

**International Forestry Quarantine Research Group
Meeting Feb 17-19, 2004**

Draft Agenda

Tuesday Feb 17, 2003

1000 – 1330 (with a break where appropriate)

- Introductions – discuss meeting goals
 - Elect chair/coordinator/consul/Caesar
- Background of science/PQ interaction
- Review IFQRG Concept and Terms of Reference
 - Organization-structure of IFQRG
 - Membership
 - Secretariat
 - IFQRG Role – International/National/Regional (what we do/don't do)
 - Relationship with IPPC
 - Formation of IPPC technical panels

1330 – 1430 Lunch

1430 - 1730

- Relationship with IUFRO WG 7.03.12 (presentation from Hugh Evans)
- Communication process – web discussion, membership list
- Document Review process
 - Receipt and distribution of documents
 - Screening process
 - Review of published vs. unpublished reports
 - Confidentiality issues
- Reporting process
 - Coordination of summary reports
 - Distribution of reports
- Coordination of science activities
 - How to solicit Plant Quarantine questions
 - How to process treatment alternatives proposed by industry
 - Development of criteria
- Funding
 - How to promote global participation

Wednesday Feb 18, 2003

0900 - 1030

- Discussion of priority PQ questions
 - Pest Prediction, Modelling – data sharing
 - Pathway analysis – beyond wood packaging, what other pathways may be important (e.g. live plant)
 - Measures to prevent movement of pests
 - Refinement of ISPM 15 including other wood treatment options (see list below)

1030 – 1100 Break

1100 - 1330

- Discussion of priority PQ questions
- 1330 – 1430 Lunch
- 1430 – 1730
- Plan joint science activities
 - The goal here will be to leave the meeting having organized at least one joint project to be conducted over the next year

Thursday Feb 19, 2003

0900 - 1030

- Plan joint science activities

1030 – 1100 Break

1100 - 1330

- Meeting summary
- Next steps (frequency of meetings)

Possible topics for refinement of ISPM 15

Treatment Alternatives

Development of guidelines for review and acceptance of new treatments

1. Heat Treatment

- verification of 56/30 for other fungi
- can fungal HT testing method be simplified by testing fungi grown in tubes vs. grown in wood blocks?
- treatment for fungi in larger sized wood blocks
- test fungi that have produced survival structures (in both wood and culture). A potential weakness of Allen's work is that fungi were "healthy" and may not have developed heat-resistant structures.

2. MeBr alternatives

- test efficacy of other fumigants on various life stages of insects, fungi and nematodes
- review recent studies, design comprehensive approach incorporating factors such as moisture, piece size, etc.

3. Electron Beam Irradiation (e.g. SureBeam)

- Can electron beam irradiation technology be used on wood packaging? Some peripheral assessment has been by the Smithsonian related to the use of Surebeam technology and its proposed use for US mail irradiation and its effect on museum specimens
(http://www.si.edu/scmre/about/mail_irradiation.htm)

4. Other alternatives

Review of risk associated with bark after approved treatment

- A debarking requirement is left as discretionary in ISPM 15. The need for technical justification is indicated. Quantification of risk associated with bark in untreated wood integrated with non-compliance statistics would provide a level of risk if bark was allowed on treated wood.

"Subject to technical justification, countries may require that imported wood packaging material subjected to an approved measure be made from debarked wood and display a mark as shown in Annex II."

Test validity of veneer peeler core exclusion in ISPM 15

- A number of solid wood materials are specifically excluded in ISPM 15.

"Wood packaging material such as veneer peeler cores (veneer peeler cores are a by-product of veneer production involving high temperatures and comprising the center of a log remaining after the peeling process),

sawdust, wood wool, and shavings, and raw wood cut into thin pieces (thin wood is considered to be 6mm thickness or less according to the Customs Harmonized Commodity Description and Coding System (the Harmonized System or HS) may not be pathways for introduction of quarantine pests and should not be regulated unless technically justified.”

A cursory review of veneer log processing techniques indicates a wide variation in temperatures used, many below 56/30, and as such may harbour unwanted organisms.

Reinfestation of wood

- An analysis of the “life history” of wood packaging might be a start. Can SWPM be categorized by how long it is in circulation, is it ever exposed to conditions where reinfestation is likely?
- Based on (1) can different categories of SWPM be risk rated and treated differently?
- Factors contributing to reinfestation (moisture, temperature, exposure)
- What organisms tend to be reinfestation problems?

Verification of treatment

- What audit tools are available to determine whether treatment has been carried out?
- Perform targeted surveys on high risk material (wire rope spools?) to determine levels of compliance and whether non-compliance is intentional or the result of inadequate treatment.

Participant List as of January 8 (tentative **in bold**)

1	Dr. Eric Allen (Canada)
2	Mr. Marcos Beeche (Chile)
3	British Wood Preserving Association/ West European Institute for Wood Preservation
4	Dr. Yeong-Jin Chung (Korea)
5	Dr. Hugh Evans (UK)
6	Dr. Robert Haack (USA)
7	Dr. Tom Hofacker (USA)
8	Dr. Barbara Illman (USA)
9	Dr. David Kaplan (USA)
10	Dr. Fusao Kawakami (Japan)
11	Mr. Brent Larson (IPPC)
12	Ms. Jane Levy (USA)

13	Mr. Jong-Ho Lee (Korea)
14	Dr. Vic Mastro (USA)
15	Mr. Bill Magee (Australia)
16	Dr. Emmanuel Mireku (Australia)
17	Mr. Mitsusada Mizobuchi (Japan)
18	Dr. Andrei Orlinski (EPPO)
19	Mr. Hans Ottens (Canada)
20	Mr. Peter Thomson (NZ)
21	Dr. Kyu-Ock Yim (Korea)
22	Dr. Wang Yuejin (China)