Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

International Plant Protection Convention

REPORT

31th Standards Committee meeting

Rome, Italy
14-18 May 2018

IPPC Secretariat

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the Meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

[1] The IPPC Secretary, Mr Jingyuan XIA, opened the meeting and welcomed all participants to the Standards Committee (SC) meeting. He introduced the new Standard Setting Unit (SSU) Lead, Mr Avetik NERSISYAN and informed the SC that Mr Brent LARSON now leads the Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU). He mentioned that these changes would strengthen the collaboration between the SC and the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC). He thanked both Unit leads for their excellent cooperation and smooth transition.

[2] He indicated that 2018 will be an important year. The IPPC annual theme for 2018 is Plant Health and Environmental Protection and this will be an important year for planning of the International Year of Plant Health 2020, when the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 will be adopted.

[3] The Secretary stressed three issues for standard setting:

- Prioritization. There are now more than 100 adopted standards. It is important to review and revise them, as necessary, and develop new standards of the highest quality.
- Cooperation. This is important at many levels: between the SC and IC, within the Secretariat (SSU and IFU), and coordination with the Bureau.
- Communication. It is important to publicize the standards and demonstrate their value. He suggested that one SC member took on this role.

[4] He also thanked the SC members that were finishing their terms for their contributions: Mr Youssef Al MASRI (Lebanon), Mr Gamil RAMADHAN (Yemen), Ms Ana Lilia MONTEALEGRE LARA (Mexico) and Ms Thanh Huong HA (Vietnam).

[5] The SSU Lead introduced himself and outlined his expertise. He thanked Mr LARSON for his contribution to the work of the SC over the last 15 years. He looked forward to the next stage in the evolution of the SC and to developing the cooperation between the SSU and IFU and between the SC and IC.

[6] He informed the SC of the selection of the following SC members during CPM-13, whose terms will start after the May 2018 SC-7 meeting: Mr Xiaodong FENG (China), Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ (Costa Rica), Mr Ouroba Alzitani ABOALBORGHOL (Syria) and Mr Abdelmoneim Ismail ADRA ABDETAM (Sudan).

[7] He acknowledged the absence of Mr HERMAWAN (Indonesia), Mr David OPATOWSKI (Israel), Mr Youssef Al MASRI (Lebanon), and Mr Bruce HANCOCKS (Australia) and noted that six observers attended the meeting (see Participants list).

[8] The SC Chairperson and SC members also thanked Mr LARSON for his work with the SC over the years.

2. Meeting Arrangements

2.1 Election of the Rapporteur

[9] The SC elected Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) as Rapporteur.

2.2 Adoption of the Agenda

[10] The SC adopted the Agenda (Appendix 1).

3. Administrative Matters

[11] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter "Secretariat") introduced the Documents list (Appendix 2) and the Participants list (Appendix 3) and invited participants to notify the Secretariat of any information that required updating or was missing.

[12] The Secretariat provided a document on **local information**[1].

[13] The Secretariat introduced the SSU staff[2] and thanked the FAO/International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) joint division, France, New Zealand, UK and USA for their in-kind contributions.

4. Updates

4.1 Items arising from governance bodies

Items arising from CPM-13 (2018)

[14] The Secretariat introduced a paper summarizing items arising from the CPM-13 (2018)[3] of relevance to the SC, including the standards that had been adopted and noted by the CPM. The SC was informed that a draft CPM Recommendation on "Next Generation Sequencing technologies as a diagnostic tool for phytosanitary purposes" will be circulated for a three-month country consultation period starting 15 May 2018.

[15] **Update on Call for topics: standards and implementation (joint call)[4].** The CPM discussed the proposals and had agreed that the Task Force on Topics (TFT) should review the submissions of topics and provide relevant recommendations to the SC and the IC. The SC and IC will evaluate the entire list of submissions and associated recommendations and recommend topics for the development of standards or implementation resources and suggest an associated position in the Framework for Standards and Implementation. The TFT will discuss SC and IC outcomes and prepare a paper with recommendations and priorities for the CPM for adoption.

[16] The Terms of Reference (ToR) of the TFT will be adjusted by the Bureau at their June meeting to clarify that the TFT is responsible for preparing the final paper on recommended topics to the CPM.

[17] The call for topics will be made every two years and, for 2018, the call has been opened from 1 May until 31 August.

[18] The SC noted that the Standard Setting Procedure will need to be amended to include the new process for the call.

[19] The SC was invited to nominate two SC members for the TFT in addition to the SC Chairperson. The TFT meeting is tentatively scheduled for October 2018 the week before the Strategic and Planning Group (SPG) meeting.

[20] One SC member noted that considerable Secretariat resources will be required to compile the submitted topics for standards and implementation, so submissions should be forwarded to the TFT to minimize the need for Secretariat input.

[21] **SC Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure[5].** The CPM adopted the revised SC ToR and the Rules of Procedure (RoP). However, one contracting party (CP) requested a revision of the Appendix 1

[1] Link to local information for meeting participants: Rome, Italy: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1034/

[2] Link to Standard Setting Unit staff (2018-04-05): https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/2463/

[3] 25_SC_2018_May

[4] Link to List of topics for IPPC standards: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/84405/, link to Call for Topics page:https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-and-implementation/call-for-topics-standards-and-implementation/

[5] Link to SC ToR and RoP: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1107/

of the CPM paper presented, because an addition to ToR point 3 was a repetition of the paragraph added to RoP Rule 7. The CP requested that this be reviewed for clarity to keep the documents consistent.

[22] **Reorganization of the fruit fly standards.** The CPM agreed to the reorganization of the fruit fly ISPMs as presented in document CPM 2018/08.

[23] **IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030**[6]. The draft Strategic Framework (SF) was presented and a revised draft will be circulated to CPs, the SC, IC, Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) and international organizations to provide comments during a ten-week consultation starting from 15 June 2018. Once the consultation period is open, the SSU will open an SC e-decision forum to capture the SC's comments. Comments will be provided to the SPG to finalize the revised draft SF for presentation to CPM-14 in 2019.

[24] **Outcome of CPM discussion on commodity standards.** The CPM discussed a paper on difficulties associated with development of commodity and pathway specific ISPMs, prepared by the CPM Bureau with input from the SC and IC. The CPM requested the Bureau and Secretariat, in consultation with the SC and IC, to develop ToR for a focus group and the SC considered the draft ToR[7].

[25] Two SC members stressed the importance of involving representatives of global trade and marketing as it was vital to bring all partners together to make progress. It was noted that the draft ToR required the focus group to have experience and expertise in trade and marketing.

[26] One SC member proposed that the focus group is also tasked to illustrate with examples how commodity or pathway standards could be structured.

[27] The SC agreed that the focus group should address the questions posed by the SC in paper CPM 2018/29 at CPM-13 (2018). The SC proposed deletion of some redundant indents in the summary of CPM-13 discussions and noted that further editorial changes would be needed.

[28] The SC nominated the SC Chairperson to represent the SC in the focus group but acknowledged that the Bureau has the final decision on membership.

[29] **Framework for Standards and Implementation.** The CPM endorsed the updated Framework for Standards and Implementation. It was noted that the Framework should be used as a reference both for responding to the Call for Topics and for reviewing and prioritizing the received proposals. The Framework should be regularly updated by including adopted ISPMs.

[30] **Implementation pilot surveillance.** The CPM requested that the IC and SC review the completed actions from the surveillance work plan and the implementation pilot on three priority pests. The IC and SC should identify lessons learnt, review the priorities in the work plan, clearly identify directions, outputs and outcomes, and recommend revisions of the plan as necessary, taking into account the newly adopted revision of ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*) and the experience of the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC).

[31] It was pointed out that the decision of the CPM had not allowed the IFU to consider how to assess the pilot prior to the May IC meeting. The SC therefore agreed to provide input after the IC's first discussion on the review.

[32] The SC:

(1) *noted* the CPM-13 update.

(2) *agreed* to provide comments on the IPPC Strategic Framework for 2020-2030 in an e-decision forum to be included into the OCS during the country consultation starting from 15 June 2018.

[6] 24_SC_2018_May

[7] 02_CRP_SC_2018_May

(3) *agreed* that Mr Stephen BUTCHER (New Zealand) will assist the Secretariat with compiling the comments on the IPPC Strategic Framework for 2020-2030 and the Secretariat will submit them on behalf of the SC.

(4) *nominated* Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (Canada) and Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile) as members for the Task Force on Topics (TFT).

(5) *agreed to consider* the suggested revision of the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the Standards Committee at their 2018 November meeting.

(6) *agreed* that the SC members of the TFT would work on proposed amendments to the Standard Setting Procedure[8] for consideration at the SC November 2018 meeting.

(7) *asked* the Bureau to note the SC comments on the draft Terms of Reference for the focus group on commodity and pathway specific ISPMs.

(8) *proposed* to the Bureau that the SC Chairperson represents the SC in the focus group on commodity and pathway specific ISPMs.

CPM Bureau: December 2017, April 2018 meeting.

[33] The Secretariat updated the SC on issues arising from the Bureau meetings[9]. The main issues discussed included the reorganization of the Secretariat, preparation for CPM-13 (2018) and a review of the Secretariat work plans for 2018.

[34] He informed the SC of the new members of the Bureau elected by CPM-13 (2018)[10].

IC interactions – last meeting.

[35] Mr Sam BISHOP (United Kingdom), the SC representative on the IC, provided an update on the first IC meeting held in December 2017. He acknowledged that the observers were able to participate freely in the meeting, however, not as part of the decision-making process. Mr Chris DALE, the IC representative on the SC, agreed that the involvement of SC and RPPO representatives in the IC meeting was helpful.

[36] The SC was informed that IC members had offered to provide comments on draft standards from an external viewpoint. The IC had agreed that it was valuable to hold meetings back-to-back with the SC to facilitate cooperation. It was suggested that involving people from expert drafting groups for standards could be helpful when the IC was drafting implementation resources.

[37] The following strategic areas were identified for potential collaboration between the SC and IC:

- Framework for Standards and Implementation. There may be a need for a joint review of the structure of the framework.
- Implementation and capacity development strategy. Input from the SC may be valuable as this is developed (see Agenda item 4.2).
- IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030. This could be used to identify or highlight areas for SC/IC collaboration.
- Dispute avoidance and settlement. If an ISPM is being considered as part of an avoidance/settlement case, involvement of the SC may be valuable.
- IPPC Regional Workshops. Both SC and IC members are represented at the workshops and further coordination may ensure there is no overlap
- International Year of Plant Health 2020. There may be opportunities for collaborative activities during the International Year.

[8] IPPC Standard Setting procedure: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/84141/

[9] Link to Bureau meeting reports: https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/bureau/

[10] CPM 2018/CRP/14

[38] When discussing SC/IC collaboration, the SC noted that collaboration should not be a goal in itself; there should be identifiable aims and clear value from the collaboration.

[39] One SC member recalled that when the concept of the IC was first discussed, it was stressed that new standards should not be developed without considering their implementation. Therefore, for new topics, it was important that the SC and IC develop effective working arrangements to facilitate the production of high quality standards and associated implementation material.

[40] One SC member felt that an important area of collaboration between the SC and IC should be to develop resources to help with the implementation of existing standards. The member queried how such work could be prioritized, particularly if there are no specific proposals from the call for topics. It was noted that the SC cannot work on topics unless they are added by the CPM to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. The SC considered that there should be flexibility for the IC to make recommendations for development of information resources.

[41] One SC member encouraged the IC to work on one of the existing standards and to take into consideration issues that had been identified by the expert drafting group, the steward and during consultation. With regard to the recently adopted revision of ISPM 6, implementation issues have been identified. However, many are conceptual, for example setting up systems for surveillance, and NPPOs may need help with practical solutions for implementation of the standard. It was noted that the SC has identified many examples of potential implementation challenges which should be shared with the IC.

[42] Another SC member pointed out that it is important that implementation resources are developed on issues related to standards. In addition, implementation tools should be produced once the standard has been adopted, rather than as occurred with the manual for ISPM 6 which now needs to be revised following changes introduced during the consultation process of the ISPM. The Secretariat noted that the improved communication between the SSU and IFU and the SC and IC should help to ensure that such situations do not occur in the future.

[43] The SC noted that, although it is important to collaborate on implementation issues and undertake other activities such as publicizing the importance of standards, the main focus of the SC should be developing high quality standards, because the IPPC is recognized as one of the three standard setting organizations in the SPS Agreement.

[44] The SC held an evening session to further develop possible specific ideas for collaboration. These included:

- **General review of implementation issues associated with existing standards**. A review of existing standards could identify implementation issues that apply widely across standards. Guidance material for such topics would be widely applicable.
- **Two-way communication**. Implementation issues identified during development of draft ISPMs are passed from the SC to the IC, and the IC could pass ideas on gaps in standards to the SC. In addition, SC stewards could explain the issues raised during the development of the draft ISPM, particularly those that were considered but not included or more relevant for guidance material.
- **Mutual involvement in relevant groups**. It was suggested that a member of the IC could be invited to participate in expert drafting groups. Similarly, a member of the expert drafting group or the steward of a draft ISPM could be invited to the IC working group to develop guidance material.
- **Collaboration on the Framework for standards and implementation**. Close cooperation between the two bodies is important. There was a suggestion to hold a joint session between the SC and IC on the Framework in the future.
- **Mirroring activities**. For example, SC members could be nominated as champions for the relevant IC subgroups and an IC member could be nominated to lead development of guidance material for a new standard.

- **Regional collaboration and informal meetings between SC and IC members**. Some regions already have regional collaboration between SC and IC members. It may be beneficial to strengthen regional collaboration, for example at IPPC Regional Workshops and RPPO meetings. Informal meetings could be held associated with CPM or SPG meetings.

[45] The SC also noted that there would be benefits from wider interactions between the IPPC and FAO regional offices. Guidance material summarizing IPPC issues could help FAO regional officers to promote the IPPC. Finally, the relationship with RPPOs is essential for the development and implementation of the Convention and standards.

[46] The SC felt it was too early to finalize the areas for collaboration with the IC, but discussion paper on possible areas for collaboration will be produced by the SC and IC representatives for consideration at a future meeting.

4.2 Briefings from IPPC Secretariat

Standard setting unit (SSU)

[47] The SSU Lead updated the SC on current staffing levels and the SSU work plan for 2018[11]. He indicated that for standard setting, is important to have skilled staff employed on a long-term basis. Current staff are highly skilled and professional but face a heavy workload. There has been a reduction in staffing levels and the SSU has been allocated additional responsibilities for publishing and the language review groups. There is therefore a need for either a reduction in workload or increased staffing.

[48] The SC noted the reduced number of staff employed on standard setting activities and the consequent challenges to support the work programme.

Update from the Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU)

[49] The IFU Lead provided an update on the work of the Unit and presented the 2018 IFU work plan [12]. The update included an explanation of the roles, responsibilities and activities of the IFU, the staff involved and the topics that would be addressed in 2018. A key issue for the future is to develop the arrangements for collaboration between the SC and IC.

[50] Cross-cutting issues of relevance to the SC were discussed, including preparations for the 2018 IPPC Regional Workshops.

[51] The SC members who will lead discussions on draft standards at the Regional Workshops confirmed their participation. It was agreed that this year, the Regional Workshops will consider draft standards in the second round of consultation.

[52] The IFU is preparing a draft strategy for the use of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) tool to be presented to the IC at their November 2018 meeting and is seeking input from the SC, the SPG, TC-RPPOs and other relevant experts.

[53] The IC will also discuss a draft strategy for the development of manuals, guides and training materials including the processes to be used, with a view to validation during the November 2018 IC meeting. The SC was invited to provide suggestions on this strategy. It is planned that both draft strategy papers will be presented to the IC during its November 2018 meeting and the SC will be invited to submit comments.

[54] In relation to the development of manuals and guides, it was acknowledged that there had been problems with the timing of development of some manuals. The Secretariat confirmed that the philosophy has now changed so that the initiation of draft guides or training material will be timed to coincide with no earlier than when a draft standard goes to the second consultation, with a view to finalizing the guides

[11] 22_SC_2018_May

[12] 10_SC_2018_May, 16_SC_2018_May

or training material once the standard is adopted. However, some funding has already been allocated for certain topics, so some flexibility is needed during this transition.

[55] One SC member welcomed the increased transparency provided by the work plan of the IFU. It was suggested that in future the SC and IC could have a coordinated work plan. However, it was noted that this would be difficult when much of the funding for the work of the IFU comes from projects. Also, oversight of a joint work plan would be difficult because it would apply to two separate committees. The Bureau therefore might need to oversee such a plan.

[56] Regarding a suggestion from the IFU that the SC consider dedicating time for IC/IFU activities, the SC considered there was a general willingness to cooperate on implementation issues, but it was too early to agree to dedicate time on activities in the absence of specific proposals. The SC and the IC need to determine how they will collaborate and on which specific areas of cooperation. These will develop as the relationship evolves.

[57] The Secretariat sought input from the SC for ideas for the IFU work plan and the strategies. The SC noted that as the SC/IC collaboration develops there should be a mutual exchange of ideas. There is a process for feedback between the two committees through the respective representatives. Further discussion on SC/IC collaboration is covered in Agenda item 4.1.

[58] The SC:

(9) *confirmed* that their participation has been taken into account for the 2018 IPPC Regional Workshops.

(10) *agreed* to work with the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee and the Implementation Facilitation Unit of the IPPC Secretariat to develop tangible ways of cooperating.

(11) *agreed* to provide comments on the strategies to promote the PCEs and the development of guides and training manuals during its November 2018 meeting.

Update from the Integration and Support Team (IST)

[59] The IST Lead provided an update on the work of the Team[13]. An e-learning course "Introduction to the International Plant Protection Convention" has been made available on the InforMEA e-learning platform[14]. It was created for learners without any prior knowledge of the IPPC and could be useful in preparations for the International Year of Plant Health 2020.

[60] The National Reporting Obligations (NRO) Year of regulated pest lists started in April 2018 and the focus will be on creating, posting and updating regulated pest lists by NPPOs. The SC was requested to remind their respective IPPC contact points to update regulated pest lists on the IPP.

[61] A List of Topics for IPPC Standards database and Participants database have been created in collaboration with the SSU. A renewed logo as approved by the CPM Bureau was developed to match with the FAO logo and has been applied to the IPP and to all new IPPC advocacy materials. The IST has published new publications in collaboration with the IFU and SSU including the 2017 IPPC Annual Report and four factsheets. The SC was invited to suggest any new publications they would like to produce with the support of the IPPC Secretariat, bearing in mind that the drafting process for standard setting related publications should be initiated by SC members.

[62] The IPPC annual theme for 2018 is "Plant Health and Environmental Protection". The IPPC Secretariat promoted the 2018 annual theme through organization of one side session and special topic session at CPM-13 (2018). The keynote address on Plant Health and Environmental Protection was delivered by the CBD Executive Secretary. Collaboration on communication with biodiversity-related conventions has been strengthened and the IPP thematic page has been updated with material relevant to the 2018 annual theme. The SC supported the IPPC Seminars, but, in response to a proposal by the Secretariat,

[13] 17_SC_2018_May

[14] InforMEA e-learning platform: https://e-learning.informea.org/course/view.php?id=43

considered it was not appropriate to hold one during the November 2018 SC meeting. It might be appropriate to consider contributing to one during the SPG meeting.

[63] The SC:

(12) *noted* the availability of the new IPPC e-learning course available on InforMEA.

(13) *agreed to* make use of new IPPC publications for advocacy purposes and to suggest any additional publications they would like to produce.

(14) *considered* participating in one IPPC seminar on the IPPC annual theme for 2018.

5. Draft ISPMs from expert drafting groups (EWG/TP) for the first consultation

[64] All draft ISPMs approved by the SC for the first round of consultation are listed in Appendix 04.

5.1 Revision of ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005), Priority 1

[65] The Steward introduced the draft ISPM and supporting documentation[15]. The Steward explained that the main aims of the revision were to review the pest status categories and to provide guidance to address problems that had been identified with implementation of the standard. The SC considered that the EWG had successfully simplified and clarified the concepts.

[66] The SC discussed the following substantial issues.

[67] **Scope – pests contained for research or diagnostic purposes**. A task of the EWG was to address collections of living organisms, which can include pests for research or diagnostic purposes. The EWG had agreed that pests kept under contained conditions should be outside the scope of the draft ISPM. However, the SC noted that collections of organisms held in botanical gardens in the open air or in greenhouses are not confined and could escape, and this may affect the pest status. Guidance had been included indicating that additional information about pest presence may be necessary in such circumstances. The SC removed the reference to pests that are contained for research or diagnostic purposes being outside the scope of the standard and provided a sentence in the main text to clarify that pests maintained in quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect pest status in an area.

[68] **Determination of the pest status**. The SC strengthened the draft to clarify that determination of pest status is done by the NPPO responsible for the area concerned by adding a sentence to the first section of the Requirements (Purpose of pest status determination).

[69] **Consistency with ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*): pest records.** As ISPM 8 and ISPM 6 are closely related, the SC noted that pest records are used to determine pest status, but the requirements for pest records in the section on Information used to determine pest status were more stringent than those in the recently adopted ISPM 6. The SC felt that this could cause confusion. It was suggested that records may be generated for pests that are not under surveillance and therefore the additional requirements in the draft ISPM 8 could be helpful. However, because the information required for pest records is already included in ISPM 6, the SC considered that there was no need to repeat the requirements. A reference to ISPM 6 was therefore added.

[70] **Quality of information and reliability.** The quality of the information and its reliability is fundamental for pest status determinations and also determines the level of uncertainty associated with pest status and pest records. Revised guidance had been included on evaluating the reliability of information and addressing sources of uncertainty, including a table with examples of six major sources of information and indications of reliability.

[71] One SC member queried whether the categories of reliability of "high" and "moderately high" were sufficiently different. Other SC members considered that some of the examples of information sources

[15] 2009-005, Link to the EWG report: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85619/, Link to Specification 59: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/2369/, 13_SC_2018_May

and the assessments of reliability could be challenged and suggested that more examples could be included. Some of the information in the table seemed to be more relevant for undertaking PRAs than determining pest status in an area. Several SC members considered that the table needed further work and, although acknowledging that it contained valuable information, it was proposed to move it to an Appendix. The Steward suggested to consider the table as an Annex rather than an Appendix. However, the SC agreed that the table should be moved to an Appendix. The SC noted that during consultation CPs can identify if the table should be in the text, an annex or remain an appendix.

[72] The Secretariat reminded the SC that one of the main tasks of the EWG had been to consider the reliability of information sources. It was difficult to include a comprehensive analysis but could provide guidance for NPPOs.

[73] The section of the table relating to information from other NPPOs was deleted because such information could be problematic, for example interceptions of pests on consignments from mixed origins. The SC considered that the main sources of information for determining pest status would be available in the country undertaking the determination. In addition, in the section on unpublished communications from sources other than NPPOs, the boxes related to "high reliability" were deleted.

[74] **Pest status categories ("present" and "absent") and sub-categories.** The SC noted that two main pest categories had been included in the revised draft and this aligns better with the current definition of "pest status" in ISPM 5. Two tables had been developed with seven sub-categories for each presence and absence category together with descriptions of each sub-category.

[75] **"Present: not widely distributed".** One SC member queried the categories "Present: not widely distributed" and "Present: not widely distributed and under official control" because they overlap. It was proposed that the former should be changed to "Present: not widely distributed and not under official control" in order to have clear differences between the two categories. The Steward explained that the second category related to the definition of a quarantine pest, whereas the first related to the concept of not widely distributed in Supplement 1 of ISPM 5 (*Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of "official control" and "not widely distributed"*). The SC decided to change the category "Present: not widely distributed" to "Present: not widely distributed *but* not under official control"

[76] The SC added a requirement to declare the purpose of the official control in the status description to "Present: not widely distributed and under official control".

[77] One SC member pointed out that sometimes an NPPO detects the presence of a pest but does not know its distribution. The SC member felt that the category ("Present: distribution unknown") was missing from the table. The Steward suggested that this circumstance could be categorized as "Present: not widely distributed but not under official control". The SC agreed that this should be raised during consultation.

[78] Two SC members pointed out that a localized pest outbreak under official control may present no risk to plants in the rest of the area, but sometimes importing NPPOs introduce measures when they see reports of a new finding of a pest in a country. In cases where a pest is localized, it might be relevant for an NPPO to provide supplementary information and there was a proposal to add new indent "in specific locations (localized outbreaks)" to the section on circumstances when it might be necessary to provide additional information. The SC agreed not to make this addition, because this situation is addressed by the category "Present: not widely distributed and under official control".

[79] **Removal of "transient" category.** The current standard does not provide guidance on the length of time a pest can remain "transient" and this can cause confusion. Transience is a temporary condition and is now covered by the new sub-category "Present, not expected to establish" which is consistent with the IPPC Glossary definition of this term.

[80] **"Absence" and "undetermined" status.** Specific guidance had been included on the determination of the pest status "absent". Absence should be supported by surveillance records or other relevant

information and when an NPPO cannot provide any specific information, the pest status may be "undetermined".

[81] **"Absence: pest records unreliable".** There were concerns about the determination of pest absence when pest records are unreliable. The SC deleted the category from the table and added examples of unreliability (ambiguous pest nomenclature or use of outdated diagnostic methods) to the paragraph on "undetermined" pest status.

