatment process. The temperature sensors are inserted at least 30 cm from the end of a board and penetrate to the centre of wood, or in the centre of pallet blocks, to ensure that the temperature at the core is measured. The piece of wood with the largest dimensions should be used for this. Any holes drilled in the wood to place the temperature sensor are sealed to prevent interference in temperature measurement by entry of air at ambient temperature.
- (7) If the air flow in the chamber is routinely reversed during treatment, an increased number of temperature sensors are used to account for a change in the location of the coldest area.
- (8) Where treatment schedules are based on monitoring chamber air temperature and used for treatment of different wood types (e.g. specific species and sizes), these schedules should take into account the species and thickness of wood being treated. A minimum of two temperature sensors are used in chambers treating wood packaging according to treatment schedules.
- (9) Temperature sensors, including the measurement and recording equipment, are calibrated at a frequency specified by the NPPO.
- (10) Temperatures should be monitored and recorded during each treatment to ensure that the prescribed minimum temperature is maintained for the required period of time. If temperatures are not maintained, the treatment should be restarted or the treatment time extended and the temperatures raised to ensure that all wood has been treated to meet the requirements.
- (11) For purposes of auditing, records of heat treatments and calibration should be retained by treatment providers for a period of time specified by the NPPO.

Heat treatment using a dielectric heat chamber (treatment code for the mark: DH)

Dielectric heating is based on the alternating electrical field of the electromagnetic wave emitted by the dielectric radiation source (e.g. microwave or radio frequency). Chemical compounds with asymmetric charge distribution, so-called dipole characters (e.g. water), tend to orientate along this electrical field and oscillate with the electrical field (e.g. 2.45 MHz causes 2.45 million oscillations per second). The friction generated through this process converts electric energy into heat energy.

Where the application of heat treatment is undertaken using dielectric radiation (e.g. microwaves), wood packaging material composed of wood not exceeding 20 cm in cross-section when measured across the smallest dimension of the piece must be heated to achieve a minimum of 60 °C for 1 minute throughout the profile of the wood. Heating to the prescribed temperature must occur within 30 minutes from ambient temperature.

Treatment schedules shall be specified or approved by the NPPO.

When approving and auditing a heat treatment provider, the NPPO shall ensure that the following factors are appropriately addressed by those involved in the treatment:

- (1) Irrespective of whether dielectric heat treatment is conducted as a batch process or as a continuous (conveyor) process, if the operator is measuring the surface temperature to estimate compliance with the prescribed standard, the operator should have initially validated through testing that the internal wood temperatures meet or exceed 60 °C for 1 minute through the entire profile of the wood (including its surface). For measuring the surface temperature at least two temperature sensors should be used.
- (2) For wood exceeding 5 cm in thickness, dielectric heating at 2.45 GHz requires bidirectional application or multiple waveguides for the delivery of microwave energy to ensure uniformity of heating. For wood less than 5 cm in thickness, uniformity of heating for the chamber should be tested and equipment modified as needed to ensure uniform heating.
- (3) Temperature sensors including the measurement and recording equipment are calibrated at a frequency specified by the NPPO.
- (4) For purposes of auditing the treatment provider, records of heat treatments and calibration should be retained by treatment providers for a period of time specified by the NPPO.

Methyl bromide treatment (treatment code for the mark: MB)

Use of methyl bromide should be undertaken taking into account the IPPC/CPM Recommendation on the replacement or reduction of the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure (CPM, 2008). NPPOs are encouraged to promote the use of alternative treatments approved in this standard¹.

The wood packaging material must be fumigated with methyl bromide in accordance with a schedule that achieves the minimum concentration-time product² (CT) over 24 hours at the temperature and final residual concentration specified in Table 1. Slight increases in the treatment time (e.g. 1–2 hours) may be permitted to achieve the required CT if the minimum final concentration is not met. This CT must be achieved throughout the wood, including at its core, although the concentrations would be measured in the ambient atmosphere. The minimum temperature of the wood and its surrounding atmosphere must be not less than 10 °C and the minimum exposure time must be not less than 24 hours. Monitoring of gas concentrations must be carried out at a minimum at 2, 4 and 24 hours. In the case of longer exposure times and weaker concentrations, additional measurement of the gas concentrations should be recorded at the end of fumigation.

