



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



International  
Plant Protection  
Convention

# **REPORT**

## **37<sup>th</sup> Standards Committee Meeting**

**Virtual Meeting  
16-19 November 2020**

**IPPC Secretariat**

Required citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2020. *Report of the virtual 37<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standards Committee, 16-19 November 2020*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2020



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original English edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

**Third-party materials.** Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

**Sales, rights and licensing.** FAO information products are available on the FAO website ([www.fao.org/publications](http://www.fao.org/publications)) and can be purchased through [publications-sales@fao.org](mailto:publications-sales@fao.org). Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: [www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request). Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).

## CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the Meeting .....	5
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat .....	5
2.	Meeting Arrangements .....	5
2.1	Election of the Rapporteur .....	5
2.2	Adoption of the agenda .....	6
2.3	Adoption of the report from the previous meeting .....	6
3.	Administrative Matters .....	6
4.	Draft specifications from first consultation for revision and approval .....	6
4.1	Annex to ISPM 38: Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009), Priority 1 .....	6
4.2	Annex to ISPM 37: Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information (2018-011), Priority 3 .....	8
4.3	Draft specification for the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) (2019-009), Priority 1 .....	10
5.	Topics .....	12
5.1	Review of current <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i> .....	12
6.	Standards Committee .....	13
6.1	Reorganize the pest risk analysis (PRA) standards into a suite of standards .....	13
6.2	Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (from May 2020 to November 2020) .....	15
7.	Discussions on the Strategic Framework 2020–2030 .....	16
7.1	IPPC development agenda .....	16
7.2	Selection of a SC representative for a CPM Focus Group dedicated to the implementation of the Development Agenda on “Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems” .....	20
8.	Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) Interactions .....	20
8.1	Update on Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)’s activities to the SC .....	20
9.	Updates .....	21
9.1	CPM Bureau: 2020 virtual meetings .....	21
9.2	Strategic Planning Group .....	22
9.3	Briefings from the IPPC Secretariat .....	23
10.	SC recommendations for CPM-15 (2021) or CPM Bureau decisions and discussions .....	24
11.	Review of the standard setting calendar .....	25
12.	Any Other Business .....	25
13.	Date and Type of the Next SC Meeting .....	25
14.	Evaluation of the Meeting Process .....	25
15.	Close of the Meeting .....	25
	Appendix 1: Agenda .....	26
	Appendix 2: Documents list .....	29

Appendix 3: Participants list .....	31
Appendix 4: Specification 70 (Annex <i>Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds</i> (2018-009) to ISPM 38 ( <i>International movement of seeds</i> )).....	37
Appendix 5: Specification 71 (Annex <i>Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information</i> (2018-011) to ISPM 37 ( <i>Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i> )).....	41
Appendix 6: Specification TP 6 ( <i>Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)</i> ) (2019-009) .....	45
Appendix 7: Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (from May 2020 to November 2020) .....	48
Appendix 8: Draft ISPM on Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002).....	57

## 1. Opening of the Meeting

### 1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The Chairperson of the Standards Committee (SC), Mr Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), opened the meeting, welcomed all participants, and invited the IPPC Standard Setting Unit (SSU) lead to address the meeting.
- [2] The SSU lead welcomed everyone to the thirty-seventh meeting of the SC and wished all SC members success in their discussions and decisions. He thanked all SC members for their successful and effective work during the year, especially given the restrictions due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and commented that the current, virtual ways of working are likely to continue for the next six months, if not more. Although it is important to be clear how the IPPC community is going to operate over this period, most of the available tools to do this are already in place. He emphasized that the IPPC community is relying on the work of the SC, because of its importance to the IPPC community and to other units of the Secretariat.
- [3] The SSU lead commented that the agenda for the SC meeting contained much business to discuss, including several issues related to the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030. This year, the entire IPPC community is focused on the implementation of the IPPC development agenda. The SSU emphasized that the most important question for SC members was what their role would be in implementing the Strategic Framework.
- [4] The SSU lead confirmed that most of the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “Secretariat”) continues to work remotely from home and will do this for at least the next two months. However, all units are operating effectively, and the work is progressing well. He also highlighted the achievements to date related to the International Year of Plant Health (IYPH), with a number of events still planned for the coming year as the IYPH has been extended because of the pandemic. The IYPH closing ceremony will be on 1 July 2021 in Helsinki, as part of the International Plant Health Conference, which is currently scheduled to be a virtual meeting but could be changed to a physical meeting if the situation allowed. On 1 June 2021, there is planned to be a high-level launch of the study on the impact of climate change on plant health, to be held virtually. It is planned that the next session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) will be convened on 16 and 18 March 2021, with the adoption of the CPM meeting report on 1 April. The meetings are scheduled to be held virtually, and contingency planning is underway. The SSU lead commented on the need for the SC to also plan its work for next year, working on the assumption that virtual meetings will continue. He noted the success of the IPPC community in using online tools with the move to virtual meetings and thanked SC members once again and also the Secretariat.
- [5] Finally, the SSU lead confirmed that Mr Jingyuan XIA remains responsible for the Secretariat as a whole, with himself (the SSU lead) in charge of day-to-day matters. The new IPPC Secretary is not likely to be appointed until the beginning of 2021. In the meantime, Ms Adriana MOREIRA is temporarily officer-in-charge for the SSU.
- [6] The SC Chairperson welcomed the new SC members, Mr Steve CÔTÉ (Canada), Mr Gerald Glenn F. PANGANIBAN (Philippines) and Mr Luis Antonio TAVARES (Guinea-Bissau). He also welcomed Ms Marica GATT as the representative of the CPM Bureau, Mr Ahmed M. Abdellah ABDELMOTTALEB as the representative of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC), the observers, and staff from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU).

## 2. Meeting Arrangements

### 2.1 Election of the Rapporteur

- [7] The SC elected Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) as Rapporteur.

## 2.2 Adoption of the agenda

- [8] The SC adopted the Agenda (Appendix 1).

## 2.3 Adoption of the report from the previous meeting

- [9] The SC adopted the report from the SC virtual meeting on 23 September 2020<sup>1</sup>.

## 3. Administrative Matters

- [10] The Secretariat introduced the Documents list (Appendix 2) and the Participants list (Appendix 3), and invited participants to notify the Secretariat of any information that required updating in the Participants list or was missing from it.

## 4. Draft specifications from first consultation for revision and approval

### 4.1 Annex to ISPM 38: Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009), Priority 1

- [11] The Steward, Ms Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America), introduced the draft specification and supporting documentation<sup>2</sup>. There had been 143 comments on the draft specification during consultation and the Steward had revised the draft accordingly. The revised draft specification had subsequently been considered by SC members via the Online Comment System (OCS) and further amendments were made.
- [12] The Steward highlighted the two main issues for discussion by the SC:
- **Understanding what the draft specification is for (i.e. its intention).** The Steward explained that the draft specification is for an annex to a standard, providing an overarching framework to support the international movement of seeds. The annex would focus only on general concepts and would not cover specific seed commodities, specific pests, or specific levels of protection. In due course, systems approaches for particular seed species or particular classes of pests could be attached as annexes to it. The intention of the proposed approach is that a phytosanitary certificate is still issued by national plant protection organizations (NPPOs), but it would be on the basis of continual monitoring, auditing and verification of the production system rather than by consignment-by-consignment testing and inspection;
  - **Multilateral recognition.** The Steward explained that although agreements are usually started bilaterally, it is hoped that, if criteria can be developed, NPPOs could enter into agreements more easily and this could then lead to multilateral recognition.
- [13] The SC Chairperson thanked the Steward for her introduction and acknowledged the difficulties in addressing multilateral recognition in an ISPM. He invited the SC to review the draft specification.
- [14] Before doing so, two general comments were made by SC members. One SC member agreed that multilateral recognition would be a challenge, and also added that whatever requirements are in place would have to be based on a pest risk analysis. The SC member from Chile then drew the attention of the SC to a pilot project currently underway in Chile, involving three international seed companies. The SC member noted that the seed industry is very interested in systems approaches, as seeds move from one country to another and can travel to four or five countries, but that development of systems approaches will entail a lot of work and it is essential that there is multilateral recognition. The project in Chile is following the ReFreSH (Regulatory Framework for Seed Health) approach developed in the United States of America, but is still only in its early stages.
- [15] The SC then reviewed the text of the specification.

---

<sup>1</sup> 2020-09 SC meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/88933/>.

<sup>2</sup> 2018-009; 04\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov; 05\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov; 17\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov.

- [16] **Purpose.** The SC changed “consignment-by-consignment phytosanitary certification” to “consignment-by-consignment testing and inspection of seeds at export”, to make it clear that phytosanitary certification would still take place with the systems approaches.
- [17] **Review of existing systems approaches.** Regarding the task on reviewing existing systems approaches, one SC member asked whether there are any European examples that could be included, as the examples given are all from the Americas. The Steward responded that she was not aware of any, but such examples could be added if they exist. The SC Chairperson noted that discussion papers relating to other examples – for instance the pilot project in Chile and a similar initiative underway in Argentina – could be submitted for consideration by the expert working group (EWG), and he invited SC members to submit such papers.
- [18] **Describing a procedure for multilateral recognition by NPPOs of quality management systems.** In the text for this task, the SC inserted “potential” before “multilateral recognition”, as agreements are likely to be bilateral in the first instance and it will take time for multilateral recognition to develop.
- [19] One SC member expressed concern about how a procedure for multilateral recognition could be described and another agreed that, although there is a need for multilateral recognition, this task will be one of the greatest challenges in developing the annex.
- [20] At this point, one SC member also commented that if industry practices are part of a systems approach and this leads to issuance of a phytosanitary certificate, then the systems approach (including the industry practices) would be a phytosanitary measure. The SC member therefore queried whether the specific systems approaches that will be developed for particular seed species or particular classes of seed pests should come under the remit of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS), which would facilitate their multilateral recognition and implementation. The Steward replied that ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) already exists, whereas the draft ISPM on *Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008) has not yet been adopted and the TPCS is not yet established, so for practical purposes the annex should remain with ISPM 38.
- [21] Returning to the task on describing a procedure for multilateral recognition, the SC Chairperson commented that although quality management systems could be incorporated within systems approaches, he was not sure whether it is going to be feasible to include requirements about recognition of quality management systems in the annex. He also highlighted that the meaning of “multilateral recognition” is not necessarily clear, as it could be taken to mean that any international or multilateral body would have the opportunity to recognize the system in question, rather than the recognition being by the countries or NPPOs that are applying the systems approaches, which is the intended meaning.
- [22] The Steward replied that the tasks on describing a procedure for multilateral recognition and developing criteria and requirements for multilateral systems approaches could involve looking for common elements that are applied within the seed industry, and then summarizing these into a single procedure. She reiterated that the annex would only be providing generic guidance, for instance for classes of pests, rather than guidance on specifics.
- [23] The SC Chairperson expanded on his concern about referring to recognition of quality management systems by explaining that it is the systems approach as a whole – which will incorporate measures that are pest-and commodity-specific – that needs to be recognized, rather than the quality management system that is a part of that.
- [24] The Steward commented that the seed company would conduct audits to verify that the system conforms to the requirements.
- [25] One SC member commented that there may have been confusion about the meaning of “quality management system” and that perhaps “quality assurance system” would be better, if verification of quality is the intended meaning. The Steward replied that there is not a clear understanding of the



distinction between the two terms. The North American Plant Protection Organization is currently working on developing guidance on terminology, but this work has not yet been completed. Given this confusion, the SC changed “quality management systems” to “quality systems” in the draft specification (both in the Tasks section and the section on Expertise), as this was all-encompassing.

- [26] The SC discussed whether multilateral recognition would relate to certain elements of quality systems, with each step of production recognized as an element, or to the whole system. The consensus was that recognition should be for the whole quality system rather than certain elements of it, as in a systems approach it is the overall system that meets the objective, rather than individual component elements. The SC noted, however, that the quality system may only be an element of a systems approach, and so the text was amended to reflect this.
- [27] One SC member wondered whether the annex would cover quality systems for seed-borne diseases. The SC Chairperson replied that the quality system would be a part of the systems approach, as well as other measures. The Steward responded that a quality system is a part of clean seed production, but the NPPO would also need to look at whether the systems approach has addressed the pests of concern or whether additional measures need to be applied. Guidance for specific pests and commodities could be produced as annexes of this overarching annex.
- [28] **Developing criteria and requirements for multilateral systems approaches.** Regarding this task, the SC Chairperson asked whether “criteria” should be “procedures”, as in the previous task. The Steward confirmed that her understanding was that “criteria” is correct in this context.
- [29] **Implementation issues.** One SC member asked whether all the various implementation issues would be considered. The Secretariat replied that the final task in the draft specification is a standard one for specifications, asking the EWG to identify implementation issues, and that such issues are then passed by the SC to the IC. The Steward added that the EWG members would also bring their own experience of implementation issues to the work.
- [30] **Expertise.** The SC Chairperson noted that there was no reference to experience of systems approaches specifically for seeds, and the SC modified the text accordingly.
- [31] The SC discussed the status of industry representatives. The Secretariat clarified that private-sector experts could participate in the EWG as invited experts, but they could not be full members of the EWG and the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting* specifies that they cannot be observers. This differs from groups such as the Sea Containers Task Force where, further to advice from the FAO Legal Office, industry participate as observers. The Secretariat clarified that the rules differ for EWGs and the Sea Containers Task Force because the duration of the groups is different. The SC therefore modified the Expertise and Participants sections of the draft specification to include an invited expert from the industry.
- [32] The SC:
- (1) *approved* Specification 70 (Annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*)) as modified in this meeting (Appendix 4);

#### **4.2 Annex to ISPM 37: Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information (2018-011), Priority 3**

- [33] The Steward, Ms Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America), introduced the draft specification and supporting documentation<sup>3</sup>. There had been 91 comments on the draft specification during consultation and the Steward had revised the draft accordingly. The revised draft specification had subsequently been considered by SC members via the OCS and further amendments were made.

---

<sup>3</sup> 2018-011; 06\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov; 07\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov; 18\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov.



- [34] The Steward summarized the main changes that had been made. The Scope section had been modified to place more emphasis on the defining of criteria to evaluate the evidence used in determining host status. The Purpose section had been revised to include a new focus on how information can be evaluated for more consistency in decision-making and the broader potential application of the annex by NPPOs. The Tasks section had been revised to include several new tasks, including splitting some of the former tasks.
- [35] The SC Chairperson thanked the Steward for presenting the paper and invited the SC to comment on the draft specification.
- [36] **Identifying different types of fruit fly–host interactions and related terminology.** In the text for this task, the SC changed the order of listing for the terms defined in ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) to “natural hosts, conditional hosts and non-hosts”, for consistency with ISPM 37 and because it is a more logical order.
- [37] **Developing general guidance for determination of host status for fruit flies in relation to specific conditions.** The SC Chairperson queried the last sentence in this task (“Provide guidance on how to interpret pest interceptions in a plant species that previously was not reported as a host”), as there are many circumstances under which a pest may be intercepted. The Steward replied that this sentence is intended to address situations such as when an individual specimen is intercepted in baggage (e.g. in over-ripe fruit or fruit coming from gardens) and there are no reports in the literature of that pest infesting the traded commodity. The SC agreed to leave the text unchanged.
- [38] **Criteria for categorizing fruit as host, conditional host and non-host.** In the phrase (“categorizing fruit as host, conditional host and non-host”), the SC inserted “natural” before “host” for consistency with ISPM 37. One SC member queried the use of “guidance” in the last sentence of this task (“Provide guidance on using such criteria, with examples from published information”), as it may imply that the annex is a guidance document. The Steward responded that it is a general word and so should be acceptable, although she was open to alternative suggestions. The SC retained “guidance”, while noting that guidance could possibly be provided in the form of an appendix to the annex.
- [39] **Updating terms and definitions in ISPM 37.** One SC member highlighted that this task is a new one, split from a former task, and has arisen as the result of a comment submitted during the consultation. However, a consequence of this change is to extend the scope of the specification to include revision of ISPM 37 itself, rather than just developing an annex to ISPM 37, and this is not the approved mandate of the EWG. The SC member therefore recommended deleting this task and returning to the text as submitted to first consultation, which only referred to the addition of new categories, not the revision of existing categories. The Steward commented that she had accepted the consultation comment proposing that “natural host” be changed to “host”, because “natural host” only appears in ISPM 37 and not in the scientific literature, where “host” is used instead. The SC agreed to revert to the wording as sent for first consultation.
- [40] **Evaluating and defining the quality and validity of information.** With regard to the reference to guidance in ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) on the reliability of information, one SC member recalled that the SC had previously decided that the revised ISPM 8 should not include this guidance and it would instead be included in implementation guidance, so it had been removed from the draft revision of ISPM 8 (2009-005). The Steward clarified that the reference to ISPM 8 refers to the current version of ISPM 8 that was adopted in 1998, and the SC agreed that no amendments were necessary to the text.
- [41] The SC:
- (2) *approved Specification 71 (Annex Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information (2018-011) to ISPM 37 (Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae))) as modified in this meeting (Appendix 5);*

### 4.3 Draft specification for the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) (2019-009), Priority 1

[42] The Steward, Mr Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), introduced the draft specification and supporting documentation<sup>4</sup>. He drew the attention of the SC to five questions arising from the consultation that would benefit from SC input:

- Proposed new task: “Consider phytosanitary measures, taking into account the principles of technical justification and equivalence.” The Steward commented that the principles of technical justification and equivalence are the ones that contracting parties should take into account when establishing and implementing their phytosanitary import requirements, but although the TPCS will analyse and list the different available options for phytosanitary measures, it will not deal with how such measures are implemented by NPPOs. For these reasons, the Steward thought that this task should not be added to the specification;
- Proposed new task: “Consider providing guidance to NPPOs on how to evaluate and choose appropriate phytosanitary measures.” The Steward commented that although he sees the value of this proposal, it seems to be an activity that is more appropriate for the IC, once the standard is adopted;
- Proposed new task: “Liaise as needed with recognized experts (e.g. academia, government or private sector) on the specified commodity.” The Steward expressed his reservations about including links to experts who are not directly involved in the standard setting process; in his view, panels should have formal links with IPPC groups that are also formally established or recognized by the CPM;
- Amended wording for the task about calls for expert drafting groups (introduced by the Steward later in this agenda item);
- Amended wording for the task about categorizing and cataloguing phytosanitary measures for use in an online search tool (introduced by the Steward later in this agenda item).