[82] **"Absent: intercepted only".** One SC member suggested that this category should cover cases when pests are intercepted in traps as well as intercepted on consignments. Sometimes a pest can be detected in traps after extreme weather events, but the pest is not established, and it would be useful to cover such circumstances in the standard. The SC considered that detection of individual pests in a trap or following annual migration may not affect pest status depending on the circumstances. The SC added a sentence explaining that after surveillance if a pest is detected in an area and it shown not represent a population, this does not affect the pest status in the area.

[83] The SC considered that interceptions do not affect the pest status of an area, so the sub-category was deleted. A sentence was added stating that pest interceptions on imported consignments while under detention do not affect the pest status in the area.

[84] **Responsibilities of NPPOs – use of interception data.** The SC noted that repeated interceptions may lead an NPPO to challenge another NPPO on its pest status declaration. Bilateral contacts may clarify the situation and may lead to the NPPO responsible for the area revising the pest status.

[85] **Responsibilities of NPPOs – Phytosanitary measures introduced by NPPOs of importing countries.** The SC was concerned about the emphasis given in a paragraph on phytosanitary measures set by importing countries when there is a high degree of uncertainty with pest status declarations. Such measures should be based on a risk assessment, taking uncertainty into account. The SC considered that the concepts were covered elsewhere and deleted the paragraph.

[86] **"Good reporting practices" - inform other NPPOs and RPPOs on changes in pest status.** The SC noted that there is already guidance on how to communicate changes in pest status in ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*) and therefore the SC added a reference to this standard.

[87] **"Good reporting practices" – exchange pest status information in conformity with articles of the IPPC.** The draft included a reference to obligations included in the Convention, but the SC considered that these were already covered in the previous indent. There was a proposal to encourage NPPOs to publish pest status lists on the IPP and other websites, but this would introduce a new requirement so the SC deleted the bullet.

[88] **Adjustments to other ISPMs.** The EWG had made suggestions for adjustments to other ISPMs due to the revision of ISPM 8. The SC noted these proposed changes, but considered that adjustments to other ISPMs should be considered after the first consultation period.

[89] **Potential implementation issues.** The EWG had noted that NPPOs will need to adjust for pest status categories that have been removed or changed. However, they considered that the revised draft should reduce implementation difficulties as it provides more explanatory information and includes good practices for determining and reporting pest status.

[90] Regarding consistency across IPPC documents, the EWG and SC recommended that the revision of the standard is completed before a manual or other guidance material is developed.

[91] The SC:

(15) *noted* the meeting report of the EWG on Revision of ISPM 8: *Determination of pest status in an area*.

(16) *approved* the draft ISPM on Revision of ISPM 8: *Determination of pest status in an area* (2009-005) as modified in this meeting for submission to the first consultation (Appendix 05).

(17) *noted* that potential consequential changes to other adopted ISPMs might be needed and *agreed* to address this in the future.

5.2 Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002), Priority 2

[92] The Steward introduced the draft ISPM and supporting documentation[16]. It was noted that the draft provides a framework for NPPOs to develop and implement a programme for the authorization of entities. The SC considered the EWG had produced a good first draft on this challenging subject.

[93] The SC discussed the following main issues.

[94] **Scope - non-NPPO public (government) entities.** The Specification states that the scope includes authorization of non-NPPO public and private entities. One SC member pointed out that the draft did not provide guidance on the differences between authorizing governmental bodies, for example Customs, and authorizing private entities such as laboratories. In some cases, government agencies cover plant and animal health and food safety and the coverage of this standard will depend on whether the whole agency or only phytosanitary officials are considered the NPPO. The SC member was concerned to ensure that the draft contained clear guidance on the requirements for other government bodies, because they may differ from requirements for private entities.

[95] Another SC member noted that auditing and oversight requirements are burdensome and proposed that the standard should clarify the requirements for the different types of entities. It was noted that importing countries could ask whether an NPPO audits all entities in accordance with the standard and the draft should, therefore, be clear where there are different requirements for government/public and private bodies.

[96] SC members pointed out that arrangements for authorization will depend on the situation in a country. They considered it would be difficult to cover all possibilities in an ISPM. A principle of authorization of entities is that NPPOs should only authorize those that are organized and qualified to undertake the work. It is up to the NPPO to decide how the delegation and authorization is undertaken and which entities should be covered by the requirements of the standard.

[97] Some SC members recognized that the NPPO may authorize other government departments to perform phytosanitary actions and it may be inappropriate to require them to comply with all parts of the standard. The SC therefore clarified that NPPOs should use the standard for authorization of private entities and NPPOs may use elements of this standard when authorizing public entities. The SC agreed that if NPPOs authorize other government/public entities, they will determine the nature of the authorization arrangement.

[98] The SC discussed whether non-governmental public bodies should also be considered in the same way as government entities. It was recognized that some may be organized in a similar way to government departments but, to avoid confusion, the SC referred to government departments.

[99] **Examples of phytosanitary actions - supervision and auditing.** One SC member questioned whether reference to supervision and auditing should be included as examples of phytosanitary actions. Others were concerned that these could be interpreted as relating to supervision and auditing of the NPPO. Several SC members provided examples where entities were authorized by the NPPO to undertake supervision or auditing activities on their behalf. The Glossary definition of phytosanitary actions does not specifically mention supervision and auditing, but they would be covered under "actions undertaken to implement phytosanitary measures" and therefore within the scope of the standard.

[100] **"Entities".** The SC noted that NPPOs authorize many different types of entities and there are many different arrangements. The SC therefore provided more details, clarifying that authorization of entities includes providers of phytosanitary actions (for example individuals, organizations, businesses) and,

[16] 2014-002, Link to the EWG report: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/84758/, Link to Spec 65: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82244/, 21_SC_2018_May

where appropriate, their facilities (such as equipment, laboratories, treatment enclosures). The SC agreed that in some cases authorization of entities may require approval of individuals in the entity, relevant documentation, and facilities.

[101] **Legal framework**. The draft ISPM stated that an NPPO should determine whether its legal framework enables it to authorize entities and, if not, the NPPO should seek to amend its legal framework to facilitate authorization. One SC member proposed deletion of references to amending the legal framework because NPPOs should work within the law. The SC revised the section to state that NPPOs should ensure that their legal framework enables the authorization arrangements.

[102] **Development of Authorization Programme**. One SC member proposed to change the list of requirements from mandatory requirements to elements for consideration. However, the SC did not agree with this because the objective of the standard is to harmonize requirements for authorizing entities.

[103] **Application for authorization.** Some SC members found the reference to an application process binding. Authorization could also be initiated by an NPPO. The SC therefore referred to development of an initiation and approval process.

[104] **Minimum training, skills and competency requirements.** One SC member was concerned about the requirement to ensure that the entities had skills at least equivalent *to those applied to* the NPPO's personnel because in some cases the NPPO may use entities with skills that they do not have. The SC changed the wording to requiring entities to have skills at least equivalent *to those required for* the NPPO's personnel to be clear that there is a minimum requirement for skills for undertaking the phytosanitary actions.

[105] **Contingency planning.** The SC agreed to add a new bullet on developing a contingency plan for business continuity in the event that an authorized entity no longer undertakes the phytosanitary actions. This should ensure that the NPPO has arrangements for continued delivery of phytosanitary actions.

[106] **Criteria for eligibility of entities.** This section included requirements for entities that will undertake phytosanitary actions and additional requirements for entities undertaking auditing of other authorized entities.

[107] **Conflicts of interest**. The SC noted that in many countries there is a requirement that there are no conflicts of interest. However, there may be cases where there are conflicts of interest. In such cases, the entities should declare the conflicts of interest and identify how they would be managed. The SC noted that NPPOs are not obliged to authorize entities if they consider the conflicts are unacceptable. In all cases, the entity should act impartially when undertaking authorized activities.

[108] **Roles and responsibilities of the NPPO.** The SC deleted a requirement to promote, clarify and demonstrate the benefits of becoming authorized because these are beyond the scope of the standard. It was noted that these might be considered in a manual on authorization.

[109] **Authorization of entities to undertake audits**. The SC noted that the requirements for authorization of entities to undertake audits or supervision were different to authorizations of entities for other phytosanitary actions. The SC therefore created a separate section to include all the requirements for entities that are authorized to audit or supervise, including the criteria for eligibility and roles and responsibilities.

[110] **Process for audits – definitions of auditing and audits**. The draft included a section defining the process of auditing and two types of audit. This was removed because the SC noted that *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014) is on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and this draft should not be in conflict with or duplicate the future ISPM.

[111] **Audits to maintain authorization**. The section was simplified to require an audit of the entity's whole system at least once a year. Additional audits may be conducted as necessary.

[112] **Potential implementation issues.** The following issues were identified by the EWG:

- NPPOs may need to set up or adjust their legal framework to support the authorization of entities.
- Capacity development material on quality systems, quality manuals and on auditing authorized entities would be particularly important to help enhance NPPOs' ability to proficiently carry out authorization of entities.
- Some NPPOs may perceive authorization of entities as being difficult to implement because of potential resistance from NPPO personnel if their tasks and responsibilities are outsourced. Education and confidence building actions may therefore be needed.

[113] The SC:

(18) *noted* the meeting report of the EWG on *Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions*.

(19) *approved* the draft ISPM on *Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002) as modified in this meeting for submission to the first consultation (Appendix 06).

(20) *asked* the Secretariat to archive the implementation issues identified for this draft standard until after the consultation period.

5.3 Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006), Priority 2

[114] The Steward introduced the draft ISPM and supporting documentation[17]. The draft was prepared by the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT). The SC considered that the draft provided good guidance. It was stressed that the main issues were related to the alignment of the draft with the requirements in other treatment standards (ISPM 42 *Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure* and draft ISPM *Requirements for the use of fumigation treatments as a phytosanitary measure* (2014-004)).

[115] The SC was informed that it had been challenging to find information on this treatment type because modified atmosphere treatments are not being currently used as phytosanitary treatments for fresh commodities. They are currently used in stored commodities but could also be used as phytosanitary measures, especially with increasing demands for freedom from chemical residues in fresh commodities.

[116] **Consistency with other standards on requirements for treatments.** The Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) had undertaken an assessment of the alignment between standards on requirements for treatments. The SC agreed that full alignment might not be possible because technical differences may be justified

[117] The SC adjusted the draft to ensure that, wherever possible, the draft was aligned with the other standards.

[118] **Scope**. The SC noted that scope of this draft and the scope of ISPM 42 referred to "treatments as phytosanitary measures for regulated pests on regulated articles". However, the TPG had found that this would be very limiting and proposed that the scope should not refer to the pests or articles for which the treatments had been applied. The SC agreed to remove references to "regulated pests or articles".

[119] **Enclosures.** The SC considered that the word "enclosure" should be used rather than "modified atmosphere enclosure" or "treatment enclosure" throughout for simplicity. The SC recommended that the SC-7 applies the same approach for the draft fumigation standard.

[120] **Treatment application**. The SC noted that there was a statement that respiration, sorption of atmospheric gases and the packaging of the commodity may result in differential gas concentrations and

[17] 2014-006, Link to the TPPT report: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85139/, Link to Spec 62: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81066/, 15_SC_2018_May

influence the efficacy of the treatment. The SC clarified that this could occur within the enclosure and treatment providers should take this into account.

[121] **Temperature measuring and mapping**. The first paragraph in this section stated that temperature affects the efficacy of modified atmosphere treatments and it also affects the respiration rate of the target organism. The SC simplified the text and moved it to the section on Treatment Application because it describes general issues relevant to the application of the treatment rather than measuring and mapping temperatures.

[122] **Adequate systems for Treatment Facilities**. The SC changed the title of the section from "Phytosanitary System Security" to "Adequate systems for Treatment Facilities" to be consistent with ISPM 42.

[123] **Approval of facilities and authorization of operators (use of the terms "entity", "facility", "treatment provider")**. The SC noted that ISPM 42 contains reference to approving facilities and authorization of an entity (person or organization), although these are not in separate sections. In contrast, the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of fumigation treatments as a phytosanitary measure* currently only contains reference to authorization of entities (which would consist of provider and facilities). The SC noted that NPPOs would normally both approve a facility and authorize an operator (treatment provider) for treatments.

[124] The TPG, following their review of the standards on requirements for treatments, had noted that the term "entity" could refer to the facility, the provider, or both. The TPG had recommended that "entity" is not used when it is clear what part of the entity is being referred to. In such cases the terms "treatment provider" or "facility" should be used.

[125] The SC considered whether to use the term "entity" throughout the draft and noted that if this was done, there could be consequential consistency issues with the draft ISPM on *Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002). The SC therefore agreed with the TPG's recommendation and, wherever possible, used the terms "treatment provider" or "facility". This was clarified in the draft in line with the discussion during agenda item 5.2.

[126] **Environment, health and safety**. One SC member proposed to remove this section because it is not part of the remit of the IPPC. Another SC member pointed out that a section on these issues had been retained in the draft standard on requirements for fumigation treatments because of the risks to human health and safety and the environment from fumigation. It was noted that the section contained important information relevant to the safe operation of the treatment but that it may be more appropriate for a manual. The SC therefore agreed to delete the section. It was proposed that a sentence be added to the scope to exclude these issues from the standard, but this was not agreed to, because the IPPC and ISPMs do not cover health and safety issues.

[127] **Monitoring and auditing - treatment programme.** The SC noted that in the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of fumigation treatments as a phytosanitary measure* the term "treatment protocol" is used instead of "treatment programme". The draft was aligned for consistency.

[128] **Documentation and Records.** For consistency with the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of fumigation treatments as a phytosanitary measure*, the SC added the requirement in the Documentation section that treatment providers should provide documentation of procedures on temperature and gas sensor calibration and recordings.

[129] **Appendix.** The SC removed the Appendix and agreed that it should be part of the IPPC Procedural Manual for Standard Setting for consistency with the other standards on requirements for treatments.

[130] **Potential implementation issues.** The SC noted that the TPPT had identified the following points that could affect the implementation of this draft ISPM:

- **Lack of information on commercial applications**. Scientific research has been conducted on modified atmosphere treatments, but there is a lack of information on commercial applications of these treatments as phytosanitary measures.
- **Costs**. Fairly sophisticated instruments are needed and this could be an impediment even if schedules are available. However, existing storage places are already equipped (e.g. for apples) to modify the atmosphere of the enclosure, so could be adapted. In addition, cost may be justifiable if there is no other option. As technology and capacity are developed, costs should decrease.
- **Lack of damage to the commodity**. For some commodity-pest combinations, these treatments could be preferable as they are not likely to damage the commodity.
- **Alternative to methyl bromide**. If methyl bromide became unavailable, modified atmosphere treatments could be substitutes.
- **Non-toxic.** Non-toxic material is used and no residues remain on the commodity.
- **Dual purpose**: Modified atmosphere treatments may increase the commodity shelf life while killing pests (already demonstrated for apples and other fruits).

[131] The SC:

(21) *approved* the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure* (2014-006) as modified in this meeting for submission to the first consultation (Appendix 07).

(22) *asked* the Secretariat to archive the implementation issues identified for this draft standard until after the consultation period.

5.4 Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001)

[132] The Steward introduced the draft amendments to ISPM 5 and supporting documentation[18].

[133] The SC discussed the following issues.

[134] **Deletions:**

- **"Commodity class**" (2015-013). The SC noted that the TPG proposed to delete this term because the definition is not well understood. In addition, there is also ongoing work to harmonize product descriptions as part of the ePhyto project and "commodity class" is not used in Appendix 1 to ISPM 12 *Electronic phytosanitary certificates, information on standard XML schemas and exchange mechanisms* or the related links on the IPPC website. These only refer to "commodity" and "product description".
- **Associated terms**. As a consequence of the proposal for "commodity class", the TPG proposed to delete the terms "bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)" (2017-001), "cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)" (2012-007), "fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)" (2017-003), "plants in vitro (as a commodity class)" (2017-006).

[135] One SC member questioned whether for commodities there could be alignment with Customs codes. It was pointed out that the Customs codes do not provide enough categories for all products. Therefore they are not appropriate for IPPC purposes and there is a need for a different mechanism.

[136] Another SC member asked whether these changes would have any impact on the draft standards on grain and cut flowers. The SC noted that, on the contrary, the deletions would eliminate some of the confusion.

[137] **Revisions:**

[18] 1994-001, Link to the TPG report: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85572/

- **"Seeds (as a commodity class)"** (2017-007), **"grain (as a commodity class)"** (2017-004). The TPG had noted that a qualifier for the Glossary term "seeds" is still required to distinguish the Glossary term from seeds in its botanical sense (i.e. a propagating organ formed in the sexual reproductive cycle of plants). The TPG therefore proposed that these terms were revised to "seeds/grain (as a commodity)".
- **"Wood (as a commodity class)"** (2017-009). A definition of wood (as a commodity) is still required to clarify that wood packaging material, processed wood material and bamboo products are not considered as wood commodities according to the Glossary. It was therefore proposed to remove "class" from the definition of "wood" for consistency with the proposed changes for "seeds" and "grain".
- **"Treatment"** (2017-008). The TPG proposed that the qualifier "as a phytosanitary measure" was added to the term so that the word "treatment" can, in other contexts, still be used in its non-official sense. "Regulated" was also added to "pests" because, according to its Glossary definition, a "phytosanitary measure" only applies to regulated pests.

[138] The SC agreed with these revisions as proposed by the TPG.

- **"Inspection"** (2017-005). The SC noted that the TPG proposed to revise the term to add a reference to "olfactory, acoustic or other examination tools" in order to reflect current inspection practices and advances in modern technology, which no longer relies solely on visual methods.

[139] One SC member proposed to replace "assisted by" with "targeted with the help of information from" and to replace "tools" with "methods". Other SC members agreed with the proposal regarding "methods" but felt that "targeted with" was a subset of "assisted by", so did not agree to that proposed change. Another SC member queried whether "visual" should be removed from the definition, but the TPG Steward explained that in any case the inspector needs to perform a visual examination to confirm the findings and that being visual is the main action used to distinguish "inspections" from "tests".

[140] Other SC members preferred the current definition. One SC member queried whether the tools added in the proposed definition may be more appropriately associated with the definition of "test". However, these tools may assist visual examinations and should not be considered a test. As there were many comments, the SC agreed to continue to consider this term in an e-forum.

[141] The SC:

(23) *approved* the draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001) as modified in this meeting for submission to the first consultation (Appendix 08).

(24) *requested* the IPPC Secretariat to open an electronic decision on the term "inspection" (2017-008).

6. Draft specifications for approval

6.1 Supplement on Guidance on the concept of the likelihood of establishment component of a pest risk analysis for quarantine pests (2015-010) to ISPM 11 (Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests) Priority 4

[142] The Steward introduced the revised draft specification and supporting documentation[19]. There had been 99 comments on the draft specification during consultation and many comments had been incorporated. The revised draft specification had been considered in an e-forum (2018_eSC_May_04) and the SC agreed to discuss it further at the 2018 May SC meeting.

[143] A**ddition of "Probability of transfer to a suitable host"**. Several CPs had proposed expanding the scope to include the "probability of entry" in addition to the "probability of establishment".

[19] 2015-010, 04_SC_2018_May, 08_SC_2018_May

[144] Several SC members were concerned about broadening the scope to include "entry" because the original focus was on the "establishment". They acknowledged that "probability of transfer to a suitable host" was an important issue related to establishment of a pest and this is included in ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) as part of "probability of entry". It was suggested that the scope be amended to refer to both "probability of transfer to a suitable host" and "probability of establishment" and this was accepted.

[145] **Type of document**. There had been a comment proposing that the expert drafting group considers whether to draft a supplement, annex or appendix to ISPM 11 or to provide information on implementation of the existing standard. It was suggested that the specification was kept open (as a supplement, annex, appendix, adjustment to ISPM 11 or explanatory document) because it is not always possible to decide on the type of document prior to drafting. The SC agreed that the document should preferably be linked to ISPM 11 because the concepts are integral parts of pest risk analysis.

[146] The SC agreed to open an e-decision to provide further specific comments on the draft.

[147] The SC:

(25) *discussed* the possible expansion of the scope to include the probability of entry and *decided* that the specification should instead be expanded to include the "probability of transfer to a suitable host".

(26) *decided* the document should preferably be an annex or appendix to ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) (without precluding an explanatory document as an implementation tool).

(27) *asked* the Secretariat to open an electronic forum to revise the specification.

7. Standards Committee

7.1 Follow-up on actions from the SC November 2017

[148] There were no comments on the report[20].

Updates on the Sea Containers Task Force.

[149] Mr Nico HORN (the Netherlands) provided an update on the activities of the Sea Containers Task Force (SCTF)[21]. The SCTF includes both phytosanitary experts and industry representatives. The SCTF has developed a five-year programme and a work plan. The main aims are to monitor the effectiveness of the industry codes and raise awareness of the risk of pests associated with the movement of sea containers.

[150] For monitoring effectiveness of the codes, the SCTF will issue a call for existing data in order to assess the current state of cleanliness of sea containers and produce a checklist for NPPOs to use when monitoring containers over the five-year period so that any data generated is comparable. Industry bodies will set up a pilot to monitor cleanliness at two shipping lines.

[151] For raising awareness, industry bodies have invited phytosanitary experts to their events to explain IPPC concerns, and to provide suggestions on possible industry actions. Industry bodies generally consider that it would be better to develop processes to achieve cleanliness themselves, with less impact on their logistics, than if NPPOs would impose measures.

[152] The SC:

(28) *noted* the update from the Sea Containers Task Force.

[20] Link to November 2017 SC report: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85285/

[21] Link to the SCTF report: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85366/

IYPH Steering Committee update

[153] Mr Jesulindo Nery DE SOUZA JUNIOR (Brazil) gave an update on activities[22]. The Steering Committee had asked about progress with the SC's promotional paper because they are working on other documents and would like to progress quickly with all of them.

[154] An FAO Steering Committee will be established once the IYPH proclamation has been approved by the United Nations. The IYPH Steering Committee of the IPPC will be maintained as a technical advisory committee to the FAO Steering Committee.

[155] The IYPH Steering Committee proposed that the SC and IC consider reducing their workload in the years leading up to 2020, particularly Secretariat input. There are six major events planned for the IYPH, and it was suggested that Secretariat staff resources will be needed for the preparation of the IYPH, particularly for communications and responses to the public. A suggested possibility was to postpone the call for topics in 2020.

[156] One SC member did not consider that postponing the call would necessarily significantly reduce the workload of the Secretariat because there are many other issues to be dealt with. The Secretariat noted that the development of draft standards may be slower in the next few years for a number of reasons, such as reduced activity of technical panels and fewer topics. However, there are other issues that the SC will need to consider such as SC/IC collaboration, outcome from the focus group on commodity standards, responses to the call for topics. It was mentioned that such suggestions from the IYPH Steering Committee should be discussed further by the Bureau and CPM.

[157] The SC:

(29) *noted* the update on the IYPH Steering Committee.

Promotional paper on positive impact of phytosanitary standards on international trade, poverty reduction and the phytosanitary situation globally

[158] Mr Sam BISHOP (United Kingdom) gave an update on progress with the draft promotional paper[23]. An SC forum on the promotional paper had been held (2018_eSC_May_11) and the proposals for improvements had been taken into account in the draft. It was assumed that FAO would provide communications support for the review of this paper. The IYPH Steering Committee is due to take forward the production of this type of promotional material.

[159] The SC discussed the latest draft and it was suggested that more data should be provided on the example (benefits of ISPM 15), such as numbers of countries that are implementing the standard or have registered the ISPM 15 symbol, and the number of companies authorized. One SC member suggested that the paper would have more relevance to the public if there was an example associated with a widely available commodity such as fruit. Such an example could explain the benefits of the fruit fly standards. The SC agreed to continue to provide ideas for the paper, particularly examples of positive impacts of standards with facts and figures.

[160] The SC:

(30) *agreed* to provide suggestions for the draft promotional paper to Mr Sam BISHOP (United Kingdom) by 31st August 2018.

7.2 Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (from November 2017 to May 2018)

[161] The Secretariat presented a summary of polls and forums discussed on the SC e-decision site[24].

[22] Link to the meetings reports of the IYPH StC: https://www.ippc.int/en/iyph/

[23] 01_CRP_SC_2018_May

[24] 09_SC_2018_May

[162] The SC:

(31) *agreed* that the "Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions" reflects the outcome of the e-decisions (Appendix 09).

8. Review of technical panels (from May 2017 to April 2018)

[163] The SC thanked all involved in the TPs for the significant results achieved, including members, stewards, technical leads, DP authors and the Secretariat. The SC also thanked the organizations and CPs that provided in-kind support, funded meetings and supported their experts to participate.

[164] The Secretariat recalled that the TP presentations would be posted publicly on the IPP.

8.1 Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT)

[165] The Secretariat presented an overview of TPPT activities carried out since May 2017 and the tentative work plan for 2018[25]. The SC noted the achievements during the year and the changes to the TPPT membership.

[166] Highlights of the TPPT activities included:

[167] **Draft ISPM on Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006)**. The TPPT considered the draft ISPM at two meetings (see Agenda item 5.3).

[168] **Treatment submissions from the 2017 call for treatments**. The TPPT evaluated 27 of the 29 treatment submissions and made recommendations to the SC on additions to the work programme and the priorities (see Agenda item 9.1). In cases where further information was required to fully evaluate submissions, the TPPT requested the Secretariat to contact the submitter and the Secretariat initiated this process.

[169] **Evaluation of the objection received at CPM-12 (2017).** The TPPT considered data provided in relation to an objection to the draft phytosanitary treatment (PT) on Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating (2007-114) received before the CPM-12 (2017) relating to the treatment of logs. The International Forestry Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG) is working on guidance material on implementation of dielectric heating treatments which may help the TPPT to respond to the objection (see Agenda item 8.5).