Table 1: Minimum CT over 24 hours for wood packaging material fumigated with methyl bromide

Temperature (°C)	CT (g·h/m ³) 24 h	Minimum final concentration (g/m ³) after 24 h [#]
------------------	----------------------------------	--

21 °C or above	650	2□
16 °C or above	800	□8
10 °C or above	900	32

In circumstances when the final concentration is not achieved after 24 hours, a deviation in the concentration of ~5% is allowed provided additional treatment time is added to the end of the treatment to achieve the prescribed CT.

One example of a schedule that may be used for achieving the specified requirements is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Example of a treatment schedule that achieves the minimum required CT for wood packaging material treated with methyl bromide (initial doses may need to be higher in conditions of high sorption or leakage)

Temperature (°C)	Dosage (g/m ³)	Minimum concentration (g/m ³) at:		
		2 h	4 h	24 h
21 °C or above	48	36	31	24
16 °C or above	56	42	36	28
10 °C or above	64	48	42	32

NPPOs shall ensure that the following factors are appropriately addressed by those involved in the application of methyl bromide treatment under this standard:

- (1) Fans are used as appropriate during the gas distribution phase of fumigation to ensure that equilibrium is reached and should be positioned to ensure that the fumigant is rapidly and effectively distributed throughout the fumigation enclosure (preferably within one hour of application).
- (2) Fumigation enclosures are not loaded beyond 80% of their volume.
- (3) Fumigation enclosures are well sealed and as gas tight as possible. If fumigation is to be carried out under sheets, these must be made of gas-proof material and sealed appropriately at seams and at floor level.
- (4) The fumigation site floor is either impermeable to the fumigant or gas-proof sheets must be laid on the floor.
- (5) Consideration should be given to the use of a vaporizer to apply methyl bromide (“hot gassing”)~~Methyl bromide is often applied through a vaporizer (“hot gassing”)~~ in order to fully volatilize the fumigant prior to its entry into the fumigation enclosure.
- (6) Methyl bromide treatment is not carried out on wood packaging material exceeding 20 cm in cross-section when measured across the smallest dimension of the piece. Therefore, Wood stacks may need separators to ensure adequate methyl bromide circulation and penetration. Wood packaging containing a piece of wood exceeding 20 cm in cross-section when measured across the smallest dimension of the piece should not be treated with methyl bromide.
- (7) The concentration of methyl bromide is always measured at a location furthest from the insertion point of the gas as well as other locations, to confirm when gas equilibrium is reached.
- (8) When calculating methyl bromide dosage, compensation is made for any gas mixtures (e.g. 2% chloropicrin) to ensure that the total amount of methyl bromide applied meets required dosage rates.

- (9) Initial dose rates and post-treatment product handling procedures take account of likely methyl bromide sorption by the treated wood packaging material or associated product (e.g. polystyrene boxes).
- (10) The measured temperature of the product or the ambient air (whichever is the lower) is used to calculate the methyl bromide dose, and must be at least 10 °C (including at the wood core) throughout the duration of the treatment.
- (11) Wood packaging material to be fumigated is not wrapped or coated in materials impervious to the fumigant.
- (12) The equipment used to measure gas concentrations and temperature (where used) is calibrated at a frequency specified by the NPPO.
- (13) Records of methyl bromide treatments and calibration are retained by treatment providers, for a period of time determined ~~and as required~~ by the NPPO, for auditing purposes.

NPPOs should recommend that measures be taken to reduce or eliminate emissions of methyl bromide to the atmosphere where technically and economically feasible (as described in the IPPC ~~CPM~~ Recommendation on the Replacement or reduction of the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure (CPM, 2008)).

Adoption of alternative treatments and revisions of approved treatment schedules

As new technical information becomes available, existing treatments may be reviewed and modified, and alternative treatments and/or new treatment schedule(s) for wood packaging material may be adopted by the CPM ~~Commission on Phytosanitary Measures~~. If a new treatment or a revised treatment schedule is adopted for wood packaging material and incorporated into this ISPM, material treated under the previous treatment and/or schedule does not need to be re-treated or re-marked.

¹ In addition, contracting parties to the IPPC may also have obligations under the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (UNEP, 2000).

² The CT product utilized for methyl bromide treatment in this standard is the sum of the product of the concentration (g/m^3) and time (h) over the duration of the treatment.

This phytosanitary treatment was adopted by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in --- 201-.

The annex is a prescriptive part of ISPM 28:2007.

