![NAPPO logo] **NAPPO**
North American Plant Protection Organization
Organización Norteamericana de Protección a las Plantas

NAPPO In-person Meeting Report

Expert Group:	Forestry – WPM Evaluation of risk
Location:	NAPPO Annual Meeting Tucson Marriott, Canyon Room
Date:	October 22, 2024, from 11:30 – 1:00
Chairperson	Meghan Noseworthy (NR Canada)
Participants:	

Samuel Podlipsky (Mexico Industry)	Brad Gething (USA Industry)	John Tyrone Jones (USDA APHIS PPQ)
Scott Geffros (Canada Industry)	María José Martínez (Mexico Industry)	Tanya Staffan (CFIA NAPPO AMC)
Adnan Uzunovic (Can Wood) guest		

Summary		
Project /Proyecto:	Evaluation of risk associated with different types of wood packaging material – Opportunities to improve ISPM 15 compliance.	
General comments:	Welcome remarks and introductions provided by the Chair. The group reviewed the draft agenda: 1.　Review project specification 2.　Review the draft outline of the S&T Google Doc 3.　Consider: - How to how to estimate risk in the absence of data – scientific explanation of risk based on biology and science. - Current state of production practices for different types of WPM - Data collection possibilities - Plans for defining categories of WPM 4.　Other	
Item 1:	Review of the project proposal/ specification	
Consensus:	- The group reviewed the project objectives. The second objective is to: 　　"Describe the production process for each type of WPM, including the application of measures, verification, and certification." PALLETS: - Brad noted that this is tricky as there are several ways different categories are created e.g., pallets may be made of wood cut	

	and treated on-site, while other producers may purchase treated wood to assemble, etc.
	- Tyrone noted that in the US, approximately 80% of manufacturers buy treated wood to assemble and 20% treat the WPM.
	- Sam noted that in Mexico, some producers buy HTKD wood to assemble and others buy untreated green wood to assemble. In addition, a paper certificate accompanies ISPM 15 compliant WPM to prevent stamp forgery, this supersedes the mark. They are considering a QR RFID code going forward
	DUNNAGE: - Tyrone noted important considerations for risk associated with WPM are age and size - Producer liability was noted as being an important aspect of the system; however, post-export the importer is responsible for WPM used.
	Action Item: To describe the production processes for different types of WPM in each country to identify differences and commonalities. This will lead to recommendations to NPPOs to improve compliance.
Item 2:	Review of the tasks outlined in the project description
Consensus:	- The group reviewed the tasks and focused on the sixth task: "Categorize and evaluate the risk associated with each type of wood packaging material" - The group recognized that this will be a qualitative assessment, and the outcome will be to make recommendations on how to collect data going forward - The group discussed what characteristics or factors would deem a category to be higher risk: e.g., inconsistent wood species, remanufacturing or modification post-treatment - Brad noted that the US industry spends a great deal of time regulating the WPM recycling industry. - Recycled WPM should have a lower risk - WPM that has new and old wood (light versus grey wood) that is inconsistently marked is flagged for inspection in the US - The group noted that the guidance for repaired wood is well outlined in ISPM 15
	Action Item: Create an Excel spreadsheet to identify commonalities among the three countries and production practices for the creation of different types of WPM. Identify discrepancies without pre-judgment. This should help identify what affects risk. Include source of wood etc. (Working group Brad, Scott, María José and Sam).
Item 3:	WPM terminology

Consensus:	- The group discussed the definitions newly reviewed by the USDA and CBP. - Meghan made a table to compare definitions across the three countries - Sam indicated that María José and he have been working with Maria-Eugenia on definitions for Mexico, and these will be shared with the NAPPO Secretariat for translation **Action Item:** Meghan to share the table on Google Docs **Action Item**: Sam and María José to share Mexican WPM definitions with the NAPPO Secretariat for translation
Item 4:	Data
Consensus:	- The group discussed and agreed that it is difficult to use or rely on existing data associated with WPM - Suggestions for future work and projects to collect data were discussed - In the absence of data can we make useful inferences regarding risk? - Agree that an outcome of this EG and the Science and Technology document will be harmonized definitions of WPM and recommendations on how to collect data associated with WPM **Action Item**: All to look at the IPPC pathway and system approach production chain framework for ideas: https://www.ippc.int/en/centre-of-excellence/phytosanitary-system/systems-approach/systems-approach-online-tools/#a

Next Steps

Responsible Person	Action	Date
Brad, Scott, Sam, María José, Meghan	Create an Excel spreadsheet to identify commonalities among the three countries and production practices for creating different types of WPM.	
Meghan	Create and share a definitions table in Google Docs – including the new USDA-CBP definitions, ISPM 5 etc.	
Sam and María José	Share WPM definitions gathered and used in Mexico with the NAPPO Secretariat for translation	
EG	All to look at the IPPC pathway and system approach production chain framework for ideas: https://www.ippc.int/en/centre-of-excellence/phytosanitary-system/systems-approach/systems-approach-online-tools/#a	

Next Meeting

Location:	Zoom meeting
Date:	December, 2024 from 2:00-3:00 pm EST

Proposed Agenda Items
1. Welcome remarks
2. Updates on WPM definitions, descriptions, and other data sources
3. Review accessibility to Google Docs and review of background and literature search sections
4. Review last meeting report and action items
5. Next video conference
6. Meeting adjourned