[170] **Review of scientific data supporting the draft annex to ISPM 28: Vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis* on *Carica papaya* (2009-109)**. The TPPT reviewed two studies on populations of *Bactrocera dorsalis* from different geographical regions and concluded that the data did not demonstrate significant differences in tolerance among the populations. Therefore PT 32: *Vapour heat treatment for* Bactrocera dorsalis *on* Carica papaya (2009-109) was adopted by CPM-13 (2018).

[171] **IPPC Phytosanitary Treatments Online Search Tool.** This was developed by the Secretariat and released in September 2017. The TPPT provided significant input.

[172] **Phytosanitary Measures Research Group (PMRG).** The TPPT acknowledged the importance of this group to their work.

[173] The SC:

(32) *noted* the following meeting reports: 2017 TPPT April virtual meeting, 2017 TPPT July face to face meeting (17-21 July, Vienna Austria), 2017 TPPT October virtual meeting, 2017 TPPT November virtual meeting, 2018 TPPT January virtual meeting, 2018 TPPT February virtual meeting, 2018 TPPT March virtual meeting.

[25] Link to the TPPT meeting reports: https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-phytosanitary-treatments/, 23_SC_2018_May

(33) *noted* the TPPT work from May 2017 to April 2018.

(34) *noted* the TPPT tentative work plan for May 2018– April 2019.

(35) *noted* the resignation of the TPPT steward, Mr Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), from the TPPT and thank him for the services rendered to the panel.

(36) *thanked* Mr Guy HALLMAN for the services rendered to the panel, who retired in 2017.

(37) *thanked* Mr Glenn BOWMAN for the services rendered to the panel (*in memoriam*).

(38) *agreed* to extend the term of Mr Scott MYERS as a TPPT member for another five-year period.

(39) *requested* the Secretariat to open a call for additional experts for the TPPT.

(40) *noted* the discussion of the TPPT on the objection to the draft phytosanitary treatment on *Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating* (2007-114) submitted before the CPM-12 (2017).

(41) *noted* that the Secretariat included a note on the submission form for phytosanitary treatments to encourage submitters to make all supporting documentation publicly available and add an option for the submitter to allow for public release of their submission and supporting documents.

(42) *noted* that the TPPT agreed to scrutinize the need to release essential information before the consultation period when recommending a draft phytosanitary treatment to the SC.

(43) *considered* the potential implementation issues identified by the TPPT on the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure* (2014-006) (introduced in the relevant Stewards notes under agenda item 5.3).

(44) *considered* the TPPT recommendation on the submitted phytosanitary treatments presented in the SC paper "Adjustments to the List of topics and the stewards" (Agenda item 9.1).

8.2 Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG)

[174] The Secretariat presented the changes to the membership of the TPG, an overview of TPG activities carried out since May 2017 and the tentative work plan for 2018[26]. In 2017, the TPG worked on 16 terms on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. Five terms are presented to the SC-7 May 2018 as part of the draft 2017 Amendments to the Glossary and ten terms are presented at Agenda 5.4. The use of the term "contamination" was reviewed for consistency across standards.

[175] Highlights of the TPG activities included:

[176] **Review of draft ISPMs submitted to the 2017 first consultation**. The TPG reviewed comments on terms and consistency submitted on the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure* (2014-004). The TPG noted that the "Outline of requirements" section should summarize the main requirements as spelled out in the core text of the standard, and not add any other requirement. The TPG suggested that the SC examines further how "Outline of requirements" are written in current draft standards, as compared to earlier practice.

[177] **"Commodity".** During the discussion on "commodity class" (2015-003) the TPG discussed the Glossary term "commodity" and felt it needed further consideration.

[178] **General recommendations on the use of terms.** The TPG modified the General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs and included them in the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting[27]. The full list of terms is available in the IPPC Style guide[28].

[179] **Ink amendments to the Glossary term "contamination" and its derivatives in adopted ISPMs (2017-002).** The TPG reviewed the use of "contamination" and its derivatives in ISPMs because there are some cases in adopted standards (e.g. ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a*

[26] Link to the TPG meeting report: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85572/, 12_SC_2018_May, 05_SC_2018_May

[27] IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1086/

[28] IPPC Style guide: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/132/

phytosanitary measure)) where "contamination" is used with a different meaning than its Glossary meaning. The TPG therefore proposed ink amendments for consistency.

[180] **Annotated Glossary.** The publication of the next version (5) of the "Annotated Glossary" is expected in 2019 and the TPG lead will prepare a 2018 intermediate version after the May 2018 SC meeting.

[181] **Call for topics: Standards and Implementation and proposals for terms.** The TPG agreed that proposals for Glossary terms could be submitted in the call for topics: standards and implementation. The TPG also discussed the possibility of working on terms not used in ISPMs that are used (e.g. in IPPC manuals). It would be useful to have a common understanding of such terms, but addition of many new terms to the Glossary would have resource implications as work on terminology is complex. The TPG eventually agreed that submissions for terms used in IPPC manuals to be defined in the Glossary could be made during the call for topics provided that the SC continue to exclusively decide on the addition of terms and the review of draft amendments to ISPM 5 to the TPG work programme.

[182] **Concept of "Regulated non-quarantine pest".** The TPG noted that the concept is still not clear for many NPPOs. The explanatory document on ISPM 16 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application*) had not been finalized and the panel felt that it would help clarify the concept. Only a small amount of work was needed to complete the document. Because it relates to a Glossary term, the TPG proposed to complete the document and that a link is added in the Annotated Glossary to clarify the concept covered by the term "Regulated non-quarantine pest".

[183] Some SC members considered that it would be more appropriate for the IC to do the work, or at least work with the TPG on the issue. It was also questioned whether this was a priority for the IPPC and it was pointed out that explanatory documents are the responsibility of the author, rather than an official publication. However, the TPG Steward noted that the Annotated Glossary is the responsibility of the TPG and is considered to provide useful guidance on Glossary terms. One SC member suggested that a submission could be made during the call for topics.

[184] The SC felt it would be unfortunate to lose the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 or to have to produce a new draft following the call for topics. The SC agreed that the TPG do the work in collaboration with the IC.

[185] The SC:

(45) *noted* the TPG work plan 2018-2019 (as presented in Appendix 6 of the 2017-12 TPG report) and the work performed by the TPG over the last year.

(46) *agreed* that Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) be renewed as TPG member for French for another five-year term, starting in January 2019.

(47) *thanked* Mr John HEDLEY (New Zealand), who retired in 2017, for the services rendered to the panel.

(48) *thanked* the TPG Secretariat leads (Ms Celine GERMAIN and Ms Eva MOLLER) who have left the IPPC Secretariat.

(49) *requested* the IPPC Secretariat to open a call for a new TPG member for English.

(50) *agreed to examine* further how the section on "Outline of requirements" is written in current draft standards

(51) *agreed* that the TPG propose ink amendments to adopted ISPMs to avoid the use of the term "commodity class".

(52) *added* the term "commodity" to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

(53) *noted* the General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs as presented in Appendix 4 of the 2017-12 TPG report.

(54) reviewed and *approved* the ink amendments proposed by the TPG to ensure a consistent use of "contamination" and its derivatives in adopted ISPMs (Appendix 10).

(55) *considered* the possibility of allowing submissions, during the call for topics: standards and implementation, of terms to be worked on by the TPG at the exclusive decision of the SC, including terms that are not used in ISPMs (e.g. terms used in IPPC manuals).

(56) *asked* the TPG to review and finalize the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application*) in collaboration with the IC.

8.3 Technical Panel for Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP)

[186] The Secretariat presented an overview of TPDP activities carried out since May 2017 and the tentative work plan for 2018[29]. The SC noted the changes to the membership of the TPDP.

[187] Highlights of the TPDP activities included:

[188] **Development of DPs**. The TPDP work programme currently comprises 11 DPs under six disciplines in various stages of development. The TPDP managed more than 40 DP authors from various countries. In 2017, a total of seven DPs were adopted as annexes to ISPM 27, and six draft DPs were moved through the consultation stage. Detailed information on the development of draft DPs was presented in document CPM 2018/12.

[189] Six draft DPs were revised in detail following the first consultation (July – September 2017) and were adopted by the SC by e-decisions (see Agenda item 7.2). The DPs will be submitted to the notification period on 1 July 2018.

[190] With reference to the revision of DP 2: *Plum pox virus* (2016-007), the panel noted the requirement for a major revision of this draft DP, extending beyond the initially intended minor revisions.

[191] During the consultation for the draft DP *Bactrocera dorsalis* complex (2006-026), one CP requested a future revision of this DP to include larvae identification, once methods are available.

[192] Two draft DPs were also revised and discussed by the panel. These are planned to be submitted for expert consultation in 2018 and to be submitted for first consultation period in 2019.

[193] **Disclaimer on the use of brand names**. The TPDP adjusted the disclaimer for laboratory methods and the use of brand names in response to several comments by CPs referring to the duplication of text in the DPs. The TPDP revised the Instructions to authors of diagnostic protocols accordingly.

[194] **Implementation issues.** Several implementation issues were raised in the consultation comments including for the use of molecular methods, especially as regards appropriate laboratory infrastructure and staff expertise. Regarding access to protocols referenced in DPs, the TPDP recommended that the contact points listed in the DPs should be contacted for assistance, if necessary.

[195] The panel also noted the difficulty that some CPs may have in obtaining quarantine pests as reference material. This is an important implementation issue, as positive controls are essential for phytosanitary diagnostics. The panel felt that it is important to further discuss this issue in the relevant IPPC bodies.

[196] **Horizontal issues affecting development and use of DPs.** In addition to drafting of DPs, the panel discussed horizontal issues that may affect diagnostics, such as quality assurance, best practices for DNA sequencing, controls for molecular methods, next generation sequencing technologies and interpretation of the results of serological tests.

[197] **Gaps in the Framework for Standards and Implementation and the need to update DPs.** The panel discussed the ongoing need for new DPs and to update adopted ones. With rapid advances in molecular methodologies and the spread of emerging threats, the panel foresees the need to develop additional DPs

[29] Link to TPDP meeting reports: https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-diagnostic-protocols/, 11_SC_2018_May

and to revise existing DPs. The TPDP also noted that if DPs are not updated, they risk becoming outdated and therefore of limited use.

[198] The TPDP recommended eight pests for inclusion as gaps in the Framework for Standards and Implementation, according to the *Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics*[30]. The panel also proposed that, if an emerging pest is identified, a DP should be developed if needed.

[199] **Working arrangements.** The TPDP had a strategic discussion on the future of the panel and arrangements for delivery of the work programme. The panel stressed the importance of continued face-to-face meetings for discussions on draft DPs and noted that the Secretariat workload is not reduced by virtual meetings because more than one meeting would be required per draft.

[200] The SC:

(57) *noted* the 2018 TPDP February meeting report.

(58) *noted* the TPDP tentative work plan for May 2018– April 2019.

(59) *thanked* Ms Jane CHARD (United Kingdom) for services rendered to the panel

(60) *agreed* that Ms Liping YIN (China) be renewed as TPDP member for Botany for another five-year term, starting in May 2018.

(61) *acknowledged* the contribution of Mr Hans DE GRUYTER (Mycology lead) who left the TPDP in 2017.

(62) *considered* asking the Secretariat to open a call for experts in Mycology depending on the outcome of the Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation.

(63) *noted* the revised TPDP Instructions to authors of diagnostic protocols (posted on the IPP on the TPDP webpage), especially for the standard texts on the use of brand names.

(64) *noted* the request from a contracting party of future revision of the DP on "*Bactrocera dorsalis* Complex (2006-026)" to include larvae identification, once methods are available (see comment 52 of the compiled comments) and archive this request for the future.

(65) *noted* the comments and their responses (comments 1, 9, 77 and 123) from the consultation on Revision of the DP 02: *Plum pox virus* (2016-007) on possible implementation issues with regards to appropriate laboratory infrastructure, staff expertise and access to protocols referenced in the DP and requested to forward the comments to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee.

(66) *noted* the comments (comments 176 and 206) from the consultation on *Xylella fastidiosa* (2004-024) on possible implementation issues on the acquisition of positive controls to perform diagnosis and forward the comments to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee.

(67) *agreed to include* in the Framework for Standards and Implementation, as gaps, the following:

- *Citrus leprosis virus*
- *Pyricularia oryzae* (syn. *Magnaporthe oryzae*) on *Triticum* spp.
- *Microcyclus ulei*
- *Mononychellus tanajoa*
- *Puccinia graminis* f.sp. *tritici* UG 99
- *Moniliophthora roreri*
- *Amaranthus palmeri*
- *Solanum rostratum*.

(68) *agreed* that Ms Françoise PETTER (EPPO) be invited to the next TPDP face-to-face meeting, as invited expert.

[30] Link to the *Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics* : https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85790/

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

[201] The Secretariat presented an overview of TPFF activities carried out since May 2017[31]. The panel did not carry out any specific tasks related to their mandate in the past year. The TPFF was kept informed throughout the process of the reorganization of the fruit fly ISPMs and provided answers or feedback to a few queries. Panel members remained active and responded to IPPC Secretariat communications during the year.

[202] As all fruit fly standards have now been adopted and CPM-13 (2018) has agreed to their reorganization, the TPFF has completed all pending work. The SC therefore agreed to propose to CPM-14 (2019) that the panel is disestablished, unless new topics related to fruit flies are added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the CPM. Should new topics be added, the TPFF membership should be renewed or extended as all terms expire at the end of 2018.

[203] The SC:

(69) *noted* the TPFF work carried out between May 2017 and April 2018.

(70) *thanked* Ms Ana Lilia MONTEALEGRE LARA (Mexico) and Ms Thanh Huong HA (Vietnam) for services rendered to the panel.

(71) *thanked* Mr Kenji TSURUTA (Japan) for his contributions as a TPFF member from 2004 until 2017.

(72) *invited* CPM-14 (2019) to disestablish the TPFF (unless new topics related to fruit flies are added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the CPM) and *acknowledged* the contributions of all former TPFF members since the establishment of this panel in 2004.

8.5 Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ)

[204] The Secretariat presented an overview of TPFQ activities carried out since May 2017 and the tentative work plan for 2018[32].

[205] Highlights of the TPFQ work included:

[206] **Revision of ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*): Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010).** The TPFQ is awaiting an IFQRG publication containing supporting science. The TPFQ may meet virtually during 2018-2019 to finalize the draft. However, this topic is currently on hold, pending the publication.

[207] **Phytosanitary treatment (PT) Heat treatment of wood chips (2017-024).** The TPFQ discussed a PT *Heat treatment of wood chips* (2017-024) submitted during the call for PTs. The TPPT concluded that the efficacy data were not presented clearly and decided to add references to establish the efficacy of the submitted treatment. These references could be available from the TPFQ and IFQRG. The TPFQ did not have any information and recommended the SC allow the TPPT to seek data directly from IFQRG.

[208] **Objection raised at CPM-12 to the adoption of the draft PT Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating (2007-114).** The TPFQ requested IFQRG to consider the technical aspects of the objection raised at CPM-12 on the draft PT Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating (2007-114) and to respond directly to TPPT. The TPFQ also asked the SC to consider assigning IFQRG to provide technical support to the TPPT to help address this objection.

[31] 18_SC_2018_May

[32] Link to the TPFQ meeting reports: https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-forest-quarantine/, 19_SC_2018_May

[209] **IFQRG questionnaire – potential areas for future research as part of a strategy setting process to inform the future IFQRG research priorities.** The TPFQ Steward introduced a proposal from IFQRG for a questionnaire on research priorities[33]. IFQRG wishes to identify new areas for international research collaboration in international forest quarantine and produced a draft questionnaire aimed at CPs, RPPOs and non-IPPC organizations. The questionnaire was sent to the TPFQ and the panel recommended that the SC consider sending the questionnaire via the Secretariat.

[210] The SC noted that, although the questionnaire sought input on many interesting areas of forest quarantine, some aspects were not relevant to the work of NPPOs. Many questions did not relate to standard setting but covered broader research needs. Moreover, some parts of the questionnaire relate to implementation issues, and the SC noted that the IC representative will raise the issue during the May 2018 IC meeting. Therefore, the SC proposed that the questionnaire be considered by the Bureau.

[211] The SC:

(73) *noted* the following TPFQ meeting reports: June 2017 virtual meeting; September 2017 virtual meeting.

(74) *noted* the work performed by the TPFQ over the last year.

(75) *agreed* with the recommendation from TPFQ to ask IFQRG to provide technical support to the TPPT in addressing the objection raised at CPM-12 to the *Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating* (2007-114) and in providing references to support the phytosanitary treatment submission on the *Heat treatment of wood chips* (2017-024).

(76) *noted* the tentative TPFQ work plan for the period May 2018-April 2019.

(77) *asked* the Secretariat to forward the IFQRG questionnaire to the Bureau for their consideration.

9. Adjustments to the List of Topics and the stewards

9.1 Review and adjustments to the List of topics for IPPC standards

[212] The Secretariat updated the SC on the changes to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* made by CPM-13 (2018) and introduced a paper with additional proposals for the SC to consider[34] .

[213] **List of submitted phytosanitary treatments in response to the call.** Twenty-nine submissions had been received in response to the call for phytosanitary treatments. The TPPT had made proposals for the inclusion of phytosanitary treatments to the *List of topics of IPPC standards*.

[214] **Change of status:**

- "***quarantine area***" (2012-006): In their 2012 meeting, the TPG discussed the revised definition of this term and how it would apply to transient pests. In 2013, the term was assigned pending status until ISPM 8 was revised. As the draft revision of ISPM 8 has been approved for the first consultation (Agenda item 5.1), the SC agreed to change the status to active.
- ***Commodity standards***: The CPM-13 (2018) requested the SC to assign "pending status" to two topics (*International movement of grain* (2008-007) and *International movement of cut flowers and foliage* (2008-005)).

[215] **Modifications to stewards**. The SC reviewed and changed stewards for some topics. The outgoing stewards were thanked for their contributions.

[33] 27_SC_2018_May

[34] Link to the online List of topics for IPPC standards: https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards/list 20_SC_2018_May

[216] For the Technical Panel for Diagnostic Protocols (2004-002), Ms Jayani Nimanthika WATHUKARAGE (Sri Lanka) was assigned steward and Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile) was assigned as assistant steward.

[217] The SC noted that, both the steward and assistant steward of the Technical Panel on Pest Free Areas and Systems Approaches for Fruit Flies (2004-003) were leaving the SC. As the SC decided to recommend to CPM-14 (2019) that the panel be disestablished pending the outcome of the call for topics, no new stewards were assigned.

[218] The TPDP had agreed at their 2017 February meeting to request the SC to assign Mr Robert TAYLOR as the TPDP lead for mycology once Mr Johannes DE GRUYTER left the TPDP. Mr DE GRUYTER continued to provide support for the responses to consultation comments on the draft DP for *Austropuccinia psidii* (2006-018).

[219] The SC:

(78) *included* the following phytosanitary treatments into the TPPT work programme.

- Irradiation treatment for *Drosophila suzukii* on all fresh commodities (2017-017), with priority 1.
- Sulfuryl fluoride fumigation treatment for *Chlorophorus annularis* on bamboo articles (2017-028) with priority 2.
- Irradiation treatment for eggs and larvae of the family Tortricidae (generic) (2017-011) with priority 1.
- Irradiation treatment for all stages of the family Pseudococcidae (generic) (2017-012)" with priority 1.
- Cold treatment of *Ceratitis capitata* on table grapes (2017-023A) with priority 1.
- Cold treatment of *Bactrocera tryoni* on table grapes (2017-023B) with priority 1.
- Heat treatment of wood chips (2017-024) with priority 3.
- Cold treatment *Thaumatotibia leucotreta* on *Citrus* spp. (2017-029) with priority 2.
- Generic irradiation treatment against all insects except Lepidoptera larvae and pupae (2017-030) with priority 2.
- Generic irradiation treatment for Curculionidae (Coleoptera) (2017-016) with priority 2.
- Cold treatment of stone fruit against *Ceratitis capitata* (2017-022A) with priority 1.
- Cold treatment of stone fruit against *Bactrocera tryoni* (2017-022B) with priority 1.
- Irradiation treatment for *Epiphyas postvittana* on all fresh commodities (2017-018) with priority 2.
- Cold treatment for *Bactrocera zonata* on *Citrus sinensis* (2017-013) with priority 2.
- Irradiation treatment for the genus Anastrepha (2017-031) with priority 1.
- Irradiation treatment for *Lobesia botrana* eggs and larvae on all fresh commodities (2017-021) with priority 4.
- Irradiation treatment for *Carposina sasakii* (2017-026) with priority 2.
- Irradiation treatment for oriental fruit fly *Bactrocera dorsalis* on all fresh commodities (2017-015) with priority 3.
- Irradiation treatment for ants (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) hitch-hiking on fresh commodities (2017-014) with priority 3.
- Irradiation treatment for *Bactrocera tau* (2017-025) with priority 3.
- Irradiation treatment for *Pseudococcus jackbeardsleyi* (2017-027) with priority 3.
- Irradiation treatment for *Frankliniella occidentalis* on all fresh commodities (2017-019) with priority 3.

- Irradiation treatment for *Sternochetus frigidus* (2017-036) with priority 2.
- Phytosanitary irradiation treatment of fresh commodities against *Liriomyza sativa*, *L. trifolii* and *L. huidobrensis* (2018-001) with priority 2.

(79) *agreed* not to include the following treatments on the TPPT work programme:

- Hydrogen cyanide fumigation treatment for pine wood nematode and wood boring beetles in debarked wood (2017-034)
- Ethanedinitrile (EDN) treatment of wood for insect pests (2017-035)
- Irradiation treatment for *Hypothenemus hampei* on coffee berries (2017-020)
- Hydrogen cyanide fumigation treatment for *Ditylenchus dipsaci* in seed bulbs of garlic (2017-033)
- Hydrogen cyanide fumigation treatment for rodents, insects and mites in containers (2017-032).

(80) *agreed* to assign Ms Jayani Nimanthika WATHUKARAGE (Sri Lanka) as steward and Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile) as assistant steward of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (2004-002).

(81) *agreed* to assign Robert TAYLOR (TPDP member) as Lead Steward for the topic Fungi and fungus-like organisms (2006-006)

(82) *agreed* to changing the status of "quarantine area" (2012-006) on the TPG work programme to active.

(83) *assigned* "pending" status to the following topics:

- *International movement of grain* (2008-007)
- *International movement of cut flowers and foliage* (2008-005)

(84) *requested* the Secretariat to update the *List of topics for IPPC standards* based on decisions taken at the SC May 2018 meeting and by removing the ISPMs that were adopted by the CPM-13 (2018).

10. Adjustments to the Framework for Standards and Implementation

[220] The Secretariat introduced the Framework for Standards and Implementation that had been endorsed by CPM-13 (2018)[35] and a paper with recommendations for adjustments based on SC and CPM decisions[36].

[221] Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (Canada), the SC champion for the Framework, noted that there was a need to work with the IC on the format of the Framework to make it more useable.

[222] **Diagnostic protocols**. The SC agreed to include the eight pests identified by the TPDP as gaps in the Framework (Agenda item 8.3) in row 74 dedicated to ISPM 27.

[223] The SC:

(85) *included* the proposals for DPs, with recommended priority, as gaps in the Framework for Standards and Implementation.

(86) *revised* the Framework for Standards and Implementation according to decisions taken during CPM-13 and this meeting and asked the Secretariat to forward it to the SPG (Appendix 11).

[35] Link to the Framework for Standards and Implementation: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82439/

[36] 28_SC_2018_May

10.1 Incorporation of host standards and sampling standards into the Framework for standards and implementation

[224] Mr Stephen BUTCHER (New Zealand) introduced a paper on two potential gaps in the Framework for Standards and Implementation[37]. For both gaps, it was proposed that groups of global experts would evaluate data provided by CPs (in response to calls) and recommend topics for standards. Such groups would thus operate in a similar way to the TPPT.

[225] **Pest-Host status standards for commodities**. The framework includes "Host and non-host status" as a concept standard and ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status for fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) provides guidelines for the determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies. It was proposed that a group could draft standards on the host status of specific commodities for specific pests. This would be of particular benefit where there are historic host records that have led to host status uncertainty and debate amongst NPPOs.

[226] **Sampling standards for commodities**. ISPM 31 (*Methodologies for sampling of consignments*) provides guidance to NPPOs on selecting appropriate sampling methodologies for consignments. A call for sampling methods and supporting evidence could be made by the IPPC for a specific commodity, which could then be considered by a group of global experts to develop the sampling standard for the commodity.

[227] The SC agreed there was a need to consider further the issues raised and how to add the proposed gaps to the Framework. For some SC members it was not clear whether pest-host status and specific commodity sampling data should be evaluated for the production of standards or whether manuals would be more appropriate. However, it was noted that standards harmonize requirements whereas manuals are only for guidance.

[228] For the pest-host status standards, it was suggested that the overarching concept standard should be drafted prior to the identification of specific gaps. With regard to sampling of commodities, one member recalled that work was being done on risk-based sampling which might be more appropriate than harmonized sampling protocols. It was also suggested that the title of this proposed gap was made more neutral, such as "sampling strategies for specific commodities" (i.e. not mentioning the term "standards").

[229] The SC agreed to address these issues again at the next meeting.