[43] Posing a general question about the draft specification, one SC member sought clarification on what happens if changes to the draft ISPM on *Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008) affect this specification. The Steward responded that he had tried to align the specification to the draft ISPM as far as possible, and thought that both documents needed to be revised together. The Secretariat added that the wording of the draft specification is more general, but if small changes to the specification were needed, this could be done without starting the whole process again because the specification is under the remit of the SC; the specification could be revisited once the draft ISPM is adopted.

[44] The SC then reviewed the draft specification.

[45] **Intended use.** In response to a suggestion from an SC member, the SC reviewed the phrase “focus on the specific commodity and the pests that are associated with it according to the intended use”, and considered whether to replace “according to” with “and may present a risk considering” to improve clarity. The Steward responded that the wording came directly from consultation comments and expressed the view that the intended meaning is clear. The SC did not therefore apply the suggested amendment.

[46] **Production practices.** In the task on considering scientific evidence and related information, one SC member sought clarification on the purpose of the EWG considering information on production practices. The SC Chairperson commented that production practices could be part of the measures that form a systems approach, so the aim of this task is to consider whether certain production practices could reduce the pest risk. The SC member responded that “existing phytosanitary measures”, referred to earlier in the paragraph, could include production practices and so suggested that there was no need to refer to production practices specifically. The Steward, however, thought that it was advisable to

---

<sup>4</sup> 2019-009;08\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov; 09\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov; 19\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov.

retain reference to production practices, given their importance in reducing pest risk (e.g. the washing of mango). Another SC member agreed that production practices should be mentioned, because of the need to emphasize that these commodity standards need to be practical and feasible and need to reflect production practices. The SC therefore left the text unchanged.

- [47] **Consistency.** In response to a query from an SC member about the difference between two of the tasks – one on consistency between the commodity standards and the overarching standard, and the other on consistency among commodity standards – the SC merged both tasks into one.
- [48] **Proposed new task on considering phytosanitary measures taking into account the principles of technical justification and equivalence.** The Steward referred to his earlier comments about this proposal and the SC agreed not to add it to the specification.
- [49] **Proposed new task on considering provision of guidance to NPPOs on how to evaluate and choose phytosanitary measures.** The Steward reiterated that this was more a task for the IC. One SC member commented that the IC has about 32 topics on their work programme, so it may take some time before this action could be addressed by the IC, but as commodity standards will include measures that are already operational in trade, contracting parties may already have some of this information; if so, the information could be gathered through a call and so it may not be too much work for the IC. The SC decided not to add the new task in question.
- [50] **Liaison with other technical panels.** The Secretariat queried whether the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine should be mentioned as the SC had decided to recommend the disestablishment of this panel, but the Steward clarified that he had retained it in the text because its disestablishment had not yet been agreed by the CPM. However, in the end, the SC decided not to list any of the individual technical panels, but just refer to “technical panels under the SC” as the meaning is clear.
- [51] **Proposed new task on liaising with recognized experts.** The Steward reiterated his view that this task was too broad. One SC member commented that an EWG will be formed to draft the specific commodity standards and so such experts may be involved at that stage instead and require no further liaison than this. The SC therefore agreed not to include the proposed new task.
- [52] **Calls for expert drafting groups.** The Steward recalled the consultation comment proposing that calls for expert drafting groups should only be recommended in exceptional circumstances. The Steward queried whether such calls would be exceptional. The Secretariat encouraged the SC to consider this carefully, as the technical panel should be able to drive the process of development of commodity standards and not continually need EWGs to support the process; otherwise, there might be a danger of the EWGs effectively taking over the role of the technical panel. One SC member suggested that the wording should make it clear that the experts on the technical panel are doing most of the work, perhaps by referring to additional experts. The SC finally amended the wording to restrict the call for EWGs to exceptional circumstances. The IC representative suggested that the specification should clarify under what exceptional circumstances these EWGs would be called. The Steward explained his understanding that an EWG would be recommended if the technical panel did not have the relevant expertise. The SC agreed, however, that no further changes to the text were necessary.
- [53] **Online search tool for phytosanitary measures.** The Steward recalled the consultation comment proposing that the TPCS should consider how to evaluate and catalogue phytosanitary measures for use in an online search tool, rather than how to categorize and catalogue the measures. The Steward explained that categorization of phytosanitary measures according to confidence in the measures is included in the draft ISPM on *Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008), so in his opinion “categorize” should be used to align with the draft ISPM. One SC member commented that how to categorize measures according to confidence is a matter for the concept standard and so did not need to be in this specification; however, the SC agreed to retain “categorize”, to align with the draft ISPM.
- [54] **Members.** The IC representative queried whether “invite experts, as observers” meant that the experts would be invited experts or observers. Referring to the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*,

the SC noted that they would be invited experts, as invited experts are permitted to attend technical panel meetings but observers are not. The SC modified the text of the specification accordingly.

[55] **Future review of the specification.** As a general comment, one SC member suggested that the SC agree a review period for this specification, once approved, to ensure that it is still fit for purpose. Another SC member suggested that it may be useful in this regard to consider the terms of reference for other technical panels. The SC Chairperson recalled that there is already a process for reviewing and updating specifications, but acknowledged that there may be a need to review the process of developing commodity standards, given that these are a new type of standard. The Secretariat suggested that the SC revisit the specification once the concept standard (draft ISPM on *Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008)) is adopted, to look again at how to best advance the development of specific commodity standards. Another SC member proposed to wait until the first commodity standard is adopted, so that lessons learned about the process could inform any revision of the specification.

[56] The SC:

- (3) *approved* Specification TP 6 (*Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)*) (2019-009) as modified in this meeting (Appendix 6);
- (4) *agreed* to revisit Specification TP 6 once the concept standard (draft ISPM on *Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008)) and the first commodity standard (annex to the concept standard) have been adopted;

## 5. Topics

### 5.1 Review of current *List of topics for IPPC standards*

[57] The Secretariat presented the paper, which listed the topics on the current *List of topics for IPPC standards* and highlighted the topics for which a steward or assistant steward was needed. Rather than going through these ones by one, the Secretariat suggested that the SC focus on the three priority topics identified in the paper (the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP), the draft ISPM on authorization, and the draft ISPM on audit), although discussion and nominations relating to other topics were also welcome.

[58] The SC Chairperson thanked the Secretariat and invited the SC to nominate stewards and assistant stewards for the priority topics identified by the Secretariat.

[59] **Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols.** Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile) was assigned as Steward of the TPDP, to replace Ms Jayani Nimanthika WATHUKARAGE, who had resigned as an SC member in September 2020 and therefore could no longer act as Steward of this panel.

[60] **Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002).** Ms Sophie Alexia PETERSON was assigned as Steward, to replace Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM, who had left the SC.

[61] **Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014).** Mr Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) was assigned as Assistant Steward.

[62] No other nominations for stewards or assistant stewards on other topics were made.

[63] The SC:

- (5) *noted* the revised *List of topics for IPPC standards* incorporating decisions taken by the SC during their 2020 virtual meetings and e-decisions;
- (6) *assigned* Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile) as the Steward of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols;

- (7) *assigned* Ms Sophie Alexia PETERSON (Australia) as the Steward for the draft ISPM on *Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002);
- (8) *assigned* Mr Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) as Assistant Steward for the draft ISPM on *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014);
- (9) *asked* the Secretariat to update the *List of topics for IPPC standards* online, based on the decisions taken at this meeting, and present it to CPM-15 (2021);
- (10) *thanked* the stewards and assistant stewards for their contributions;
- (11) *acknowledged* the contributions of Ms Jayani Nimanthika WATHUKARAGE and Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM and *thanked* them for their services they had rendered to the SC;

## 6. Standards Committee

### 6.1 Reorganize the pest risk analysis (PRA) standards into a suite of standards

[64] The Steward, Mr Masahiro SAI (Japan), presented the paper regarding the next steps for reorganization of the PRA standards, together with the draft specification<sup>5</sup>. The SC had reviewed the draft specification via e-forum from 7 to 14 October 2020, and the Steward had revised the specification accordingly.

[65] The Steward explained that the specification had been developed and revised based on the following points:

- ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*), ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*), and the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) would be reorganized into one single standard, comprising one overarching standard on PRA together with an annex for each stage of the PRA process. This is the same approach as the one used for the reorganization of the fruit fly standards;
- The Steward had drafted the specification on the premise of avoiding substantial deviation from the original guidance and requirements in ISPM 2 and ISPM 11. So, for example, the main text of the standard and Annex 1 on Stage 1 (Initiation) could be developed by reorganizing the relevant sections from ISPM 2 and ISPM 11, with no need to substantially revise them;
- The Steward thought that revision of the original requirements and guidance for Stage 2 (Pest risk assessment) should be done separately from the reorganization of the PRA standards;
- The text on Stage 3 (Pest risk management) should be drafted by revising the requirements and guidance for this stage that currently exist in ISPM 2 and ISPM 11, and with following the current work on the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001);
- The standard could include Annex 1, Annex 2 and Annex 3 of ISPM 11 by incorporating the information into the overarching standard. However, the EWG would need to consider how Annex 4 (Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests) to ISPM 11 would be included in the new PRA standard.

[66] With respect to the third of these points, the Steward added that he also understood the need to revise the requirements and guidance in ISPM 2 and ISPM 11, especially those relating to Stage 2, at the same time as reorganizing the PRA standards, for the following reasons: the core text of ISPM 11 had remained unchanged since 2004, more PRA guidance on commodity standards will be necessary for the development of such standards, and it would address Specification 68 (Supplement on *Guidance on the concept of probability of transfer to a suitable host and establishment as used in a pest risk analysis for quarantine pests* to ISPM 11).

<sup>5</sup> 25\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov; 2020-001.



- [67] The Steward asked the SC for direction on two questions:
- whether the guidance and requirements for Stage 2 should be revised at the same time as the reorganization or separately to the reorganization work;
  - whether the text for Stage 3 should continue to be developed as now or transferred directly to the new EWG.
- [68] Finally, the Steward commented that if the direction of the draft specification was accepted by the SC, then the review of the content could start, but if the direction were to change, then further updates would be needed to the draft specification.
- [69] The SC Chairperson thanked the Steward and the Assistant Stewards for their work on the draft specification, and then opened the floor for general comments.

### **General comments**

- [70] One SC member suggested that, for Stage 3, the SC first review the current text of the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001), rather than discarding it and starting again, as much work had already been done on it.
- [71] The SC member from Canada highlighted the comments he had submitted after the e-forum had closed<sup>6</sup>. These suggested that more than one expert working group is likely to be required, and that it would be beneficial and a better use of resources if the work was progressed by three groups: a working group of SC members to develop the overarching standard using existing text from ISPM 2 and ISPM 11 together with some new text; one EWG, composed of plant health risk assessors, to focus on the annexes on Stage 1 and Stage 2; and a second EWG, composed of risk managers, to focus on the annex on Stage 3 through the development of a new draft.
- [72] In relation to Stage 3, one SC member recalled the amount of work done by the small group of SC members in preparing papers on the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) for the SC meeting in November 2019, and proposed that the SC consider those suggestions first, before starting from scratch with Stage 3.
- [73] In response, the SC member from Canada acknowledged the need to look at the work done to date, but said that it is more a question of taking a fresh look, to see how the draft standard could fit within the overarching standard. Another SC member agreed that there is a need to relook at the material prepared for the SC meeting in November 2019, but to look at it in the context of all the PRA standards being brought together into one standard, because the papers for the SC November 2019 meeting had been prepared on the assumption that ISPM 2 and ISPM 11 would still exist as separate standards.
- [74] Further to the comments made by Canada on EWG composition, the SC noted that the Steward of the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) is a risk manager by profession.
- [75] There being no further comments, the SC then reviewed the draft specification.

### **Review of the draft specification**

- [76] **Reason for the revision of the standards.** In the introductory paragraph, one SC member pointed out that it is the pest risk that is managed by the phytosanitary measures, not the pests. The SC amended the text accordingly.
- [77] The SC reviewed the first bulleted list describing the need for reorganization. As one of the reasons for the reorganization is to have all the aspects of PRA in one document, making it a “one stop shop” on PRA, the SC changed the wording to refer to the need to “integrate” rather than “combine” PRA standards. The SC then simplified and clarified the list by merging the second and third bullet points

---

<sup>6</sup> 26\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov.

and deleting redundant text, including the phrase “to make more sense for readers” as its meaning was not clear in this context.

[78] Regarding the introductory stem to the second bulleted list, which referred to the recommendation of the CPM Bureau to have one single PRA standard, the SC Chairperson queried whether it is appropriate to refer to the CPM Bureau in a specification, as the Bureau is not part of the Standard setting procedure; normally it would be the CPM making such decisions. The SC discussed possible ways to resolve this, including: adding a footnote to explain why the Bureau had been involved; greying-out the paragraph and adding a footnote to say that the paragraph is just explanatory, not open for comment, and will be removed before adoption; or deleting the whole paragraph, including the bulleted list, completely. The SC modified the draft specification according to the first of these options, but noted later in the meeting that the other options could also be considered during further discussions using the OCS. For the sake of consistency with changes to the previous paragraph, the SC also changed “better linkages” to “better integration”.

[79] At this point, given the heavy agenda for the SC meeting, the SC Chairperson suggested that further discussion of the draft specification be deferred, and that another small group of SC members could perhaps move forward with the draft and another SC meeting be held before May, specifically to discuss this draft specification. The SC considered the relative merits of holding an e-forum, setting up a small group, and reviewing via the OCS, and agreed to continue the review of the specification using the OCS. The SC Chairperson encouraged SC members, when reviewing the specification in the OCS, to provide responses to the comments of others, as well as submitting their own modifications.

[80] The SC:

- (12) *requested* that the Secretariat open a review of the draft specification on *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) in the Online Comment System, so that the SC can continue to work on the text of this draft specification and to make general comments about the points highlighted by the Steward in the paper presented to this meeting;
- (13) *requested* that, if the next steps for the draft specification on *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) are not clear after the review of the text in the Online Comment System, the Secretariat open an e-forum to continue the discussion;

## 6.2 Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (from May 2020 to November 2020)

[81] The Secretariat presented a paper summarizing the outcomes of the SC e-decision forums and polls conducted between May and November 2020<sup>7</sup>.

[82] The Secretariat then presented a proposal to streamline the e-decisions process to facilitate the work of the SC, particularly in light of the current circumstances with remote working being more prominent<sup>8</sup>. The proposal included the following changes:

- expansion of the topics that can be considered via e-decisions;
- a more flexible timeframe, allowing a shorter time period for some e-decisions;
- the review of documents via the OCS as part of the process.

[83] The SC Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for presenting the proposal and invited the SC to consider it.

[84] **Timeframe.** A few SC members, while acknowledging the intention is to be quicker and more flexible, expressed concern about shortening the timeframe for responding to e-decisions to one week, as this could give rise to fewer responses given SC members’ workloads and that people may be on holiday. One SC member commented that many e-decisions are already extended beyond two weeks,

<sup>7</sup> 15\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov.

<sup>8</sup> 14\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov.



so shortening to one week perhaps would not change anything. The Secretariat therefore amended the text to revert to the original wording regarding the timeframe.

[85] **Rules for agreement.** One SC member queried the proposed changes to the paragraph that describes what happens if there is no consensus, and expressed a preference for the original wording as being clearer. The Secretariat therefore amended the text to revert to the original wording.

[86] **Types of discussion and decisions that the SC can make by electronic means.** The Secretariat noted that there had been no comments from the SC on the suggestion to expand the types of topics that can go to e-decision, and so would retain that element in the proposal.

[87] The Secretariat added that, because a greater proportion of SC work is now being conducted in virtual mode, the Secretariat is already using e-decisions and e-forums more than usual. Even though this is not in the current procedures, these are SC procedures and the SC can therefore revise them at any time.

[88] The SC Chairperson proposed that the SC send further comments on this proposal to the Secretariat, for the Secretariat to then revise it and bring to the next SC meeting.

