



***REPORT***

Rome, Italy  
13-15 May 2015

# **Report of the meeting for the Revision of the Standard Setting Procedure**



**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations**

## CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the Meeting.....	3
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat.....	3
1.2	Election of the Chairperson .....	3
1.3	Election of the Rapporteur.....	3
1.4	Adoption of the agenda.....	3
2.	Administrative Matters.....	3
3.	Updates from the Standards Committee Meeting .....	3
4.	Background .....	3
5.	Analysis of the Implementation of the CPM-7 (2012) IPPC Standard Setting Procedure.....	3
5.1	Review of the tasks for the SC-7 in reviewing the IPPC Standard setting procedure .....	4
5.2	Discussion of the IPPC Standard setting procedure.....	4
	Clarification on entities that contribute to the IPPC Standard setting process .....	4
	Call for topics (Stage 1, Step 1) .....	4
	Adjustment and adoption of the List of topics for IPPC standards (Stage 1, step 2) .....	5
	Drafting (Stage 2, step 3 and Stage 3, step 5 and 6).....	5
	Preparation of the ISPM (Stage 2, step 4) .....	5
	Consultation periods (Stage 3, Steps 5 and 6).....	7
	Length and dates for consultation periods.....	7
	Editorial team .....	9
	Clarification of the process after the second consultation (Step 6) .....	9
	Formal objections before CPM (Stage 4, Step 7).....	9
	Consensus within the SC.....	11
	Fast process for minor technical updates to adopted ISPMs .....	11
	Practical issues .....	12
6.	Revision of the IPPC Standard Setting Procedure .....	12
6.1	Development of SC background paper .....	12
6.2	Proposed revision of the IPPC Standard setting procedure .....	12
6.2	SC Recommendations.....	12
7.	Next Steps .....	13
8.	Close of the Meeting .....	13

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX 01 – Agenda .....	14
APPENDIX 02 – Documents list.....	15
APPENDIX 03 – Participants list .....	16
APPENDIX 4 – Proposed changes to the IPPC Standard setting procedure adopted by CPM-7 (2012) .....	20
APPENDIX 05 – Provisions for the availability of standard setting documents.....	25

## **1. Opening of the Meeting**

### **1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat**

[1] The Standards Officer welcomed the participants to the meeting.

### **1.2 Election of the Chairperson**

[2] Ms Marie-Claude FOREST (Canada) was elected Chairperson.

### **1.3 Election of the Rapporteur**

[3] Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK (Poland) was elected Rapporteur.

### **1.4 Adoption of the agenda**

[4] The agenda was adopted (Appendix 1)

## **2. Administrative Matters**

[5] The Secretariat introduced the Documents list (Appendix 2), Participants list (Appendix 3) and the Local information document, asking that participants inform the Secretariat should they find any information that needed to be changed.

## **3. Updates from the Standards Committee Meeting**

[6] The Secretariat provided an update from the SC May 2015 meeting<sup>1</sup> highlighting the main points raised by SC members which are also recorded in the report of the SC May 2015 meeting posted on the IPP.

## **4. Background**

[7] The Secretariat introduced the document outlining the background for the revision to the IPPC Standard setting procedure (SSP), noting that the review was exclusively of the current procedure as adopted by CPM-7 (2012)<sup>2</sup>.

[8] One member noted that there were clearly many issues (direct and indirect) that would need to be reviewed in detail. He urged the group to decide on the scope of the meeting and limit discussions to this.

[9] The group discussed the scope of the meeting and agreed that it would be to “adjust the procedure to ensure that it facilitates the development of technically sound standards through a transparent process that truly engages IPPC members”. The group discussed whether to include in the scope also the feasibility of implementation of the standards, but found that although a very important issue it would be too ample a scope to be dealt with on this occasion.

## **5. Analysis of the Implementation of the CPM-7 (2012) IPPC Standard Setting Procedure**

[10] The Secretariat recalled that out of the twenty four CPM-7 (2012) decisions on “improving the IPPC Standard setting procedure”, one had not been implemented (20) and one had been implemented only partly (2).

[11] The group provided responses to these CPM-7 (2012) decisions that have not been implemented (Task 11). The group analyzed the implementation of the decisions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Extract from the draft Standards Committee meeting report: 01\_CRP\_SSPRevision\_2015\_May

<sup>2</sup> 10\_SSPRevision\_2015\_May

## 5.1 Review of the tasks for the SC-7 in reviewing the IPPC Standard setting procedure

[12] The participants reviewed the task decided by the SC November 2014<sup>3</sup>.

## 5.2 Discussion of the IPPC Standard setting procedure

[13] The participants based their considerations on the discussion papers submitted<sup>4</sup> and discussed the SSP.

[14] Regarding document 07, which outlined several specific proposals for changes to the SSP, one member queried if the whole Secretariat had agreed to the suggestions of the document and whether the FAO Legal Officer had reviewed the full document. The Standards Officer explained that some of the suggestions made in the document had been discussed with some SC members, whereas other suggestions came from the Standard setting team and had not previously been discussed by the SC. Regarding input from other Secretariat teams, he recalled that the SC November 2014 had suggested that the SC-7 group would be updated on this during this meeting. The FAO Legal Officer confirmed that she had provided comments on the full document.