[230] The SC:

(87) *Asked* Mr Bruce HANCOCKS (Australia) and Mr Stephen BUTCHER (New Zealand) to revise the discussion paper on proposed gaps to the Framework for standards and implementation ('Pest-Host status standards for commodities' and Sampling strategies for specific commodities') according to the SC May discussion for discussion at the November 2018 SC meeting

11. Concepts and implementation issues related to draft or adopted standards

11.1 Implementation issues associated with ISPM 41 (International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment)

[231] At the SC May 2017 meeting the SC noted that the text of the 7th row of Appendix 2 of ISPM 41 (*International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment*) was not fully aligned with the scope of the ISPM[38]. There were concerns that this could lead to the introduction of phytosanitary measures for vehicles, machinery and equipment for uses that are not covered by the scope. However, it was also noted that the Appendix is not a prescriptive part of the standard.

[37] 06_SC_2018_May

[38] 14_SC_2018_May

[232] The SC held an e-forum discussion on four options to resolve the issue (2018_eSC_May_12). In general, SC members supported keeping the information in Appendix 2 without revising it. One SC member introduced an explanatory document on the issue[39] and the SC noted the recommendations for dealing with the issue in the document. The SC considered that if there were remaining concerns, a proposal for guidance material on this issue could be submitted to the call for topics: standards and implementation. The representative of the IC indicated that the issue would be raised at the IC meeting but was not clear about the type of implementation material that would be needed.

[233] The SC:

(88) *agreed* with the recommendations provided in document 26_SC_2018_May that NPPOs:

- Direct efforts to those used vehicles, machinery and equipment (VME) that present a higher risk of pests.
- Use pest interception data to provide evidence of the ability of a pest to be associated with the pathway.
- Evaluate whether to apply a phytosanitary measure if a live quarantine pest is intercepted on the used VME listed in row 7, Appendix 2 of ISPM 41(*International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment*) and consider whether to take into account interception data from other countries.

12. SC recommendations for CPM-14 (2019)

[234] There were no recommendation made to CPM-14 at this meeting.

13. Agenda items deferred to future SC Meetings

[235] There were no agenda items deferred.

13.1 Future SC e-decisions

[236] The following SC e-forums and e-decisions are tentatively planned between SC May 2018 and SC November 2018:

- Strategic framework for 2020-2030.
- Supplement on *Guidance on the concept of the likelihood of establishment component of a pest risk analysis for quarantine pests* (2015-010) to ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) Priority 4.
- Revision of the term “inspection” (2017-005) in the draft 2018 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001).
- Selection of experts for the following groups after the Secretariat opens a call
  - TPPT
  - TPDP
  - TPG.

14. Review of the standard setting calendar

[237] The Secretariat explained that the standard setting calendar is presented on the IPP[40]. The SC was informed of planned standard setting activities during 2018.

[39] 26_SC_2018_May

[40] Link to the IPP calendar: https://www.ippc.int/en/year/calendar/

15. Any Other Business

15.1 Definition for emerging pests – discussion paper from TC-RPPOs

[238] Mr SUAZO (NAPPO) introduced a paper on emerging pests[41]. The Bureau, in June and October 2017, proposed some criteria for identifying "emerging pests". RPPOs have had a standing Agenda item at the TC-RPPOs to provide an update on emerging pests in the different regions since 2016. Over the last two years several regions have identified the same pests as emerging pests of concern.

[239] In 2017, RPPOs consider they would benefit from sharing methodologies to categorize emerging pests. In order to use the same criteria for what constitutes an emerging pest, the TC-RPPOs proposed adding the term "emerging pest" to the TPG work programme.

[240] SC members indicated that: not all the criteria have to be fulfilled at the same time, some criteria (e.g. wide host range) are not restricted to emerging pests, and the term should not apply only to continental jump of a pest into a new region. It was noted that it may be difficult to provide a definition, as some countries consider emerging pests to be simply those that have changed their risk profile. It may be more useful to provide examples than to try to define the term too closely.

[241] The SC agreed that the TPG discuss the issue because it would be beneficial for the IPPC to have a common understanding of what was meant when the term "emerging pest" is used.

[242] The SC:

(89) *included* the task of defining the term "emerging pest" in the TPG work programme.

16. Date and venue of the next SC Meeting

[243] The next SC meeting is scheduled from 19-23 November 2018 in Rome, Italy.

17. Evaluation of the meeting process

[244] The Secretariat invited all SC members and observers to complete the evaluation of the meeting via this link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2018_May_SC by Friday, 1 June 2018.

18. Review and Adoption of the report

[245] The SC adopted the report.

[246] For ease of reference, a list of action points arising from the meeting is attached as Appendix 12

19. Close of the meeting

[247] The SC Chairperson thanked all participants for their active participation and noted that their input and expertise had led to the success of the meeting. He thanked outgoing SC members and wished them success for the future. He stressed the importance of the support from the Secretariat both before and during the meeting. This resulted in a well-organized and smooth-running meeting. He thanked the Rapporteur, the report writer and Secretariat for their attention to detail and accuracy in ensuring the production of an accurate record of the meeting. He also expressed appreciation for others who had contributed to the success of the meeting, including the interpreters and the messenger.

[248] The SSU lead echoed these remarks and noted the dedication of the members of the SSU. He encouraged SC members to continue to communicate between sessions.

[249] The IC representative also thanked the SC for the ability to contribute actively to the meeting. Some SC members noted that some members had left before the end of the meeting and stressed the importance of ensuring that those receiving assistance for the meeting were able to participate to the whole meeting.

[41] 07_SC_2018_May

[250] The SC thanked the SC Chairperson for guiding the meeting throughout the week.

[251] The SC Chairperson closed the meeting.

Appendix 1: Agenda

	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1.	**Opening of the Meeting**		
1.1	Opening by the IPPC Secretariat	---	XIA / NERSISYAN
2.	**Meeting Arrangements**		
2.2	Election of the Rapporteur	---	Chairperson
2.3	Adoption of the Agenda	01_SC_2018_May	Chairperson
3.	**Administrative Matters**		
3.1	Documents List	02_SC_2018_May	KISS
3.2	Participants List	03_SC_2018_May	KISS
3.3	Local Information	Link to local information	KISS
3.4	Standard Setting Unit staff	Link to standard setting staff	NERSISYAN
4.	**Updates**		
4.1	**Items arising from governance bodies**		
	❖ Items arising from CPM-13 (2018) ○ Update on Call for topics: standards and implementation (joint call) ○ SC Terms of Reference ○ Reorganisation of the fruit fly standards ○ Strategic framework for 2020-2030 ○ Outcome of CPM discussion on commodity standards	25_SC_2018_May Link to List of Topics Link to the Call for Topics page Link to SC ToR and RoP 24_SC_2018_May	NERSISYAN / FERRO
	❖ CPM Bureau: December 2017, March 2018 and April 2018 meeting	Link to Bureau meeting reports	NERSISYAN
	❖ IC interactions – last meeting	Link to the IC report	DALE/ BISHOP
4.2	**Briefings from IPPC Secretariat** ❖ Update from the Standard Setting Unit (SSU) ❖ Update from the Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU) ○ 2018 Work Plan of the IFU ❖ Update from the Integration and Support Team (IST)	 22_SC_2018_May 10_SC_2018_May 16_SC_2018_May 17_SC_2018_May	 NERSISYAN LARSON AL-DOBAI
5.	**Draft ISPMs from expert drafting groups (EWG/TP) for the first consultation**		

	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
5.1	**Revision of ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005), Priority 1** - Steward: Ms Marina ZLOTINA ❖ Specification 59 (for information) ❖ Steward's summary and potential implementation issues	2009-004 Link to the EWG report Link to Specification 59 13_SC_2018_May	ZLOTINA / MOREIRA
5.2	**Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002), Priority 2** - Steward: Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM ❖ Specification 65 (for information) ❖ Steward's summary and potential implementation issues	2014-002 Link to the EWG report Link to Spec 65 21_SC_2018_May	RAMARATHNAM / NERSISYAN
5.3	**Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006), Priority 2** - Steward: Mr Nicolaas Maria HORN ❖ Specification 62 (for information) ❖ Steward's summary and potential implementation issues	2014-006 Link to the TPPT report Link to Spec 62 15_SC_2018_May	HORN / MOREIRA / KISS
5.4	**Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001)** - Steward: Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC ❖ TPG December 2017 meeting report	1994-001 Link to the TPG report	BOUHOT-DELDUC / GORITSCHNIG
6.	**Draft specifications for approval**		
6.1	**Supplement on Guidance on the concept of the likelihood of establishment component of a pest risk analysis for quarantine pests (2015-010) to ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) Priority 4** - Steward: Ms Marina ZLOTINA ❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response) ❖ Steward's notes	2015-010 04_SC_2018_May 08_SC_2018_May	ZLOTINA/ KISS
7.	**Standards Committee**		
7.1	**Follow-up on actions from the SC November 2017**	Link to November 2017 SC report	Chairperson
	❖ Updates on the Sea Containers Task Force	Link to the SCTF report	HORN
	❖ IYPH Steering Committee update - Promotional paper on positive impact of phytosanitary standards on international trade, poverty reduction and the phytosanitary situation globally	Link to report of the 3rd meeting of the IYPH StC	OMAR/ DE SOUZA JUNIOR BISHOP
7.2	**Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site** (from November 2017 to May 2018)	09 _SC_2018_May	KISS

	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
8.	**Review of technical panels (from May 2017 to April 2018)**		
8.1.	**Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT)** - Steward: Mr David OPATOWSKI ❖ Call for treatments ❖ TPPT meeting reports: o 2017 April virtual meeting o 2017 July meeting(face-to-face) o 2017 October virtual meeting o 2017 November virtual meeting o 2018 January virtual meeting o 2018 February o 2018 March ❖ Update on activities of the TPPT o Evaluation of the objection received at CPM-12 (2017) o Membership	Link to the TPPT meeting reports 23_SC_2018_May	MOREIRA / OPATOWSKI / KISS
8.2	**Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG)** - Steward: Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC ❖ TPG meeting report (2017 December, face-to-face) ❖ Update on activities of the TPG o Membership ❖ Ink amendments to the Glossary term “contamination” and its derivates in adopted ISPMs (2017-002)	Link to the TPG meeting report 12_SC_2018_May 05_SC_2018_May	GORITSCHNIG / BOUHOT-DELDUC
8.3	**Technical Panel for Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP)** - Steward: Ms Jane CHARD ❖ TPDP meeting reports: o TPDP meeting report (2018 February, face-to-face) ❖ Update on activities of the TPDP o Membership	Link to the TPDP meeting reports 11_SC_2018_May	MOREIRA / CHARD
8.4	**Technical Panel on Pest Free Areas and Systems Approaches for Fruit Flies (TPFF)** - Steward: Ms Ana Lilia MONTEALEGRE ❖ Update on the activities of the TPFF	18_SC_2018_May	MOREIRA / MONTEALEGRE
8.5	**Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ)** - Steward: Ms Marina ZLOTINA	Link to the TPFQ meeting reports	MOREIRA / ZLOTINA

	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
	❖ TPFQ meeting reports ○ 2017 June virtual meeting ○ 2017 September virtual meeting ❖ Update on activities of the TPFQ ❖ IFQRG questionnaire - potential areas for future research as part of a strategy setting process to inform the future IFQRG research priorities	19_SC_2018_May 27 _SC_2018_May	
9.	**Adjustments to the List of Topics and the stewards**		
9.1	Review and adjustments to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*[42]	20_SC_2018_May Link to the online List of topics for standards	MOREIRA / CASSIN
10.	**Adjustments to the Framework for Standards and Implementation**	Link to the Framework for Standards and Implementation 28_SC_2018_May	GORITSCHNIG / RAMARATHNAM
10.1	Incorporation of host standards and sampling standards into the Framework for standards and implementation	06_SC_2018_May	BUTCHER
11.	**Concepts and implementation issues related to draft ISPMs or adopted standards**		
11.1	Implementation issues associated with ISPM 41 (*International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment*) ❖ Explanatory document: ISPM 41 (*International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment*) - Appendix 2 - category in 7th row	14_SC_2018_May 26_SC_2018_May	SAI SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE
12.	**SC recommendations for CPM-14 (2019)**		Chairperson
13.	**Agenda items deferred to future SC Meetings**		Chairperson
14.	**Review of the standard setting calendar**	Link to the IPP calendar	NERSISYAN
15.	**Any Other business**		Chairperson
15.1	Definition for emerging pests – discussion paper from TC-RPPOs	07_SC_2018_May	SUAZO / CHOUIBANI
16.	**Date and venue of the next SC Meeting**		NERSISYAN
17.	**Evaluation of the meeting process**	Link to online survey [43]	Chairperson
18.	**Review and Adoption of the report**		Chairperson
19.	**Close of the meeting**		Chairperson

[42] List of topics for IPPC standards main page: https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards/

[43] Link to survey on the evaluation of the meeting process: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2018SCMay

Appendix 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED/ DISTRIBUTED
Draft ISPMs			
2009-005	5.1	Revision of ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005)	2018-03-01
2014-002	5.2	Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)	2018-03-01
2014-006	5.3	Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006)	2018-03-01
1994-001	5.4	Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001)	2018-03-01
Specifications			
2015-010	6.1	Draft Specification: Supplement on *Guidance on the concept of the likelihood of establishment component of a pest risk analysis for quarantine pests* to ISPM 11	2018-03-29
Other Documents			
01_SC_2018_May	2.3	Draft Agenda	2018-02-28 2018-04-27 2018-08-09
02_SC_2018_May	3.1	Documents List	2018-04-27 2018-05-09
03_SC_2018_May	3.2	Participants List	2018-04-27
04_SC_2018_May	6.1	Compiled comments with steward's responses - *Supplement on guidance on the concept of the likelihood of establishment component of a pest risk analysis for quarantine pests to ISPM 11*	2018-03-29
05_SC_2018_May	8.2	Ink amendments to the Glossary term "contamination" and its derivates in adopted ISPMs (2017-002)	2018-04-09
06_SC_2018_May	10.1	Incorporation of host standards and sampling standards into the Framework for standards and implemetation	2018-04-09
07_SC_2018_May	15.01	Definition for emerging pest	2018-04-13
08_SC_2018_May	6.1	Steward's Notes - Supplement on Guidance on the concept of the likelihood of establishment component of a pest risk analysis for quarantine pests (2015-010) to ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*)	2018-04-13
09_SC_2018_May	7.2	Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (from November 2017 to May 2018)	2018-04-24
10_SC_2018_May	4.2	Update from the Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU)	2018-04-24
11_SC_2018_May	8.3	Update on activities of the TPDP	2018-04-25
12_SC_2018_May	8.2	Update on activities of the TPG	2018-04-25
13_SC_2018_May	5.1	Steward's summary and potential implementation issues – Revision of ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005),	2018-04-25

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED/ DISTRIBUTED
14_SC-2018_May	11.1	Implementation issues associated with ISPM 41 (*International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment*)	2018-04-25
15_SC_2018_May	5.3	Steward's summary and potential implementation issues – Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006)	2018-04-25
16_SC_2018_May	4.2	2018 Work Plan of the IFU	2018-04-26
17_SC_2018_May	4.2	Update from the Integration and Support Team (IST)	2018-04-26
18_SC_2018_May	8.4	Update on the activities of the TPFF	2018-04-26
19_Sc_2018_May	8.5	Update on activities of the TPFQ	2018-04-26
20_Sc_2018_May	9.1	Adjustments to the List of topics and the stewards	2018-04-27
21_SC_2018_May	5.2	Steward's summary and potential implementation issues - Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)	2018-04-27
22_SC_2018_May	4.2	Standard Setting Unit update	2018-04-27
23_SC_2018_May	8.1	Update on activities of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT)	2018-04-27
24_SC_2018_May	4.1	IPPC Strategic framework for 2020-2030	2018-04-27
25_SC_2018_May	4.1	Items arising from CPM-13 (2018) Update	2018-04-27
26_SC_2018_May	11.1	Explanatory document: ISPM 41 (*International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment*) - Appendix 2 - category in 7th row	2018-05-09
27_SC_2018_May	8.5	IFQRG questionnaire	2018-05-09
28_SC_2018_May	10	Framework for Standards and Implementation	2018-05-09

IPP LINKS:	Agenda item
Link to Local Information	2
Link to Standards Setting Staff	2
Link to the 2017 April CPM Bureau report	3
Link to Specification 56 (Cut Flowers)	4.1
Link to Specification 62 (Fumigation)	4.2
Link to the TPPT meeting reports	4.2, 6.1
Link to Specification 60 (Grain)	4.3
Link to the EWG report (Grain)	4.3
Link to the TPG Dec 2016 meeting report	4.4, 6.2
Link to the nominations (TPG, EWG for the revision of ISPM 8)	5.2
Link to the TPDP meeting reports	6.3

IPP LINKS:	Agenda item
Link to the TPFQ meeting reports	6.5

Appendix 3. Participants list

SC members participating in the 2018 May SC meeting

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Africa Member	**Ms Alphonsine LOUHOUARI TOKOZABA** Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage, 24, rue Kiélé Tenard, Mfilou, Brazzaville, **REPUBLIC OF CONGO** Tel: +242 01 046 53 61 Tel: +242 04 005 57 05	louhouari@yahoo.fr; A.louhouaritoko@gmail.com;	Replacement member for Ms Nadia HADJERES CPM-10 (2015) 1st term / 3 years	2018
Africa Member SC-7	**Ms Esther KIMANI** Managing Director Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) P.O. BOX 49592-00100, Nairobi **KENYA** Tel:+254 020 6618 000 Mobile: +254 0709 891 000	ekimani@kephis.org; director@kephis.org;	CPM-9 (2014) CPM-12 (2017) 2nd term / 3 years	2020
Africa Member	**Mr David KAMANGIRA** Senior Deputy Director and IPPC Focal point Department of Agricultural Research Services Headquarters, P.O. Box 30779, Lilongwe 3. **MALAWI** Tel: : +265 888 342 712 Tel: +265 999 122 199	davidkamangira1@gmail.com;	CPM-11 (2016) 1st term / 3 years	2019
Africa Member	**Mr Moses Adegboyega ADEWUMI** Head of inspection Southwest Zone Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service FAAN HQT Complex Ikeja, Lagos, Lagos state, **NIGERIA** Tel: +234 -8033913847 / 8059607047	adegboyegamoses37@yahoo.com;	Replacement member for Ms Alice Ntoboh Sibon NDIKONTAR CPM-10 (2015) 1st term / 3 years	2018
Asia Member	**Ms Jayani Nimanthika WATHUKARAGE** Assistant director (Research) National Plant Quarantine Service, Canada Friendship Road, Katunayake, SRI LANKA Tel : +94718015660 / +94 112252028 - 9 Fax : +94112253709	jayaninimanthika@gmail.com	Replacement member for Ms Walaikorn RATTANADE CHAKUL CPM-12 (2017) 1st term / 3 years	2018

Asia Member	**Mr Masahiro SAI** Senior Researcher (Head of Section) Risk Analysis Division Yokohama Plant Protection Station Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF**)** **JAPAN** Tel**:** +81-45-211-0375	saim@pps.maff.go.jp;	Replacement member for Mr Lifeng WU CPM-10 (2015) 1st term / 3 years	2018
Asia Member SC-7	**Ms Thanh Huong HA** Deputy Director of Plant Quarantine Division, Plant Protection Department 149 Ho Dac Di Street Dong Da district Hanoi City **VIET NAM** **Tel:** (+8424) 35334813 Fax: (+8424) 35330043	ppdhuong@yahoo.com; ppdhuong@gmail.com ;	CPM-7 (2012) CPM-10 (2015) 2nd term/3 years	2018
Europe Member	**Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC** Plant health section Sub-directorate for plant quality, health and protection Department of sanitary action in primary production General directorate for food Ministry of agriculture, and food 251 rue de Vaugirard 75732 PARIS CEDEX 15 **FRANCE** Tel: +33 149558437	laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr ;	CPM-10 (2015) 1st term / 3 years	2018
Europe Member SC-7	**Mr Nicolaas Maria HORN** Senior Officer Plant Health, Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA) National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) P.O. Box 9102 6700 HC Wageningen **THE NETHERLANDS** Phone: (+31) 651998151	n.m.horn@nvwa.nl;	CPM-9 (2014) CPM-12 (2017) 2nd term / 3 years	2020
Europe Member	**Mr Samuel BISHOP** Plant Health Policy team Room IIG35 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs National Agri-Food Innovation Campus Sand Hutton York North Yorkshire **UNITED KINGDOM** YO41 4LZ Tel: +44 (0) 2080262506 Mob.: +44 (0) 7827976902	sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk;	Replacement member for Ms Hilde Kristin PAULSEN CPM-10 (2015) 2nd term / 3 years	2018
Latin America and Caribbean Member	**Mr Jesulindo Nery DE SOUZA JUNIOR** 177 Dyer Road, Hillcrest Office Park, Ground Floor Hillcrest, Pretoria 0083 South Africa **BRAZIL** +27 1236 65200 +27 7281 55380	jesulindo.junior@agricultura.gov.br; jesulindo@gmail.com;	CPM-11 (2016) 1st term / 3 years	2019

Latin America and Caribbean Member	**Ms Ana Lilia MONTEALEGRE LARA** Harmonization and International Evaluation Deputy Director Dirección General de Sanidad Vegetal SENASICA/SAGARPA Boulevard Adolfo Ruiz Cortines No. 5010, Piso 4 Colonia Insurgentes Cuicuilco, Delegación Coyoacán, México D.F., C.P. 04530 **MEXICO** Tel: (+11) 52-55 59 05 10 00 ext 51341	ana.montealegre@senasica.gob.mx;	CPM-7(2012) CPM-10 (2015) 2nd term / 3 years	2018
Latin America and Caribbean Member SC Chairperson	**Mr Ezequiel FERRO** Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA Av, Paeso Colón 315 C.A. de Buenos Aires **ARGENTINA** Tel/Fax : (+5411) 4121-5091	eferro@senasa.gov.ar;	CPM-11 (2016) 2nd term / 3 years	2019
Latin America and Caribbean Member SC-7	**Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE** Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal Av. Presidente Bulnes 140, 4th floor, Santiago, **CHILE** Tel + 56 2 234 5120	alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl ;	CPM-10 (2015) 1st term / 3 years	2018
Near East Member SC Vice-Chairperson SC-7	**Ms Shaza OMAR** Senior Phytosanitary Officer Central Administration for Plant Quarantine Ministry of Agriculture 1 Nadi al Said Street Dokki, Giza, **EGYPT** Mobile: +201014000813 Fax: (+20) 237608574	shaza.roshdy@gmail.com;	CPM-11 (2016) 1st term / 3 years	2019
Near East Member	**Mr Gamil RAMADHAN** General Director of Plant Protection Department of Yemen, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, Aden **YEMEN** Tel: 00967 770712209 or 00967 733802618	abuameerm21@gmail.com	Replacement member for Mr. Nazir Al BDOUR CPM-12 (2017) 1st term / 3 years	2019
Near East Member	**Mr Abdulqader Khudhair ABBAS** Ministry of Agriculture Plant protection directorate Abu Ghraib Baghdad **IRAQ** Tel : 9647801876544 (mobile)	abdulkader_abbas@yahoo.com; crop_prot@moagr.org	Replacement member for Ms Maryam JALILI MOGHADAM and Mr Ali Amin KAFU CPM-12 (2017) 1st term / 3 years	2019

North America Member	**Ms Marina ZLOTINA** IPPC Technical Director USDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) 4700 River Rd, 5c-03.37 Riverdale, MD 20737 **USA** Phone: 1-301-851-2200 Cell: 1 -301-832-0611	Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov;	CPM-10 (2015) 1st term / 3 years	2018
North America Member SC-7	**Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM** Senior Specialist (International Phytosanitary Standards): International Phytosanitary Standards Section, Plant Protection Division, CFIA-ACIA 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa ON K1A OY9 **CANADA** Tel: (+1) 613-773-7122 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7252	rajesh.ramarathnam@inspection.gc.ca;	CPM-11 (2016) 1st term / 3 years	2019
Pacific Member SC-7	**Mr Stephen BUTCHER** Manager, Plant Imports, Plants & Pathways Directorate Ministry for Primary Industries Pastoral House 25 The Terrace PO Box 2526 Wellington 6140 **NEW ZEALAND** Tel: (+64) 4 894 0478 Fax: (+ 64) 4 894 0662 Mob: (+ 64) 29 894 0478	stephen.butcher@mpi.govt.nz;	Replacement member for Mr John HEDLEY CPM-4 (2009) CPM-7 (2012) CPM-11 (2016) 3rd term / 3 years	2019
Pacific Member	**Mr Lupeomanu Pelenato FONOTI** Assistant Chief Executive Officer Quarantine Division Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, P.O. Box 1874, Apia, **SAMOA** Tel.: H: (685)27054 W: (685) 20924 M: 7767305	aceo@samoaquarantine.gov.ws	CPM-12 (2017) 1st term / 3 years	2020

Other participants

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Observer / NEPPO	**Mr Mekki CHOUIBANI** Executive Director The Near East Plant Protection Organization (NEPPO) Baterinentic INRA, Angle Avenue Ibn Al Duazzani et Hassan II fabat **MOROCCO** Office: +212 537 704810/ +212 537 776 598 Cell: +212 673997808 Fax: +212 537 708763	m.chouibani@neppo.org	N/A	N/A