ISPM 28:2007 ANNEX X: VAPOUR HEAT TREATMENT OF *CUCUMIS MELO* VAR. *RETICULATUS* FOR *BACTROCERA CUCURBITAE* (201)

Publication history

Date of this document	2011-05-16
Document category	Draft new Annex XX to ISPM 28:2007
Current document stage	2011-06 Member consultation
Origin	CPM-2 (2007) added topic 2006-TPPT-110 Fruit fly treatments
Major stages	Treatment submitted to TPPT in 2006 Text updated July 2010 Approved by SC E-decision 2011-05 to go for MC
Notes	2011-04 formatted in template. 2011-05-16 formatted for MC.

Scope of the treatment

This treatment applies to the vapour heat treatment of *Cucumis melo* var. *reticulatus* (netted melon) fruit to result in the mortality of eggs and larvae of *Bactrocera cucurbitae* (melon fly) at the stated efficacy level¹.

Treatment description

Name of treatment Vapour heat treatment of *Cucumis melo* var. *reticulatus* fruit for *Bactrocera cucurbitae*

Active ingredient N/A

Treatment type Vapour heat

Target pest *Bactrocera cucurbitae* (Coquillett) (Diptera: Tephritidae)

Target regulated articles Fruit of *Cucumis melo* var. *reticulatus* (Netted melon)

Treatment schedule

This schedule requires a pre-heating time of between 3 to 5 hours using saturated water vapour (of greater than 90% RH) at 46 °C to allow the core of the melons to reach the target temperature of 45 °C.

Once the core temperature of the fruit reaches 45 °C, expose the melons at 46 °C using saturated

water vapour (of greater than 90% RH) for 30 minutes.

This treatment should be followed by cooling at ambient air temperatures.

Efficacy and confidence level of the treatment is ED_{99,9922} at the 95% confidence level.

The commodity temperature and relative humidity should be monitored during treatment and should not fall below the stated level.

Other relevant information

Following treatment, fruit was not artificially cooled.

In evaluating this treatment, the TPPT considered issues associated with treatments based on temperature, taking into account the work of Hallman and Mangan (1997).

This schedule was based on the work of Iwata *et al.*, 1990.

This schedule was developed using cultivar “Earl’s Favourite”.

References

- Hallman, G.J. & Mangan, R.L.** 1997. Concerns with temperature quarantine treatment research. *In* Proceedings of the 1997 Annual International Research Conference on Methyl Bromide Alternatives and Emissions Reduction, San Diego, California, USA. Available at <http://www.mbao.org/mbrpro97.html> (accessed September 2010).
- Iwata, M., Sunagawa, K., Kume, K. & Ishikawa, A.** 1990. Efficacy of vapour heat treatment on netted melon infested with melon fly, *Dacus cucurbitae*, Coquillett (*Diptera: Tephritidae*). Research Bulletin of the Plant Protection Service, Japan, 26:45–49.

¹ The scope of phytosanitary treatments does not include issues related to pesticide registration or other domestic requirements for approval of treatments. Treatments also do not provide information on specific effects on human health or food safety, which should be addressed using domestic procedures prior to approval of a treatment. In addition, potential effects of treatments on product quality are considered for some host commodities before their international adoption. However, evaluation of any effects of a treatment on the quality of commodities may require additional consideration. There is no obligation for a contracting party to approve, register or adopt the treatments for use in its territory.

This phytosanitary treatment was adopted by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in --- 201-.

The annex is a prescriptive part of ISPM 28:2007.

ISPM 28:2007 ANNEX X: HEAT TREATMENT OF WOOD PACKAGING MATERIAL USING DIELECTRIC HEAT (20--)

Publication history

Date of this document	2011-05-16
Document category	Draft new Annex XX to ISPM 28:2007
Current document stage	Approved to go for MC 2011-06
Origin	CPM-1 (2006) added topic 2006-011 Revision of ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) SC 2010-11 added topic 2007-114 Microwave irradiation of wood packaging material
Major stages	2006-12 treatment submitted to TPPT meeting 2007-07 revised text considered by TPFQ 2007-12 further revised text submitted to TPPT 2009-07 amended text considered by TPFQ, July 2009 2009-10 additional information submitted to TPPT, October 2009 2010-07 text updated July 2010 2011-03-29 text submitted to SC e-discussion forum and revised based on SC comments Text submitted to SC e-discussion poll SC 2011-05 approved to go for MC
Notes	2011-05 formatted and revised according to changes made to draft annex 1 to ISPM 15:2009

Scope of the treatment

This treatment applies to the heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heat to reduce the risk of introduction and spread of Asian longhorned beetle (*Anoplophora glabripennis*) (ALB), pinewood nematode (*Bursaphelenchus xylophilus*) (PWN)¹ and those pests required to meet the criteria for treatment as prescribed in ISPM 15.