[89] The SC:

- (14) *agreed* that the “Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions May 2020 –November 2020” accurately reflects the outcome of the SC e-decisions (Appendix 7);
- (15) *noted* that SC e-decisions may increase in the coming years because of the virtual modality of work;
- (16) *requested* that the Secretariat modify the proposed revision to the e-decisions process to take account of the discussion in this meeting and any further comments sent to the Secretariat by 28 February 2021, and present it to the next SC meeting;

## **7. Discussions on the Strategic Framework 2020–2030**

### **7.1 IPPC development agenda**

#### ***Commodity- and pathway- specific ISPMs***

[90] The SSU lead introduced the paper summarizing the discussions at the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) virtual meeting in October 2020 related to the development of commodity standards<sup>9</sup>. He invited the SC to note and discuss the outcomes of the SPG and the next steps for the development of commodity standards. He also invited comment on what the role of the SC would be in the implementation of the development agenda item on commodity standards.

[91] The SC then discussed the issues raised in the paper.

[92] **Engaging stakeholders.** The SC Chairperson referred to the possibility, described in the paper, of engaging stakeholders in commodity standards by following a similar approach to the ePhyto (electronic phytosanitary certificate) Industry Advisory Group. He queried how this would work for commodity standards, given that commodity standards are exclusively the responsibility of NPPOs, in contrast to ePhyto where stakeholders are directly involved.

[93] The Secretariat clarified that it had been difficult for the Secretariat alone to draft together this and the other two papers on the Strategic Framework, given that the Strategic Framework cuts across the work of various IPPC bodies who are all progressing parts of it, so the aim of the paper was just to put forward some suggestions as a way of initiating discussions. Recognizing that stakeholders would need to be involved at some stage of the development of commodity standards, the Secretariat had included the ePhyto approach as an example of a type of forum mechanism because it represented a precedent about how to engage stakeholders, but it was only a suggestion. The Secretariat suggested

---

<sup>9</sup> 10\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov.

that one way forward may be to perhaps form an SC working group, including also some members of the Bureau and perhaps some members of the SPG, to look at the three development agenda items which are under the SC remit. The Secretariat highlighted that the Secretariat's role is to coordinate implementation of the development agenda items, with the actual delivery of implementation being the responsibility of the contracting parties, but the Secretariat needed some direction from the SC, especially as it was already nearly the end of the first year of the ten-year Strategic Framework. The SC Chairperson responded that it was a good proposal to involve stakeholders and have a forum, but he again queried their involvement in the design and development of commodity standards and thought that the solution might be different to ePhyto.

- [94] One SC member highlighted the way that the North American regional plant protection organization is structured and supports the participation of industry in the development of regional standards, which has helped to ensure that these standards are practical and implementable from an industry perspective.
- [95] The SSU lead emphasized that as the responsibility for commodity standards had now been transferred from the CPM focus group to the SC, the SC should be proactive and set the direction for the commodity standards. It is a totally new approach and the Secretariat was trying to be innovative in thinking of how to progress it. He commented that, in his view, the work on commodity standards would still be ongoing at the end of the Strategic Framework, but that is why it is important to set the right direction now.
- [96] One SC member commented that, even if the SC's view was that it was not appropriate to involve industry in the development of standards, except as invited experts for certain standards where needed, it was important to seek the advice of the FAO Legal Office on what was permitted, and there may be other ways that industry could be involved and help, for instance by funding meetings.
- [97] **Implementation.** The Secretariat suggested that, with respect to implementation of the development agenda items, perhaps more close interaction with the IC may be needed. The Secretariat's role is to coordinate and facilitate activities, but the contracting parties are ultimately responsible for delivering activities, so the SC also needs to consider how to collaborate with the IC. The Secretariat clarified that only three development agenda items had been included in the agenda for this SC meeting because, for coordination and management purposes, individual development agenda items had been assigned across the Secretariat and these three were the ones assigned to the SSU, but the Secretariat as a whole is working on an integrated approach.
- [98] The IC representative emphasized how important it is to engage stakeholders with respect to implementation of standards, including commodity standards, and noted that NPPOs are responsible for implementation. The question, however, is how best to get stakeholders involved. Referring to the paragraph on the implementation plan in the SC paper, he noted that another thing to consider was whether to adopt a general implementation plan that will cover all standards, or have a separate implementation plan for each standard. He pointed out that all this needs to be coordinated between the various IPPC bodies and the Secretariat.

#### *Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities*

- [99] The Secretariat presented the paper summarizing the discussions at the SPG virtual meeting in October 2020 related to the development of guidance on the use of third-party entities<sup>10</sup>.
- [100] The Secretariat highlighted once again that the development agenda is not the work plan of the Secretariat, as the Strategic Framework is to be delivered by all the contracting parties and not just the Secretariat, but so far the Secretariat lacked sufficient guidance from IPPC governing bodies on how to proceed with it. The Secretariat had presented some suggestions to the SPG (included as an annex to the SC paper). The SPG had asked where the information presented to them came from, and the Secretariat had confirmed that they had used the Strategic Framework and the five-year investment

---

<sup>10</sup> 12\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov.

plan as reference material, so the financial information and the examples of activities were drawn from those sources. The SPG had asked about the “Scoping study and analysis to increase international confidence in authorization systems”, and the Secretariat had clarified that this was not ongoing, but that an Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) desk study had recently been produced: *Authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions: an overview of the current use of authorization by national plant protection organizations*. The SPG had recommended not to work on partnerships at the moment, because it was too ambitious and it is too early in the process. The Secretariat was therefore looking for guidance from the SC on the way forward with this development agenda item: for instance, if the draft ISPM on *Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002) is adopted, will the guide on authorization that is on the IC work programme be sufficient to deliver this development agenda, or are other activities needed?

[101] One SC member asked whether the concerns with the draft ISPM are solely from the European region. The Secretariat clarified that although countries in other regions initially had concerns, most of these had been addressed during the IPPC regional workshops, so the only comments raised during the second consultation were from the European region. A webinar had been held recently, with participants including representatives from countries with concerns, and this had also been helpful in clarifying some of the issues. The Secretariat suggested that perhaps SC members from countries with successful authorization programmes could make suggestions to the Secretariat on how to advance this development agenda item (e.g. training activities that the Secretariat could organize). This could then feed into an action plan.

[102] The SC member from Australia responded to this suggestion by recognizing the wealth of information on Australian authorization schemes that is publicly available on the Internet, and offered to provide links to this material. She acknowledged that the standard is going to take a long time to go through the process and that even though the advice from the FAO Legal Office had been presented to concerned countries, this did not appear to have convinced them. She was therefore unsure how to get over this problem without clear articulation of the concerns from the countries in question. With this in mind, she suggested that perhaps the SC members from the European region could liaise with colleagues in the region to write their concerns down clearly, and that perhaps there is a need to relook at the Convention text, not just the draft ISPM.

[103] The SC member from Nigeria commented that most of the NPPO activities in his country were not done alone, but in collaboration with other parties such as research institutes, especially where specialized equipment is required. So, authorization can be important for developing countries. He cited the example of ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*), where the Nigerian NPPO had had to look for companies that could be authorized to do the specialised treatment required. Referring to Article V of the IPPC, he did not think there should be any problem with implementation of the draft standard on authorization.

[104] Another SC member commented that there appear to be some entrenched positions on the draft authorization standard, and suggested the Secretariat could maybe conduct a survey, together with the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization, to ascertain, for example, which particular activities give rise to concerns (e.g. a country may view authorization as acceptable for some activities such as diagnostics or wood packaging treatments, but not inspection). Such a survey could start with an explanation of sovereign rights.

[105] The IFU lead observed that such a survey was a perfect example of how the IRSS system could support the SC. To progress this, the SC would need to assign someone to draft a submission to the IRSS subgroup of the IC.

[106] The SC Chairperson highlighted that within four months this standard may be adopted by the CPM, so there would not be much time to continue discussion with countries about their concerns. He suggested, therefore, that the SC probably needed to progress it through the Standard setting process and noted that the CPM Bureau had already recommended that the SC recommend the draft standard

for adoption. He recalled the SC's previous conclusion that the issues raised are not technical and noted that the SC had done all it could, from a technical point of view, to address the concerns.

- [107] One SC member added a further suggestion that, as there are no technical grounds for the objections to the standard and the concerns raised relate to implementation, it should be made clear when working on this issue that the IC will be developing guidance on implementation.

### ***Diagnostic laboratory networking***

- [108] The Secretariat presented the paper summarizing the discussions at the SPG virtual meeting in October 2020 related to diagnostic laboratory networking<sup>11</sup>. As it had been difficult for the Secretariat to know how to address these development agenda items, given the lack of guidance on this, the paper presented by the Secretariat to the SPG (included as an annex to the SC paper) had been drawn largely from the output of the TPDP meeting in 2019, when the panel discussed the Strategic Framework. The SPG had made some recommendations to the SC in response to the paper. The SPG had acknowledged that diagnostic laboratory networking is an important development agenda item, but thought that it is perhaps not a top priority relative to other items (e.g. commodity standards, ePhyto, strengthening pest outbreak and response systems, e-commerce).
- [109] The Secretariat commented that although the Strategic Framework is a ten-year plan and the establishment of international diagnostic laboratory networking will take time, it would still be helpful to at least have some discussion about this development agenda. The Secretariat invited the SC to consider the offer made by the TPDP to continue exploring the options for delivery of this development agenda item, reporting back to the SC. The TPDP is a group of enthusiastic diagnosticians and they are willing to contribute to this development agenda item, although not necessarily to be the drivers. A further possibility for the SC to consider was the creation of SC subgroups for these development agenda items, reporting back to the SC, to help advance these items.
- [110] One SC member asked whether the TPDP has the capacity to look at existing diagnostic protocols that have been used for trade but are not annexes to ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*) and assess their equivalence. This would increase harmonization and would help, later on, with the development of commodity standards and with multilateral acceptance of certain implementation programmes. Equivalence might be more important at this point than helping countries to build diagnostic capacity, because they may already have equivalent techniques.
- [111] The Secretariat responded that although this is a little outside the usual work of the TPDP, it is possible that they have the capacity to do it, and the suggestion from the IFU lead about using IRSS to conduct a study is also a good one. However, the SC would need to give approval to the TPDP to continue to explore the options for this agenda item, besides their usual work of developing diagnostic protocols under ISPM 27.
- [112] Another SC member suggested that it would be better to use the IRSS to gather information.
- [113] The SC Chairperson asked the SC whether an e-forum on these development agenda topics should be opened.
- [114] The IFU lead commented that although the SPG had recommended that the CPM set up a focus group to develop implementation plans for all eight development agenda items, he thought that doing this would delay the development of the implementation plans. He supported the idea of an SC e-forum to continue to discuss the way forward, but suggested that it be extended to all eight development agenda items, rather than simply the three for which the SSU is the lead, as SC input is needed on all eight. The SC Chairperson suggested that perhaps a small group could discuss not only how the SC and the IC interact, but how the development agenda items should be addressed from the point of view of the SC and implementation. As it is a new issue for the SC, there is a need for time to discuss the matter internally within the SC to come up with some ideas— hence the proposal for an e-forum.

---

<sup>11</sup> 11\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov.

- [115] The Secretariat confirmed that the e-forum, which would be to gather comments, ideas and suggestions, could be left open for a while, as there was no need for a decision at the moment. The Secretariat would then compile responses and report back to the SC. The Chairperson proposed that the e-forum cover all three development agenda items for which the SSU is the lead, not just diagnostic laboratory networking.
- [116] The SSU lead emphasized that it is important to clearly establish what the role of the SC will be in the implementation of the Strategic Framework, and specifically for each of the eight development agenda items. In some cases, the SC may not have the capacity to provide input, but the SC should be clear about where it can provide input and where it can provide support to other IPPC bodies. He noted that there needs to be an action plan for the development agenda items, to define the activities that would be needed in the short-term and long-term to implement the Strategic Framework.
- [117] The IFU lead proposed opening a joint SC–IC e-forum on the eight development agenda items. The SC Chairperson, while welcoming the suggestion, recommended that the SC discuss the matter first, and then have a joint discussion.
- [118] The IC representative on the SC noted that the IC terms of reference include an overview about the relationship of the IC with the SC, with some guidelines about collaboration. He also noted that in the SC terms of reference there is a short statement about collaboration. He suggested that a joint document could be developed, clarifying how to align the work of the IC and SC, based on the guidelines stated in the terms of reference.
- [119] The SC:
- (17) *noted* the Strategic Planning Group discussions on the IPPC development agenda items on commodity standards, the use of third-party entities and the development of international diagnostic laboratory networking;
  - (18) *invited* the Secretariat to open an e-forum to continue the discussion on how to take forward the IPPC development agenda items on commodity standards, use of third-party entities and the development of international diagnostic laboratory networking;

## **7.2 Selection of a SC representative for a CPM Focus Group dedicated to the implementation of the Development Agenda on “Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems”**

[120] The SC:

- (19) *nominated* Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy) as the SC representative on the CPM Focus Group on Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems;

## **8. Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) Interactions**

### **8.1 Update on Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)’s activities to the SC**

- [121] The IC representative to the SC provided an update on IC activities<sup>12</sup>. He emphasized that cooperation between the SC and IC is of utmost importance and is needed to support the implementation of standards. He reiterated that in the terms of reference for the IC there is an overview of cooperation with the SC, including some guidelines, and suggested once again that there should be joint guidelines on the relationship between the committees. He thanked the SC and the IC for the opportunity to represent the IC on the SC and also thanked his predecessor Mr Chris DALE. Finally, he noted that Ms Ruth ARÉVALO MACÍAS (Chile) had been nominated by the IC to be the IC representative on the Expert Working Group for the Draft Revision of ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) (2009-002).

---

<sup>12</sup> 16\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov.



[122] The Secretariat thanked the IC representative for his presentation and highlighted that Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile) is the SC representative to the IC. The Secretariat also confirmed that the EWG for the draft revision of ISPM 4 would be meeting at the beginning of December 2020.

[123] The IFU lead clarified that Mr Samuel BISHOP, the SC representative on the IRSS, had expressed his intention to stand down from this role and that Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE had taken on this role on a temporary basis until this SC meeting. Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE agreed to continue as the SC representative for the time being.

[124] The SC:

- (20) *noted* the update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee;
- (21) *nominated* Mr Alvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile) to represent the Standards Committee on the IC Implementation Review and Support System subgroup;
- (22) *agreed* that Ms Ruth ARÉVALO MACÍAS (Chile) be the IC representative on the Expert Working Group for the Draft Revision of ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) (2009-002), as in invited expert;

## 9. Updates

### 9.1 CPM Bureau: 2020 virtual meetings

[125] The Bureau representative, Ms Marica GATT, thanked the SC for this opportunity to present the update from the Bureau and the Secretariat for preparing the paper on recent Bureau meetings<sup>13</sup>. She confirmed that the Bureau had been holding their meetings virtually every month, with some extraordinary meetings in addition to this.

[126] The Bureau representative first outlined some changes in personnel. Mr Stephen BUTCHER had been replaced by Mr Peter THOMSON as representative for the South West Pacific region, and Mr Greg WOLFF had been replaced by Mr John GRIEFER as representative for the North American region. Since the last update to the SC, there had also been changes in the IPPC Secretariat, with Mr Jingyuan XIA appointed as Director of the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division. Until the new IPPC Secretary is in place, Mr XIA will still act as Officer-in-Charge for overall IPPC issues, with the SSU lead responsible for the day-to-day matters of the Secretariat.

[127] The Bureau representative then highlighted some of the Bureau decisions, both operational and strategic:

- The Bureau had decided that, unless a member decides otherwise, the composition of the Bureau should continue as it is, even though it had formally expired in April 2020;
- The Bureau had endorsed the extension of global activities for the International Year of Plant Health into the first semester of 2021, including CPM-15 (2021) and the International Conference on Plant Health in Helsinki, and had endorsed the International Day of Plant Health, to be held on 12 May 2021;
- The mandate of the Sea Containers Task Force had been extended until the end of 2021;
- At its meeting in November, the Bureau had decided that CPM-15(2021) would be held virtually starting on 16 March 2021, with clear indications to participants on what decisions would be taken on which days;
- The draft ISPM on *Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002) had been discussed at the extraordinary meeting of the Bureau held in June, and the Bureau had concluded that the normal Standard setting procedure should be followed; the Bureau had also recommended that the SC proceed to recommend the draft ISPM to the next CPM session for adoption;

<sup>13</sup> 23\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov; Bureau reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/bureau/>.

- The repositioning of the Secretariat within the FAO structure had been discussed, following the decision taken at the June 2020 meeting of the FAO Council. As a result of these discussions within the Bureau, the CPM Chairperson had sent a letter to the FAO Deputy Director-General, to which an encouraging reply had been received. The FAO Deputy Director-General had assured the CPM Chairperson that Mr XIA would be replaced in full without delay as a D-1 level position;
- The Bureau had concluded that the current evidence, priorities and resources do not justify a greater involvement by the CPM Bureau and the IPPC Secretariat in the One Health approach, but agreed to review this if further elements arise and as deemed relevant;
- The Bureau had noted the information in a paper by the Secretariat on the Phytosanitary Treatment Research Tool, and some Bureau members had highlighted that the role of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments needed to be better clarified in this context;
- The Bureau had discussed the Strategic Framework and concept notes for three of the associated development agenda items, and had agreed that the concept notes for the rest of the eight development agenda items would be presented to the SPG and that a prioritizing exercise would be needed in delivering the tasks outlined in these.