[15] The discussions on the SSP are detailed in the following sections.

### Clarification on entities that contribute to the IPPC Standard setting process

[16] The Secretariat recalled that in several steps of the SSP, the term “IPPC members” had been used in relation to entities that may submit topics or comments. “IPPC members” had been defined in a footnote on the first page in the SSP (annexed to the Rules of procedure of the CPM) as: “contracting parties, national plant protection organizations (NPPOs), regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) and relevant international organizations”.

[17] The FAO Legal Officer clarified that normally “IPPC members” refers only to contracting parties (CPs) and their NPPOs. Hence, this term would not include non-CPs, RPPOs and relevant international organizations, as it is currently used. The FAO Legal Officer also noted that as the IPPC specifies that CPs have an obligation to establish an NPPO, it might be preferred to use another term for similar organizations in non-CPs and suggested we refer to these as national plant protection services. The CPM, she recalled, may fully decide who is included in the SSP because, under international law, an international treaty may grant rights to non-CPs but not impose obligations.

[18] The Group considered the entities that contribute to the SSP and found that the various stages of engagement be considered separately.

### Call for topics (Stage 1, Step 1)

[19] The group discussed the entities that may participate in the first stage of the Standard setting process.

[20] Several members were in favor of allowing non-CPs and RPPOs propose topics<sup>5</sup>, stressing what they felt was the main difference between CPs and non-CPs; namely the decisive authority. Only CPs can decide on which topics are put on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

[21] Some members were in favor of restricting inclusion to CPs only, stressing that this would be one of the benefits of becoming a CP versus the considerable resources that CPs spend on participating in the SSP. CPs and non-CPs should therefore not have the same rights. One member felt that there could be some benefits of having non-CPs included in the process, but he warned of the “slippery slope” of involvement of non-CPs due to the resources that are needed to train, build capacities, communicate

---

<sup>3</sup> 04\_SSPRevision\_2015\_May

<sup>4</sup>05\_SSPRevision\_2015\_May;06\_SSPRevision\_2015\_May;07\_SSPRevision\_2015\_May;08\_SSPRevision\_2015\_May; 09\_SSPRevision\_2015\_May

<sup>5</sup> Topics were intended to mean topics as per the Hierarchy for terms for standards.

effectively to ensure engagement, and so forth with non-CPs. The limited resources of the IPPC Secretariat should be used to engage CPs.

- [22] The group decided that only CPs should be allowed to submit topics. RPPOs would therefore be excluded from submitting topics, as some RPPOs may have non-CPs as members. It was clarified that the technical panels would no longer be able to propose topics. Any other organization may propose topics through an NPPO.
- [23] The members in favor of not having topics being proposed by the SC highlighted the possible conflict of interest and the importance of having topics submitted by CPs so that topics submitted were really desired at a national level which would later help ensure implementation of such standards. The group agreed that the SC should not be able to submit topics in response to the call for topics but gave the SC some leeway when doing their annual review of the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.
- [24] The group discussed whether the call for topics would include call for phytosanitary treatments (PTs). The current procedure has been silent on this point, and the Secretariat recalled that the preparation for a submission of PTs requires lengthy research and data collection. This is different from a call for topics, where a draft specification and a literature review are all that is required. The group felt that PTs should be excluded from the regular call for topics and added text to this effect.
- [25] *Hierarchy of terms*. The Secretariat had proposed to the CPM-3 (2008) rule on the *Hierarchy of terms*, which differentiated between technical area, topic and subject. The group did not find it was useful to introduce a change. NPPOs and RPPOs use these terms and introducing changes now may only create confusion.
- [26] Changes to Stage 1, step 1 were introduced for clarity.

#### **Adjustment and adoption of the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (Stage 1, step 2)**

- [27] The Group agreed that when the SC reviews the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, the SC may recommend adjustments which would include proposals for addition or deletion of topics or adjustments to existing topics such as proposing a change of priorities.

#### **Drafting (Stage 2, step 3 and Stage 3, step 5 and 6)**

- [28] The group discussed the entities that may comment on draft specifications and draft ISPMs during consultation periods.
- [29] One member found that only CPs, RPPOs through their NPPOs, other relevant international organizations and any other entities that the SC may decide on should be allowed comment. He also felt that the Secretariat should not have to notify any other entity than the CPs because of the resources that may be involved in this work.
- [30] Other members highlighted that the IPPC encourages non-CPs to apply phytosanitary measures and the Convention (Art. XIII), so opening to non-CPs create overall benefits because it may help in the implementation of the IPPC; preventing the introduction and spread of pests. For this reason, it would seem only logical to include the non-CPs as much as possible to raise awareness about the standards as they will be part of the end-users. It was additionally recalled that there are non-CPs which are part of the RPPOs and are encouraged to comment on standards for instance in regional workshops; it would be practically difficult to exclude them from the process.
- [31] The group agreed that as many stakeholders as possible, including national plant protection services of non-CPs, should be invited to submit comments during consultation periods to ensure the best possible drafts are developed. Text was modified to clarify this.