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Observer / NAPPO	**Mr Alonso SUAZO** NAPPO Technical Director, North American Plant Protection Organization 1730 Varsity Dr. Suite 145 – Raleigh, NC, 27606 **USA** Tel.: 919 559 3302	alonso.suazo@nappo.org	N/A	N/A
Observer / IAPSC	**Mr Abdel Fattah Mabrouk AMER** Senior Scientific Officer Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC) P.O. Box. 4170 – Nlongkak Yaounde **CAMEROON** Mob: (237) 677 65 31 38	abdelfattahsalem@ymail.com amera@africa-union.org	N/A	N/A
Observer / Thailand	**Ms Chonticha RAKKRAI** Director Plant Quarantine Research Group. Plant Protection Research and Development Office (PPRDO) Department of Agriculture (DOA) as NPPO of Thailand Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC) 50 Phaholyothin Rd. Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900, **THAILAND** Tel: 662 579 5583 Fax: 662 940 5396	rakkrai@yahoo.com	N/A	N/A
Observer / IC	**Mr Chris DALE** Assistant Director, International Plant Health Surveillance Program, Plant Division Department of Agriculture and Water Resources 7 London Circuit, Canberra ACT 2601 GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 **AUSTRALIA** Phone +61 2 6272 5192 Mobile +61 466 459 129	agriculture.gov.au	N/A	N/A
Observer / Costa Rica	**Mr Hernando MORERA GONZÁLEZ** Pest Risk Analyst Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado 300 Sur de Teletica, Sabana Sur, San José, **COSTA RICA** Tel: +(506) 8660-8383	hmorera@sfe.go.cr	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	**Mr Avetik NERSISYAN** Standard Setting Unit Lead	Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Adriana MOREIRA** Standard Setting Officer	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Sandra GORITSCHNIG** Standard Setting Associate	Sandra.Goritschnig@fao.org	N/A	N/A

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Janka KISS** Standard Setting Associate	Janka.Kiss@fao.org	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Jane CHARD** Report writer	janemchard@yahoo.co.uk	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	**Mr Simon ANNING** Project Support Officer, Plant Health Policy Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Rm 11G35, Sand Hutton Site, York, YO41 1LZ, United Kingdom Telephone +44 (0)208 0262428	simon.anning@defra.gsi.gov.uk	N/A	N/A

Memebers who did not attend

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Asia Member	**Mr HERMAWAN** Centre for Plant Quarantine and Bio-Safety Indonesian Agricultural Quarantine Agency Ministry of Agriculture Jl. Harsono RM. 3 Pasar Minggu, Jakarta Selatan 12550 **INDONESIA** Tel: + 62 21 7816482 Fax: + 62 12 7816482	Hermawan1961@gmail.com;	CPM-11 (2016) 2nd term/3 years	2019
Near East Member	**Mr Youssef Al MASRI** Engineer Ministry of agriculture; crop protection division Rwayseh Salima Maten alala Babda Mount Lebanon - 7103 **LEBANON** Phone : +961-3-957482	yalmasri@agriculture.gov.lb; Yalmasri755@yahoo.com	CPM-11 (2016) 1st term / 3 years	2019
Europe Member	**Mr David OPATOWSKI** 1-3 avenue de la Paix 1202 Geneva, Switzerland **ISRAEL** Tel: (+41) 79945 7344	dopatowski@yahoo.com;	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) CPM-12 (2017) 3rd term / 3 years	2020
Pacific Member	**Mr Bruce HANCOCKS** Assistant Director | Plant Health Policy | Biosecurity Plant Division Department of Agriculture GPO Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601 **AUSTRALIA** Tel: +61 2 62723826	Bruce.Hancocks@agriculture.gov.au;	CPM-12 (2017) 1st term / 3 years	2020

Appendix 4: List of draft ISPMs approved for consultation

[252] The SC at the 2018 May meeting agreed to submit the following draft ISPMs for consultation (1 July – 30 September 2018):

- Revision of ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) (2009-005)
- Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)
- Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006)
- Amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001)

Appendix 5: DRAFT ISPM: Revision of ISPM 8: *Determination of pest status in an area* (2009-005)

Status box

This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
Date of this document	2018-05-29
Document category	Draft revision of ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area* (2009-005))
Current document stage	*To* First consultation
Major stages	2009-11 Standards Committee (SC) recommended adding to the work programme. 2010-03 CPM-5 added topic *Revision of ISPM 8 (Determination of pest status in an area)* (2009-005) to the work programme. 2013-11 SC approved Specification 59. 2017-09 Expert working group (EWG) meeting. 2018-05 SC revised draft and approved for first consultation.
Steward history	2015-11 SC Ms Marina ZLOTINA (US, Lead Steward) 2015-11 SC Ms Shaza OMAR (EG, Assistant Steward) 2012-11 SC Mr Ebbe NORDBO (DK, Assistant Steward) 2009-11 SC Ms Beatriz MELCHO (UY, Lead Steward)
Notes	2018-01 Edited 2018-05 Edited

CONTENTS [TO BE INSERTED]

Adoption

[To be inserted following adoption]

INTRODUCTION

Scope

[253] This standard describes the use of pest records and other information to determine pest status in an area. Descriptions of pest status categories are provided, as well as recommendations for good reporting practices.

[254] This standard is not concerned with reporting obligations, but with the quality of information used in determining pest status.

References

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

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

Definitions

[257] Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

Outline of Requirements

[258] Pest status is determined by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) responsible for the area, using sources of information as outlined in this standard. This standard also provides guidance on the purpose of the determination of pest status.

[259] Guidance on evaluating the reliability of information is provided and sources of uncertainty in determining the pest status in an area are described.

[260] This standard identifies categories for pest status under "presence" or "absence". It also describes the responsibilities of NPPOs and good practices for determining and reporting pest status.

BACKGROUND

[261] Pest records and other information are used to determine the presence or absence of a pest in an area. All importing and exporting countries need information concerning the status of pests for pest risk analysis, the establishment of and compliance with phytosanitary regulations, and the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas.

[262] This standard describes how information is used to determine the pest status in an area. This information includes records from surveillance as described in ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*). Pest records and pest status are also used by NPPOs in pest reporting as described in ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*).

IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

[263] This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests that can have an impact on biodiversity and the environment. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and to apply phytosanitary measures to protect biodiversity and the environment.

REQUIREMENTS

1. Purpose of Pest Status Determination

[264] Determination of pest status is a vital component of a number of activities covered under the IPPC and by the principles noted in ISPM 1 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*) and the international standards for phytosanitary measures that have been developed from them. Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area.

[265] NPPOs may use pest status information for:

- pest risk analysis
- market access requests
- planning national, regional or international pest management programmes
- establishing and complying with phytosanitary regulations
- establishing and maintaining pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence
- exchanging information as outlined in the IPPC.

[266] Information on the status of a pest in areas may be used to establish the global distribution of a pest.

2. Information Used to Determine Pest Status

[267] Information from pest records or other sources should be used to inform decisions on the appropriate selection of pest status categories as described in section 3.

[268] The information that should be included in pest records is described in ISPM 6.

[269] Sometimes pest status can be difficult to determine because of uncertainty. Sources of uncertainty may include:

- limited critical information on pest biology
- taxonomic revisions or ambiguity
- conflicting, contradictory or outdated information
- difficulties with survey methodologies
- difficulties with diagnostic methodologies
- insufficient understanding of host associations
- unknown aetiology
- findings of signs of organisms without finding live pest or pest damage
- insufficient understanding of the distribution in an area
- unreliability of the information sources used to determine pest status.

[270] Information is available from many sources and has varying levels of reliability. Appendix 1providesguidance that may be used by the responsible NPPO to assess the reliability of different information sources.

[271] Ideally, highly reliable sources should be used to determined pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources may be used. This may increase uncertainty but can also identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (ISPM 6).

3. Describing Pest Status in an Area

[272] The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status in an area.

[273] Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reported, the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date the pest status was determined should be included. Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.

3.1 Presence

[274] A pest is deemed to be present if records indicate that it is indigenous, introduced or transient. If a pest is present and reliable information is available, then it should be possible to characterize its distribution using the categories provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Categories of pest status – Present

Status	Status description
Present: widely distributed	The pest is present throughout the area where conditions are suitable.
Present: not widely distributed and not under official control	The pest is present in a part or parts of the area in accordance with Supplement 1 (Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of "official control" and "not widely distributed") to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).
Present: not widely distributed and under official control	The pest is present in the area and subject to "official control" in accordance with Supplement 1 (Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of "official control" and "not widely distributed") to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*). The purpose of the official control should be stated alongside the status determination.
Present: at low prevalence	The pest is present in the area but its prevalence is low in accordance with ISPM 22 (*Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*).
Present: except in specified pest free areas	The pest is present in the area except for areas which are free from the pest in accordance with ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*). These areas should be described alongside the status determination.
Present: except in specified pest free places of production or production sites	The pest is present in an area except for pest free places of production or production sites in accordance with ISPM 10 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*). These places should be described alongside the status determination.
Present: not expected to establish	The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient, or the pest is not expected to establish because appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).

[275] In some cases, it might be necessary to provide additional information about pest presence, for instance that the pest has only been reported under limited conditions, such as:

- on specific hosts
- in enclosed structures
- in botanical gardens
- in the environment but not associated with a plant host (e.g. soil or water)
- at certain times of the year.

3.2 Absence

[276] A pest is considered to be absent if surveillance and other information indicate that the pest is not found in the area. If a pest is absent and reliable information is available, then it should be possible to characterize this status using the categories provided in Table 2.

Table 2. Categories of pest status – Absent

Status	Status description
Absent: pest not recorded	Surveillance supports the conclusion that the pest is absent and has never been recorded.
Absent: pest free area (entire country)	The entire country is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*).
Absent: pest records invalid	Pest records indicate the presence of a pest, but the conclusion is reached that the records are invalid or no longer valid, such as in the following cases: - changes in taxonomy have occurred - misidentification has occurred - there are errors in the record or records - reinterpretation of the record or records may be needed as a result of changes in national borders.
Absent: pest no longer present	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past, but surveillance indicates that the pest is no longer present. The reason or reasons may include: - climate or other natural limitation to pest perpetuation - changes in hosts cultivated - changes in cultivars - changes in production practices.
Absent: pest eradicated	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past. A documented pest eradication programme was conducted and was successful (see ISPM 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*)). Surveillance confirms continued absence.

[277] It is possible to conclude that a pest is absent if information on presence is unreliable. Negative results of surveillance may provide knowledge about the absence of a pest. However, lack of information does not necessarily constitute a basis for determining pest absence.

[278] Pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention do not affect the pest status of the area. Detections of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population, do not affect the pest status in an area.

[279] Pest status may be "undetermined" if the NPPO cannot provide results from surveillance or any other supporting information. This could include cases, for example, where pest records indicate the presence of a pest, but the taxonomic nomenclature is ambiguous or the identification or diagnostic methods are outdated. In such cases, surveillance may be necessary.

4. Responsibilities of NPPOs and Good Reporting Practices

[280] Contracting parties have obligations under the IPPC (Article VIII.1(a)) to report "the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests". Information pertaining to pest status in an area contributes to pest reports. Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area concerned using pest records and other information from different sources. It is the responsibility of an NPPO to provide pest records and supporting evidence upon request from another NPPO.

[281] There may be some instances in which a pest status declared by an NPPO is questioned by another NPPO (e.g. when there are repeated interceptions or contradictory pest records). In these situations, bilateral contacts between NPPOs should be made to clarify the situation, and if needed the pest status may be revised by the NPPO responsible for the area.

4.1 Good practices for determining and reporting pest status

[282] NPPOs should:

- use the categories of “presence” and “absence” set out in this standard when exchanging pest status information, to promote harmonization and transparency
- base determinations of pest status in an area on the most reliable and timely information available
- maintain pest records and supporting evidence, taking into account that they may be needed to support the determination of pest status
- re-evaluate pest status if appropriate
- inform other NPPOs and their regional plant protection organization, where appropriate, of relevant changes in pest status according to ISPM 17.

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

APPENDIX 1: Guidance on reliability of information sources

Information source	Reliability	Examples
Information gathered from surveillance	**High**	Surveillance conducted by NPPOs, or by entities authorized by the NPPO, supported by: - documented protocols - diagnostics laboratories with a high degree of expertise and high-quality infrastructure - use of validated methods - use of information management systems to capture and manage data in a consistent manner - trained personnel - implementation of quality management systems
	Moderately high	Surveillance with a high degree of NPPO oversight or participation, supported by: - documented protocols - diagnostics laboratories with recognized expertise - use of information management systems to capture and manage data in a consistent manner - trained personnel
	Moderately low	Structured general surveillance programmes with some degree of NPPO oversight, where: - sample identification requires confirmation by recognized authorities or laboratories - data capture and information management systems are in place but with uncertain verification and validation procedures - there is little or no direct training of personnel and their competency is uncertain
	Low	General surveillance activities with low or no NPPO oversight and participation, where: - identification expertise is low and there is little diagnostic laboratory support - information management infrastructure is weak - training and expertise are minimal or variable
Peer-reviewed journals	**High**	Multiple original research papers with detailed description of the methodological approach or approaches used; approaches are widely accepted; published in high impact-factor journals
	Moderately high	- At least one original research paper with detailed description of methodological approach - Several original research papers without specified methodology - Multiple published review articles; articles cite independent (separate) sources of information
	Moderately low	Only one or a few original research papers; any found do not describe methodology ***or*** methodology used is not widely accepted; published in low impact-factor journals
	Low	No peer-reviewed literature available

Information source	Reliability	Examples
Databases and websites	**High**	Published by a reputable organization; uses authoritative scientific sources and terminology; provides links or details to locate primary records and the dates of the primary records or last review of content; has a published updating and quality control policy
	Moderately high	Published by a reputable organization; uses authoritative scientific sources and terminology but may not provide all of the following: links or details to locate primary records; the dates of the primary records or last review of content; a published updating and quality control policy
	Moderately low	One or two criteria above are met, but most information not verified or traceable
	Low	The publisher is not authoritative and there may not be links to primary scientific sources (so records cannot readily be traced); data may be old or undated and there may not be a current updating or quality control policy
Other published expert sources that are not peer-reviewed (e.g. from universities, subject matter experts, scientific societies) –may include extension reports, non-journal articles, bulletins, alerts, etc.	**High**	Many reports from independent sources; well understood methodology; general consensus between information sources
	Moderately high	Several independent articles or reports based on independent information; methodology is described
	Moderately low	A few articles and reports that may or may not have each been based on independent (different) information sources
	Low	- Single reports; if more than one report, those that are found may or may not be based on independent (different) information sources - No supporting evidence found
Unpublished communications from sources other than NPPO	**Moderate**	- Opinion from a recognized expert that has been documented by the NPPO and can be provided upon request - Personal communication that has been archived
	Low	Informal or unarchived personal communication

Appendix 6: DRAFT ISPM: Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)

Status box

This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
Date of this document	2018-05-22
Document category	Draft ISPM
Current document stage	*To* First consultation
Major stages	2013-11 Standards Committee (SC) recommended topic *Authorization of non-NPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions* to be added to the work programme. 2014-04 CPM-9 added the topic *Authorization of non-NPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002) to the work programme with priority 3 (subsequently changed to priority 2 by CPM-10). 2016-05 SC approved Specification 65 (*Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions*). 2017-06 Expert working group (EWG) drafted ISPM. 2018-05SCrevised draft and approved for first consultation.
Steward history	2016-05 SC Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (CA, Lead Steward) 2016-05 SC Ms Marina ZLOTINA (US, Assistant Steward) 2014-05 SC Ms Marie-Claude FOREST (CA, Lead Steward)
Notes	2017-09 Edited 2018-05 Edited

CONTENTS [TO BE INSERTED LATER]

Adoption

[To be inserted following adoption]

INTRODUCTION

Scope

[283] This standard provides a framework that enables national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) to authorize private entities to perform specific phytosanitary actions associated with import, domestic and export systems on behalf of the NPPO. Elements of this standard may also apply when authorizing public entities.

[284] This standard does not cover the issuance of phytosanitary certificates; these are issued by authorized public officers only (Article V.2 (a) of the IPPC).

References

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

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

Definitions

[287] Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

Outline of Requirements

[288] This standard outlines the key requirements for the development of an authorization programme and the eligibility criteria for entities to become authorized. The standard identifies the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved in the implementation of an authorization programme. It also describes processes for audits, types of nonconformities, and types of authorization status that may apply to entities.

BACKGROUND

[289] It is becoming common in various countries throughout the world for national plant protection organizations to authorize entities to perform specific phytosanitary actions such as inspection, testing, surveillance and treatment. Concepts of quality management systems applied in the manufacturing sector are increasingly being applied to the delivery of a wide range of phytosanitary actions, including those undertaken by such authorized entities. However, there is a need to ensure the credibility of such authorizations and that the practice aligns with the principles of the IPPC.

[290] The need for harmonization when considering, developing and implementing authorization programmes has led to the development of this standard.

IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

[291] Standardized authorization programmes may have a positive impact on biodiversity and the environment because they may result in more effective and consistent delivery of phytosanitary actions, helping to enhance the integrity (i.e. the overall effectiveness and reliability) of the NPPO's phytosanitary system.

REQUIREMENTS

[292] Authorization is a process that may be used by NPPOs to formally recognize entities to undertake specific NPPO phytosanitary actions. An NPPO's authorization programme operates within its phytosanitary system.

[293] An NPPO should determine whether to authorize entities to perform phytosanitary actions. Examples of phytosanitary actions that an NPPO may authorize an entity to perform on its behalf include monitoring, sampling, inspection, testing, surveillance, treatment, post-entry quarantine, destruction, supervision and auditing. Under an authorization programme, entities may perform phytosanitary actions within a phytosanitary regulatory system (import, domestic or export).

[294] In this standard "entities" include the providers of phytosanitary action (e.g. individuals, organizations, businesses) and, where appropriate, their facilities (such as equipment, laboratories, treatment enclosures). In some cases, authorization of entities may require an NPPO to approve individuals within the entity (such as those responsible for specific phytosanitary actions), relevant documentation, their facilities, or any combination of these. NPPOs should apply this standard when authorizing private entities. NPPOs may also decide to apply elements of this standard when authorizing public entities, such as other government departments. In such cases, the NPPO and the public entity will determine the nature of the authorization arrangement.

[295] NPPOs should ensure that their legal framework enables them to authorize entities to perform phytosanitary actions on their behalf. The NPPO's legal framework should allow it to suspend, revoke and reinstate authorizations, and should also enable an authorized entity to withdraw from the authorization programme.

1. Development of Authorization Programme

[296] The NPPO should define its objectives for, and develop, an authorization programme that is appropriate for its purposes. When developing an authorization programme, the NPPO should:

- develop and establish the requirements that must be met in order for an entity to be authorized to carry out specific phytosanitary actions on behalf of the NPPO
- develop an initiation and approval process for authorizing entities
- develop a training plan to ensure that NPPO personnel are trained and obtain the expertise to manage the authorization programme
- identify minimum training, skills and competency requirements for entities to perform phytosanitary actions, these requirements being at least equivalent to those required for NPPO personnel to undertake the same phytosanitary actions
- develop a template arrangement, such as a contract or a memorandum of understanding, that can be used to formalize the authorization of entities
- develop performance criteria
- develop an audit process and supporting tools, including audit checklists and corrective action reports
- develop criteria to determine nonconformities
- develop a process to address nonconformity, this including, where appropriate, suspending or revoking authorization
- develop a process for the entity to voluntarily withdraw from the authorization programme
- develop a contingency plan for business continuity in the event that an authorized entity has withdrawn from the authorization programme or had its authorization suspended or revoked
- develop a process to ensure efficient and effective communication between the NPPO and the authorized entity.

2. Criteria for Eligibility of Entities

[297] The NPPO should ensure that the entity meets the following criteria:

- it has legal status to operate in the country of authorization
- it has the ability to enter into a formal arrangement with the NPPO
- it has sufficient resources (financial and human), including the expertise, equipment and infrastructure required, to undertake the specific phytosanitary actions and to ensure continuity of service
- it agrees to conform with the requirements set by the NPPO, including submitting to the NPPO its documented quality management system, this including a documented quality manual and standard operating procedures (an NPPO may determine that a quality manual is not required, and that other documentation may be sufficient, hereafter referred to as "documentation in lieu of a quality manual"; standard operating procedures need to describe how specific phytosanitary actions are undertaken (i.e. who does what, when, where and how))
- it declares any possible conflict of interest and identifies how this would be managed to ensure that it acts impartially as regards the specific phytosanitary actions it undertakes.

3. Roles and Responsibilities for Implementing the Authorization Programme

3.1 Roles and responsibilities of the NPPO

[298] The roles and responsibilities of the NPPO should include the following:

- to assess the entity against the criteria for eligibility established by the NPPO

- to define clearly the phytosanitary actions the entity is authorized to perform, the performance criteria and corrective actions
- to evaluate the entity against the requirements set by the NPPO regarding its documented quality manual (or documentation sufficient to address the specific phytosanitary actions)and implementation of standard operating procedures on-site, and propose suggestions for improvement as necessary
- to enter into an arrangement which authorizes the entity to perform specific phytosanitary actions, and review and update the arrangement as necessary
- to train NPPO personnel and ensure that their skills and competencies are maintained at an adequate level to consistently implement the authorization programme
- to carry out regular audits of the authorized entity to verify that it conforms with the requirements of the NPPO's authorization programme
- to carry out internal audits of its own procedures and processes to verify that the objectives of its authorization programme continue to be met
- to implement processes for addressing identified nonconformities, including, where appropriate, suspending or revoking authorization, which may include regulatory enforcement
- to maintain documentation, including records and lists of authorized entities
- to implement and maintain transparent, efficient and effective communication on the authorization programme, in particular between the NPPO and the authorized entities.

3.2 Roles and responsibilities of the authorized entity

[299] The roles and responsibilities of the authorized entity should include the following:

- to provide necessary information to the NPPO when applying for authorization to perform specific phytosanitary actions on behalf of the NPPO
- to enter into an arrangement to perform the specific phytosanitary actions on behalf of the NPPO
- to implement a documented quality management system to conform with the requirements set by the NPPO, which may cover:
  - standard operating procedures
  - competency of personnel
  - training of personnel
  - document control
  - revision of documents
  - records, in particular of the activities undertaken in relation to the specific phytosanitary actions
  - internal audit
  - management of nonconformity
- to maintain infrastructure, where applicable, and resources to consistently carry out the actions necessary to conform with the requirements set by the NPPO
- to ensure personnel have the relevant education and experience to perform the specific phytosanitary actions
- to train personnel and ensure that their skills and competencies are maintained at an adequate level to consistently carry out the actions necessary to conform with the requirements set by the NPPO
- to maintain and provide quality management system documents (including records) to the NPPO as required
- to undergo audits by the NPPO (or its authorized entity) as described in the requirements set by the NPPO.

3.2.1 Roles and responsibilities of entities authorized to audit or supervise

[300] An entity that audits other authorized entities or supervises phytosanitary actions should:

- develop and carry out an action plan or procedures for dealing with nonconformities that compromise the integrity of and trust in the programme, including notification of these to the authorizing NPPO
- maintain confidentiality of information gained through its phytosanitary actions
- maintain impartiality and independence from the entities to be audited or supervised, and be free from any conflict of interest.

4. Process for Audits

4.1 Audits to authorize an entity

[301] Before granting authorization, the NPPO (or its authorized entity) should carry out an initial evaluation of the entity's quality manual (or documentation in lieu of a quality manual).

[302] When the quality manual (or other documentation sufficient to address the specific phytosanitary actions) is acceptable, the NPPO (or its authorized entity) should carry out an audit to evaluate the entire system and the capability of the entity to implement the standard operating procedures for each phytosanitary action.

[303] At each step of the audit, the NPPO (or its authorized entity) should provide recommendations for improvement as necessary.

[304] The NPPO should normally grant authorization to the entity if the system audit conducted by the NPPO (or its authorized entity) demonstrates that the NPPO's requirements for authorization of entities have been met.

4.2 Audits to maintain authorization

[305] The NPPO should determine the ongoing frequency of the audits to maintain authorization, based on the level of risk and complexity associated with the phytosanitary actions, the performance and the conformance of the entity.

[306] Audits to maintain authorization should be conducted at least once a year on the entity's entire system. Additional audits on a specific part or parts of the entity's system may be conducted as necessary.

5. Types of Nonconformity

[307] When the authorized entity does not meet the requirements specified by the NPPO, this should be considered as a nonconformity.

[308] A nonconformity may be identified during audits, supervision, investigations, or through notification of non-compliance (ISPM 13 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*)).

[309] The type and number of nonconformities identified should be used by the NPPO to determine the ongoing status of the entity (authorized, suspended or revoked) and the subsequent audit frequency.

[310] Any nonconformity identified should result in a corrective action to be agreed between the NPPO (or the entity authorized to audit or supervise) and the authorized entity being audited.

[311] Nonconformities may be considered as critical nonconformities (section 5.1) or other nonconformities (section 5.2).

5.1 Critical nonconformity

[312] Critical nonconformity is nonconformity that immediately impacts the integrity of and trust in the NPPO's phytosanitary system and that requires an immediate corrective action to be identified and implemented.

[313] If the authorized entity does not immediately implement the mutually agreed corrective action or the corrective action is not implemented to the satisfaction of the NPPO (or the entity authorized to audit or supervise), the authorization of the entity should be suspended or revoked by the NPPO.

5.2 Other nonconformity

[314] Other nonconformity is nonconformity that does not directly or immediately impact the integrity of and trust in the NPPO's phytosanitary system but that will need corrective actions to be taken within a timeframe specified by the NPPO (or the entity authorized to audit or supervise).

6. Suspension, Revocation and Reinstatement of Authorization

[315] **Suspension.** An entity whose authorization is suspended may continue to operate only under the direct supervision of the NPPO (or the entity authorized to audit or supervise).