Treatment description

Name of treatment Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heat

Active ingredient N/A

Treatment type Heat

Target pest Asian longhorned beetle (*Anoplophora glabripennis*) (ALB) and pinewood nematode (*Bursaphelenchus xylophilus*) (PWN).

Target regulated articles Debarked wood not exceeding 20 cm in cross-section**Treatment schedule**

Where the application of heat treatment is undertaken using dielectric radiation (e.g. microwaves), wood packaging material composed of wood not exceeding 20 cm in cross-section when measured across the smallest dimension of the piece must be heated to achieve a minimum of 60 °C for 1 minute throughout the profile of the wood. Heating to the prescribed temperature must occur within 30 minutes from ambient temperature.

Efficacy and confidence level of the treatment to kill the larvae and pupae of *Anoplophora glabripennis* and all life stages of *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* are greater than ED_{99,99683} at the 95% confidence level.

When approving and auditing a heat treatment provider, the National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) shall ensure that the following factors are appropriately addressed by those involved in treatment:

- The treatment needs to be monitored where the temperature is likely to be the coldest to ensure the target temperature is maintained.
- Irrespective of whether the dielectric heat treatment is conducted as a batch process or as a continuous (conveyor) process, if the operator is measuring the surface temperature to estimate compliance with the prescribed standard, the operator should have initially validated through testing that the internal wood temperatures meet or exceed 60 °C for 1 minute through the profile of the wood. For measuring the surface temperature at least two temperature sensors should be used.
- For wood exceeding 5 cm in thickness, dielectric heating at 2.45 GHz may require bidirectional application or multiple waveguides for the delivery of microwave energy to ensure uniformity of heating. For wood less than 5 cm in thickness, uniformity of heating for the chamber should be tested and equipment modified as needed to ensure uniform heating.
- Temperature sensors including the measurement and recording equipment are calibrated at a frequency specified by the NPPO.

Other relevant information

The coldest part of the wood will differ depending on the energy sources or processes applied. When using microwaves as a heating source, the coldest part of the wood is the surface.

The TPPT based its evaluation of this treatment for ALB and PWN on the research work reported respectively by Fleming *et al.*, 2003, and Hoover *et al.*, 2010.

The general effectiveness of this treatment against other pests was supported by Fleming *et al.*, 2004; Henin *et al.*, 2008; Soma *et al.*, 2002, 2003; Tomminen, J., Halik, S. and Bergdahl, D.R., 1991 and Tomminen, J. and Nuorteva, M., 1992.

References

- Dubois, T., Hajek, A.E. & Smith, S.** 2002. Methods for rearing the Asian longhorned beetle (Coleoptera: Cerambycidae) on artificial diet. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, 95: 223–230.
- Fleming, M., Hoover, K., Janowiak, J., Fang, Y., Wang, X., Liu, W., Wang, Y., Hang, X., Agrawal, D., Mastro, V. & Roy, R.** 2003. Microwave irradiation of solid wood packing material (pallet and crate lumber): An effective technique to destroy the Asian longhorned beetle (*Anoplophora glabripennis*) hitchhiking to the United States. *Forest Products Journal*, 52: 1–7.
- Fleming, M.R., Janowiak, J.J., Kearns, J., Shield, J.E., Roy, R., Agrawal, D.K., Bauer, L.S., Miller, D.L. & Hoover, K.** 2004. Parameters for scale-up of microwave treatment to eradicate cerambycid larvae infesting solid wood packing materials. *Forest Products Journal*, 54 (7/8): 80–84.
- Henin, J.-M., Charron, S., Luypaert, P.J., Jourez, B. & Hebert, J.** 2008. Strategy to control the effectiveness of microwave treatment of wood in the framework of the implementation of ISPM 15. *Forest Products Journal*, 58: 75–81.
- Hoover, K., Uzunovic, A., Gething, B., Dale, A., Leung, K., Ostiguy, N. & Janowiak, J.J.** 2010. Lethal temperature for pinewood nematode, *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus*, in infested wood using microwave energy. In press.
- Soma, Y., H. Naito, H., Misumi, T., Tsuchiya, Y., Mizobuchi, M., Matsuoka, I., Kawakami, F., Hirata, K. & Komatsu, H.** 2002. Effects of some fumigants on pine wood nematode, *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* infecting wooden packages. 2. Mortality of pine wood nematode by methyl bromide tent fumigation. *Research Bulletin of the Plant Protection Service Japan*, 38: 13–19.
- Soma, Y., Goto, M., Naito, H., Ogawa, N., Kawakami, F., Hirata, K., Komatsu, H. & Matsumoto, Y.** 2003. Effects of some fumigants on mortality of pine wood nematode, *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* infecting wooden packages. 3. Mortality and fumigation standards for pine wood nematode by methyl bromide. *Research Bulletin of the Plant Protection Service Japan*, 39: 7–14.
- Stamps, W.T. & Linit, M.J.** 1995. A rapid and simple method for staining lipid in fixed nematodes. *Journal of Nematology*, 27: 244–247.
- Tomminen, J., Halik, S. & Bergdahl, D.R.** 1991. Incubation temperature and time effects on life stages of *Bursaphelenchus-xylophilus* in wood chips. *Journal of Nematology*, 23: 477–484.
- Tomminen, J. & Nuorteva, M.** 1992. Pinewood nematode, *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* in commercial sawn wood and its control by kiln-heating. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* 7: 113–120.

