



Canadian Food  
Inspection Agency

Agence canadienne  
d'inspection des aliments

# Asia Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) – North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) workshop on ISPM 15

Shane Sela

Canadian Food Inspection Agency  
NAPPO Annual Meeting, Huatulco,  
Mexico

October 20 - 24, 2014



Canada

# 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 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