[316] **Revocation.** An entity whose authorization is revoked should no longer have its phytosanitary actions recognized by the authorizing NPPO within the NPPO's phytosanitary system.

[317] **Reinstatement.** An entity whose authorization has been suspended or revoked and that wishes to have its authorization status reinstated should apply to the NPPO for reinstatement.

[318] An entity that has voluntarily withdrawn from an authorization programme and that wishes to have its authorization status reinstated should also apply to the NPPO for reinstatement.

Appendix 7: DAFT ISPM: Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as phytosanitary measures (2014-006)

Status box

This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
Date of this document	2018-05-22
Document category	Draft ISPM
Current document stage	*To* First consultation
Major stages	2014-04 CPM-9 added the topic *Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure* (2014-006) to the work programme with priority 2. 2014-05 Standards Committee (SC) revision of the draft specification. 2014-11 SC approved draft Specification 62 (*Requirements for the use of phytosanitary treatments as phytosanitary measures*) for consultation via e-decision (2014_eSC_Nov_06). 2015-05 SC approved Specification 62. 2015-08 Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) meeting (deferred). 2017-07 TPPT meeting revised the draft. 2018-02 TPPT virtual meeting approved the draft. 2018-05 SC revised draft and approved for first consultation.
Steward history	2017-11 SC Mr Nico HORN (NL, Steward) 2016-11 SC Ms Marina ZLOTINA (US, Steward) 2016-11 SC Mr Scott MYERS (US, Assistant Steward) 2014-05 SC Mr Scott MYERS (US, Steward)
Notes	This is a draft document 2018-02 Edited 2018-05 Edited

CONTENTS [to be inserted later]

Adoption

[Text to this paragraph will be added following adoption]

INTRODUCTION

Scope

[319] This standard provides technical guidance for national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) on the application of modified atmosphere treatments as phytosanitary measures. The purpose of this standard is to enhance harmonization of such measures in different countries. This standard specifically does not include use of modified atmospheres for other purposes, such as minimizing the perishability of foodstuffs or other quality related uses of modified atmospheres. This standard does not provide details on specific modified atmosphere treatments.

References

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

[321] **Heather, N.W. & Hallman, G.J.** 2008. Disinfestation with modified (controlled) atmosphere storage, In: N.W. Heather & G.J. Hallman. *Pest management and phytosanitary trade barriers*, pp. 171–185. Wallingford, UK, CABI. 272 pp.

Definitions

[322] Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

Outline of Requirements

[323] NPPOs should ensure that the application of modified atmosphere treatment is carried out effectively so that critical parameters are met at the required level to achieve the stated efficacy.

[324] The main requirements for enclosures used for the treatments, application of modified atmosphere treatment, measuring of treatment parameters, and treatment procedures should be followed. Treatment facilities should implement systems which includes preventing the contamination of the treated commodity. Record keeping and documentation requirements should be followed to enable auditing, verification or trace back.

[325] The roles and responsibilities of parties involved in the modified atmosphere treatments are described. Guidance is provided to NPPOs on authorizing, monitoring and auditing entities involved in modified atmosphere treatments.

BACKGROUND

[326] The purpose of this standard is to provide generic requirements for the application of modified atmosphere phytosanitary treatments, specifically those adopted under ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*).

[327] Modified atmosphere phytosanitary treatments involve altering ambient atmospheric gas concentrations without the introduction of a toxic agent. They are typically based on achieving an increase in the carbon dioxide content (hypercarbia) or reducing the oxygen content (hypoxia or anoxia) of the treatment environment, or both, to create an atmosphere lethal to target pests.

[328] The term "modified atmosphere" is often used interchangeably with the term "controlled atmosphere". However, a controlled atmosphere is a modified atmosphere in which the atmospheric components are actively maintained within prescribed parameters.

IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

[329] Modified atmospheres may be used to prevent the introduction and spread of target pests into a regulated area and hence may be beneficial to biodiversity and the environment. The use of modified atmosphere treatments as a replacement for methyl bromide fumigation provides an additional benefit to the environment by reducing methyl bromide emissions. While high CO_2 or low O_2 atmospheres may be harmful, in this application they have negligible impacts on biodiversity and the environment.

REQUIREMENTS

1. Treatment Objective

[330] The objective of using a modified atmosphere as a phytosanitary measure is to achieve pest mortality at a specified efficacy.

2. Treatment Application

[331] Modified atmosphere treatments for phytosanitary use may be applied before export, or during transport, or at the point of entry under suitable conditions of confinement.

[332] Parameters to consider when implementing treatments include:

- atmospheric gas concentrations, as influenced by the conditions of the enclosure and the commodity being treated (i.e. load factor, leakage, sorption, respiration)
- air and commodity temperature
- humidity
- pressure under which the treatment is applied.

[333] In a modified atmosphere treatment, the lethal atmosphere should be maintained for an adequate length of time, typically for more than a day. An enclosure is therefore required to achieve and maintain the lethal atmospheric conditions over the duration of the treatment. Enclosures can be designed as a continuous gas flow system or a static system.

[334] Maintenance of the atmosphere at the required gas composition levels depends on being able to compensate for the gas loss from the enclosure. This is influenced by the permeability of the structural fabric and the effectiveness of seals at joins and entry points, where surface to volume ratio has a major influence.

[335] Respiration, sorption of atmospheric gases and the packaging of the commodity may result in differential gas concentrations within the enclosure and influence the efficacy of a modified atmosphere treatment. This should be taken into account when applying treatments.

[336] Temperature is a factor in achieving the required efficacy of modified atmosphere treatments, in particular because it affects the respiration rate of the target organism. In general, the lower the temperature, the lower the respiration rate of the organism and the greater the duration of exposure needed to achieve the required efficacy.

2.1 Methods for modifying atmospheres

[337] Treatment atmospheres may be modified in the following ways:

- changing the proportion of O_2 and CO_2 in the atmosphere by adding CO_2 or an inert gas (such as nitrogen) and maintaining this atmosphere
- converting O_2 to CO_2 by combustion of a hydrocarbon
- hermetic or semi-hermetic storage in which the respiration of the commodity and organisms infesting it deplete the level of O_2 and increase the level of CO_2
- partial vacuum, which lowers concentrations of all atmospheric gases proportionally.

3. Enclosures Used for Modified Atmosphere Treatments

[338] The enclosure may consist of modified atmosphere packaging, or a portable or fixed structure.

[339] Enclosures that are fixed structures (e.g. vacuum chambers, freight containers, warehouses, cargo ship holds)are specifically designed and constructed to maintain the parameters of the treatment. Features of specifically designed and constructed enclosures include:

- gas tight doors

- pressure control
- temperature control
- gas concentration control
- systems to alert operators when there is a treatment failure
- recirculation of atmospheric gases within the enclosure
- exhaust systems.

[340] Modified atmosphere treatments that rely on positive pressure of inert gases to achieve anoxic conditions may use non-gas-tight chambers or use enclosures that were not specifically designed for modified atmosphere treatments. Particular attention to pressure should be made when using enclosures that were not specifically designed for modified atmosphere treatment use.

4. Measuring Treatment Parameters

[341] Critical parameters of the treatment should be measured at regular intervals to ensure that it is conducted properly to mitigate the risk of target pests in regulated articles. The crucial parameters for modified atmospheres are typically O_2 and CO_2 concentrations, temperature and duration of exposure.

4.1 Measuring gas concentration

[342] Atmospheric gas concentrations should be measured at regular intervals during modified atmosphere treatments. Treatment providers (e.g. companies or individuals) should verify, before each treatment, that sensors used to measure gases are calibrated according to the manufacturer's instructions.

4.2 Measuring and mapping temperature

[343] Treatment providers should verify that sensors used to measure temperature are calibrated according to the manufacturer's instructions.

[344] Temperature mapping of the enclosure should be performed to identify temperature variation under commercial operating conditions.

[345] Temperature mapping should be conducted according to appropriate procedures using loads and packaging equivalent to that used in commercial application. Temperature variation in the enclosure can be used to determine the best locations for placing the temperature sensors.

[346] The temperature of the commodity and the atmosphere within the enclosure should be measured at regular intervals to ensure that the required treatment parameters are achieved throughout the enclosure.

5. Adequate Systems for Treatment Facilities

[347] Confidence in the adequacy of a modified atmosphere treatment as a phytosanitary measure is primarily based on assurance that the treatment is effective against the pest of concern under specific conditions and the treatment has been properly applied. Systems for treatment delivery should be designed, used and monitored to ensure that treatments are properly conducted and commodities are protected from infestation and contamination after treatment.

[348] The NPPO of the country in which the treatment facility is located or where treatments are initiated is responsible for ensuring that the system requirements are met.

5.1 Authorization of entities

[349] In this standard, "entities" include both treatment providers and treatment facilities. Modified atmosphere treatments are applied by treatment providers in treatment facilities.

[350] Treatment entities should be authorized by the NPPO in the country in which the treatment is conducted or initiated. This authorization normally includes approval of both treatment

facilities and treatment providers. Specific procedures appropriate for each facility, provider and commodity treatment should be approved by the NPPO.

[351] NPPOs should maintain a list of authorized entities for modified atmosphere treatment, including, where appropriate, approved facilities and approved providers.

5.2 Prevention of infestation and contamination after treatment

[352] The consignment owner is responsible for prevention of infestation and contamination after treatment and may cooperate with the provider on how to achieve this. Measures should be implemented to prevent possible infestation or contamination of the commodity after the treatment. The following measures may be required:

- keeping the commodity in a pest free enclosure
- packing the commodity immediately after treatment
- segregating and identifying treated commodities
- dispatching the commodity immediately after treatment.

5.3 Labelling

[353] Commodities may be labelled with treatment lot numbers or other features of identification (e.g. locations of packing and the treatment facility, dates of packing and treatment) allowing trace-back for non-compliant consignments. The labels should be easily identifiable and placed on visible locations.

5.6 Monitoring and auditing

[354] The NPPO of the country in which the treatment is conducted is responsible for monitoring and auditing the facilities and providers. Continuous supervision of treatments should not be necessary provided there is a system for continuous monitoring of the treatment parameters, and treatment programmes are properly designed to ensure a high degree of system integrity for the facility, process and commodity in question. The monitoring and auditing should be sufficient to detect and correct deficiencies promptly.

[355] Parameters to consider when verifying treatment programmes include meeting requirements for treatment atmospheric conditions, treatment time, temperature, humidity and ventilation. A modified atmosphere treatment protocol should include the following to ensure that the treatment schedule is met:

- a treatment monitoring protocol that is conducted by the NPPO at the facility where the treatment occurs
- audit provisions, including unannounced visits
- a system to maintain and archive treatment records and provide access to NPPOs
- corrective action to be taken in the event of non-compliance.

6. Documentation

[356] The NPPO of the country in which the facility is located is responsible for ensuring that treatment providers keep appropriate records, such as raw data on treatment parameters recorded during treatments. Accurate record keeping is essential to allow for trace-back capability.

6.1 Documentation of procedures

[357] Procedures should be documented to ensure that commodities are treated consistently in accordance with the treatment schedule. Process controls and operational parameters should be established to provide the operational details necessary for a specific approval of a treatment facility. Calibration and quality control programmes should be documented by the treatment provider. As a minimum, they should address the following:

- commodity handling procedures before, during and after treatment
- orientation and configuration of the commodity during treatment
- critical treatment process parameters and the means for their monitoring

- contingency plans and corrective actions to be taken in the event of treatment failure or problems with critical treatment processes
- procedures for handling rejected lots and treatment failures
- temperature and gas sensor calibration and recordings
- labelling (if required), recordkeeping, and documentation requirements
- training of personnel.

6.2 Record keeping

[358] Treatment providers should keep records for each treatment application. These records should be made available to the NPPO of the importing or the exporting country when, for example, a trace-back is necessary.

[359] Appropriate records for modified atmosphere treatments as phytosanitary measures should be retained by the treatment provider for at least one year to enable the trace-back of treated lots. Information that may be required to be recorded includes:

- identification of facility and responsible parties
- identity of commodities treated
- target pest
- packer, grower and identification of the place of production of the commodity
- lot size, volume and identification, including number of articles or packages
- identifying markings or characteristics
- date of treatment
- any observed deviation from the treatment specification.

6.3 Documentation by the NPPO

[360] All NPPO procedures should be appropriately documented and records, including those of monitoring inspections made and phytosanitary certificates issued should be maintained for at least one year. In cases of non-compliance or new or unexpected phytosanitary situations, documentation should be made available upon request as described in ISPM 13 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*).

7. Inspection

[361] Inspection is carried out to determine compliance with phytosanitary import requirements. Where live non-target pests are found after treatment, the NPPO should consider if their survival indicates a treatment failure and whether additional phytosanitary measures may be necessary.

[362] The NPPO of the importing country may inspect documentation and records for treatments conducted during transport to determine compliance with phytosanitary import requirements.

8. Responsibilities

[363] The NPPO of the country in which the treatment is initiated or conducted is responsible for the evaluation, approval and auditing of modified atmosphere treatments as phytosanitary measures, including those performed by other authorized entities. However, when treatments are conducted or completed during transport, the NPPO of the exporting country is usually responsible for authorizing the entity applying the treatment during transport, and the NPPO of the importing country is responsible for verifying if the treatment requirements have been met.

[364] To the extent necessary, it is the NPPO's responsibility to cooperate with other national and international regulatory agencies concerned with the development, approval and safety of the modified atmosphere treatment, including the training and certification of personnel conducting the treatment, the authorization of operators, and the approval of modified atmosphere facilities. Their respective

responsibilities should be identified to avoid requirements that are overlapping, conflicting, inconsistent or not technically justified.

Appendix 8: Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5: *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* (1994-001)

Publication history *(This is not an official part of the standard)*

Date of this document	2018-05-17
Document category	Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5 *(Glossary of phytosanitary terms)* (1994-001)
Current document stage	To first consultation (2018-07)
Major stages	CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms 2006-05 Standards Committee (SC) approved specification TP5 2012-10 Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) revised specification 2012-11 SC revised and approved revised specification, revoking Specification 1 2017-12 TPG drafted text 2018-05 SC discussed draft
Notes	Note to Secretariat formatting this paper: formatting in definitions and explanations (strikethrough, bold, italics) needs to remain.

[365] IPPC Official contact points are asked to consider the following proposals for deletion and revision of terms and definitions to ISPM 5 *(Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms)*. A brief explanation is given for each proposal. For revision of terms and definitions, only the proposed changes are open for comments. For full details on the discussions related to the specific terms, please refer to the meeting reports on the IPP.

1. DELETIONS

1.1 "commodity class" (2015-013)

[366] The term "commodity class" (2015-013) was added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the Standards Committee (SC) in November 2015, because difficulties related to the understanding of its Glossary definition had been identified. The SC asked the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) to review this term in light of the discussions on the concept of a commodity standard and commodity classes within the context of ePhyto and consider deletion.

[367] In December 2016, the TPG discussed the term "commodity class". They felt that the definition for "commodity class" was not useful and that it might be suitable to delete it from the Glossary. The TPG agreed to analyze how the term had been used in standards and suggested that the various Glossary terms defining different commodity classes also be reviewed to determine if their definitions added value or rather created difficulties.

[368] In May 2017, the SC confirmed that the TPG should consider the term "commodity class" (2015-013) and its possible deletion. The SC removed the pending status of the term "cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)" (2012-007) and added the following terms to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*: "bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)" (2017-001), "fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)" (2017-003), "grain (as a commodity class)" (2017-004), "plants in vitro (as a commodity class)" (2017-006), "seeds (as a commodity class)" (2017-007) and "wood (as a commodity class)" (2017-009).

[369] In their December 2017 meeting, the TPG discussed the term "commodity class" as well as the above listed Glossary terms defining different commodity classes.

[370] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the deletion of the term "commodity class":

[371] The current Glossary definition of "commodity class" refers to "similar commodities that can be considered together in phytosanitary regulations". This could be interpreted as meaning that the same requirements should be established for all commodities within a commodity class. However, the grouping of commodities based on an *a priori* perceived similar pest risk has proven to be unrealistic in that it conflicts with the actual specific requirements that may be set for individual commodities within a commodity class. Thus, the Glossary definition of "commodity class" and the categorization of specific commodities into commodity classes has caused confusion for the IPPC community when developing commodity standards.

[372] Grouping commodities into a higher level of commodity classes and defining this hierarchy in the Glossary is not useful for the development of standards, because the scope of an individual standard should define which commodities are covered by the standard. Furthermore, commodity classes' definitions often created confusion and did not provide clarity and support for the drafting of commodity standards.

[373] Harmonization of product descriptions is needed for the development of the ePhyto project, but the current Glossary terms related to commodity classes are not helpful for that work. The term "commodity class" is not used within the context of the ongoing work on ePhyto: Appendix 1 to ISPM 12 on *Electronic phytosanitary certificates, information on standard XML schemas and exchange mechanisms* and the related links on the IPPC website only refer to "commodity" and "product description", and not to "commodity class".

[374] Not having a definition for "commodity class" in the Glossary would not prevent countries from considering similar commodities together in phytosanitary regulations, whenever technically justified.

[375] "Commodity class" is used as a qualifier in several Glossary terms (e.g. "seeds (as a commodity class)") and is used in several adopted ISPMs. Ink amendments to adopted ISPMs removing "commodity class" could be easily applied without affecting the meaning of those standards. According to the TPG's review, most ink amendments could be carried out by deleting "commodity class" or replacing it with "commodity".

[376] ***Proposed deletion***

commodity class	A category of similar **commodities** that can be considered together in **phytosanitary regulations** [FAO, 1990]

1.2 "bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)" (2017-001)

[377] In addition to the background information provided in section 1.1 for "commodity class" (2015-013), the following specific explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the deletion of the term "bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)":

[378] The Glossary term "bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)" is used inconsistently in adopted ISPMs and not always according to its Glossary definition. Some ISPMs use "bulbs and tubers" while others use the words separately; some ISPMs use "bulbs" or "tubers" in association with other commodities, such as in "bulbs, tubers and rhizomes" or "bulbs and rhizomes", whereas the Glossary definition for "bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)" includes rhizomes.

[379] The Glossary term "bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)" being defined as 'for planting' has not been used consistently in ISPMs with that exclusive meaning, as some bulbs and tubers (in the botanical sense) can be used for consumption and not for planting. As such, the definition has proven too artificial to be useful and does not improve understanding and implementation of ISPMs. Rather, where bulbs or tubers are mentioned in standards, their intended use should be specified in the context, if so needed.

[380] The use of the words "bulbs" and "tubers" in their broad, common sense is appropriate and well understood in all current ISPM contexts.

[381] The deletion of the term "bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class)" from the Glossary would not require any ink amendments.

[382] ***Proposed deletion***

bulbs and tubers (as a **commodity class**)	Dormant underground parts of **plants** intended for **planting** (includes corms and rhizomes) [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]

1.3 "cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)" (2012-007)

[384] In addition to the background information provided in section 1.1 for "commodity class" (2015-013), the following specific explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the deletion of the term "cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)":

[385] The current Glossary term "cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)" is not consistent with the scope of the draft ISPM on *International movement of cut flowers and foliage* (2008-005), which currently excludes woody foliage. There is no need for a Glossary definition to clarify what a standard should cover, as this should be defined by the scope of the standard.

[386] The Glossary term "cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)" does not have any specific meaning in the phytosanitary context. It is making explicit the intended use of cut flowers and branches (i.e. "for decorative use and not for planting") and their state (i.e. "fresh), but this is also clear from the common meaning of the term.

[387] The use of the words "cut flowers" or "cut flowers and branches" in their common sense is appropriate and well understood in all ISPM contexts where they are used.

[388] The deletion of the term "cut flowers and branches (as a commodity class)" from the Glossary would not require any ink amendments.

[389] ***Proposed deletion***

cut flowers and branches (as a **commodity class**)*	**Fresh** parts of **plants** intended for decorative use and not for **planting** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]

1.4 "fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)" (2017-003)

[391] In addition to the background information provided in section 1.1 for "commodity class" (2015-013), the following specific explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the deletion of the term "fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)":

[392] The Glossary term "fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)" does not have any specific meaning in the phytosanitary context. It is making explicit the intended use of fruits and vegetables (i.e. "for consumption and processing and not for planting") and their state (i.e. "fresh"), but this is also clear from the common meaning of the term.

[393] The use of the words "fruits" and "vegetables" in their common sense is appropriate and well understood in all ISPM contexts where they are used.

[394] The deletion of the term "fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class)" from the Glossary would not require any ink amendments.

[395] ***Proposed deletion***

fruits and vegetables (as a **commodity class**)	**Fresh** parts of **plants** intended for consumption or processing and not for **planting** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]

1.5 "plants *in vitro* (as a commodity class)" (2017-006)

[397] In addition to the background information provided in section 1.1 for "commodity class" (2015-013), the following specific explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the deletion of the term "plants *in vitro* (as a commodity class)":

[398] The Glossary term "plants *in vitro* (as a commodity class)" does not have any specific meaning in the phytosanitary context.

[399] "Plants *in vitro*" is only used in ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*) and ISPM 33 (*Pest free potato (Solanum spp.) micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade*) and the common understanding of "plants *in vitro*" is appropriate in those contexts.

[400] The deletion of the term "plants *in vitro* (as a commodity class)" from the Glossary would not require any ink amendments.

[401] ***Proposed deletion***

plants *in vitro* (as a **commodity class**)*	**Plants** growing in an aseptic medium in a closed container [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1999; ICPM, 2002; formerly "plants in tissue culture"]

2. REVISIONS

2.1 "seeds (as a commodity class)" (2017-007), "grain (as a commodity class)" (2017-004)

[403] See background information provided in section 1.1 for "commodity class" (2015-013).

[404] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposals for the revision of "seeds (as a commodity class)" and "grain (as a commodity class)":

[405] The terms "seeds" and "grain" and their definitions should remain in the Glossary, because they are essential to explain the difference between these commodities in a phytosanitary context. While the Glossary definitions of "seeds" and "grain" both refer to "seeds (in the botanical sense)", they distinguish "seeds" in the Glossary sense from "grain" in the Glossary sense by stating that their intended use is different, "seeds" being for planting and "grain" being for processing or consumption, but not for planting.

[406] "Seeds" is used in several ISPMs and CPM recommendations, either according to its Glossary definition or in its botanical sense. The scope of ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) is consistent with the Glossary definition for "seeds" and this definition did not create any challenge during the development of this standard.

[407] "Grain" is used consistently in several ISPMs according to its Glossary definition: for consumption or processing, but not for planting. Also in the draft ISPM on the *International movement of grain (*2008-007*)*, the use of the term "grain" is consistent with its Glossary definition, even if the current scope of the draft standard is restricted to only three particular types of grain commodities (cereals, oilseeds and pulses).

[408] Because the term "commodity class" is proposed for deletion from the Glossary (see section 1.1), it would be confusing to use "as a commodity class" as a qualifier to the terms "seeds" and "grain". However, having a qualifier for the Glossary term "seeds" is needed to distinguish the Glossary term from seeds in its botanical sense (i.e. a propagating organ formed in the sexual reproductive cycle of plants) or even from seeds in its agricultural broad sense (including not only true seeds, but also vegetative plant parts which may be sown e.g. seed potatoes). Since grouping commodities into higher levels and defining this hierarchy in the Glossary is not useful, it is proposed to use the qualifier "as a commodity" instead of "as commodity class" to allow for the use of "seeds" in its botanical or

agricultural broad sense where necessary. For consistency, the qualifier "as a commodity" should also be used for the Glossary term "grain".

[409] ***Current definitions***

seeds (as a **commodity class**)	Seeds (in the botanical sense) for **planting** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]
grain (as a **commodity class**)	Seeds (in the botanical sense) for processing or consumption, but not for **planting** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]

[412] ***Proposed revisions***

seeds (as a **commodity ~~class~~**)	Seeds (in the botanical sense) for **planting** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]
grain (as a **commodity ~~class~~**)	Seeds (in the botanical sense) for processing or consumption, but not for **planting** [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]

2.2 "wood (as a commodity class)" (2017-009)

[413] See background information provided in section 1.1 for "commodity class" (2015-013).

[414] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the revision of "wood (as a commodity class)":

[415] Although wood packaging material, processed wood material and bamboo products would normally be considered as wood in its broad sense, the Glossary definition of "wood" clearly excludes these materials and products. Because of these exclusions, the Glossary definition of "wood" is useful and the term should remain in the Glossary.

[416] The scope of ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*) is consistent with the Glossary definition of "wood" as it also excludes wood packaging material which is covered by ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*), processed wood material and bamboo.

[417] For consistency with the proposed deletion of "commodity class" (see section 1.1) and revision of "seeds" and "grain" (see section 2.1), the qualifier "as a commodity" should be used instead of "as commodity class".

[418] ***Current definition***

wood (as a **commodity class**)	**Commodities** such as **round wood**, **sawn wood**, wood chips and wood residue, with or without **bark**, excluding **wood packaging material**, **processed wood material** and bamboo products [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]

[420] ***Proposed revision***

wood (as a **commodity ~~class~~**)	**Commodities** such as **round wood**, **sawn wood**, wood chips and wood residue, with or without **bark**, excluding **wood packaging material**, **processed wood material** and bamboo products [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001; CPM, 2016]

2.3 "treatment" (2017-008)

[421] In May 2017, the SC added the term "treatment" to the *List of Topics for IPPC Standards* for a possible revision to make the term usable in a non-official sense. Because treatment in the Glossary sense is always official and finding an alternative term to be used in national legislations for the non-official

cases (e.g. farmers treating their crops) has proven difficult, it may be useful to consider revising the definition.