¹ The scope of phytosanitary treatments does not include issues related to pesticide registration or other domestic requirements for approval of treatments. Treatments also do not provide information on specific effects on human health or food safety, which should be addressed using domestic procedures prior to approval of a treatment. In addition, potential effects of treatments on product quality are considered for some host commodities before their international adoption. However, evaluation of any effects of a treatment on the quality of commodities may require additional consideration. There is no obligation for a contracting party to approve, register or adopt the treatments for use in its territory.



Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of outbreak detection

(2011)

Title

Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of outbreak detection in pest free areas for fruit flies.

Reason for the standard

In the event of an outbreak detection of a target species of fruit fly in a fruit fly-pest free areas (FF-PFA), fruit and vegetables exports from these areas will lose their status and may be directly affected. National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) of importing countries may request different measures to be implemented. Because of the lack of a standard on this topic, the criteria to establish and maintain quarantine areas within a pest free area and ensuing phytosanitary measures for pest risk mitigation are usually diverse. Annex 1 of ISPM 26:2006, *Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*, provides guidance on surveillance and control of fruit fly outbreaks as part of corrective actions to be implemented in FF-PFAs, but does not provide guidance on how to establish and maintain fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak, or the phytosanitary measures that should be taken by importing and exporting countries with respect to plant products being exported, processed or transported both in and through such areas.

When fruit flies are detected in FF-PFAs, to establish and maintain quarantine areas within a pest free area, NPPOs usually apply phytosanitary measures to the critical stages of fruit and vegetables production for export. These measures should be harmonized.

Therefore, a standard on this topic would provide useful guidance to NPPOs of exporting countries on establishing and maintaining fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak and to NPPOs of importing countries on how to respond in a harmonized manner to outbreaks in FF-PFAs in exporting countries, thus minimizing negative impacts on trade.

Scope and purpose

This draft is proposed as an annex to ISPM 26:2006. It will provide guidance on the establishment and maintenance of quarantine areas within a pest free area when fruit fly outbreaks are detected. It provides guidance on phytosanitary measures that are intended to protect other production areas within a pest free area and, as far as possible, allow for the continuation of fruit and vegetables production,

movement and handling, treatment, and shipping when some or all of the components of the fruit and vegetables export process are located in quarantine areas within a pest free area.

Tasks

The expert drafting group should develop a document that will:

