



# NAPPO

North American Plant Protection Organization  
Organización Norteamericana de Protección a las Plantas

## NAPPO Conference Call Report

Expert Group:	Forestry- <i>Evaluating the risk associated with different types of wood packaging material – Opportunities to improve ISPM 15 compliance.</i>	
Location:	York meeting room, Delta Ottawa, Canada	
Date:	October 10, 2025	
Chairperson	Meghan Noseworthy (NR Canada)	
Participants:		
Samuel Podlipsky (Mexico Industry)	Arvind Vasudevan (CFIA)	Tyrone Jones (APHIS PPQ)
Brad Gething (U.S. Industry)	Leigh Greenwood (TNC)	Marcel Dawson (for Scott Geffros)
Tanya Staffen (CFIA – NAPPO AMC)	John Daniels (USDA)	Eric Allen (Canada) *
*virtual		
<b>Summary</b>		
Project:	Forestry- <i>Evaluating the risk associated with different types of wood packaging material – Opportunities to improve ISPM 15 compliance.</i>	
General comments:	The meeting focused on updates and progress regarding the project, including the harmonization of terminology for wood packaging materials between Canada, the United States, and Mexico. The group reviewed the objectives and tasks as listed in the Project Specification, discussed next steps, and potential recommendations specifically in light of the lack of data to analyze on WPM.	
Item 1:	EG tasks review	
Consensus:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The group reviewed the tasks and agreed that the first five tasks were complete.</li> <li>- The group agreed that the following three tasks required data collection on WPM that was not possible at this time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Categorize and evaluate the risk associated with each type of WPM</li> <li>o Determine if dunnage is a higher risk category of WPM</li> <li>o Consider measures which could improve the use of compliant dunnage</li> </ul> </li> <li>- The group agreed that the focus going forward should be on the outstanding tasks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Development of a technical document</li> <li>o Development of recommendations on how to improve compliance for higher-risk WPM</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<p>categories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The group also agreed to continue work on submission for harmonization of terminology (potentially at the IPPC level). This task is noted in the evaluation criteria for new projects.</li> </ul>	
Item 2:	Potential recommendations	
Consensus:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The group discussed potential recommendations that could be made in the S&amp;T document, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Adoption of harmonized terminology for categories of WPM to improve management of WPM, as well as data collection for regulators to potentially apply risk-based management models to WPM inspection</li> <li>o Review of production process associated with different categories of ISPM 15 WPM to potentially improve WPM that is less common or irregular (e.g. custom crates, dunnage)</li> <li>o Potential data collection recommendations</li> <li>o Training and education opportunities for the production and verification of ISPM 15 WPM (IPPC guides and courses, and regional workshops)</li> <li>o Research opportunities</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Item 3:	Production process evaluation	
Consensus:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The group discussed the idea of viewing the production of different types of WPM using a critical control points.</li> <li>- Eric Allen presented a table with examples of how this might be executed, listing CCPs: supplier verification, debarking, treatment optimization, operator training, separation of treated and untreated wood, record keeping, audit, storage, repair, and remanufacturing. Each CCP had an example associated, rationale, and considerations for the different categories of WPM.</li> <li>- The group considered but required more time to determine how this would be populated.</li> </ul>	
Item 4:	Writing subgroup	
Consensus:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The group discussed how to help move the current ideas and suggestions forward with a writing subgroup that could meet more frequently and develop the S&amp;T document</li> <li>- The Google Docs version could be used to track progress and changes for the larger group.</li> <li>- EG members identified to be a part of this smaller writing group: Leigh Greenwood, Eric Allen, Meghan Noseworthy, Brad Gething, Sam Plopinsky</li> </ul>	
<b>Next Steps</b>		
<b>Responsible Person</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Date</b>
Meghan Noseworthy	Send a doodle poll to subgroup	

<b>Next Meeting</b>	
Location:	Zoom meeting
Date:	TBD 2026 from 2:00 to 3:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time
<b>Proposed Agenda Items</b>	
1. Review action items of the July and October EG meetings.	
2. Review S&T document recommendations from the subgroup.	
3. Initiate writing subgroup meetings.	