[422] The TPG discussed the term "treatment" in their December 2017 meeting. The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for its revision:

[423] "Treatment" is both a common term and a phytosanitary term defined in the Glossary. It is useful to retain the Glossary term in order to refer to treatments as official procedures, as opposed to non-official treatments applied by farmers to their crops.

[424] When used according to its Glossary definition, a treatment is a phytosanitary measure. The qualifier "as a phytosanitary measure" should be added to the term so that the word "treatment" can, in other contexts, still be used in its non-official sense. When used in the context of a phytosanitary measure, "treatment" would refer to an official procedure as per its Glossary definition.

[425] "Regulated" should be added to "pests" in the Glossary definition of "treatment (as a phytosanitary measure)" because, according to its Glossary definition, a "phytosanitary measure" only applies to regulated pests. In some situations, official treatments need to be applied on imports for pests which are not yet regulated; however, this would not conflict with the proposed revised definition of "treatment (as a phytosanitary measure)" because the application of treatments in those situations would refer to emergency actions.

[426] Editorials are proposed to simplify the definition and make it more readable, as all the actions of killing, inactivating, removing, rendering infertile and devitalizing are related to regulated pests.

[427] ***Current definition***

treatment	**Official** procedure for the killing, **inactivation** or removal of **pests**, or for rendering **pests** infertile or for **devitalization** [FAO, 1990, revised FAO, 1995; ISPM 15, 2002; ISPM 18, 2003; ICPM, 2005]

[428] ***Proposed revision***

treatment (as a phytosanitary measure)	**Official** procedure for ~~the~~ killing, **inactivating~~on~~**, ~~or~~ removing~~al of~~ **~~pests~~**, ~~or for~~ rendering ~~**pests**~~ infertile or ~~for~~ **devitalizing~~ation~~ regulated pests** [FAO, 1990, revised FAO, 1995; ISPM 15, 2002; ISPM 18, 2003; ICPM, 2005]

Appendix 9: Summary of standards committee e-decisions (November 2017 – May 2018)

Table 1: SC e-decisions presented between November 2017 and May 2018

E-decision number	SC decision	SC members commenting in the forum	Polls (yes/no)
2018_eSC_May_01	SC approval of the Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology	15	
2018_eSC_May_02	SC approval of the draft specification on *Use of systems approaches in managing risks associated with the movement of wood commodities* (2015-004) for first consultation	18	
2018_eSC_May_03	SC approval of the draft specification: Revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) (2015-011)	17	
2018_eSC_May_04	SC approval of the Draft specification: Guidance on the concept of the likelihood of establishment component of a pest risk analysis for quarantine pests (2015-010) to ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*)	17	
2018_eSC_May_05	SC approval of the draft diagnostic protocol for *Austropuccinia psidii* (2006-018) for adoption	15	11/0
2018_eSC_May_06	SC approval of the draft diagnostic protocol for *Bactrocera dorsalis* complex (2006-026) for adoption	15	11/0
2018_eSC_May_07	SC approval of the draft diagnostic Protocol for *Xylella fastidiosa* (2004-024) for adoption	15	
2018_eSC_May_08	SC approval of the draft diagnostic protocol for *Conotrachelus nenuphar* (2013-002) for adoption	16	
2018_eSC_May_09	SC approval of the draft revision of the DP 2: Plum pox virus (2016-007) for adoption	17	
2018_eSC_May_10	SC approval of the draft diagnostic protocol for Ips spp. (2006-020) for adoption	17	
2018_eSC_May_11	SC discussion on the IYPH Promotional paper	9	
2018_eSC_May_12	SC discussion on the implementation issues raised at CPM-12 (2017) and at SC May 2017 in relation to ISPM 41	7	

2018_eSC_May_01: Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology

[429] The forum was open from 29 November to 13 December 2017.

[430] The Secretariat reviewed SC members' responses. 15 SC members commented in the forum and all agreed to include the Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology in the TPG section of the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting. A consensus was reached, therefore no poll needed to be done.

[431] Two SC members provided editorial suggestions, which were considered by the IPPC Secretariat and incorporated into the document where appropriate and according to the IPPC Style Guide.

SC e-decision

[432] Based on the forum discussion, the SC agreed to have the Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology (Appendix 1) incorporated in the TPG section of the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting.

2018_eSC_May_02 Draft specification: Use of systems approaches in managing pest risk associated with the movement of wood commodities (2015-004) for approval for consultation

[433] The forum was open from 8 to 22 January 2018.

[434] The Secretariat reviewed SC members' responses. 18 SC members commented in the forum.

[435] Some SC member proposed editorial changes to increase clarity. To allow sufficient time for the consideration of the modified draft, the forum stayed open for an additional week, until the 29 January 2018.

SC e-decision

[436] Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the draft specification on *Use of systems approaches in managing risks associated with the movement of wood commodities* (2015-004) for first consultation as modified in the forum.

2018_eSC_May_03 Draft specification: Revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) (2015-011) for approval

[437] The forum was open from 01 February to 15 February.

[438] The Secretariat reviewed SC member's responses. 17 members commented on the draft specification.

[439] One member highlighted the importance of task 3 of the Specification: "Consider whether the situations and requirements set out in ISPM 12, section 6 (particularly section 6.1), are sufficiently comprehensive, or whether there is benefit in expanding on some additional typical re-export situations in ISPM 12, or in giving additional guidance on more specific situations in a manual. If it is considered that expanded or additional guidance is needed, provide recommendations for the SC or the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee to consider."

[440] He stated that there is clearly a need to give more guidance to NPPOs on specific re-export situations but this may not be done through large changes to ISPM 12 but to the recommendation to produce guidance material on re-export situations.

[441] Another member thought that the expert working group should aim to make the smallest number of changes possible and should give due consideration to the possibility that some of the issues may best be dealt with by the IC.

SC e-decision

[442] Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the draft specification on *Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export (2015-011)* and the responses to the consultation comments. Consensus was reached, therefore no poll was needed.

2018_eSC_May_04 Draft specification: Guidance on the concept of the likelihood of establishment component of a pest risk analysis for quarantine pests (2015-010) to ISPM 11 (Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests) for approval

[443] The forum was open from 01 to 15 February 2018.

[444] The Secretariat reviewed SC members' responses. 17 SC members commented on the draft specification.

[445] Some SC members expressed concerns with the expansion of scope of the specification to include the probability of entry along with the original concept on the likelihood of establishment. These changes were made based on the consultation comments, and "entry" was included due to the fact that

"Possibility of transfer in to a suitable host" was categorized as a subsection of "Probability of entry of a pest" in ISPM 11.

[446] One consultation comment also suggested that after reviewing the relevant standards and existing guidance on PRA it was determined that existing guidance adequately and clearly describes the process related to the likelihood of establishment, however, that there may be issues with inconsistent interpretation of the existing guidance.

[447] The SC discussed a possible alternative solution to develop an explanatory document and that this could be proposed during the next call for topics for standards and implementation.

[448] It was suggested that the SC consider the specification more thoroughly at its May 2018 meeting and give more specific guidance to the expert working group whether it should be additional requirements to ISPM 11 or an "explanation on how the existing guidance can be better implemented" in ISPM 5.

SC e-decision

[449] The SC did not approve the draft specification for Supplement on Guidance on the concept of the likelihood of establishment component of a pest risk analysis for quarantine pests (2015-010) to ISPM 11 *(Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests)* for consultation but instead agreed to discuss it at the 2018 May SC meeting.

2018_eSC_May_05 Diagnostic protocol for *Austropuccinia psidii* (2006-018) for approval for adoption

[450] The forum was open from 2 to 16 March 2018.

[451] The Secretariat reviewed SC members' responses. 15 SC members commented in the forum.

[452] SC members discussed the need to modify the structure of section 5 (Records) to become more specific for *Austropuccinia psidii*.

[453] After consultation with the TPDP discipline lead the IPPC Secretariat modified the draft DP taking into account the comments of the SC members, and opened a poll to provide opportunity to the SC members to review the modified document.

[454] The poll was open from 20 to 26 March 2018. 11 SC members provided responses to the poll question.

SC e-decision

[455] Based on the outcome of the poll, the SC approved the draft diagnostic protocol for *Austropuccinia psidii* (2006-018) to be submitted to the 45-day DP Notification Period starting on 1 July 2018 for adoption.

2018_eSC_May_06 Diagnostic Protocol for *Bactrocera dorsalis* complex (2006-026) for approval for adoption

[456] The forum was open from 2 to 16 March 2018.

[457] The Secretariat reviewed SC members' responses. 15 SC members commented in the forum.

[458] One SC member suggested minor editorial modifications and that a reference be updated, as the provided reference was to a draft document from 2013 and the final publication was now available.

[459] Another SC member suggested to add "economically important" to the section describing the scope of the protocol, as the protocol describes in detail only a subset of six economically important species of the *Bactrocera dorsalis* complex.

[460] After consultation with the TPDP discipline lead the IPPC Secretariat modified the draft DP taking into account the comments of the SC members, and opened a poll to provide opportunity to the SC members to review the modified document.

[461] The poll was open from 20 to 26 March 2018. 11 SC members provided responses to the poll question.

SC e-decision

[462] Based on the outcome of the poll, the SC approved the draft diagnostic protocol for *Bactrocera dorsalis* complex (2006-026) to be submitted to the 45-day DP Notification Period starting on 1 July 2018 for adoption.

2018_eSC_May_07 Diagnostic Protocol for *Xylella fastidiosa* (2004-024) for approval for adoption

[463] The forum was open from 2 to 16 March 2018.

[464] The Secretariat reviewed SC member's responses. 15 members commented and approved the responses to the comments and the draft DP. Some editorial modifications were proposed, which were incorporated into the protocol.

SC e-decision

[465] Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the draft diagnostic protocol for *Xylella fastidiosa* (2004-024) to be submitted to the 45-day DP Notification Period starting on 1 July 2018 for adoption.

2018_eSC_May_08 Draft diagnostic protocol for *Conotrachelus nenuphar* (2013-002) for approval for adoption

[466] The forum was open from 27 March to 10 April 2018.

[467] The Secretariat reviewed SC member's responses. 16 members commented and approved the responses to the comments and the draft DP. There were no additional comments.

SC e-decision

[468] Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the draft diagnostic protocol for *Conotrachelus nenuphar* (2013-002) to be submitted to the 45-day DP Notification Period starting on 1 July 2018 for adoption.

2018_eSC_May_09 Draft revision of the DP 2: *Plum pox virus* (2016-007) for approval for adoption

[469] The forum was open from 27 March to 10 April 2018.

[470] The Secretariat reviewed SC member's responses. 17 members commented and approved the responses to the comments and the draft DP. There were no additional comments.

SC e-decision

[471] Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the draft revision of DP 2: *Plum pox virus* (2016-007) to be submitted to the 45-day DP Notification Period starting on 1 July 2018 for adoption.

2018_eSC_May_10 Draft diagnostic protocol for Ips spp. (2006-020) for approval for adoption

[472] The forum was open from 27 March to 10 April 2018.

[473] The Secretariat reviewed SC member's responses. 17 members commented and approved the responses to the comments and the draft DP. There were no additional comments.

SC e-decision

[474] Based on the forum discussion, the SC approved the draft diagnostic protocol for *Ips* spp. (2006-020) to be submitted to the 45-day DP Notification Period starting on 1 July 2018 for adoption.

2018_eSC_May_11 IYPH Promotional paper

[475] The forum was open from 27 March to 10 April 2018. The Secretariat reviewed SC members' comments. Seven SC members provided comments and suggestions on the draft promotional paper.

[476] The SC members thanked the working group for their work on this draft promotional paper. A number of suggestions to improve the paper were put forward and endorsed by the members.

[477] Several members provided suggestions for improving the introductory paragraph, in order to better highlight the benefits of standards and their importance in facilitating trade and to make the overall message stronger. One member suggested emphasizing the fact that IPPC standards, especially ISPM 15, not only facilitate trade in plants and plant products, but also trade in general. Several members suggested emphasizing the beneficial effects of global harmonization of plant protection that is facilitated by the implementation of the IPPC standards. Several alternative wordings to highlight the benefits of plant health standards were provided by the members.

[478] One member disagreed with the notion of not including important IPPC terminology in the paper, and suggested that instead of removing IPPC terms, they should be well explained. In General, the members recommended the text be concise and in simple language, to make it accessible to a wide audience.

[479] The members agreed that graphics and images are important to facilitate the understanding of this promotional paper for the public. One member suggested adding a graphic depicting the international movement of commodities. Members agreed to include the numbers of the UN Strategic Development Goals (SDG) in the relevant paragraph.

[480] Several members provided feedback on the examples used in the promotional paper:

[481] The SC members recommended expanding the example on Wood Packaging Material (WPM), to include mention of danger to trees and wood, as it was suggested that the danger to trees and forests posed by the spread of harmful pests may be perceived by the general public as being more relevant. The members further suggested mentioning the associated standard (ISPM 15) and to emphasize the impact that the associated globally accepted mark on wood pallets has had on global trade.

[482] One member argued, and others agreed, that citrus fruit is not a good example, as it is not an issue per se and there are no associated standards. They suggested to provide "Fruit flies as a significant problem in global trade of fresh fruit" as an alternative example, since there are several standards, diagnostic protocols and treatments available. Several members further suggested that this topic may be a good example to include mention of standards related to pest risk analysis and pest free areas.

[483] Alternatively, one member suggested to include topics related to ISPM12 (Phytosanitary certificates) or ISPM38 (International movement of seeds) as examples.

[484] In summary, a number of suggestions for improving the promotional paper for IYPH were provided by the SC members, and will form the basis for a discussion of the paper during the 2018 May SC meeting.

2018_eSC_May_12 Implementation issues raised at CPM-12 (2017) and at SC May 2017

[485] During an SC e-forum (2018_eSC_May_12) the SC members were invited to *consider* the implementation issues outlined in this document and to *provide* suggestion on how to address this issue in order to facilitate the discussion in the 2018 May SC meeting

[486] The SC e-forum was open from 27 March to 10 April 2018. Nine members provided comments, which are summarized below.

[487] In general, the SC members favoured Option 4: *The information of the 7h row in Appendix 2 can be kept without revising.* The Members agreed that the text in the appendix is not fully aligned with the scope of the standard, but reminded that a statement explaining this was included in the text of the appendix and has been discussed during the May 2017 SC meeting.

[488] One member suggested the FAO legal office be consulted if Contracting Parties face uncertainties concerning the wording in Appendix 2 of ISPM 41.

[489] Several members suggested that this issue be addressed through the development of guidance material for implementation and recommended submitting a proposal during the upcoming Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation.

[490] Several members pointed out that it would be difficult to ascertain whether a used vehicle as described in row 7 of the appendix has ever been utilized in a circumstance where it could have been in contact with a pest. One member suggested that considerations under rows 5-7 of the appendix (which are considered beyond the scope of the ISPM) would be more relevant for exporting countries to decide whether phytosanitary measures are required.

[491] Mr Alvaro Sepulveda LUQUE offered to write a support paper to clarify the implementation issues in order remove some concerns.

[492] The SC will further discuss the issue at their 2018 May meeting.

Appendix 10: Ink amendments to ensure a consistent use of “contamination” and its derivatives in adopted ISPMs

Table 1: proposed ink amendments to avoid using “contamination” or its derivatives where the intended meaning does not correspond to the Glossary definition of “contamination”

ISPM	ISPM SECTION	CURRENT TEXT	PROPOSED INK AMENDMENT	EXPLANATION
ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*)	1.1 Initiation points	*S2* The types of LMOs that an NPPO may be asked to assess for phytosanitary risk include: - plants for use (a) as agricultural crops, for food and feed, ornamental plants or managed forests; (b) in bioremediation (as an organism that cleans up contamination) […]	*S2* The types of LMOs that an NPPO may be asked to assess for phytosanitary risk include: - plants for use (a) as agricultural crops, for food and feed, ornamental plants or managed forests; (b) in bioremediation (as an organism that cleans up ~~contamination~~ pollution) […]	“Contamination” is not used according to its Glossary definition. Bioremediation is a waste management technique that involves the use of organisms to neutralize pollutants from a contaminated site. According to EPA (USA), bioremediation is a "treatment that uses naturally occurring organisms to break down hazardous substances into less toxic or non-toxic substances". Therefore, the suggested ink amendment is to replace the term “contamination” by the word “pollution”.
ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*)	ANNEX 2 Criteria *3. Product handling, storage and segregation*	Commodities are handled in an environment that does not increase the risk of contamination from physical, chemical or biological hazards	Commodities are handled in an environment that does not increase the risk ~~of contamination~~ from physical, chemical or biological hazards	“Contamination” is not used according to its Glossary definition. The suggested ink amendment is to avoid using “contamination”.
ISPM 21 (*Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*)	3.3.1 Pest effects	In some cases, economic consequences may only become apparent after a long period of time (e.g. a degenerative disease in a perennial crop, a pest with a long-lived resting stage).	In some cases, economic consequences may only become apparent after a long period of time (e.g. a degenerative disease in a perennial crop, a pest with a long-lived resting stage). Furthermore, the infestation in the plants may result in	“Contamination” is not considered to be used strictly according to its Glossary definition, in which “places of production” are not listed. Rewording is suggested to avoid using “contamination”.

ISPM	ISPM SECTION	CURRENT TEXT	PROPOSED INK AMENDMENT	EXPLANATION
		Furthermore, the infestation in the plants may result in contamination of places of production with a consequential impact on future crops. […]	the pest remaining in the ~~contamination of~~ places of production with a consequential impact on future crops. […]	
ISPM 33 (*Pest free potato (*Solanum *spp.) micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade*)	3.1 Establishment of pest free potato micropropagative material	[…] In addition to the laboratory testing procedure for regulated pests described below, potato micropropagative material should be inspected and found free from other pests or their symptoms and general microbial contamination.	[…] In addition to the laboratory testing procedure for regulated pests described below, potato micropropagative material should be inspected and found free from other pests or their symptoms and from microbes in general ~~microbial contamination~~.	"Contamination" is not used according to its Glossary definition. Rewording is suggested to avoid using "contamination".
ISPM 36 (*Integrated measures for plants for planting*)	APPENDIX 1 Table 1	6 Pests spread by water - Use of uncontaminated water sources, free of pests	6 Pests spread by water - Use of ~~uncontaminated~~ water sources~~,~~ free of pests	"Uncontaminated" is not considered to be used strictly according to the Glossary definition of "contamination", in which "water sources" are not listed. Furthermore, the word is redundant. Rewording is suggested to avoid using "uncontaminated".

Table 2: proposed ink amendments to ISPM 2 (Framework for pest risk analysis) where the term “contamination” is used in relation to biological control agents or beneficial organisms, but the use of “contaminants” is more appropriate

ISPM	ISPM SECTION	CURRENT TEXT	PROPOSED INK AMENDMENT	EXPLANATION
ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*)	1.2.2 Biological control agents and other beneficial organisms	Biological control agents and other beneficial organisms are intended to be beneficial to plants. Thus, when performing a PRA, the main concern is to look for potential injury to non-target organisms. Other concerns may include: - contamination of cultures of beneficial organisms with other species, the culture thereby acting as a pathway for pests	Biological control agents and other beneficial organisms are intended to be beneficial to plants. Thus, when performing a PRA, the main concern is to look for potential injury to non-target organisms. Other concerns may include: - ~~contamination~~presence of other species as contaminants of cultures of beneficial organisms ~~with other species~~, the culture thereby acting as a pathway for pests.	“Contamination” is not used according its Glossary definition. The wording proposed instead uses “contaminants” because it is a word commonly used in this context and well understood. This is also in line with the note on “contaminant” in the *General recommendation in the use of terms in ISPMs* (as proposed by the TPG in their December 2017 meeting).

Table 3: proposed ink amendments to adopted ISPMs where "contaminant" is used but the Glossary terms "contamination" or "contaminating pest" should be used instead.

ISPM	ISPM SECTION	CURRENT TEXT	PROPOSED INK AMENDMENT	EXPLANATION
ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*)	1.2.1 Plants as pests	Plants as pests may also be introduced unintentionally into a country, for example as contaminants of seeds for sowing, grain for consumption or fodder, wool, soil, machinery, equipment, vehicles, containers or ballast water.	Plants as pests may also be introduced unintentionally into a country, for example as ~~contaminants of~~ contaminating pests with seeds for sowing, grain for consumption or fodder, wool, soil, machinery, equipment, vehicles, containers or ballast water.	The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term "contaminating pest".
ISPM 11 *(Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*)	ANNEX 4 Introduction	This annex provides specific guidance on conducting PRA to determine if a plant is a pest of ….. It focuses primarily on plants proposed for import, whether as plants for planting or for other intended uses. It does not cover the unintentional introduction of plants as contaminants in commodities or conveyances.	This annex provides specific guidance on conducting PRA to determine if a plant is a pest of… It focuses primarily on plants proposed for import, whether as plants for planting or for other intended uses. It does not cover the unintentional introduction of plants as ~~contaminants~~ contaminating pests in commodities or conveyances.	The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term "contaminating pest".
ISPM 11	ANNEX 4 *Probability of spread (refer to section 2.2.3)*	The likelihood and extent of spread depends on natural and human-mediated factors. […] Human-mediated factors, whether intentional or unintentional, may include: - intended use, consumer demand, economic value and ease of transport	The likelihood and extent of spread depends on natural and human-mediated factors. […] Human-mediated factors, whether intentional or unintentional, may include: - intended use, consumer demand, economic value and ease of transport - the movement of propagules of contaminating pests ~~as a contaminant of~~ with soil or other materials (e.g. clothing,	The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term "contaminating pest".

ISPM	ISPM SECTION	CURRENT TEXT	PROPOSED INK AMENDMENT	EXPLANATION
		- the movement of propagules as a contaminant of soil or other materials (e.g. clothing, conveyances, machinery, tools, equipment)	conveyances, machinery, tools, equipment)	
ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*)	3. Relationship with PRA and Available Risk Management Options	**Harvest** - sanitation (e.g. removal of contaminants, “trash”)	**Harvest** - sanitation (e.g. removal of contamination ~~contaminants~~, “trash”)	The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”.
ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*)	5.1.6.2 Emergency action	Emergency action may be required in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation, such as the detection of quarantine pests or potential quarantine pests: - as contaminants of conveyances, storage places or other places involved with imported commodities.	Emergency action may be required in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation, such as the detection of quarantine pests or potential quarantine pests: - as ~~contaminants~~ contaminating pests of conveyances, storage places or other places involved with imported commodities.	The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contaminating pest”.
ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*)	2.3.2 Compliance of phytosanitary requirements	Inspection can be used to verify the compliance with some phytosanitary requirements. Examples include: freedom from contaminants (e.g. leaves, soil)	Inspection can be used to verify the compliance with some phytosanitary requirements. Examples include: - freedom from ~~contaminants~~contamination (e.g. leaves, soil)	The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”.

ISPM	ISPM SECTION	CURRENT TEXT	PROPOSED INK AMENDMENT	EXPLANATION
ISPM 33 (*Pest free potato (*Solanum *spp.) micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade*)	Annex 2 Operating procedures	- a monitoring programme to check the level of air-borne contaminants in the subculture room, cabinets and growth room	- a monitoring programme to check the level of air-borne ~~contaminants~~contamination in the subculture room, cabinets and growth room	The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”.
ISPM 41 (*International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment*)	Appendix 2 **Category:** Agricultural, forestry and horticultural used VME, such as:	**Contamination notes:** Contaminants: soil, pests.	**Contamination notes:** ~~Contaminants~~ Contamination by: soil, pests	The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”.
ISPM 41	Appendix 2 **Category:** Earth moving used VME, such as: - bulldozers - graders - surface mining equipment. Reconditioned or field-tested	**Contamination notes:** Soil is the main contaminant; pests, plant debris and seeds can also be contaminants	**Contamination notes:** ~~Soil is the main contaminant;~~ Contamination mainly by soil; but also by pests, plant debris and seeds ~~can also be contaminants~~	The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”.

ISPM	ISPM SECTION	CURRENT TEXT	PROPOSED INK AMENDMENT	EXPLANATION
	used VME are included. Pest risk is variable, but high levels of contamination may occur in this category			
ISPM 41	Appendix 2 **Category:** Used military VME, such as:	**Contamination notes:** Contaminants: soil, pests […]	**Contamination notes:** ~~Contaminants~~ Contamination by: soil, pests […]	The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”.
ISPM 41	Appendix 2 **Category:** Waste management used VME, such as:	**Contamination notes:** Organic waste debris is the main contaminant, including: soil, pests […]	**Contamination notes:** Contamination mainly by o~~O~~rganic waste debris ~~is the main contaminant~~, including: soil, pests […]	The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”.
ISPM 41	Appendix 2 **Category:** Deep mining used VME.	The most likely contaminants are soil and to a lesser extent pests. Pest risk is generally low unless used VME are contaminated with surface soil […]	~~The~~ Contamination is most likely ~~contaminants are~~ by soil and to a lesser extent by pests. Pest risk is generally low unless used VME are contaminated with surface soil […]	The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”.
ISPM 41	Appendix 2 **Category:**	**Contamination notes:** Contaminants: soil, pests […]	**Contamination notes:** ~~Contaminants~~ Contamination by: soil, pests […]	The meaning corresponds to that of the Glossary term “contamination”.