- (1) determine criteria to establish and maintain quarantine areas **within a pest free area** and their boundaries in the event of an outbreak
- (2) develop a standardized procedure that can be followed when establishing and maintaining a quarantine area within an FF-PFA
- (3) identify and describe phytosanitary procedures, such as surveillance and pest control, that could be used for production units in orchards located in the quarantine areas **within a pest free area** and in areas of natural vegetation where host plants are growing
- (4) identify and describe phytosanitary measures required for fruit and vegetables movement and handling from and through such quarantine areas **within a pest free area**
- (5) identify and describe phytosanitary measures required for fruit and vegetables processing in packing facilities located within/outside the quarantine areas **within a pest free area**
- (6) identify and describe phytosanitary measures required for fruit and vegetables shipping in ports located within/outside quarantine areas **within a pest free area**
- (7) consider the title and the use of the terms “regulated area” versus “infested area”, “quarantine area” and “affected area” (the latter has already been used within ISPM 26:2006)
- (8) identify and describe any specific reporting requirements for stakeholders affected by outbreaks and a process of notification between NPPOs
- (9) ensure that there are no inconsistencies with guidance provided in ISPM 26:2006 and give guidance on any possible solutions (e.g. the interaction between corrective actions and establishment of quarantine areas within pest free areas)
- (10) consider whether the new annex 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 supplement.

Provision of resources

Funding for the meeting will be provided by the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat. 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. The Secretariat will use the IPPC criteria for prioritizing participants to received travel assistance to attend meetings.

Collaborator

To be determined.

Steward

Please refer to the IPPC standard setting work programme.

Expertise

Expertise of members of the Technical Panel on Fruit Flies (TPFF) should be supplemented with expertise in tropical and temperate species of fruit flies, establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies, implementation of quarantine areas **within a pest free area** and experience in phytosanitary regulations related to fruit flies.

Participants

Details of TPFM membership can be found on the IPP:

https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=tpff&no_cache=1&L=0. Panel members are selected by the SC for a 5-year term. The SC reviews the composition of the panel on a regular basis. The SC may renew individual memberships for additional terms.

References

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

Cdfa (California Department of Food and Agriculture). 2001. *Exotic fruit fly regulatory response manual*. Sacramento (CA), Cdfa, USDA (available at http://www.cdfa.ca.gov/phpps/pe/EFRRM/fruit_fly_manual.html, last accessed 11 May 2011).

ISPM 26. 2006. *Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies* (Tephritidae). Rome, IPPC, FAO.

SAG (Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero). 2007. *Procedimiento para la implementacion de medidas fitosanitarias de cuarentena ante la detección de un brote de Mosca del Mediterráneo*, *Ceratitis capitata* (Wiedemann).

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.

SC 2009-11 introduced *Establishment and maintenance of regulated areas upon outbreak detection in fruit fly free areas* (2009-007) as a topic

CPM-5 (2010) confirmed topic

SC 2010-11 approved draft specification for member consultation

2011-02-13 Member consultation period closed

Steward revised specification in response to 47 member comments

SC 2011-05 revised and approved specification

Specification 53. *Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of outbreak detection.*



SPECIFICATION 54

International movement of seed

(2011)

Title

International movement of seed.

Reason for the standard

Many seeds (including pelleted and coated seeds) are moved internationally primarily for food and ornamental plant production but also for a number of other purposes (for example, production of biofuels, fibre, pharmacological as well as for pre-commercial (research, seed increase) purposes). Effective phytosanitary measures applied to the movement of seed are likely to decrease the number of potential regulated pests moving to new areas. They may also aid in improving food security by helping to ensure that imported seeds are free of pests of concern that could decrease seed fecundity and/or yield.

There is currently no international guidance focused specifically on phytosanitary measures for the international movement of seed in adopted IPPC standards resulting in a lack of harmonized approaches to managing phytosanitary risks associated with seeds. Several international organizations and industry associations (for example, the International Seed Federation (ISF) and the International Seed Testing Association (ISTA)) have developed widely recognized tests, guidelines and standards applicable to the international movement of seed. While many of these tests, guidelines and standards are solely focused on ensuring the quality of seeds (for purity, germination capacity, etc.) it is important that national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) do not confuse measures applied to ensure seed quality with phytosanitary measures applied to manage pest risk. In addition, there are also some commercial practices that have the potential to cause phytosanitary issues for NPPOs (for example, mixing of seeds from a number of production sites to increase germination percentages may result in the inability of NPPOs to clearly identify the true origin of a consignment). Additional international guidance on phytosanitary measures related to the international movement of seed is required so as to provide harmonized guidance on managing pest risks associated with the movement of seed.

The potential for widespread movement of pests associated with seeds moved internationally is well understood. Since numerous important pests are seed-borne or seed-transmissible, the movement of infested seed may pose a risk for the international spread of pests. Many NPPOs have already established specific phytosanitary import requirements for treatment, origin-based restrictions, and associated phytosanitary certification of seed to manage the risk of pests associated with the international movement of seed. As more NPPOs move to establish such requirements, an international standard will provide useful guidance and will help promote international harmonization of phytosanitary import requirements for seed.

