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Background

- The International standard for phytosanitary measures (ISPM)15 Regulation of wood [packaging in international trade provides a harmonized approach to regulation of wood packaging material (WP)]
  - Treatment
  - Certification by way of a mark acceptable to all NPPOs
- ISPM 15 was adopted by Commission on phytosanitary measures (CPM) in 2002.
Background

- North American countries adopted ISPM 15 in 2006
- Since adoption compliance has improved from about 75% of inspected consignments to more than 90%
- Much of the non-compliance continues to be associated with shipments from Asia
- How to improve further?
- NAPPO Forestry Panel proposed a workshop in cooperation with the APPPC as a starting point in developing NPPO and industry cooperation leading to increased compliance
APPPC-NAPPO workshop on ISPM 15

- Meeting held in Beijing, June 10-14, 2014
- Hosted by:
  - Ministry of Agriculture
  - General Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine of the People’s Republic of China (AQSIQ)
- APPPC & NAPPO developed the agenda
  - Context and background of ISPM 15
  - Existing practical guidance
  - Country experiences in implementation,
  - Country experiences in dealing with non-compliance
  - Recommendations and best practices for improving implementation and reducing non-compliance
- Field trip to Chinese wood packaging facilities
Participants

- Australia
- Cambodia
- Canada
- China
- India
- Japan
- Laos
- Malaysia
- New Zealand
- Philippines
- Republic of Korea
- Singapore
- Thailand
- United States
- Vietnam
- APPPC
- NAPPO
- International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat
Reports on implementation

- Most have implemented the export components of ISPM 15
- Great deal of variability in structure of implementation of export components (direct oversight, third parties, technical monitoring, etc.)
- Sufficient facilities registered to produce compliant wood packaging
- A few have chosen not to implement the import components
- A number of countries indicated insufficient resources to adequately monitor imports and supervise exports. Many expressed interest in understanding the use of third party systems used by other countries
Reports on implementation

- Challenges to identify high risk imports
- Concerns about the possibility of infestation after treatment and advocated additional measures to protect WP after treatment
- Forgery or fraudulent uses of marks was a concern
  - Ownership of the mark and ability to stop unauthorized uses was unclear
Reports on non-compliance

- Non-compliances have reduced over time but continue to be recorded
- Non-compliance was < 5% of inspected shipments
- Notifications of non-compliances (NNCs) provided by the NPPO’s of the importing country contain insufficient information or are not provided in adequate time to permit effective follow-up.
- Volumes in trade tend to be directly proportional to non-compliances
Reports on non-compliance

- The majority of non-compliances reported were lack of marks.
- Detection of infested material was less frequent (e.g. < 10% of non-compliant shipments)
- Often non-compliances are associated with lack of awareness by traders
Recommendations – improved guidance

- Increased sharing of technical information between NPPOs (e.g. use of the IPP)
  - Technical information of treatments and treatment supervision
  - Use of third parties
  - Protection of the mark
  - Approaches for enforcement

- Improved technical guidance within existing implementation tools (improve explanatory documents)

- Increased information on the risks of infestation after treatment
Recommendations – harmonization of implementation practices

NPPO’s should:
- Establish and communicate export oversight systems
- Cooperate with FAO in registration of the symbol
- Possess legislative or regulatory authorities for enforcement
- Addition of additional traceability information to support more effective NNCs (e.g. batch numbers, date stamps, etc.)
- Update info on the IPP regarding requirements
- Provide NNCs within a month of detection
- Cooperate on developing improved tools for sharing NNCs
Recommendations – harmonization of implementation practices

NPPO’s should:
- Contact information on IPP is up-to-date
- Include a minimum of information on NNCs to allow effective tracing
  - General information on the shipment
  - Information on mark
  - Any other information on the WP or consignment
  - Photographs
  - Information on any pests detected
  - Shipping and export information
  - Date and description of actions taken
- Avoid taking action on contaminating pests
- Pay particular attention to how large size WP is treated
- Undertake increased outreach
- Cooperate and share resources to support outreach
- Publicise enforcement actions
- Strengthen cooperation
Other recommendations

- FAO should provide more detailed information on scope of use of the symbol
- NPPOs should
  - Advocate revision of the standard to require increased traceability information
  - Advocate for an international workshop to address issues of implementation
- Encourage the development of a secure web-portal for sharing NNC information
Next steps

- The IPPC Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine has proposed that the Standards Committee of CPM advocate for an IPPC Workshop
  - Goal: advance the recommendations arising from the regional workshop to harmonized standards
- NPPOs in Quad countries have begun sharing technical information on oversight systems, technical standards, etc.
- International Forest Quarantine Research Group working on developing guidance on contaminant pests, infestation after treatment and HT probe use