[128] Finally, the Bureau representative gave further details about CPM-15 (2021). The Bureau had decided that CPM-15 (2021) would be held over a three-week period, with two three-hour sessions on Tuesday 16 and Tuesday 23 March 2021, but these dates are still pending final confirmation from FAO. After these two sessions, there will be a further session on Tuesday, 30 March, for the adoption of the report. The Bureau decided to cancel the CPM-15 ministerial segment, but to allow ministerial statements during the opening session. It had been agreed that a relevant paper would be drafted by the CPM Chairperson, explaining the role of the Bureau during the pandemic.

[129] The SC Chairperson thanked the Bureau representative for her comprehensive update and invited comments or questions from the SC. There were no comments.

[130] **Draft ISPM on authorizing entities.** Referring to the earlier SC discussions, the SC Chairperson invited the SC to make a decision on the draft ISPM on *Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002).

[131] One SC member commented that, given the contentious nature of this draft ISPM and the virtual mode of the CPM session, it might be challenging to have side-sessions with countries that have concerns. The SC member asked whether there any plans on how to deal with this. The Bureau representative replied that, so far, there has only been a preliminary discussion about the virtual mode of CPM-15 (2021), but she recognized that this was a valid point as the time allocated to the issue may be insufficient. She offered to take this question to the Bureau for consideration.

[132] The SC:

- (23) *noted* the update from the CPM Bureau;
- (24) *noted* the recommendation from the CPM Bureau regarding the draft ISPM on *Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002) and *recommended* the draft ISPM for submission to CPM-15 (2021) for adoption (Appendix 8);

## 9.2 Strategic Planning Group

[133] The SC Chairperson referred to the virtual meetings of the SPG, held on 8-9 October and 10 November 2020, highlighting that the SC had already discussed most of this earlier in the meeting (see agenda item 7.1). Other issues had also been discussed at the SPG, including harmonization of



electronic data exchange, e-commerce, postal and courier pathways, and phytosanitary research coordination. He referred SC members to the SPG meeting reports for further detail<sup>14</sup>.

[134] The SC Chairperson invited the SC to comment. There were no comments.

[135] The SC:

(25) *noted* the update on matters raised at the Strategic Planning Group meetings in 2020;

### **9.3 Briefings from the IPPC Secretariat**

#### ***Standard Setting Unit***

[136] The SSU lead introduced the paper on recent SC activities<sup>15</sup>, and introduced the staff of the SSU. He highlighted that, for the first time, the SC had reviewed draft ISPMs using the OCS. The SSU lead thanked the SC for their flexibility in this, which had allowed all the planned activities in the work plan to go ahead, and also thanked the Bureau for taking the necessary decisions to allow the progression of standard setting work following the cancellation of the CPM session in 2020. The consultation period had started on time, with three draft specifications, five draft phytosanitary treatments and four draft ISPMs submitted for first consultation, and seven draft phytosanitary treatments and one draft CPM recommendation submitted for second consultation. One of the other important achievements during the year had been the webinar on *Enhancing the understanding of the concept of authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions*, which had attracted more than 150 participants and allowed some useful discussion. He referred SC members to the updates in the paper on the number of e-decisions taken, upcoming e-decisions, updates on the work of the technical panels, the Strategic Framework, and the continued liaison with other international organizations. Finally, he mentioned that the SSU had developed a brochure on ISPMs, which is now available in all FAO languages.

[137] The SC Chairperson thanked the SSU lead and invited the SC to comment. There were no comments.

[138] The Secretariat then presented a draft work plan for the SSU in 2021<sup>16</sup>. The Secretariat confirmed that FAO had recommended that meetings in the first semester of 2021 (i.e. the first six months) should be held in virtual mode, which means that the SC and SC-7 meetings in May 2021 will be held in virtual mode. Discussions on draft ISPMs will take place in advance of the meetings, using the OCS.

[139] The SC Chairperson thanked the SSU lead and invited the SC to comment. There were no substantive comments.

[140] The SC:

(26) *noted* the update from the Standard Setting Unit, including the draft work plan for 2021 and the proposed topics for expert working groups;

#### ***Implementation and Facilitation Unit***

[141] The Secretariat referred the SC members to the paper on IFU activities during the period 8 September to 23 October 2020, including the recommendations, and the draft 2021 IFU work plan<sup>17</sup>.

[142] An IFU staff member introduced the idea of a challenge between the IC and SC to promote IYPH, the suggestion being that members of the two committees share ideas on how to promote the International Year. The SC Chairperson suggested that SC members send comments to the Secretariat.

---

<sup>14</sup> SPG meeting reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/strategic-planning-group/>.

<sup>15</sup> 22\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov.

<sup>16</sup> 21\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov.

<sup>17</sup> 20\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov; CRP\_01\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov.

[143] The SC then considered the various recommendations presented in the update paper and selected SC members to follow the development of the PRA e-learning (2020-002) and the export certification e-learning (2020-003).

[144] Finally, the SC Chairperson suggested that it would be useful to have a merged update from IC and IFU at future SC meetings, to avoid duplication between papers.

[145] The SC:

- (27) *noted* the update from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit;
- (28) *invited* SC members to send comments to the Secretariat on working with the IC to promote the International Year of Plant Health;
- (29) *noted* the invitation from the IC to submit new proposals for Implementation Review and Support System topics or proposals for changing priorities;
- (30) *invited* SC members to send comments to the Secretariat on improvements to the “Phytosanitary system” component pages of the International Phytosanitary Portal;
- (31) *noted* that the SC will be invited to peer review the revision to the *Plant pest surveillance* guide (2017-049), which is under the remit of the IC;
- (32) *selected* Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ (Costa Rica) to follow the development of the PRA e-learning (2020-002), which is under the remit of the IC;
- (33) *selected* Mr Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) to follow the development of the export certification e-learning (2020-003), which is under the remit of the IC;
- (34) *invited* the Secretariat to open an e-decision to select a representative to participate in the informal e-Commerce network and be involved in the e-Commerce programme, which are under the remit of the IC;
- (35) *noted* that the Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU) will share with the SC the “IFU update to the IC” when the IFU sends it out on a regular basis;
- (36) *suggested* that, for future SC meetings, the updates from the IC and IFU could perhaps be merged, to avoid duplication between the two papers;

### ***Integration and Support Team***

[146] The Secretariat referred the SC members to the paper on the work of the Integration and Support Team<sup>18</sup>.

[147] The SC:

- (37) *noted* the update from the Integration and Support Team.

## **10. SC recommendations for CPM-15 (2021) or CPM Bureau decisions and discussions**

[148] The SC noted that the following will be recommended for CPM-15 (2021):

- the draft ISPM on *Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002) for adoption (Appendix 8);
- *List of topics for IPPC standards* (to note the updates).

[149] The SC noted that a paper on the following will be submitted to CPM-15 (2021):

- concerns about the draft ISPM on *Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2014-002) (as per the paper submitted in 2020, but also referring to the CPM Bureau’s recommendation to the SC to proceed with recommending the draft ISPM for adoption).

---

<sup>18</sup> 24\_SC\_Tel\_2020\_Nov.

## **11. Review of the standard setting calendar**

[150] The SC Chairperson directed SC members to the link to the standard setting calendar that is available on the IPP<sup>19</sup>.

## **12. Any Other Business**

[151] There was no other business.

## **13. Date and Type of the Next SC Meeting**

[152] The next SC meeting is scheduled for 10-14 May 2021. The SC-7 is scheduled for 17-21 May 2021.

## **14. Evaluation of the Meeting Process**

[153] The SC Chairperson encouraged all SC members and observers to complete the evaluation of the meeting via this link: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/QSHNDBR> by 7 December 2020.

## **15. Close of the Meeting**

[154] The SC Chairperson thanked all participants for their valuable contributions and closed the meeting. The SSU lead added his thanks to SC members and expressed his gratitude to the SC Chairperson for his chairing of the meeting.

---

<sup>19</sup> IPP calendar: <https://www.ippc.int/en/year/calendar/>.

**Appendix 1: Agenda**

1.	Opening of the Meeting	Document number / link	Presenter / IPPC Secretariat support
1.1.	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat		NERSISYAN
2.	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>		
2.1.	Election of the Rapporteur	–	<b>Chairperson (FERRO)</b>
2.2.	Adoption of the Agenda	01_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	<b>Chairperson</b>
3.	<b>Administrative Matters</b>		
3.1.	Documents list	02_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	MUSHEGYAN
3.2.	Participants list	03_SC_Tel_2020_Nov <a href="#">SC membership list</a>	MUSHEGYAN
3.3.	Standard Setting Unit staff	<a href="#">Link to standard setting staff</a>	MUSHEGYAN
4.	<b>Draft specifications from first consultation for revision and approval</b>		
4.1.	<b>Annex to ISPM 38: Annex 1 - Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009) Priority 1</b> - Steward: Ms Marina ZLOTINA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compiled comments (including Steward's response)</li> <li>Steward's notes</li> <li>SC OCS Review Compiled Comments report</li> </ul>	2018-009  04_SC_Tel_2020_Nov  05_SC_Tel_2020_Nov_Rev1  17_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	<b>ZLOTINA / SHAMILOV</b>
4.2.	<b>Annex to ISPM 37: Criteria for the determination of host status for fruit flies based on available information (2018-011) Priority 3</b> - Steward: Ms Marina ZLOTINA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compiled comments (including Steward's response)</li> <li>Steward's notes</li> <li>SC OCS Review Compiled Comments report</li> </ul>	2018-011  06_SC_Tel_2020_Nov  07_SC_Tel_2020_Nov  18_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	<b>ZLOTINA / SHAMILOV</b>
4.3.	<b>Draft specification for the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) (2019-009), Priority 1</b> - Steward: Mr Ezequiel FERRO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compiled comments (including Steward's response)</li> <li>Steward's notes</li> <li>SC OCS Review Compiled Comments report</li> </ul>	2019-009  08_SC_Tel_2020_Nov  09_SC_Tel_2020_Nov  19_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	<b>FERRO / MOREIRA</b>
5.	<b>Topics</b>		

5.1.	Review of current List of Topics for IPPC Standards	<a href="#">Link to List of Topics for IPPC standards</a> 13_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	CASSIN
<b>6.</b>	<b>Standards Committee</b>		
	Reorganize the pest risk analysis (PRA) standards into a suite of standards		
6.1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Next steps to move forward with the reorganization proposal and the impact of its inclusion in the standard setting programme</li> <li>Draft Specification for approval for consultation</li> <li>Additional comments on the Specification for the PRA reorganization</li> </ul>	25_SC_Tel_2020_Nov  2020-001  26_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	<b>SAI, WILLSON, GONZÁLEZ / KISS</b>
6.2.	Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (from May 2020 to November 2020) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal to adapt the e-decisions process to working virtually</li> </ul>	15_SC_Tel_2020_Nov  14_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	KISS
<b>7.</b>	<b>Discussions on the Strategic Framework 2020-2030</b>		
	IPPC development agenda		
7.1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commodity- and pathway- specific ISPMs</li> </ul>	10_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	NERSISYAN / MOREIRA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities</li> </ul>	12_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	SHAMILOV / KISS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Diagnostic laboratory networking</li> </ul>	11_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	MOREIRA / CASSIN
7.2.	Selection of a SC representative for a CPM Focus Group dedicated to the implementation of the Development Agenda on "Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems"	<a href="#">Call for Experts for the CPM Focus Group on Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems</a>	<b>FERRO</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Implementation and Capacity Development (IC) Committee Interactions</b>		
8.1.	Update on Implementation and Capacity Development (IC) Committee's activities to the SC	<a href="#">Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) webpage</a> 16_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	<b>ABDELMOTTALEB / SEPULVEDA LUQUE</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Updates</b>		
9.1.	CPM Bureau: 2020 virtual meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authorization of entities</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Link to the CPM Bureau meeting reports</a> 23_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	<b>Bureau Rep / NERSISYAN</b>
9.2.	Strategic Planning Group (SPG)	<a href="#">Link to the SPG meeting reports</a>	<b>FERRO</b>
9.3.	Briefings from the IPPC Secretariat:		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update from the Standard Setting Unit (SSU)</li> </ul>	22_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	NERSISYAN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation of the 2021 SSU draft work plan</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	21_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	MOREIRA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updates from the IFU</li> </ul>	20_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	MUSHEGYAN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2021 IFU Work Plan</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	CRP_01_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	MUSHEGYAN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updates from the IST</li> </ul>	24_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	MUSHEGYAN
10.	<b>SC recommendations for CPM-15 (2021) or CPM Bureau decisions and discussions</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>
11.	<b>Review of the standard setting calendar</b>	<a href="#">Link to the IPP calendar</a>	MUSHEGYAN
12.	<b>Any other business</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>
13.	<b>Date and type of the next SC Meeting</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>
14.	<b>Evaluation of the meeting process</b>	<a href="#">Link to survey</a>	<b>Chairperson</b>
15.	<b>Close of the meeting</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>

**Appendix 2: Documents list**

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
<b>Draft Specifications</b>			
2018-009	4.1	Annex to ISPM 38: Annex 1 - Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (in track changes)	2020-10-15 2020-11-03
2018-011	4.2	Annex to ISPM 37: Criteria for the determination of host status for fruit flies based on available information (from OCS review)	2020-10-15 2020-11-02
2019-009	4.3	Draft specification for the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) (in track changes)	2020-10-15 2020-11-03
2020-001	6.1	Reorganization of Pest Risk Analysis standards	2020-11-05
<b>Other Documents</b>			
01_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	2.2	Agenda	2020-10-01 2020-11-03
02_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	3.1	Documents List	2020-10-15 2020-11-03
03_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	3.2	Participants List	2020-10-06 2020-10-12
04_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	4.1	Compiled comments with Steward's responses – draft specification: Annex to ISPM 38: Annex 1 - Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds	2020-10-15
05_SC_Tel_2020_Nov_Rev1	4.1	Steward's notes on draft specification: Annex to ISPM 38: Annex 1 - Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds	2020-10-15 2020-11-02
06_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	4.2	Compiled comments with Steward's responses – draft specification: Annex to ISPM 37: Criteria for the determination of host status for fruit flies based on available information	2020-10-15
07_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	4.2	Steward's notes on draft specification: Annex to ISPM 37: Criteria for the determination of host status for fruit flies based on available information	2020-10-15
08_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	4.3	Compiled comments with Steward's responses – draft specification: Draft specification for the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)	2020-10-15
09_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	4.3	Steward's notes on draft specification: Draft specification for the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)	2020-10-15
10_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	7.1	IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030; Commodity Standards	2020-11-02
11_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	7.1	IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030: Diagnostic laboratory Networking	2020-11-02
12_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	7.1	IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030: Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities	2020-11-02



13_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	5.1	Adjustments to the List of Topics and the Stewards	2020-11-02 2020-11-05
14_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	6.2	Proposal to adapt the e-decisions process to working virtually	2020-11-02
15_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	6.2	Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions	2020-11-02
16_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	8.1	Update on Implementation and Capacity Development Committee's activities	2020-11-02
17_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	4.1	OCS SC review: Annex to ISPM 38. Annex 1 Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009)	2020-11-02
18_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	4.2	OCS SC Review: Annex to ISPM 37: Criteria for the determination of host status for fruit flies based on available information (2018-011)	2020-11-02
19_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	4.3	OCS SC Review: Draft specification for the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) (2019-009)	2020-11-02
20_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	9.3	Update from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU) to the SC	2020-11-03
21_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	9.3	Standard Setting Unit (SSU) 2021 tentative work plan	2020-11-03
22_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	9.3	Update on recent developments regarding the standard setting work	2020-11-03
23_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	9.1	Update on recent Bureau meetings	2020-11-03
24_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	9.3	Update from the Integration and Support Team (IST) to the SC	2020-11-03
25_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	6.1	Next steps to move forward with the reorganization proposal and the impact of its inclusion in the standard setting programme	2020-11-05
26_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	6.1	Additional comments on the PRA reorganization	2020-11-05
<b>Conference room papers</b>			
CRP_01_SC_Tel_2020_Nov	9.3	2021 Work Plan of the IFU	2020-11-16

**Documents links** (presented in the order of the agenda items)

Links	Agenda item	Document link
SC membership list	3.2	<a href="#">SC membership list</a>
Standard Setting Unit staff	3.3	<a href="#">Link to standard setting staff</a>
Review of current LOT for IPPC Standards	5.1	<a href="#">Link to List of Topics for IPPC standards</a>
Call for Experts for the CPM Focus Group on Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems	7.2	<a href="#">Call for Experts announcement page</a>
Update on IC activities to the SC	8.1	<a href="#">IC webpage</a>
CPM Bureau: 2020 virtual meetings	9.1	<a href="#">Link to the CPM Bureau meeting reports</a>
Strategic Planning Group (SPG)	9.2	<a href="#">Link to the SPG meeting reports</a>
Review of the standard setting calendar	11	<a href="#">Link to the IPP calendar</a>
Evaluation of the meeting process	14	<a href="#">Link to survey</a>