Scope and purpose

This standard would apply to seed⁵⁶ moved internationally (including forest tree seeds). The proposed standard is intended to provide additional guidance to assist NPPOs to identify, assess and manage the pest risk associated with the international movement of seed. The standard may also facilitate the international movement of seed through increased harmonization of phytosanitary import requirements. The standard should identify and describe specific phytosanitary measures that could be used to reduce pest risk associated with the international movement of seed, including phytosanitary measures that may be applied during growth, at seed harvest, seed extraction, during post-harvest seed processing, and on arrival, inspection and testing. The standard would not apply to grain⁵⁷. This standard will help minimize the risk of the global spread of pests of plants including those which can be considered invasive alien species and other organisms whose pest risk has not yet been identified.

Tasks

The expert drafting group should undertake the following tasks:

- (1) Identify and analyse existing international guidance, such as agreements, standards or industry guidelines dealing with the international movement of seed and consider the extent to which these are relevant to the development and application of phytosanitary measures under the IPPC (for example, UN organizations: Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO); intergovernmental organizations: Bioversity International (formerly IPGRI), Centre for Agricultural Bioscience International (CABI), International Seed Testing Association (ISTA), Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (seed schemes); and non-governmental organizations: International Seed Federation (ISF)).
- (2) Identify information and provide guidance required for determining the potential of pests to be associated with seeds moving in international trade and their potential as a pathway for the introduction and spread of such pests that may be used in a PRA conducted in accordance with ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 11:2004 and ISPM 21:2004 including, for example, risks related to specific pest groups associated with seed-borne or seed-transmissible pests, plants as pests, development of tolerances for regulated non-quarantine pests, risks associated with pelleted or coated seeds.
- (3) Consider the relationship between the potential for pests to establish and the intended use of the seeds, including whether different measures should be applied to seeds intended for field sowing without restrictions versus those seeds intended for research and development.
- (4) Identify and provide guidance in relation to any phytosanitary measures and verification methods developed in accordance with IPPC guidance (for example, ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 11:2004 and ISPM 21:2004) that are currently utilized by countries with the intent of decreasing the movement of pests associated with seeds moved internationally. Elements to consider when assessing the pest risk and developing phytosanitary measures may include:
 - . pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence or other measures during growth
 - . seed treatments
 - . harvest and production methods to minimize contamination or to prevent build-up of pests during processing (e.g. methods of seed extraction, post-harvest seed cleaning or other method of purification)
 - . post-harvest storage methods
 - . laboratory testing methods, including rapid ones, and diagnostics to detect and identify contaminants, various seed-borne or seed-transmissible pests
 - . methods of packaging for preventing pest spread and to ensure phytosanitary security

⁵⁶ Seeds are defined as “A commodity class for seeds for planting or intended for planting and not for consumption or processing” (ISPM 5).

⁵⁷ Grain is defined as “A commodity class for seeds intended for processing or consumption but not for planting (see seeds)” (ISPM 5).

- . inspection and testing of pelletized, coated or treated seeds
 - . requirements for the mixing of seeds from different origins
 - . seed production process and field inspections
 - . prohibiting import (for some high-risk seeds)
 - . post-entry quarantine (including limitation on quantity of seed)
 - . designation of planting areas (for example, isolation).
- (5) Identify the phytosanitary import requirements most commonly used by NPPOs in relation to imported seed consignments. Consider providing guidance on their technical basis including identifying the need for any specific guidance in relation to the technical justification of the phytosanitary import requirement.
- (6) Make recommendations, as appropriate, for basic information that may be included on phytosanitary certificates to allow for the international movement of seed such as origin description of the consignment (lot number, year of harvest) taking into account existing guidance in adopted ISPMs. Identify and, if appropriate, describe harmonized additional declarations of phytosanitary certificates developed for phytosanitary measures identified under task 4.
- (7) Discuss and recommend, if appropriate, the need for specific technical annexes and appendixes containing information related to this ISPM. The annexes and appendixes may, for example, contain reference to the major seed-transmitted commodity pest lists, ISTA/ISF-agreed testing methods and test methods for specific pest/host combinations, seed cleaning and treatment methodology. Consider whether to identify and describe major pest groups or types according to their pest risks.
- (8) 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.

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 IPPC standard setting work programme.