ISPM	ISPM SECTION	CURRENT TEXT	PROPOSED INK AMENDMENT	EXPLANATION
	Used vehicles, such as: - cars, vans, trucks, buses			

Appendix 11: Framework for Standards and Implementation updated by the SC at their May 2018 meeting

Framework for Standards and Implementation

Adopted by CPM-11 (2016); Updated by SC May 2017 and CDC May 2017;

Reviewed by the SPG 2017; endorsed by CPM-13 (2017); updated by SC May 2018

LEGEND:

Red text: indicates gaps for new topics, new revisions to adopted ISPMs that are not already on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

Underlined text: indicates topics on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* for revisions to adopted ISPMs (topic number in brackets)

Bolded text: indicates topics on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* for new ISPMs (topic number in brackets)

Adopted ISPMs are listed with title and ISPM number.

ISPMs or proposed gaps that cover or should cover both conceptual issues and implementation issues in one standard are centered.

Other guidance (developed, under development and planned to be developed/needed) are in the relevant columns.

IPPC Area: GENERAL IPPC Strategic Objectives (SOs): A3, A4, B1, B2, B3, D2, D4					
	Concept standards - "what"	**Implementation standards - "how"**	**Other guidance**		
			Developed	**Under development**	**Planned to be developed/needed**
1)	**Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-003) (Priority 1)**	No gap.	Audit in the phytosanitary context		
					Manuals
2)	No gap.	No gap.	Organization and provision of information on technical resources		
			Phytosanitary resource page (roster of experts, projects database, activities calendar, technical documents) IPPC Capacity Development and Resources presentation Advocacy fact sheet for phytosanitary page	Reorganization of the Phytosanitary resources page	
3)	No gap.	No gap.	Cooperation with other Organizations e.g. environmental		
			Memorandums of Understanding: Ozone Secretariat, CBD; Partnership paper (CPM 9/2014/21). Please Review: the new IPPC Online Comment System	IPPC-CBD joint work plan (2017-2018)	Sharing resources: ePhyto, evaluation tools

			Training material for users on OCS		
4)	No gap.	No gap.	Environmental protection and climate change e.g. surveillance of wild flora		
			Guide to implementation of phytosanitary standard in forestry; e-learning: Trade in forest commodities and the role of phytosanitary measures ICPM-7 decisions in relationship to Cooperation with the CBD: Treaty to biodiversity by IAS CPM Recommendation CPM-3/2008 - Replacement or reduction of the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure IRSS study: Aquatic Plants: Their Uses and Risks - A review of the global status of aquatic plants CPM Recommendation Number: CPM-9/2014/01 - Recommendation on the IPPC Coverage of Aquatic Plants	GEF project scoping through the IPPC Resource Mobilization Task Force (RMTF)	Protocol for alternative treatments for MB
5)	No gap.	No gap.	International cooperation among NPPOs		
			Manual on managing relationships with stakeholders		Cooperation on pest diagnostics among NPPOs. e.g.: training, manuals, videos Mentoring on specific issues: PRA, risk

					based inspection, etc. Roster of experts
6)	No gap.	No gap.	How standards relate to and impact on key topics (e.g. Market access, IAS, climate change)		
			Market Access - a guide to phytosanitary issues for national plant protection organizations PRA materials	Market access training materials Market access online learning modules	Awareness raising and advocacy documents Case studies on concrete relationships between Standards and key topics, measuring impacts Desk studies and methodologies to estimate impact of Standard implementation
7)	No gap.	No gap.	Advocacy for NPPO resource mobilization		
			PCE factsheet Manual on Establishing an NPPO Manual on Operation of an NPPO		Manual for Advocacy and gaining political support

IPPC GENERAL RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS IPPC SOs: A1, A2, B2, B3, B4, C3, D3, Y4					
	Concept standards - "what"	**Implementation standards - "how"**	**Other guidance**		
			Developed	**Under development**	**Planned to be developed/needed**
8)	Elements of an effective NPPO e.g. training, engagement of stakeholders, competency (Priority 1)	No gap.	Elements of an effective NPPO e.g. training, engagement of stakeholders, competency.		
			Manual on Establishing an NPPO Manual on Operation of an NPPO Manual on managing relationships with stakeholders Manual of good practices for CPM participation NPPO establishment training kit NPPO operations training kit IPPC Introduction presentation PCE tool; Explanatory document (2005) on ISPM 20 *(Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system)* (includes appendix on rights, roles & responsibilities in relation to the IPPC, ISPMs and SPS) IPPC Guide to Resource Mobilization: Promoting contracting party partnerships	Training materials for STDF401 project Preparing a national phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy - A Phytosanitary Capacity Development Training Tool For NPPOs	

			IRSS study: The Biosecurity approach: A review and evaluation of its application by FAO, internationally and in various countries		
9)	Revision: Pest reporting (ISPM 17) (Priority 2)		National reporting obligations		
			Recommendation information exchange (ICPM 2/1) Role of IPPC contact points (CPM 1/1) Explanatory document (2005) on ISPM 17:2005 (Pest reporting) Explanatory document (2005) on ISPM 17 (Pest reporting) IPPC Secretariat News letters on NROs	e-learning tool on reporting obligations to be developed and launched Support documents and tools for the NRO work plan	
10)	Revision: Guidelines on lists of regulated pests (ISPM 19) (Priority 2)		Pest reporting		
					Regulated pest lists clarification of terminology and its use in ISPM 19.
11)	Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action (ISPM 13)		Notification of non-compliance		
			Model notification form - import verification manual		Guidance on tools for harmonized notification
		No gap.	Development of national phytosanitary legislation		

12)	National legislation requirements (Priority 4)		Guidelines for the revision of national phytosanitary legislation – FAO Manual on Establishing an NPPO Training kit on Establishing an NPPO Manual on Operation of an NPPO Training kit on Operation of an NPPO PCE module on legislation IRSS study: The Biosecurity approach: A review and evaluation of its application by FAO, internationally and in various countries	Training material on phytosanitary legislation - STDF401	Case studies Legal and policy frameworks of plant protection
13)	No gap.	No gap.	International Cooperation between contracting parties (consider to combine with NPPO line 5)		
14)	No gap.	No gap.	Elements of an effective RPPO e.g. training, engagement of stakeholders, competency		
			Procedure for the recognition of new RPPOs - ICPM-4 (2002); Role and functions of the RPPOs ICPM-5 (2003) Appendix XIX Role and function of the RPPO adopted during CPM 12 (2017).		Recognition procedures for RPPOs to be reviewed and Procedure for de-recognizing the RPPOs

IPPC Area: PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES (interpretation of the Convention) IPPC SOs: B2, B3, C3, D1, D3		
Concept standards - "what"	**Implementation standards - "how"**	**Other guidance**

			Developed	Under development	Planned to be developed/needed
15)	Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade (ISPM 1)	No gap.	Undue delay and prompt action		
16)	Glossary of phytosanitary terms (ISPM 5) Terminology of the Convention on Biological Diversity in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (ISPM 5 – Appendix 1)	No gap.	Glossary		
			Annotated Glossary: Explanatory document (2013) on ISPM 5 *(The Glossary of phytosanitary terms)*		
17)	**Efficacy of measures (2001-001) (Priority 4)**	No gap.	Efficacy of measures		
			Beyond the compliance tool		Studies on efficacy of measures (e.g. treatments for fruit flies)
18)	No gap.	Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence (ISPM 29).	Technical Justification including reliability of scientific information		
			Plant pest surveillance manual	Manual on implementation of pest free areas and related phytosanitary improvement measures	IAEA Manual for fruit flies
19)	Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures (ISPM 24)		Equivalence of phytosanitary measures		
			IRSS study - Review of the application of equivalence between phytosanitary measures used to manage pest risk in trade Beyond the compliance tool		Studies on efficacy of measures (e.g. ; treatments for fruit flies)
20)	**Authorization of entities other than national plant protection**	No gap.	Supervision of authorized bodies, including procedures for examination and assessment of competencies		

	organizations to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002) (Priority 2)		Manual on establishment of an NPPO Manual on operation of an NPPO operation		Audit manual
21)	No gap.	No gap.	Appropriate level of protection		
22)	No gap.	No gap.	State of plant protection in the world		
			CPM materials The IPPC seminars 2016 Global emerging issues – a report of findings from the 2016 IPPC regional workshops questionnaire	Soil and plant health paper	Range of papers to be elaborated within the framework of IYPH CPM papers Wish list to communicate with others

IPPC Area: PEST STATUS IPPC SOs: A1, A2, B1					
	Concept standards - "what"	**Implementation standards - "how"**	**Other guidance**		
			Developed	**Under development**	**Planned to be developed/needed**
23)	Revision of ISPM 8 Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005, Priority 1)			Guidelines for the determination of pest status in an area	
24)	Revision: Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application (ISPM 16), to broaden to pests and clarify the concepts related to quarantine pests, RNQP and pests of national concern (Priority 2) Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests (ISPM 5 - Supplement 1)	No gap.	Revision of ISPM 16 to broaden to pests and clarify the concepts related to quarantine pests, RNQP and pests of national concern :		
			IPPC coverage of aquatic plants (CPM recommendation CPM-9/2014/01) GMOs, Biosafety and Invasive Species: ICPM 3 (2001) decision Plant pest surveillance manual		
25)	Host and non-host status (Priority 3)	Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) (ISPM 37)	Host and non-host status		
				IAEA manual for fruit flies	Range of materials might be elaborated under the pilot implementation programme on surveillance
26)	Surveillance (ISPM 6)				
27)	No gap.	Specific guidance on surveillance for a pest or a group of pests (Priority 3)	Guidance on surveillance for a pest or a group of pests.		
			Plant pest surveillance manual	Outputs of the implementation pilot on	

			Factsheet on Xylella fastidiosa Special topic session on Red Palm Weevil presentations posted on the phyto page with additional presentations related to surveillance	Surveillance (activities on three example pests)	
28)	Revision of ISPM 4 Requirements for the establishment of pests free areas (2009-002) (Priority 4) Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae) (ISPM 26)		Guidance on PFA, PFPP and ALPP for a pest or a group of pests		
				Manual on implementation of pest free areas and related phytosanitary improvement measures	
29)	Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites (ISPM 10)		Guidance on PFA, PFPP and ALPP for a pest or a group of pests		
				Manual on implementation of pest free areas and related phytosanitary improvement measures	
30)	Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence (ISPM 22)		Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence		
			Plant pest surveillance manual	Manual on Implementation of pest free areas and related phytosanitary measures IAEA manual for fruit flies	
31)	No gap.	Specific guidance on PFA, PFPP and ALPP for a pest or a group of pests (Priority 4) Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (ISPM 30) Control measures for an outbreak within a fruit fly-pest free area (ISPM 26 - Annex 2)	Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence		
			Plant pest surveillance manual	Manual on Implementation of pest free areas and related phytosanitary measures IAEA manual for fruit flies	Range of materials could be elaborated under the pilot implementation on surveillance

IPPC Area: PEST RISK ANALYSIS IPPC SOs: C2, C3, B2, B3, B4					
	Concept standards - "what"	**Implementation standards - "how"**	**Other guidance**		
			Developed	**Under development**	**Planned to be developed/needed**
32)	Framework for pest risk analysis (ISPM 2) **Supplement on Guidance on the concept of the likelihood of establishment component of a pest risk analysis for quarantine pests to ISPM 11 *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests* (2015-010) (Priority 4)**	Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests (ISPM 11) Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests (ISPM 21) Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk (ISPM 32) Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms (ISPM 3) Guidance on climate change (supplement to ISPM 11) (Priority 3)	Commodity and host pest lists		
			PRA awareness toolkit PRA training (manual and eLearning) Diversion from Intended Use: Consideration of the extent of the issue	Risk communication guidelines	Guidance on adherence to ISPM 32 Pest modelling in context of PRA
33)	Revision and combination of PRA standards (including ISPM 2, 11 and 21) (priority 4)		Commodity and host pest lists		
34)	**Guidance on pest risk management (2014-001)** (Priority 2)	Specific guidance on pest risk management for pests or a group of pests (Priority 3)	Pest risk management for pests or group of pests		
35)	Risk communication (Priority 3)		Risk communication		
				Risk communication guidelines	
36)			Economic analysis in PRA		

	Guidelines on the understanding of potential economic importance and related terms including reference to environmental considerations (ISPM 5 - Supplement 2)	Economic analysis in PRA (Priority 2)			Template for economic analysis of pest impact
37)	Diversion from intended use (Priority 2? to be determined) (concept standard or supplementary document)	No gap.	Diversion from intended use		
			IRSS study on Diversion from intended use - consideration of the extent of the issue		

IPPC Area: PEST MANAGEMENT IPPC SOs: A1, A2, B1, B2, B4, C2, D1					
	Concept standards - "what"	**Implementation standards - "how"**	**Other guidance**		
			Developed	**Under development**	**Planned to be developed/needed**
38)	Management of regulated pests (Priority 4)	No gap.	Management of regulated pests		
				CDC document on Phytosanitary measures	
39)	No gap.	No gap.	Pest management options		
			Beyond the compliance tool		Studies on efficacy
40)	Contingency planning and emergency response (Priority 1)	No gap.	Contingency planning and emergency response		
			Manual on managing relationships with stakeholders Manual on Establishing an NPPO Manual on Operation of an NPPO	Communication plan for Xylella	Guidelines for development of contingency plans Products of workshops for contingency planning and emergency response

			CPM9 side session materials on natural disasters		
41)	No gap.	**Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (draft annex to ISPM 15) (2006-010)** (Priority 2) Revision of annex 1 and 2 of ISPM 15 (Inclusion of the Phytosanitary treatment *Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material* ~~(2006-010A)~~ and *Revision of dielectric heating section* ~~*(2006-010B).*~~	Treatment of wood packaging material		
			Replacement of MB (CPM 3/1)		
42)	Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pest (ISPM 28)	Non-commodity specific phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests (e.g. soil drench, sterilization) (Annexes to ISPM 28) (Priority 4)	Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pest		
			Explanatory document (2006) on ISPM 18:2003 (Guidelines on the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary treatment)		DB of treatments
43)	Requirements for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure (Revision to ISPM 18) (2014-007) (Priority 3)		Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure		
			Explanatory document (2006) on ISPM 18:2003 *(Guidelines on the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary treatment)*		Manual for irradiation
44)	No gap.	**Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure** (2014-004) (Priority 1)			Manual

45)	No gap.	Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure (ISPM 42)			Manual
46)	No gap.	**Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure** (2014-006) (Priority 2)			Manual
47)	No gap.	**Requirements for the use of chemical treatments as a phytosanitary measure** (2014-003) (Priority 3)			Manual
48)	Guidelines for pest eradication programmes (ISPM 9)		Eradication programmes		
			Manual on managing relationships with stakeholders Manual on Establishing an NPPO Manual on Operation of an NPPO CPM9 side session material on natural disaster	Communication plan for Xylella	Manual for development of contingency plan Manual for eradication Products of workshops for contingency planning and emergency response
49)	No gap.	Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly management (Annex 3 of ISPM 26)	Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly		
				IAEA manual on fruit flies	
50)	Integrated measures plants for planting (ISPM 36)		Integrated measures & systems approach		
51)	Systems approach (ISPM 14)	Pest free potato (Solanum spp.) micropropagative	Beyond the compliance		Manual

	Clarification on the concepts of integrated measures and systems approach (Priority 4)	material and minitubers for international trade (ISPM 33) Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae) (ISPM 35) **Use of systems approaches in managing risks associated with the movement of wood commodities** (2015-004) (Priority 3) Specific guidance on systems approaches for commodities or pests (Priority 4)			

IPPC Area: PHYTOSANITARY IMPORT & EXPORT REGULATORY SYSTEMS IPPC SOs: A3, B4, C1, C2, C3, D3					
	Concept standards - "what"	**Implementation standards - "how"**	**Other guidance**		
			Developed	**Under development**	**Planned to be developed/needed**
52)	Phytosanitary certification system (ISPM 7)	Phytosanitary certificates (ISPM 12) Electronic phytosanitary certificates, information on standard XML schemes and exchange mechanisms (ISPM 12 - Appendix 1) Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) (2015-011) (Priority 2)	Phytosanitary certification		
			Export certification manual ePhyto related documents	ePhyto (proposed system: HUB)	
53)	Consignments in transit (ISPM 25)		Transit		
			Transit manual		
54)	No gap.	Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms (ISPM 3) Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests (ISPM 28)			
			Import verification manual		Guideline on biological control agents regulation process
55)	Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system (ISPM 20)		Import regulation		
			Import verification manual Explanatory document (2005) on ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) Manual on Establishing an NPPO		

			Manual on Operation of an NPPO		
56)		Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system (ISPM 20) **Use of specific import authorization (2008-006) (ISPM 20, new annex)** (Priority 4)	Import regulation		
			Import verification manual Explanatory document (2005) on ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) Manual on Establishing an NPPO Manual on Operation of an NPPO		
57)	No gap.	Guidelines for inspection (ISPM 23)	Inspection		
					Manuals
58)	Methodologies for sampling of consignments (ISPM 31)		Sampling		
			Explanatory document (2009) on ISPM 31 (*Methodologies for sampling of consignments*) Diagnostic manual Plant pest surveillance manual		Manuals
59)	No gap.	Design and operation of post-entry quarantine stations for plants (ISPM 34)	Post-entry quarantine stations for plants		
					Design plan for PEQ
60)	No gap.	No gap.	Dispute settlement		
			Dispute settlement manual		
61)	Arrangements for the verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country (Annex 1 of ISPM 20)	No gap.			
62)	No gap.	No gap.	Traceability		

					Proposed trace back guidance
63)	No gap.	**Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts (2008-002)** (Priority 3)	Pathways		
					Code of conduct
64)	No gap.	**International movement of cut flowers and foliage (2008-005)** (Priority 4)	International movement of cut flowers and foliage		
					Procedural guide related to ISPMs
65)	No gap.	**Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004)** (Priority 2)	Safe handling and disposal of waste		
					Procedural guide related to ISPMs Code of conduct
66)	No gap.	International movement of growing media in association with plants for planting (ISPM 40)	International movement of growing media		
					Procedural guide
67)	No gap.	**Minimizing pest movement by sea containers (2008-001)** (Priority 1)	Pest movement by sea containers		
			CPM Recommendation on sea containers (CPM-10/2015/1) Code of Conduct CPM Complementary action plan sea containers		Guidance for the implementation of the CPM recommendation on sea containers
68)	No gap.	**International movement of grain (2008-007)** (Priority 1)	International movement of grain		
			Protocol for alternative treatments for MB		Manual on grain Procedural guide related to ISPMs
	No gap.		Dielectric heat treatment		

69)		Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade (ISPM 15) (Revision of ISPM15 to include fraudulent use) (Priority 2)	Explanatory document (2014) on ISPM 15 (*Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade*) Quick guide to Dielectric heating		
70)	No gap.	International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (ISPM 41)	International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment		
					Codes of conduct
71)	No gap.	International movement of seeds (ISPM 38)	International movement of seeds		
			Phytosanitary treatments		Manual Procedural guide related to ISPMs
72)	No gap.	International movement of wood (ISPM 39)	International movement of wood		
			Phytosanitary treatments (MB etc.)		**Manual Procedural guide related to ISPMs**
73)	No gap.	**International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood (2008-008)** (Priority 2)	International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood		
			Internet trade (e-commerce) in plants and other regulated articles (CPM recommendation CPM-9/2014/2) Materials of the CPM12 special topic session on e-commerce.		

IPPC Area: DIAGNOSTICS
IPPC SOs: A1, B1, B4

	Concept standards - "what"	Implementation standards - "how"	Other guidance		
			Developed	**Under development**	**Planned to be developed/needed**
74)	Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests (ISPM 27)	Annexes to Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests (ISPM 27) *Citrus leprosis virus* (Priority 2) *Pyricularia oryzae (syn. Magnaporthe oryzae)* on *Triticum* spp. (Priority 1) *Microcyclus ulei* (Priority 1) *Mononychellus tanajoa* (Priority 2) *Puccinia graminis f.sp. tritici* UG 99 (Priority 1) *Moniliophthora rorer* (Priority 3) *Solanum rostratum* (Priority 2) *Amaranthus palmeri* (Priority 2)	Requirements for diagnostics Guide to delivering phytosanitary diagnostic services CPM11 recommendation on the importance of plant pest diagnosis	Assessment framework for diagnostic services Specimen imaging guide for contracting parties	
75)	No gap.	Requirements for diagnostics (Priority 2)	Requirements for diagnostics Guide to delivering phytosanitary diagnostic services	Assessment framework for diagnostic services	Guidance on use of molecular DB Inventory of trainings related to diagnostics
76)	No gap.	No gap.	International or regional cooperation for diagnostics (e.g. Regional centers of expertise) CPM11 recommendation on the importance of plant pest diagnosis		Inventories of taxonomic collections Roster of taxonomic experts

Appendix 12: Action points arising from the SC May 2018 meeting

Action	Section / Paragraph / Decision point	Responsible	Deadline
1. Propose amendments to the Standard Setting Procedure to include the new process for the call for topics: standards and implementation for consideration at the SC November 2018 meeting	4.1 [18] (6)	Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM, Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE and Mr Ezequiel FERRO	26 Oct 2018
2. Provide comments on the IPPC Strategic Framework for 2020-2030 in an e-decision forum to be included into the OCS during the country consultation starting from 15 June 2018	4.1 [23] (2)	SC members	30 Jul 2018
3. Assist the Secretariat with compiling the comments on the IPPC Strategic Framework for 2020-2030 and the Secretariat will submit them on behalf of the SC	4.1 (3)	Mr Stephen BUTCHER	before the 30 August 2018
4. Inform the Bureau that Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (Canada) and Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile) were nominated as members for the Task Force on Topics (TFT)	4.1 (4)	Secretariat	11 Jun 2018
5. Consider the suggested revision of the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the Standards Committee at their 2018 November meeting	4.1 (5)	SC members	Next SC meeting
6. Forward the SC comments on the draft Terms of Reference for the focus group on commodity and pathway specific ISPMs to the Bureau and inform them that Mr Ezequiel FERRO represents the SC.	4.1 (7, 8)	Secretariat	11 Jun 2018
7. Develop a paper on possible areas for collaboration between the SC and IC for consideration at a future meeting.	4.1 [47]	SC and IC representatives	19 Oct 2018
8. Provide comments on the strategies to promote the PCEs and the procedure for the development of guides and training manuals during their November 2018 meeting.	4.1 (11)	SC members	Next SC meeting
9. Consider potential consequential changes to other adopted ISPMs based on the Revision of ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005) in the future.	4.1 (17)	SC members	To future SC meeting
10. Archive the implementation issues identified for the draft ISPM on Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002) until after the consultation period.	5.2 (20)	Secretariat	Dec 2018
11. Incorporate the text of Appendix 1 to the draft ISPM on Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary	5.3 [130]	Secretariat	Sep 2018

Action	Section / Paragraph / Decision point	Responsible	Deadline
measure (2014-006) into the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting as a TPPT procedure			
12. Archive the implementation issues identified for the draft ISPM on Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006) until after the consultation period	5.3 (21)	Secretariat	Dec 2018
13. Open an electronic decision on the term "inspection" (2017-008)	5.4 (24)	Secretariat	05 Jun 2018
14. Open an electronic decision to revise the draft specification on the Supplement on Guidance on the concept of the likelihood of establishment component of a pest risk analysis for quarantine pests (2015-010) to ISPM 11 (Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests)	6.1 (27)	Secretariat	19 Jun 2018
15. Provide suggestions for the draft IYPH promotional paper to Mr Sam BISHOP (email: sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk)	7.1 (30)	SC members	31 Aug 2018
16. Open a call for additional experts for the TPPT	8.1 (39)	Secretariat	Jul 2018
17. Open a call for a new TPG member for English	8.2 (49)	Secretariat	Jul 2018
18. Review and finalize the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application*) in collaboration with the IC	8.2 (56)	TPG	Dec 2018
19. Open a call for a TPDP expert in Mycology depending on the outcome of the Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation	8.3 (62)	Secretariat	TBD
20. Archive the request of a contracting party to include larvae identification, once methods are available (see comment 52 of the compiled comments) of future revision of the DP on *Bactrocera dorsalis* Complex (2006-026)	8.3 (64)	Secretariat	15 Jun 2018
21. Forward the possible implementation issues on the Revision of the DP 02: Plum pox virus (2016-007) and *Xylella fastidiosa* (2004-024) to the IC	8.3 (65, 66)	Secretariat	01 Sep 2018
22. Forward the IFQRG questionnaire to the Bureau for their consideration	8.5 (77)	Secretariat	11 Jun 2018
23. Update the *List of topics for IPPC standards* based on decisions taken at the SC May 2018 meeting and by removing the ISPMs that were adopted by the CPM-13 (2018)	9.1 (84)	Secretariat	15 Jun 2018
24. Open a Call for experts for the EWG on *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014)	9.1	Secretariat	Jul 2018

Action	Section / Paragraph / Decision point	Responsible	Deadline
25. Forward the revised Framework for Standards and Implementation to the SPG	10 (86)	Secretariat	Sep 2018
26. Revise the discussion paper on proposed gaps to the Framework for standards and implementation ('Pest-Host status standards for commodities' and Sampling strategies for specific commodities') according to the SC May discussion for discussion at the November 2018 SC meeting	10.1 ((87)	Mr Bruce HANCOCKS and Mr Stephen BUTCHER	19 Oct 2018
27. Evaluation of the meeting	[245]	SC members	01 Jun 2018