**Appendix 3: Participants list**

<b>Region / Role</b>	<b>Name, mailing address, telephone</b>	<b>Email address</b>	<b>Membership Confirmed</b>	<b>Term expires</b>
Africa Member	<b>Mr David KAMANGIRA</b> Senior Deputy Director and IPPC Focal Point Department of Agricultural Research Services Headquarters, P.O. Box 30779, Lilongwe 3 <b>MALAWI</b> Tel: +265 888 342 712 Tel: +265 999 122 199	<a href="mailto:davidkamangira1@gmail.com">davidkamangira1@gmail.com</a>	CPM-11 (2016) CPM-12 (2017) 2nd term / 3 years	2022
Africa Member	<b>Mr Moses Adegboyega ADEWUMI</b> Head of Inspection Southwest Zone Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service FAAN HQT Complex, Ikeja, Lagos, Lagos State <b>NIGERIA</b> Tel: +234 -8033913847 / 8059607047	<a href="mailto:adegboyegamoses37@yahoo.com">adegboyegamoses37@yahoo.com</a>	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years	2021
Africa Member	<b>Mr Luis Antonio TAVARES</b> Ministério da Agricultura, Pescas e Recurso Protection des Vegetaux / Direcção dos Serviços de Protecção Vegetal MADR / DSPV.Box 844 Bissau <b>GUINEA-BISSAU</b>	<a href="mailto:luistavares1954@gmail.com">luistavares1954@gmail.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:tavaresluis123@yahoo.com">tavaresluis123@yahoo.com</a>	<b>Replacement member for Ms Esther Wandia MACHARIA</b> CPM-9 (2014) CPM-12 (2017) 2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years  (2)	2020
Asia Member	<b>Ms Chonticha RAKKRAI</b> Director, Plant Quarantine Research Group, Plant Protection Research and Development Office, Department of Agriculture, 50 Phaholyothin Rd., Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok, 10900 <b>THAILAND</b> Tel: (+66) 2561 2537 Fax: (+66) 2561 2146 Mobile: (+66) 8 9128 6488	<a href="mailto:rakkrai@yahoo.com">rakkrai@yahoo.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:chonticha.r@doa.in.th">chonticha.r@doa.in.th</a>	CPM-14 (2019) 1st term/3 years	2022

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Asia Member	<b>Mr Gerald Glenn F. PANGANIBAN</b> Assistant Director for Operations and Administration, Bureau of Plant Industry, 692 San Andres Street, Malate, Manila <b>PHILIPPINES</b> Tel: +639153141568	<a href="mailto:gerald_glenn97@hotmail.com">gerald_glenn97@hotmail.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:gfpanganiban@gmail.com">gfpanganiban@gmail.com</a>	<b>Replacement member for Ms Jayani Nimanthika WATHUKARA</b>  CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years (2)	2021
Asia Member SC-7	<b>Mr Masahiro SAI</b> Senior Researcher (Head of Section) Risk Analysis Division Yokohama Plant Protection Station Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) <b>JAPAN</b> Tel: +81-45-211-0375	<a href="mailto:saim@pps.maff.go.jp">saim@pps.maff.go.jp</a>	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years	2021
Asia Member	<b>Mr Xiaodong FENG</b> Deputy Director of the Division of Plant Quarantine, NATESC Ministry of Agriculture No. 20, Maizidian Street, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100125 <b>CHINA</b> Tel: (8610)59194524	<a href="mailto:fengxdong@agri.gov.cn">fengxdong@agri.gov.cn</a>	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years	2021
Europe Member	<b>Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC</b> Plant health section Sub-directorate for plant quality, health and protection Department of Sanitary Action in primary production General directorate for food Ministry of agriculture and food 251 rue de Vaugirard 75732 PARIS CEDEX 15 <b>FRANCE</b> Tel: +33 149558437	<a href="mailto:laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr">laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr</a>	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) 2nd term / 3 years	2021

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Europe Member	<b>Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI</b> Plant Health Expert Plant Protection Service ERSAF - REGIONE LOMBARDIA Via Pola, 12. 20124 Milano <b>ITALY</b> Tel: (+39) 3666603272	<a href="mailto:Mariangela.Ciampitti@ersaf.lombardia.it">Mariangela.Ciampitti@ersaf.lombardia.it</a>	CPM-14 (2019) 1st term / 3 years	2022
Europe Member SC-7	<b>Mr Samuel BISHOP</b> Plant Health Policy team Room 11G35 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs National Agri-Food Innovation Campus Sand Hutton York North Yorkshire <b>UNITED KINGDOM</b> YO41 4LZ Tel: +44 (0) 2080262506 Mob.: +44 (0) 7827976902	<a href="mailto:sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk">sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk</a>	CPM-13 (2018)	2021
Europe Member	<b>Mr David OPATOWSKI</b> 1-3 avenue de la Paix 1202 Geneva, Switzerland <b>ISRAEL</b> Tel: (+41) 79945 7344	<a href="mailto:dopatowski@yahoo.com">dopatowski@yahoo.com</a>	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) CPM-12 (2017) 3rd term / 3 years	2020
Latin America and Caribbean Member	<b>Mr André Felipe C. P. da SILVA</b> Federal Inspector Quarantine Division Ministry of Agriculture, Live Stock and Food Supply <b>BRAZIL</b> Tel: (61) 3218-2925	<a href="mailto:andre.peralta@agricultura.gov.br">andre.peralta@agricultura.gov.br</a>	CPM-14 (2019) 1st term / 3 years	2022
Latin America and Caribbean Member SC-7	<b>Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ</b> Pest RiskAnalyst Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado 300 Sur de Teletica, Sabana Sur, San José, <b>COSTA RICA</b> Tel: +(506) 8660-8383	<a href="mailto:hmorera@sfe.go.cr">hmorera@sfe.go.cr</a>	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years	2021
Latin America and Caribbean Member SC Chairperson	<b>Mr Ezequiel FERRO</b> Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA Av.Paeso Colón 315 C.A. de Buenos Aires <b>ARGENTINA</b> Tel/Fax: (+5411) 4121-5091	<a href="mailto:eferro@senasa.gov.ar">eferro@senasa.gov.ar</a>	CPM-14 (2019) 3rd term / 3 years	2022

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Latin America and Caribbean Member	<b>Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE</b> Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal Av. Presidente Bulnes 140, 4 <sup>th</sup> floor, Santiago, <b>CHILE</b> Tel: + 56-2 234 5120	<a href="mailto:alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl">alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl</a>	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) 2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years	2021
Near East Member  SC-7	<b>Mr Nader ELBADRY</b> Phytosanitary Specialist, Central Administration of Plant Quarantine, 6 Michel Bakhoun St., Dokki, Giza, <b>EGYPT</b> Tel: +201096799493	<a href="mailto:nader.badry@gmail.com">nader.badry@gmail.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:naderelbadry@hotmail.com">naderelbadry@hotmail.com</a>	<b>Replacement member for Mr Abdulqader Khudhair ABBAS</b>  CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years	2021
Near East Member	<b>Mr Abdelmoneem Ismaeel ADRA ABDETAM</b> Manger of plant Quarantine and plant protection Directorate, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Khartum <b>SUDAN</b> Tel: +24991238939 / +249 912138939	<a href="mailto:ppdsudan@hotmail.com">ppdsudan@hotmail.com</a>	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years	2021
North America Member  SC-7	<b>Ms Marina ZLOTINA</b> IPPC Technical Director USDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) 4700 River Rd, 5c-03.37 Riverdale, MD 20737 <b>USA</b> Tel: 1-301-851-2200 Cell: 1 -301-832-0611	<a href="mailto:Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov">Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov</a>	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) 2nd term / 3 years	2021
North America Member	<b>Mr Steve CÔTÉ</b> National Manager, International Phytosanitary Standards Plant Import/Export Division 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 <b>CANADA</b> Tel: (+1) 613-773-7368 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7576	<a href="mailto:Steve.Cote@canada.ca">Steve.Cote@canada.ca</a> ;	<b>Replacement member for Mr Rajash RAMARTNAM</b>  CPM-11 (2016) CPM-14 (2019) 2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 3 years	2022

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Pacific Member	<b>Ms Joanne WILSON</b> Principal Adviser, Risk Management Plant Imports Group Ministry for Primary Industries. <b>NEW ZEALAND</b> Tel: +64 489 40528 Mob: +64 2989 40528	<a href="mailto:joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz">joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz</a>	CPM-14 (2019) 1st term / 3 years	2022
Pacific Member SC-7	<b>Ms Sophie Alexia PETERSON</b> Assistant Director   Plant Health Policy   Biosecurity Plant Division Department of Agriculture and Water Resources GPO Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601 <b>AUSTRALIA</b> Tel: (+61) 2 6272 3769 Mobile: +61 402 313 170	<a href="mailto:sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au">sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au</a>	<b>Replacement member for Mr Bruce HANCOCKS</b>  CPM-12 (2017) 1st term / 3 years	2020

*Others*

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
IC / Observer	<b>Mr Ahmed M. Abdellah ABDELMOTTALEB</b>	<a href="mailto:bidoeng@yahoo.com">bidoeng@yahoo.com</a>
Bureau / Observer	<b>Ms Marica GATT</b>	<a href="mailto:I_kouame@yahoo.fr">I_kouame@yahoo.fr</a>
USA / Observer	<b>Ms Stephanie DUBON</b>	<a href="mailto:tephanie.m.dubon@usda.gov">tephanie.m.dubon@usda.gov</a>
Australia / Observer	<b>Ms Susie COLLINS</b>	<a href="mailto:Susie.Collins@awe.gov.au">Susie.Collins@awe.gov.au</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Avetik NERSISYAN</b> Standard Setting Unit Lead	<a href="mailto:Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org">Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Adriana MOREIRA</b> Standard Setting Officer	<a href="mailto:Adriana.Moreira@fao.org">Adriana.Moreira@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Artur SHAMILOV</b> Standard Setting Officer	<a href="mailto:Artur.Shamilov@fao.org">Artur.Shamilov@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Aoife CASSIN</b> Standard Setting Associate	<a href="mailto:Aoife.Cassin@fao.org">Aoife.Cassin@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Janka KISS</b> Standard Setting Associate	<a href="mailto:Janka.Kiss@fao.org">Janka.Kiss@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Edgar MUSHEGYAN</b> Standard Setting Associate	<a href="mailto:Edgar.Mushegyan@fao.org">Edgar.Mushegyan@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Alejandra JIMENEZ TABARES</b> Standard Setting Assistant	<a href="mailto:Alejandra.JimenezTabares@fao.org">Alejandra.JimenezTabares@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Karen ROUEN</b> Report writer	<a href="mailto:karen@karenrouen.com">karen@karenrouen.com</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Brent LARSON</b> Implementation and Facilitation Unit Lead	<a href="mailto:Brent.Larson@fao.org">Brent.Larson@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Descartes KOUMBA</b> Agricultural Officer	<a href="mailto:Descartes.Koumba@fao.org">Descartes.Koumba@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Ketevan LOMSADZE</b> Agricultural Officer	<a href="mailto:Ketevan.Lomsadze@fao.org">Ketevan.Lomsadze@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Qingpo YANG</b> Associate Professional Officer	<a href="mailto:Qingpo.Yang@fao.org">Qingpo.Yang@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Natsumi YAMADA</b> Agricultural Officer	<a href="mailto:Natsumi.Yamada@fao.org">Natsumi.Yamada@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Sarah BRUNEL</b> Agricultural Officer	<a href="mailto:Sarah.Brunel@fao.org">Sarah.Brunel@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Denis ALLEX</b> Implementation Facilitation Specialist	<a href="mailto:Denis.Allex@fao.org">Denis.Allex@fao.org</a>



## **Appendix 4: Specification 70 (Annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*))**

### **SPECIFICATION 70**

#### **Annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* to ISPM 38**

*(Approved 2020, published 2020)*

##### **Title**

[155] Annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*).

##### **Reason for the annex to the standard**

[156] As they seek to implement ISPM 38, national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) and the worldwide seed industry are currently exploring the use of systems approaches to manage the pest risk associated with the international movement of seeds. A systems approach could incorporate industry practices that contribute to a reduction in the pest risk associated with seeds. Relevant industry best-management practices and quality systems could be the bases for the design of systems approaches as an alternative option for the phytosanitary certification of seeds. An annex to ISPM 38 could provide a framework for harmonization of systems approaches and provide guidance to NPPOs on recognition and audit of such systems.

##### **Scope**

[157] The proposed annex should apply to any seeds moving internationally (including seeds for sale, production, trialling, bulk-up, breeding, or other purposes). The annex should provide a general, standardized framework of requirements for systems approaches, including existing pest management practices used in the seed industry in combination with quality systems that incorporate defined audit and verification procedures. The annex should also define a harmonized process by which NPPOs may recognize conformity with the requirements of the systems approaches. This recognition by NPPOs could form the basis for phytosanitary certification and would provide an alternative to the existing phytosanitary certification of seeds.

##### **Purpose**

[158] Differences in phytosanitary import requirements currently implemented by NPPOs can result in significant complications in the movement of seeds between countries, particularly in re-export situations. This annex will provide standardized guidance for a harmonized alternative to consignment-by-consignment testing and inspection of seeds at export by multilaterally recognizing existing industry measures that minimize the pest risk and incorporating them into systems approaches.

##### **Tasks**

[159] The expert working group (EWG) should undertake the following tasks:

- (1) Consider existing standards that are relevant (e.g. ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*), ISPM 36 (*Integrated measures for plants for planting*), ISPM 38, North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) 40 (NAPPO, 2014)).
- (2) Review examples of phytosanitary import requirements for seeds. Examine regional guidance for importation, if such is available, in relation to seed-borne or seed-transmitted pests. Identify potential pest risk management measures for categories of identified pests (e.g. viruses, fungi, bacteria).

- (3) Review existing:
- (4) management systems for seeds (e.g. Good Seed and Plant Practices (GSPP), the Regulatory Framework for Seed Health (ReFreSH) of the United States Department of Agriculture, the Disease Prevention Program (DPP));
- (5) relevant systems approaches in other industry and commodity sectors (e.g. the Biosecure Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) approach, the Systems Approach for Nursery Certification (SANC) of the National Plant Board (covering the 50 states of the United States of America, together with Puerto Rico and Guam).
- (6) Examine how existing seed production practices contribute to the mitigation of pest risk and how they could be incorporated into a systems approach.
- (7) Define the general requirements of a systems approach for seeds, ensuring that the phytosanitary measures included are technically justified.
- (8) Examine how existing management systems adopted by the seed industry (e.g. audits, verification processes) could be incorporated into a systems approach.
- (9) Describe a procedure for potential multilateral recognition by NPPOs of quality systems used by seed companies and how such quality systems could be considered as elements of systems approaches.
- (10) Develop criteria and requirements for multilateral systems approaches.
- (11) Consider whether the annex could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft annex.
- (12) Consider implementation of the annex by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the Standards Committee.

### **Provision of resources**

[160] Funding for the meeting may be provided from sources other than the regular programme of the IPPC (FAO). As recommended by ICPM-2 (1999), whenever possible, those participating in standard setting activities voluntarily fund their travel and subsistence to attend meetings. Participants may request financial assistance, with the understanding that resources are limited and the priority for financial assistance is given to developing country participants. Please refer to the *Criteria used for prioritizing participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat* posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) (see <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/>).

### **Collaborator**

[161] To be determined.

### **Steward**

[162] Please refer to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* posted on the IPP (see <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards>).

### **Expertise**

[163] Experts with a wide knowledge and experience in one or more of the following areas: the development or implementation of phytosanitary measures to manage the pest risk associated with the production, processing and international movement of seeds, pest risk analysis, seed testing and storage, and use of integrated measures in systems approaches specifically for seeds. The EWG should include at least one person with knowledge of existing international guidance related to the international movement of seeds; at least one person with knowledge of quality systems and auditing for compliance; at least two persons with knowledge of seed pathology; and at least one person as an invited expert with knowledge of operational industry seed-quality systems, including seed production, processing and testing, and preferably nominated by the seed industry.

## Participants

[164] Five to seven experts and one invited expert.

## References

[165] The IPPC, relevant ISPMs and other national, regional and international standards and agreements as may be applicable to the tasks, and discussion papers submitted in relation to this work.

**ASTA** (American Seed Trade Association). 2019. *ReFreSH – A regulatory framework for seed health* [online]. Concept paper. Ver. 4.0. Alexandria, USA, ASTA. [Cited 14 October 2020]. [https://www.betterseed.org/wp-content/uploads/ReFreSH-Concept-Paper-Draft\\_-2019.pdf](https://www.betterseed.org/wp-content/uploads/ReFreSH-Concept-Paper-Draft_-2019.pdf)

**ISPM 2.** 2019. *Framework for pest risk analysis*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

**ISPM 5.** *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

**ISPM 10.** 2016. *Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

**ISPM 11.** 2019. *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

**ISPM 12.** 2017. *Phytosanitary certificates*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

**ISPM 14.** 2019. *The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

**ISPM 20.** 2019. *Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

**ISPM 23.** 2019. *Guidelines for inspection*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

**ISPM 24.** 2017. *Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

**ISPM 27.** 2016. *Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

**ISPM 31.** 2016. *Methodologies for sampling of consignments*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

**ISPM 32.** 2016. *Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

**ISPM 36.** 2019. *Integrated measures for plants for planting*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

**ISPM 38.** 2017. *International movement of seeds*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

**NAPPO** (North American Plant Protection Organization). 2014. *Principles of pest risk management for the import of commodities*. Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) 40. Ottawa, NAPPO. 28 pp.