Expertise

An expert working group (EWG) of 5–10 phytosanitary experts with expertise in one or more of the following areas: the development and/or implementation of phytosanitary measures to manage pest risk associated with the international movement of seeds, pest risk analysis (PRA), seed testing and storage, knowledge of existing international guidance relating to the international movement of seed. In addition to those experts, ISTA should be invited to nominate an expert to be considered by the Standards Committee as a member of this EWG.

ISF should be requested to nominate a participant who will be invited to attend the relevant parts of the EWG meeting(s) as an invited expert.

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, guidance from the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine on forest tree seeds 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

SC 2009-11 introduced *International movement of seed* as a topic

CPM-5 (2010) approved topic (2009-03)

SC 2010-12 (e-decision) approved draft specification for member consultation

2011-02-13 Member consultation closed; Steward revised draft specification in response to 76 member comments

SC 2011-05 revised and approved specification

Specification 54. *International movement of seed.*



SPECIFICATION TP 1 REV. 3

Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols

(2011)

Title

Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols.

Reason for the technical panel

Proper pest detection and pest identification are crucial for the appropriate application of phytosanitary measures. In particular, contracting parties need proper diagnostic procedures for determination of pest status and pest reporting (ISPM 8:1998, *Determination of pest status in an area*; ISPM 17:2002, *Pest reporting*), and the diagnosis of pests in imported consignments (ISPM 13:2001, *Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*). ICPM-6 (2004) recognized that there was a need for international diagnostic protocols within the framework of the IPPC and approved the formation of a technical panel on diagnostic protocols.

Scope and purpose

The Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) develops diagnostic protocols (DPs) within the framework of ISPM 27:2006 and develops guidance on related issues.

Tasks

The TPDP should undertake the following:

- (1) Identify the need for DPs to be developed based on the guidance paper on “*Criteria for the prioritisation of diagnostic protocols*” (TPDP, July 2010), including considering suggestions for new DPs (i.e. put forward by national plant protection organizations (NPPOs), regional plant protection organizations, expert working groups (EWGs) or other technical panels), and submit subjects for new protocols to the Standards Committee (SC).
- (2) Identify specialists for the development or revision of a DP (authors, editorial team, experts to be consulted) and if applicable provide advice to the SC accordingly.
- (3) Produce or supervise the production or revision of DPs.
- (4) Submit draft DPs to the SC.
- (5) Review adopted DPs regularly, identify the need for revising DPs and submit revisions to the SC.

- (6) Consider aspects of quality assurance related to the development of DPs and their application. Where necessary establish general guidance on the criteria for methods to be included in DPs (e.g. validation).
- (7) Provide specific advice to the SC and other technical panels or EWGs on issues related to the correct nomenclature of pests.
- (8) Under the direction of the SC, consider other topics related to diagnosis of regulated pests.

Provision of resources

Funding for meetings is provided from the regular programme of the IPPC Secretariat (FAO) or from extra budgetary resources.

Expertise

Members of this panel should primarily have diagnostic expertise (where appropriate taxonomic) with at least one member representing each discipline: entomology, acarology, nematology, mycology, bacteriology, virology (including viroids and phytoplasma) and botany. Between them, participants should have practical expertise in the use of morphological and molecular/biochemical diagnostic techniques, in quality assurance and in phytosanitary procedures.

Participants

Details of TPDP membership may be found on the IPP:

https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=tpdp&no_cache=1&L=0. Panel members are selected by the SC for a 5-year term. The SC reviews the composition of the panel on a regular basis. The SC may renew individual memberships for additional terms.

References

Regional standards; NPPO DPs; diagnostic manuals; European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) DPs; International Seed Testing Association; other relevant information.

Publication history

This is not an official part of the specification

ICPM-6 (2004) added *Diagnostic protocols for specific pests* (2004-002) as a work programme topic for a technical panel

SC 2004-04 approved specification

Specification TP 1. *Technical Panel to develop diagnostic protocols for specific pests.*

SC 2004-11 approved revised specification (rev. 1)

Specification TP 1 rev. 1. *Technical Panel to develop diagnostic protocols for specific pests.*

SC May 2007 approved revised specification (rev. 2)

Specification TP 1 rev. 2. *Technical Panel to develop diagnostic protocols for specific pests.*

SC 2011-05 revised and approved specification (rev. 3)

Specification TP 1 rev. 3. *Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols.*