**NAPPO** (North American Plant Protection Organization). 2018. *Use of systems approaches to manage pest risks associated with the movement of forest products*. Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) 41. Raleigh, USA, NAPPO. 54 pp.

## Discussion papers

[166] Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat ([ippc@fao.org](mailto:ippc@fao.org)) for consideration by the EWG.

## Publication history

*This is not an official part of the specification*

2019-04 CPM-14 added topic *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (Annex to ISPM 38)* (2018-009), priority 1.

2019-08 Steward revised the draft specification.

2020-01 Standards Committee (SC) reviewed via e-forum and Steward revised the draft.

2020-07 First consultation.

2020-10 Steward revised the draft based on consultation comments.

2020-11 SC reviewed and approved the specification.

**Specification 70.** 2020. Annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*). Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

Publication history last updated: 2020-11

**Appendix 5: Specification 71 (*Annex Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information (2018-011) to ISPM 37 (Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae))*)**

**SPECIFICATION 71**

***Annex Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information to ISPM 37***

***(Approved 2020, published 2020)***

**Title**

[167] *Annex Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information (2018-011) to ISPM 37 (Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae))*.

**Reason for the annex to the standard**

[168] A variety of published information on fruit fly host status is used by national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) to implement adopted International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) related to pest risk analysis, pest free areas, the design of import and export programmes, eradication, surveillance, pest records, and more. There is considerable inconsistency in the interpretation of published information, which can lead to disputes between NPPOs. Nearly 30 terms describing host status can be found in the literature. Examples include: preferred host, rare host, field host, primary host, secondary host, experimental host and reproductive host. To promote harmonization, the use of multiple ambiguous and inconsistent terms needs to be avoided, and standardized terms that are aligned with the terms defined in ISPM 37 used instead. Consistent and transparent criteria for listing fruit fly hosts and for determining host status of fruit based on available information need to be developed. This will be crucial for preventing future trade challenges over whether a particular fruit fly should be regulated by NPPOs on different hosts.

**Scope**

[169] This annex should outline the criteria that should be used when evaluating evidence in order to determine the host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) based on information that already exists. It should also provide guidelines for the consistent application of these criteria, aligned with terms used in ISPM 37. The annex should apply to all commodities in global trade that can potentially be hosts to fruit flies.

**Purpose**

[170] The annex will provide defined criteria for assessing information (e.g. scientific literature, NPPO reports, pest records) to determine the status of hosts to fruit flies without conducting experiments. These criteria will help NPPOs develop host lists for use in activities such as pest risk analysis, surveillance, inspection, and development of standards and regulations. The annex will discuss how information can be evaluated to provide more consistency in decision-making. Suggested terminology used to describe the status of hosts with respect to fruit flies will be aligned with terms defined in ISPM 37.

**Tasks**

[171] The expert working group (EWG) should undertake the following tasks:

- (1) Review relevant literature and other documentation related to determination of host status for fruit flies, including any available standardized guidance.
- (2) Identify different types of fruit fly–host interactions and related terminology used in scientific and regulatory literature (e.g. host, non-host, conditional host, natural host, non-natural host, reproductive host, alternate host) and align those with the categories defined in ISPM 37: natural hosts, conditional hosts, non-hosts.

- (3) Consider developing general guidance for determining host status for fruit flies in relation to specific conditions (e.g. where the pest is present only on specific hosts in a specific area, or present on the host only during a particular plant stage of development such as fruit maturity, or present on the host seasonally when other known hosts in the area are not available) and include an explanation of how conditional host status should be considered in practical terms for activities such as survey or pest risk analysis. Provide guidance on how to interpret pest interceptions in a plant species that previously was not reported as a host.
- (4) Taking the above tasks into consideration, identify consistent criteria for categorizing fruit as natural host, conditional host and non-host, based on various aspects of fruit fly biology. Parameters for consideration could include fecundity, emergence of viable adults, reproduction rate, type of the reported infestation (e.g. natural infestation in the field, forced infestation, or laboratory studies only), and others if relevant. Provide guidance on using such criteria, with examples from published information.
- (5) Identify the most relevant types of fruit fly–host interactions and specific conditions that determine host status (e.g. conditions related to natural host, conditional host, non-host) and align those with categories in ISPM 37; propose new host categories if appropriate.
- (6) Describe how the quality and validity of information should be evaluated and defined, including how to evaluate primary sources and secondary citations. Provide guidance on the reliability of information in a similar way to section 2.2 of ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*).
- (7) Discuss how uncertainty relates to host status records, and include guidance on assessing conflicting opinions, contradictory reports and weight of evidence (e.g. multiple reports versus single reports).
- (8) Consider whether the annex could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft annex.
- (9) Consider implementation of the annex by contracting parties and identify potential impediments to operational and technical implementation. Provide information on these impediments, and possible recommendations on how to overcome them, to the Standards Committee.

### Provision of resources

[172] Funding for the meeting may be provided from sources other than the regular programme of the IPPC (FAO). As recommended by ICPM-2 (1999), whenever possible, those participating in standard setting activities voluntarily fund their travel and subsistence to attend meetings. Participants may request financial assistance, with the understanding that resources are limited and the priority for financial assistance is given to developing country participants. Please refer to the *Criteria used for prioritizing participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat* posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) (see <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/>).

### Collaborator

[173] To be determined.

### Steward

Please refer to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* posted on the IPP (see <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards>).

### Expertise

[174] The participants should have collective expertise in:

- pest risk analysis, with experience in developing lists of hosts of fruit flies for various reasons (e.g. surveillance, inspection, trade negotiations, development and implementation of national, regional or international standards on host status);
- entomology (e.g. operational experience in detecting infestation by fruit flies in host commodities) with an emphasis on Diptera: Tephritidae.



## Participants

- [175] Six to eight experts.

## References

- [176] The IPPC, relevant ISPMs and other national, regional and international standards and agreements as may be applicable to the tasks, and discussion papers submitted in relation to this work.
- Aluja, M. & Mangan, R.L.** 2008. Fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae) host status determination: Critical conceptual, methodological, and regulatory considerations. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 53: 473–502.
- APPPC** (Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission). 2005. *Guidelines for the confirmation of non-host status of fruit and vegetables to Tephritid fruit flies*. Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) 4. Bangkok, APPPC.
- Cowley, J.M., Baker, R.T. & Harte, D.S.** 1992. Definition and determination of host status for multivoltine fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae) species. *Journal of Economic Entomology*, 85(2): 312–317.
- Gastaminza, G., Augier, L., Villagrán, M.E., Villagrán, M.F. & Willink, E.** 2008. Determination of the condition of lemons as host of *Ceratitis capitata* and *Anastrepha fraterculus*. In E. Willink, G. Gastaminza, L. Augier & B. Stein, eds. *Moscas de los frutos y su relevancia cuarentenaria en la citricultura del Noroeste Argentino: once años de investigaciones 1996–2007* [Fruit flies and their quarantine relevance in the citriculture of Northwestern Argentina: eleven years of research 1996–2007]. Las Talitas, Argentina, Estación Experimental Agroindustrial Obispo Colombres. EBook.
- ISPM 2.** 2019. *Framework for pest risk analysis*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.
- ISPM 8.** 2017. *Determination of pest status in an area*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.
- ISPM 11.** 2019. *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.
- ISPM 17.** 2017. *Pest reporting*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.
- ISPM 37.** 2018. *Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.
- NAPPO** (North American Plant Protection Organization). 2008. *Guidelines for the determination and designation of host status of a fruit or vegetable for fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae)*. Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) 30. Ottawa, NAPPO. 19 pp.
- NAPPO** (North American Plant Protection Organization). 2014. *Principles of pest risk management for the import of commodities*. Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) 40. Ottawa, NAPPO. 28 pp.

## Discussion papers

- [177] Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat ([ippc@fao.org](mailto:ippc@fao.org)) for consideration by the EWG.

## Publication history

*This is not an official part of the specification*

2019-04 CPM-14 (2019) added topic *Criteria for the determination of host status for fruit flies based on available information (Annex to ISPM 37)* (2018-011), priority 3.

2019-08 Steward revised the draft specification.

2020-01 Standards Committee (SC) reviewed via e-forum and Steward revised the draft.

2020-07 First consultation.

2020-10 Steward revised the draft based on consultation comments.

2020-11 SC reviewed and approved the specification.

**Specification 71.** 2020. Annex *Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information* (2018-009) to ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*). Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

Publication history last updated: 2020-11

## **Appendix 6: Specification TP 6 (*Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)*) (2019-009)**

### **SPECIFICATION**

#### **TP 6**

#### **Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)**

*(Approved 2020, published 2020)*

#### **Title**

[178] Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) (2019-009).

#### **Reason for the technical panel**

[179] ISPM XX [the concept standard] provides guidance on the use and content of commodity standards. There is broad consensus that commodity standards based on scientific methods and evidence will support the development of technically justified phytosanitary import requirements to facilitate safe and more streamlined trade to the benefit of contracting parties. The development of commodity standards is therefore included in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030. In order to develop such standards and ensure that sufficient rigour, resources and focus can be provided, CPM-14 (2019) supported the establishment of the Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS).

#### **Scope and purpose**

[180] The TPCS develops and updates commodity standards within the framework of ISPM XX [the concept standard] and develops guidance on related aspects.

#### **Tasks**

[181] The TPCS should undertake the following:

- (1) Draft commodity standards as prioritized by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, either directly or through expert drafting groups established by the Standards Committee (SC).
- (2) When drafting a commodity standard:
  - focus on the specific commodity and the pests that are associated with it according to the intended use so that the standard is practical and feasible;
  - consider scientific evidence, such as existing pest risk analyses, existing phytosanitary measures and related information (e.g. regional and national standards) that are relevant to the standard under development, together with production practices that may inform the development of the standard, according to the submissions made by contracting parties;
  - evaluate technical information on the commodity, relevant pests and phytosanitary measures and identify which pests and measures are to be included in the standard, using criteria established for this purpose in ISPM XX [the concept standard].
- (3) Ensure that the commodity standards being developed are consistent with the requirements and criteria in ISPM XX [the concept standard] and consistent with each other.
- (4) Review adopted commodity standards (either ISPMs or annexes to ISPMs), identify revisions needed and recommend revisions to the SC.
- (5) Provide recommendations to the SC on subjects, topics and priorities for the development or revision of commodity standards.
- (6) Liaise as needed with the other technical panels under the SC and with the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee.
- (7) In exceptional circumstances, recommend to the SC calls for expert drafting groups for specific commodity standards as needed.

- (8) Provide advice to the stewards and the SC, as requested, on appropriate responses to consultation comments relating to draft commodity standards.
- (9) Consider how to categorize and catalogue phytosanitary measures included in commodity standards, and those in other standards, for use in an online search tool for target pest, commodity and measure, cross-referenced to relevant sources of information.
- (10) When evaluating a phytosanitary measure such as a treatment for inclusion in a commodity standard, consider whether there is sufficient information to support it being proposed to the SC as a subject for the development of an annex to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) through the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments process, or as a topic for a specific, stand-alone ISPM.
- (11) Consider whether commodity standards could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft commodity standard.
- (12) Consider the use of commodity standards by contracting parties and identify potential impediments to operational and technical implementation. Provide information on these impediments, and possible recommendations on how to overcome them, to the SC.

### Expertise

[182] Members of this panel should primarily have combined expertise in:

- commodity pest risk assessment;
- commodity pest risk management;
- development and management of phytosanitary import requirements;
- selection and implementation of phytosanitary measures for use in trade;
- development of regional and international phytosanitary standards;
- evaluation of commodity production practices in relation to pest risk management.

### Members

[183] Eight to ten. Details of the technical panel membership may be found on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/>. Panel members are selected by the SC for a five-year term. The SC reviews the composition of the panel on a regular basis. The SC may renew individual memberships for additional terms.

[184] The TPCS may invite experts, with previous agreement by the SC, as invited experts.

### Steward

[185] The SC shall assign a member of the SC to be the Steward of the TPCS.

[186] Please refer to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* posted on the IPP (see <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards/list>).

### Provision of resources

[187] Funding for the meeting may be provided from sources other than the regular programme of the IPPC (FAO). As recommended by ICPM-2 (1999), whenever possible, those participating in standard setting activities voluntarily fund their travel and subsistence to attend meetings. Participants may request financial assistance, with the understanding that resources are limited and the priority for financial assistance is given to developing country participants. Please refer to the *Criteria used for prioritizing participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat* posted on the IPP (see <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/>).

## References

[188] The IPPC, relevant ISPMs and other national, regional and international standards and agreements as may be applicable to the tasks, and discussion papers submitted in relation to this work.

**ISPM 28.** 2016. *Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

### Publication history

*This is not an official part of the specification*

2019-06 Focus group on commodity standards recommended adding to the work programme.

2019-10 Strategic Planning Group reviewed and provided comments.

2019-11 Standards Committee (SC) reviewed and proposed changes.

2019-12 CPM Bureau reviewed.

2020-06 CPM Bureau added topic (2019-009) to work programme.

2020-07 First consultation.

2020-10 Steward revised the draft based on the consultation comments.

2020-11 SC reviewed and approved the specification.

**Specification TP 6.** 2020. *Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

Publication history last updated: 2020-11

## Appendix 7: Summary on polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (from May 2020 to November 2020)

**Table 1: SC e-decisions presented between May and November 2020**

E-decision number	SC decision	SC members commenting in the forum	Polls (yes/no)
2020_eSC_Nov_01	Selection of experts for the EWG on Revision of ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) (2009-002)	18	
2020_eSC_Nov_02	Update on activities of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) from 2019 May to 2020 May	14	
2020_eSC_Nov_03	Possible ways to streamline the development processes of subjects on the work programme of technical panels	11	
2020_eSC_Nov_04	Selection of experts for the EWG on the use of specific import authorizations (2008-006)	19	8
2020_eSC_Nov_05	Update on activities of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) from May 2019 to June 2020	17	
2020_eSC_Nov_06	Update on activities of the Technical Panel for the Glossary from May 2019 to May	17	
2020_eSC_Nov_07	Summary of Standards Committee e-decisions November 2019 – May 2020	15	
2020_eSC_Nov_08	Confirmation of Stewards of the ISPM on commodities and the TPCS	15	
2020_eSC_Nov_09	Reorganization of standards related to pest risk analysis	15	
2020_eSC_Nov_10	Selection of experts in Botany for the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP)	10	11
2020_eSC_Nov_11	Membership of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) and invited experts	17	

### 2020\_eSC\_Nov\_01: Selection of experts for the EWG on Revision of ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) (2009-002)

#### Summary of SC e-forum discussion

[189] During the SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_Nov\_01) the SC was invited to select experts for the Expert Working Group on the Revision of ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) (2009-002).

[190] The SC e-forum was open from 09 – 16 July to 2020 and 18 members provided comments, indicated which experts did they think were most suitable to participate in revising the ISPM 4.

[191] One member suggested that when there are more candidates with the required skills than the maximum number of experts allowed in the EWG, the additional relevant candidates should be kept in a supplementary list, in case the selected candidates cannot participate in the expert group meeting.

#### SC e-decision

[192] Based on the forum discussion the SC selected the following 7 experts for the EWG on Revision of ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) (2009-002):

- (1) Mr Jose Rafael HERNANDEZ
- (2) Mr Craig HULL

- (3) Mr Mohamed MAGDY
- (4) Ms Naima AIT OUMEJJOUT
- (5) Mr Thomas Kimeli KOSIOM
- (6) Ms Ha Thanh HUONG
- (7) Mr Harry ARIJS

## **2020\_eSC\_Nov\_02: Update on activities of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) from 2019 May to 2020 May**

### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[193] During the SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_Nov\_02) the SC was invited to review of the workprogramme of the Technical panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT), and to provide guidance on outstanding issues.

[194] The SC e-forum was open from 19 June to 03 July 2020 and 14 SC members provided comments.

### **SC e-decision**

[195] Considering general the SC members diverging opinions on how to move forward with the objection, no clear conclusion was reached. Further discussion of, the topic is deferred to a face to face meeting.

[196] Based on the forum discussion the SC *noted* the following TPPT meeting reports:

- 2019-07 TPPT face to face Meeting Report (Vienna, Austria)
  - 2020-02 TPPT Virtual Meeting Report
  - 2020-02 Second TPPT Virtual Meeting Report
  - 2020-03 TPPT Virtual Meeting Report
- (1) *removed* from the TPPT work programme the following draft phytosanitary treatments:
    - Irradiation treatment for *Drosophila suzukii* (2017-017) – priority 1
    - Irradiation treatment for *Omphisa anastomosalis* (2018-042) – priority 2
    - Irradiation treatment for ants (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) hitchhiking on fresh commodities (2017-014) – priority 3
  - (2) *changed* the priority of the following topic from 3 to 1: Revision to ISPM 18 (*Requirements for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) (2014-007)
  - (3) *assigned* Mr Walther ENKERLIN HOEFLICH as the assistant steward of the following topic: Revision to ISPM 18 (*Requirements for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) (2014-007)
  - (4) *agreed* that the TPPT review the Annotated template for phytosanitary treatments once the workload of the TPPT allows it
  - (5) *approved* the participation of TPPT members in the International Plant Health Conference provided IPPC Secretariat resources are not impacted
  - (6) *noted* the work accomplished by the TPPT from May 2019 to May 2020 presented in this paper;
  - (7) *noted* the TPPT tentative work plan for May 2020 to April 2021;

## **2020\_eSC\_Nov\_03: Possible ways to streamline the development processes of subjects on the work programme of technical panels**

### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[197] During the SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_Nov\_03) the SC was invited to consider possible ways to streamline the standard setting process for subjects (terms, phytosanitary treatments (PTs) and diagnostic protocols (DPs)). The TPs have discussed this as requested by the SC in May 2019 and



have provided suggestions on how to work more efficiently. The details of the suggestions were presented in the Background document.

[198] The SC e-forum was open from 19 June to 10 July 2020 and 11 members provided comments, which are summarized below.

### ***SC e-decision***

[199] Regarding the TPDP recommendations, the SC:

- (1) *Agreed* to call an additional consultation period for DPs, as needed;
- (2) *Agreed* with the principle to collect information on diagnostics of emerging pests, as contributed resources on the IPP, provided it is clear that they are not adopted or approved by CPM, in lieu of or as temporary resource for contracting parties during development of an IPPC DP;
- (3) *Noted* that developing a DP implies a minimum span of time due to the fact that this is an international standard;
- (4) *Agreed* to requesting commitments from applicants to Calls for authors, especially on deadlines to be respected.

[200] Regarding the TPPT recommendations, the SC:

- (5) *noted* the discussions of the TPPT on PTs development;
- (6) *noted* the proposal to review of the submission form for PTs and the checklist for evaluating treatment submissions taking into account the PMRG research guidelines;
- (7) *noted* the TPPTs willingness to provide input in the process of developing commodity standards and associated phytosanitary measures;
- (8) *agreed* to call an additional consultation period for PTs per year, as needed;
- (9) *considered* the minimum number of consultation periods necessary for PTs and the possibility to submit a PT for adoption after only one consultation period, if no substantial change was introduced, and the consultation comments are adequately addressed;
- (10) *decided* to further discuss the issue of the minimum number of consultation periods and in which cases they would be possible.

[201] Regarding the TPG recommendations, the SC:

- (11) *considered* the TPG comments regarding the potential impact of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 on the work of the TPG, streamlining technical panel processes, and the possible TPG contributions to IPPC processes and materials;
- (12) *agreed* revising the process for translation of ink amendments resulting from the consistency review of standards so that, where resources permit, initial translation is undertaken by TPG members following the SC May meeting each year, for subsequent checking by the FAO Translation Office;
- (13) *agreed* that TPG will develop the language versions of the ink amendments for “commodity class”, pending confirmation from the IPPC Secretariat of the availability of resources to prepare the consistency tables in languages;
- (14) *requested* that the IPPC Secretariat amends section 7.5.2 of the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting (*Process for proposal of terms to be defined or revision of terms*) at its next revision to remove the requirements to include an executive summary in TPG reports and to attach as an appendix a list of all requests to define or refine terms.
- (15) *recommended* that all expert working groups, including both those working on Standard Setting and those working on capacity development topics, are provided with both ISPM 5 (*Glossary of*

*phytosanitary terms*) and the Annotated Glossary (Explanatory document on ISPM 5) to ensure consistency of terms

## **2020\_eSC\_Nov\_04: Selection of experts for the EWG on the use of specific import authorizations (2008-006)**

### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

- [202] During the SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_Nov\_04) the SC was invited to consider the nominations and select member(s) for the EWG on the use of specific import authorizations (2008-006).
- [203] The SC e-forum was open from 25 June to 9 July, with an additional extension to 16 July 2020. 19 SC members provided comments and indicated which experts they thought were most suitable to perform the tasks of the EWG.
- [204] Due to technical problems, the missing nomination from Japan (Mr Teppei SHIGEMI) was added to the list later and the SC e-decision was extended until 16 July 2020.
- [205] After the inclusion of the missing nomination, 7 SC members voted for Mr Teppei SHIGEMI.
- [206] While 12 SC members supported 7 candidates before the inclusion of the missing nomination, another 3 SC members supported all 8 candidates after the inclusion of the latter.
- [207] The SC Chair proposed to involve Mr Sultan-Makhmud SULTANOV as an invited expert to benefit from the perspective of the Russian language, which could be beneficial to the EWG discussions.
- [208] Due to the late additions of one of the nominees, the IPPC Secretariat was unable to draft a clear conclusion from this e-forum. Noting the proposal of the SC Chair, it is suggested to select 7 of the experts as members of the EWG and the last candidate as an "invited expert". A poll was opened to indicate the preference for the role of invited expert in the doodle poll.
- [209] The poll was open from 20 to 27 July 2020. 8 SC members participated, where 7 of them selected Mr Sultan-Makhmud SULTANOV as an "invited expert", and 1 selected Mr Samuel BISHOP in the same capacity.

### **SC e-decision**

- [210] Based on the forum discussion and the poll, the SC selected the following 7 experts for the EWG:
- Ms Beatriz Sara SPREAFICO;
  - Ms Bussakorn MPELASOKA;
  - Mr Tiago Rodrigo LOHMANN;
  - Ms Tamara Isabel Gálvez REYES;
  - Mr Samuel BISHOP;
  - Mr Teppei SHIGEMI;
  - Ms Dorothy C. WAYSON.
- [211] Mr Sultan-Makhmud SULTANOV was selected as an "invited expert" for the EWG on the use of specific import authorizations (2008-006).

## 2020\_eSC\_Nov\_05: Update on activities of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) from May 2019 to June 2020

### Summary of SC e-forum discussion

- [212] During the SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_Nov\_05) the SC was invited to review of the work programme of the Technical panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP), and to provide guidance on outstanding issues.
- [213] The SC e-forum was open from 23 July to 06 August 2020 and 17 SC members provided comments.
- [214] One member thought that some of the TPDP recommendations need a broader debate, not only at the SC level but also at the IC and even Bureau or CPM. Decision points (7), (8) and (9) (under section "Regarding diagnostic laboratory networking") go beyond the standard setting. It means that the TPDP would be directly involved in implementation issues. Even agreeing conceptually, he thought it is a topic that requires further discussion.
- [215] Regarding decision point 22 (about International Year for Plant Health) he agreed with the attendance of TPDP members to the Plant Health conference noting that travel funds will need to be provided by its members' countries.

### SC e-decision

- [216] Based on the forum discussion the SC agreed to the following recommendations:

[217] **Regarding commodity- and pathway-specific ISPMs**, the SC:

- (1) *noted* that the scope of DPs should be clearly defined in the framework of commodity and pathway standards
- (2) *noted* that the development of DPs should still be based on pest taxonomy rather than commodity, otherwise the scope of concerned pests would be considerable and very difficult to achieve
- (3) *noted* that the TPDP considered it too early to provide detailed feedback
- (4) *noted* that the TPDP considered that "inspection standards" may be needed and possible in the future, and that TPDP could help in that prospect, provided that the main pests of concern have been defined previously
- (5) *noted* that the TPDP considered that High-Throughput Sequencing (HTS) technologies are promising, but that it is premature to consider them for DPs since development of such technologies is very fast, and also taking into consideration the need for laboratory capacity in the majority of countries
- (6) *noted* that the TPDP strongly expressed its willingness to be involved at the beginning of the development of such standards, to avoid duplications, to understand potential gaps and build stronger relationships with the SC and the new technical panel.

[218] **Regarding diagnostic laboratory networking**, the SC:

- (7) *agreed* that the TPDP gather different sources of information (manual, guides, videos) from different regions, in order to identify gaps in the existing manual of diagnostic protocols, noting that it may require further discussion
- (8) *agreed* that, in collaboration with the SC and IC, the TPDP develops or revise manuals and guidelines when needed (e.g. the existing manual of diagnostic protocols, or guidelines on proficiency tests), noting that it may require further discussion
- (9) *considered* amending Specification TP 1 in order to allow the TPDP to participate to the activities described above, noting that it may require further discussion

- (10) *noted* that the TPDP recommended that a CPM recommendation on “Facilitating shipment and transport of reference material and specimens, to support diagnostic activities for regulated pests” be developed, and asked Mr Brendan RODONI and Ms Juliet GOLSMITH, supported by Ms Françoise PETTER to draft a justification for that purpose to be discussed during the next TPDP meeting
- (11) *noted* that TPDP is willing to take the lead in organizing the *first international workshop on diagnostic laboratories* in 2021, and asked Mr Norman BARR, supported by Mr Brendan RODONI, to draft a detailed proposal (justification, programme, resource mobilization) to be discussed during the next TPDP meeting.

**[219] Regarding pest outbreak alert and response systems, the SC:**

- (12) *noted* that diagnostic networking could improve the support already given to these systems by the current activities of the TPDP, and *pass* this information to the IC.

**[220] Regarding the emerging and fast-spreading pests, the SC is invited to:**

- (13) *noted* that developing a DP implies following an IPPC process, which makes difficult to issue the DP in time
- (14) *noted* that in case of an emergency, consideration could be given to making available to contracting parties information on other type of diagnostics sourced from NPPOs, RPPOs or other bodies, but gathering the data would require a strong international network and further resources allocated to the IPPC Secretariat
- (15) *noted* that the TPDP noted that the process to include new topics to the work programme could be speeded up, with better communication between the several bodies involved and making use of the TPDP as part of it.

**[221] Regarding analysis of draft diagnostic protocols added to the work programme as requested by the SC, the SC:**

- (16) *agreed* that the draft DP for Psyllid vectors of ‘*Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum*’ (2018-030) be developed at species level
- (17) *agreed* that it is feasible to develop a DP for Pospiviroid species (except *Potato spindle tuber viroid* (DP 7)) (2018-031) and that the DP should cover plants and seeds
- (18) *agreed* that it is feasible to develop a DP for *Acidovorax avenae* subsp. *citrulli* (2018-032) and to *noted* that it may be beneficial to liaise with the International Seed Testing Association (ISTA), the International Seed Federation (ISF) and the International Seed Health Initiative (ISHI)
- (19) *agreed* changing the priority from 2 to 1 as *Acidovorax avenae* subsp. *citrulli* has a high economic impact, especially for developing countries, and is highly seed-transmitted
- (20) *agreed* that the draft for *Meloidogyne mali* (2018-019) is at species level, and to *noted* that if there is a need to develop at genus level, additional guidance from the SC should be given on which species should be focused on, as for other DPs (e.g. *Anguina*)
- (21) *agreed* that it is feasible to develop a DP for *Cronartium comandrae* (2018-015), and to *noted* that during the development the scope may change to include other species.

**[222] Regarding the International Year for Plant Health, the SC:**

- (22) *agreed* that the TPDP should participate at the workshop on plant health diagnostics foreseen in the draft programme of the International Plant Health conference being organized within the framework of the 2020 International Year for Plant Health (IYPH) from 5 to 8 October 2020<sup>20</sup>,

<sup>20</sup> These dates were correct at the time of the meeting however due to the COVID-19 pandemic the meeting has been moved to 2021. This should not affect the decision of the SC on this point.

provided that no IPPC resources are used and should gather information from different sources for this purpose.

## **2020\_eSC\_Nov\_06: Update on activities of the Technical Panel for the Glossary from May 2019 to May 2020**

### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[223] During the SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_Nov\_06) the SC was invited to review of the work programme of the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG), and to provide guidance on outstanding issues.

[224] The SC e-forum was open from 23 July to 06 August 2020 and 17 SC members provided comments.

#### **[225] SC e-decision**

[226] Based on the forum discussion the SC

- (1) *Supported* continuation of the membership of Ms MELCHO and Mr ORLINSKI for a third term and for one year, respectively;
- (2) *Agreed to* issue a call for expert for Russian language for the TPG starting the term from 2021;
- (3) *Noted* the TPG's proposed amendments to ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*), ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) and ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) and request that the Secretariat archive these amendments for future revision of these ISPMs (Appendix 1);
- (4) *Noted* the TPG's suggested amendment to ISPM 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*) and request that the Secretariat archive this amendment for future revision of ISPM 9 (Appendix 1);
- (5) *Agreed* adding the term “surveillance” to the TPG work programme in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*;
- (6) *Agreed* adding the term “germplasm” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*;
- (7) *Agreed* adding the terms “emergency measure”, “provisional measure”, “phytosanitary procedure” and “phytosanitary action” to the TPG work programme in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*;
- (8) *Noted* that the *General recommendations on use of terms in ISPMs* remain unchanged;
- (9) *Agreed to share* the draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application*) with the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee for their comments;
- (10) *Noted* the *TPG work plan for 2020* (see TPG November 2019 meeting report);

## **2020\_eSC\_Nov\_07: Summary of Standards Committee e-decisions November 2019 – May 2020**

### **Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[227] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_Nov\_07), the SC was invited to review the forum summaries in order to decide if they accurately reflect what the SC decided.

[228] The SC e-forum was open from 17-31 August 2020. 15 SC members commented in the forum.

**SC e-decision**

[229] Based on the forum discussion the SC agreed that the “Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions between November 2019 – May 2020” accurately reflects the outcome of the SC e-decisions. The forum summary is attached to the SC 2020 September virtual meeting report.

**2020\_eSC\_Nov\_08: Confirmation of Stewards of the ISPM on commodities and the TPCS****Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[230] During an SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_Nov\_08), the SC was invited to confirm the agreement of the SC and have a formal discussion and selection of the Stewards and Assistant Stewards.

[231] The SC e-forum was open from 17-31 August 2020. 15 SC members commented in the forum.

**SC e-decision**

[232] Based on the poll, the SC confirmed the selection of the following:

- Mr Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom) as Steward, and Ms Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) and Mr Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina) as Assistant Stewards for the ISPM on *Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008) and
- Mr Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina) as Steward, and Ms Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) and Mr Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom) as Assistant Stewards for the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (2019-009).

**2020\_eSC\_Nov\_09: Reorganization of standards related to pest risk analysis****Summary of SC e-forum discussion**

[233] During the SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_Nov\_09) the SC was invited to discuss the guidance provided by the Bureau and agree on the steps forward.

[234] The SC e-forum was open from 17 August to 27 October 2020 and 15 members provided comments.

[235] The forum was longer than the normal e-decisions to provide an opportunity for discussion and a platform for the work towards the development of a Specification on the topic. The SC at their September virtual meeting assigned Stewards and Assistant Stewards to the topic and the stewards developed the first draft of the specification. The SC was incited to provide comments on it. The comments were incorporated by the Stewards and the Specification is going to be presented to the SC at their 2020 November meeting.

**2020\_eSC\_Nov\_10: Selection of experts in Botany for the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP)**

[236] During the SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_Nov\_10) the SC was invited to consider the nominations and select member(s) in Botany for the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP).

[237] The SC e-forum was open from 04 - 25 September 2020 and 7 members provided comments.

[238] Some SC members considered the expertise of the candidates in detail, highlighting the skills needed for the panel. Some SC members noted they found Ms Colette C. JACONO to be qualified to be part of the panel, but she would be the fourth expert from North America in the TPDP. However, it was pointed out that that the SC should select the best qualified candidate on a technical basis as the regional representation is ensured in the SC who oversees and reviews the output of TPs.



[239] Based on the forum discussion, the SC did not reach consensus. Therefore, the Secretariat opened a poll to select one of the three preferred experts that received the most support by the SC.

[240] The poll was open from 5 to 21 October 2020. 11 SC members participated.

***SC e-decision***

[241] Based on the forum discussion and the poll, the SC selected Ms Colette C. JACONO as the member in Botany for the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP).

**2020\_eSC\_Nov\_11: Membership of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) and invited experts**

[242] During the SC e-decision (2020\_eSC\_Nov\_11) the SC was invited to review the membership of the TPPT and consider to invite experts.

[243] The SC e-forum was open from 6-29 October 2020 and 17 members provided comments.

[244] The SC discussed what specific expertise is needed for the TPPT and whether a new call for experts is necessary; Some members felt that there is no urgent need for a new call for experts at this point in time, however as the workload for the TPPT is very heavy, they noted that adding a new member would be helpful. They noted that there seems to be less expertise in chemical and modified atmosphere treatment, that there is considerable amount of irradiation treatments in the TPPT work programme, and that another expert in irradiation for the panel would be advisable.

***SC e-decision***

[245] Based on the forum discussion the SC agreed to extend the terms of Mr Eduardo WILLINK, Mr Michael ORMSBY and Mr Toshiyuki DOHINO as a TPPT members for another 5-year period; agreed to invite Mr Guy HALLMAN to the TPPT meetings; agreed to invite Carl BLACKBURN to the next TPPT meeting; and selected Mr Guy HALLMAN as the Assistant Steward for the Requirements for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure (Revision to ISPM 18) (2014-007).



## Appendix 8: Draft ISPM on Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)

### **DRAFT ISPM: *REQUIREMENTS FOR NATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATIONS IF AUTHORIZING ENTITIES TO PERFORM PHYTOSANITARY ACTIONS (2014-002)***

#### **Status box**

This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
<b>Date of this document</b>	2019-12-02
<b>Document category</b>	Draft ISPM
<b>Current document stage</b>	To CPM-15 (2020)
<b>Major stages</b>	<p>2013-11 Standards Committee (SC) recommended topic <i>Authorization of non-NPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions</i> to be added to the work programme.</p> <p>2014-04 CPM-9 added the topic <i>Authorization of non-NPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions</i> (2014-002) to the work programme with priority 3 (subsequently changed to priority 2 by CPM-10).</p> <p>2016-05 SC approved Specification 65 (<i>Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions</i>).</p> <p>2017-06 Expert working group drafted ISPM.</p> <p>2018-05 SC revised and approved draft for first consultation.</p> <p>2018-07 First consultation.</p> <p>2019-05 SC-7 revised and approved draft for second consultation.</p> <p>2019-07 Second consultation.</p> <p>2019-11 SC revised the draft.</p>
<b>Steward history</b>	<p>2016-05 SC Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (CA, Lead Steward)</p> <p>2016-05 SC Ms Marina ZLOTINA (US, Assistant Steward)</p> <p>2014-05 SC Ms Marie-Claude FOREST (CA, Lead Steward)</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>2017-09 Edited</p> <p>2018-05 Edited</p> <p>2019-05 SC-7 changed title to <i>Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions</i></p> <p>2019-05 Edited</p> <p>2019-12 Edited</p>

## CONTENTS

Adoption.....	59
INTRODUCTION.....	59
Scope .....	59
References .....	59
Definitions .....	59
Outline of Requirements .....	59
BACKGROUND.....	59
IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT .....	59
REQUIREMENTS .....	60
1. Basic Understanding of Authorization .....	60
2. Authorization programme.....	60
2.1 Development of Authorization Programme .....	60
3. Criteria for Eligibility of Entities.....	61
4. Roles and Responsibilities for Implementing the Authorization Programme .....	62
4.1 Roles and responsibilities of the NPPO .....	62
4.2 Roles and responsibilities of the entity .....	62
4.2.1 Roles and responsibilities of entities authorized to audit or supervise.....	63
5. Process for Audits.....	64
5.1 Audits to authorize an entity .....	64
5.2 Audits to maintain authorization .....	64
6. Types of Nonconformity.....	64
6.1 Critical nonconformity .....	64
6.2 Other nonconformity .....	65
7. Suspension and Revocation of Authorization.....	65

## Adoption

[To be inserted following adoption]

## INTRODUCTION

### Scope

[246] This standard provides requirements for national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) if they decide to authorize entities to perform specific phytosanitary actions on their behalf.

[247] In accordance with Article V.2(a) of the IPPC, this standard does not cover the issuance of phytosanitary certificates. Also, this standard does not cover the development and establishment of phytosanitary measures.

### References

[248] The present standard refers to ISPMs. ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms>.

IPPC. 1997. *International Plant Protection Convention*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

### Definitions

[249] Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

### Outline of Requirements

[250] This standard outlines the key requirements for the development of an authorization programme and the eligibility criteria for entities to become authorized. The standard identifies the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved in the implementation of an authorization programme. It also describes processes for audits, types of nonconformities, and suspension and revocation of authorization.

## BACKGROUND

[251] Article IV of the IPPC sets out the responsibilities for NPPOs. Article V.2(a) of the IPPC provides for the possibility of NPPOs authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions. The concept of authorization is referred to in several ISPMs, such as ISPM 3 (*Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms*), ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*), ISPM 7 (*Phytosanitary certification system*), ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*), ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*), ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*), ISPM 42 (*Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures*) and ISPM 43 (*Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure*). In order to foster confidence between NPPOs, there is a need to harmonize the requirements for authorizations of specific phytosanitary actions and to ensure that the practice aligns with the principles of the IPPC. If an NPPO decides to authorize entities, it remains responsible for the phytosanitary actions performed by the entities on its behalf.

## IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

[252] Authorization programmes may have a positive impact on biodiversity and the environment because they may contribute to the delivery of phytosanitary actions.

## REQUIREMENTS

[253] There is no obligation for NPPOs to authorize entities to perform phytosanitary actions. However, if an NPPO decides to authorize entities, the following requirements apply.

### 1. Basic Understanding of Authorization

[254] An NPPO decides whether to use authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions. Authorization may be used by NPPOs to authorize entities to perform specific phytosanitary actions, to audit other authorized entities, or to supervise phytosanitary actions. Examples of phytosanitary actions that an NPPO may decide to authorize an entity to perform include monitoring, sampling, inspection, testing, surveillance, treatment, post-entry quarantine and destruction. If an NPPO decides to authorize entities, it should have sole responsibility for deciding which entity is authorized and for which specific phytosanitary actions. Audits may be conducted by an authorized entity in order to assess the eligibility of another entity to perform a specific phytosanitary action; however, the decision to authorize should be the responsibility of the NPPO alone.

[255] The NPPO is responsible for ensuring that the authorized entity performs the phytosanitary actions according to the NPPO's requirements. With the authorization, the phytosanitary action is performed by the entity but the responsibility remains with the NPPO. Authorization may be given only to perform phytosanitary actions to implement phytosanitary measures that are decided by the NPPO. Authorization to perform phytosanitary actions does not include NPPO core activities such as issuance of phytosanitary certificates or development and establishment of phytosanitary measures because these are not phytosanitary actions. The NPPO should have sufficient staff with the necessary expertise to carry out oversight, including auditing, of authorized entities.

[256] In this standard, "entities" include the providers of phytosanitary action (e.g. individuals, organizations, enterprises) and, where appropriate, their facilities (such as equipment, laboratories, treatment enclosures). In some cases, authorization of entities may require an NPPO to approve individuals within the entity (such as those responsible for specific phytosanitary actions), relevant documentation, facilities, or any combination of these. The NPPO and the entity should determine the nature of the authorization agreement.

### 2. Authorization programme

[257] Under its phytosanitary system, an NPPO deciding to authorize entities to perform specific phytosanitary actions should establish an authorization programme.

[258] Before deciding to authorize entities to perform phytosanitary actions and developing an authorization programme, NPPOs should ensure that their country's legal framework enables them to authorize, suspend, revoke and reinstate authorizations.

[259] NPPOs should only set up authorization programmes that result in effective phytosanitary actions that are delivered with integrity and transparency. The authorization programme should ensure that the authorized entities are accountable to the NPPO for these actions and that phytosanitary security is maintained, consistent with the provisions of the IPPC and ISPMs.

#### 2.1 Development of Authorization Programme

[260] The NPPO should develop an authorization programme that is appropriate for its purposes, first defining the programme's scope and objectives. When developing an authorization programme, the NPPO should:

- set the requirements that must be met by an entity to be authorized
- develop procedures for receiving, maintaining and delivering information, including procedures to ensure confidentiality

- develop procedures to process the information received, from the time of receipt of the information required by the NPPO and its subsequent evaluation to the decision on whether to grant authorization to the entity
- develop a training plan to ensure that NPPO personnel have the expertise to manage the authorization programme
- develop training or identify minimum training, equipment, competency and skills requirements for entities to perform phytosanitary actions; these requirements should be equivalent to those required for the NPPO if it were to undertake the same phytosanitary actions
- develop a template agreement that can be used to formalize the authorization of entities and make the authorization legally binding
- determine a validity period for the authorization agreement, including the timing of any review and the length of any extension if appropriate
- develop specific performance criteria, guidelines and performance-based verification processes for the actions performed by the entities
- develop an audit or monitoring process and supporting tools, which may include audit or monitoring checklists and templates for audit or monitoring reports, and templates for corrective action reports
- develop criteria to determine nonconformities
- develop a process to address nonconformity, this including, where appropriate, suspending, reinstating or revoking authorization
- develop a process for the authorized entity to voluntarily withdraw from the authorization agreement with the NPPO
- identify risks which may arise from authorization and which need to be managed through the authorization programme
- develop contingency plans for ensuring continuity of action in the event that an authorized entity has its authorization suspended or revoked or voluntarily withdraws from the authorization programme
- develop a process to ensure efficient and effective communication between the NPPO and the authorized entity
- develop a process to maintain an up-to-date list of authorized entities.
- develop a framework to assess the impartiality and independence of entities, and to assess and identify any potential conflicts of interest and address them appropriately (e.g. by requiring entities to be free of any conflict of interest or by allowing entities to manage conflicts of interest).

### 3. Criteria for Eligibility of Entities

[261] The NPPO should ensure that the entity meets the following criteria:

- it can legally operate in the country of authorization
- it has the ability to enter into an agreement with the NPPO
- it has sufficient resources (financial and human), including the expertise, equipment and infrastructure required, to undertake the specific phytosanitary actions to be performed and to ensure continuity of service
- it appoints or identifies the individual or individuals who will be responsible for delivery of the phytosanitary actions to be performed
- it has documentation demonstrating the process by which it will consistently meet the requirements set by the NPPO for the phytosanitary actions to be performed
- it agrees to conform with the NPPO's requirements, including requirements on impartiality, independence and conflicts of interest (e.g. to declare whether it is free of any conflict of interest or to identify potential conflicts of interest)

- it has a clear statement of liability for damages if these result from actions it performs in its role as an authorized entity
- it has a process to ensure efficient and effective resolution of conflicts with the client receiving delivery of the phytosanitary action (if the client is not the NPPO), including a process to elevate issues to the NPPO for a final decision.

## **4. Roles and Responsibilities for Implementing the Authorization Programme**

### **4.1 Roles and responsibilities of the NPPO**

[262] The roles and responsibilities of the NPPO should include the following:

- to assess the entity against the criteria for eligibility for authorization set in this standard and those established by the NPPO
- to evaluate the entity against the requirements set by the NPPO regarding its documented procedures and their implementation on-site, and propose suggestions for improvement as necessary
- to clearly define the phytosanitary actions the entity is authorized to perform and the performance criteria
- to enter into an agreement which authorizes the entity to perform specific phytosanitary actions, and to review and update the agreement as necessary
- to notify entities that do not meet the criteria for eligibility and provide the rationale for the decision
- to train NPPO personnel and, if needed, authorized entities' personnel and ensure that their skills and competencies are maintained at an adequate level to consistently implement the authorization programme
- to carry out regular audits or monitoring of the authorized entity to verify that it conforms with the requirements of the NPPO's authorization programme
- to carry out internal audits of its own procedures and processes to verify that the objectives of its authorization programme continue to be met
- to implement processes for addressing identified nonconformities, including determining the corrective actions and requiring the authorized entity to take the corrective actions, and, where appropriate, suspending or revoking authorization, which may include regulatory enforcement
- to implement processes for reinstatement of authorization
- to implement processes for the entity to voluntarily withdraw from the authorization agreement with the NPPO, when needed
- to maintain documentation, including records and published lists of authorized entities, corresponding authorized phytosanitary action, and authorization period, if applicable
- to identify for how long an entity needs to save its records, in relation to the specific phytosanitary actions performed
- to implement and maintain transparent, efficient and effective communication on the authorization programme, in particular between the NPPO and the authorized entities
- to ensure that NPPO personnel involved in authorization of entities maintain impartiality and are free of any conflict of interest.

### **4.2 Roles and responsibilities of the entity**

[263] The roles and responsibilities of the entity should include the following:

- to provide required information to the NPPO when being considered for authorization to perform specific phytosanitary actions
- to enter into a written agreement to perform the specific phytosanitary actions

- to implement documented procedures to conform with the requirements set by the NPPO, which may cover:
  - operating procedures describing how specific phytosanitary actions are performed (i.e. who does what, when, where and how)
  - skills and competency of personnel
  - training of personnel
  - document control, which includes:
    - revision of documents
    - records, in particular of the activities undertaken in relation to the specific phytosanitary actions
  - a list of equipment and their maintenance or calibration schedule, where appropriate
  - internal audit
  - management of nonconformity
- to provide notification (within an agreed time frame) to the NPPO upon a major change in management or location, a change in process, a nonconformity or any other information that has an impact on the specific phytosanitary action that has been authorized
- to maintain infrastructure and security, where applicable, and resources to consistently carry out the specific phytosanitary actions to conform with the requirements set by the NPPO
- to ensure that personnel have the relevant knowledge and experience required by the NPPO to perform the specific phytosanitary actions
- to train personnel and ensure that their skills and competencies are maintained at an adequate level to consistently carry out the specific phytosanitary actions to conform with the requirements set by the NPPO
- to maintain and provide documented procedures (including records of its activities) to the NPPO as required
- to undergo monitoring, audits and controls as described in the requirements set by the NPPO
- to comply with the requirements set in the authorization agreement, the phytosanitary procedures, standards, legislation and guidelines of the NPPO that relate to the authorization
- to maintain the confidentiality of the information obtained through the authorized phytosanitary actions.

#### **4.2.1 Roles and responsibilities of entities authorized to audit or supervise**

[264] The NPPO may choose to authorize entities to audit other authorized entities or to supervise phytosanitary actions. An entity that audits other authorized entities or supervises phytosanitary actions should meet the requirements in section 4.2. The roles and responsibilities of the entity should also include the following:

- to develop and carry out an action plan, including procedures or corrective actions, for dealing with nonconformities of the entities it audits that compromise the integrity of and trust in the programme, including notification (within an agreed time frame) of these to the authorizing NPPO
- to maintain confidentiality of information gained through its auditing or supervisory activities
- to maintain impartiality and independence from the entities it audits or supervises, and be free of any conflict of interest
- to ensure personnel have the relevant knowledge, experience and training to carry out the specific audits or supervision being performed
- to undertake internal audits to provide continuous feedback and identify system gaps (if applicable).



## 5. Process for Audits

### 5.1 Audits to authorize an entity

- [265] If an NPPO decides to consider the authorization of an entity, the NPPO (or the entity authorized to conduct audits) should first carry out an initial evaluation of the entity's documented procedures.
- [266] When the documented procedures are acceptable, the NPPO (or the entity authorized to conduct audits) should carry out an audit to evaluate the entire system and the capability of the entity to implement the documented operating procedures for each phytosanitary action.
- [267] At each step of the audit, the NPPO (or the entity authorized to conduct audits) should provide feedback to the entity on observations and opportunities for improvement as necessary.
- [268] The decision about whether to grant authorization should rest solely with the NPPO. The NPPO should only authorize the entity if the audit demonstrates that the NPPO's requirements for authorization of entities have been met.

### 5.2 Audits to maintain authorization

- [269] The NPPO should determine the minimum frequency of the audits to maintain authorization, based on the scope and complexity of the phytosanitary actions and the associated level of pest risk, the performance of the authorized entity and the nonconformities identified, and the results of previous audits. An unscheduled audit may be conducted, for instance upon receipt of a notification of non-compliance from an importing country.
- [270] Audits may be conducted by the NPPO (or the entity authorized to conduct audits) on a specific part or parts of the entity's system, as necessary.

## 6. Types of Nonconformity

- [271] When the authorized entity does not meet the requirements specified by the NPPO as set out in the authorization agreement, this should be considered as a nonconformity.
- [272] A nonconformity may be identified during audits, supervision, or investigations triggered by notification of non-compliance (ISPM 13 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*)).
- [273] The type and number of nonconformities identified should be used by the NPPO to determine the status of the entity (authorized, suspended or revoked) and the follow-up audit frequency.
- [274] If a nonconformity is identified, the NPPO (or the entity authorized to audit or supervise) should require the authorized entity to take corrective action.
- [275] Nonconformities may be considered as critical nonconformities (section 6.1) or other nonconformities (section 6.2).

### 6.1 Critical nonconformity

- [276] "Critical nonconformity" is a nonconformity that immediately impacts the integrity of and trust in the NPPO's phytosanitary system and that requires a rapid corrective action to be identified and implemented. The NPPO may consider nonconformities to be critical in situations such as:
- when there is evidence of failing to properly perform authorized phytosanitary actions
  - when a corrective action is not implemented to the satisfaction of the NPPO (or the entity authorized to audit or supervise)
  - when there is a failure to implement timely corrective actions to remedy the shortcomings identified
  - when the integrity or impartiality of the entity is shown to have been compromised

- when there is evidence of fraud.

[277] An entity's authorization to perform a specific phytosanitary action should be suspended or revoked immediately if a critical nonconformity is identified. The NPPO should have a system in place to manage the critical nonconformity.

## 6.2 Other nonconformity

[278] "Other nonconformity" is a nonconformity that does not directly or immediately impact the integrity of and trust in the NPPO's phytosanitary system and is not considered a critical nonconformity by the NPPO.

[279] Other nonconformity requires corrective actions to be taken within a time frame specified by the NPPO (or the entity authorized to audit or supervise).

[280] Suspension or revocation of the authorization is not needed but may be considered when this type of nonconformity is repeatedly identified or when corrective actions are not taken within the required time frame. The decision about whether to suspend or revoke authorization of the entity should rest solely with the NPPO.

## 7. Suspension and Revocation of Authorization

[281] The decision to suspend, revoke or reinstate authorization of the entity should rest solely with the NPPO.

[282] **Suspension.** The NPPO temporarily suspends the authorization of an entity for a specified time in order for the entity to implement corrective action.

[283] **Revocation.** The NPPO withdraws the authorization of an entity.

[284] An entity that has had its authorization suspended and that wishes to have its authorization reinstated should apply to the NPPO for reinstatement. When an entity's authorization has been revoked, the NPPO should evaluate if the entity is eligible for a new authorization. Affected entities should make an application for a new authorization, according to the rules set by the NPPO. The decision about whether to reinstate an entity's authorization should rest solely with the NPPO.

[285] An entity that has voluntarily withdrawn from an authorization agreement and that wishes to have its authorization reinstated should apply to the NPPO for reinstatement.