#### **Preparation of the ISPM (Stage 2, step 4)**

##### ***Possible organization of scientific symposia***

- [32] The group considered including in the SSP scientific symposia such as the expert consultations held in 2013 (Expert Consultation on Cold Treatments) and 2014 (Expert consultation on phytosanitary treatments for *Bactrocera dorsalis* complex). These *ad hoc* scientific symposia would be information gathering meetings to bring scientist together to exchange information and collaborate on research which would provide the scientific foundation for standards. It had been proposed to use the words “scientific symposia” instead of the former term “expert consultations” as “expert consultations” is already used in relation to DPs with another meaning.
- [33] The group did not add a step related to scientific symposia to the SSP because they did not wish to limit the SC to arranging this type of initiative only. The majority of the group strongly supported that the SC may decide that any type of initiative, such as scientific symposia, may be needed to support the development of standards and therefore may task the Secretariat to organize such a meeting.
- [34] One member of the group did not support the organization of scientific symposia because he felt that the selection of experts for these meetings was not transparent. He believed that experts should be identified through calls for experts. It was pointed out that these were open meetings and any interested individual was welcome to attend.

#### ***Organization of expert consultations on draft ISPMs***

- [35] The Standard setting team proposed to add a sentence in Step 4 (Preparation of a draft ISPM) to provide for the organization of expert consultations on draft ISPMs to ensure the scientific quality of draft ISPMs. This process currently takes place for draft DPs because wider consultations of experts on draft protocols in earlier stages of development are crucial to ensure the quality of the protocols and to facilitate the adoption process. It was clarified that this process was open to any experts and information inviting experts was made available through various channels (i.e. not only through the NPPO because it was felt that there may be excellent experts which may not have links to the NPPOs, e.g. experts hired by CABI). One reason for adding this opportunity to improve draft standards was that some experts may not be interested in joining an EDG because of the long engagement needed, but that they would be available to provide comments or input for brief periods of time. Additionally, it was noted, there are more experts worldwide than those selected for the EDG and that some experts did not have established links with their NPPO and it would be opportune to allow input from these as well.
- [36] One member felt that this step would complicate the process. He emphasized that NPPOs should be able to identify the experts and that rather than adding a step to the SSP, the consultative process should improve in the country. Other members felt that expert consultations should be added as a possibility for all standards because it had proved valuable for DPs.
- [37] The group did not agree on the provisions for this step, and decided to limit to the expert consultations only on DPs; text was modified to this effect. It was clarified that the expert consultations on DPs would take place after a draft had been prepared but before the first consultation period. The draft would only be made available to the self identified experts, and the comments would be reviewed by the drafting team and TPDP discipline lead and suggestions or comments incorporated if they helped improve the draft.

#### ***Possible drafting of the ISPM by an individual expert***

- [38] The group discussed the Secretariat proposal to allow SC, in specific cases, to decide that a draft standard may be developed by an individual expert.
- [39] The FAO Legal Officer noted that experts for EWG must normally be proposed by NPPOs, RPPOs and governments (see 6.1 of the IPPC Standard setting procedure manual), hence the proposal for having an expert draft the standard would require a revision to the procedures.
- [40] The group did not agree with this proposal. Some members felt that it could be helpful in terms of accelerating the process and saving resources. But overall the group agreed that international standards, which may be used in WTO-SPS disputes, need a different approach to ensure that many

views are presented. They noted that this approach may be appropriate for manuals which do not carry the same legal implications.

### **Consultation periods (Stage 3, Steps 5 and 6)**

[41] In November 2014, the SC agreed that the second consultation period is useful for contracting parties to see how their comments from member consultation were incorporated, and submit any substantial concerns. It also helps to focus the SC November discussions. However, as to the types of comments submitted and the confusion regarding the purpose of the periods, some SC members noted that categorizing a comment as substantial was subjective; what may be substantial to one member may not be to another. Additionally, it was noted that a draft standard may have changed significantly between consultation periods, and that all types of comments would be useful to improve the draft. Lastly, several SC members stressed that it would not be advisable to set restrictions as to what and when the different types of comments can be submitted because it is the members' conventional right to comment. They highlighted that it is important to receive any good comments that will help improve the draft.

### **Length and dates for consultation periods**

[42] The group agreed that two consultation periods should be maintained.

[43] The group discussed the proposal to have both consultation periods last 90 days during the same period (1 July to 30 September). The Secretariat noted that this would allow issues regarding the comments to be discussed with the November SC on any substantive issue raised during the first consultation period. Currently, this is not possible as member consultation ends on 30 November, just a few weeks after the SC November meeting. It would also allow enough time for the revised draft standards approved for the second consultation period to be translated into French and Spanish (as this is currently done for the first consultation period). In the current SSP, the timeframe between the May SC-7 meeting and the start date of the SCCP (1 June) is too short and does not allow time for draft standards to be translated. Lastly, having the same start and end dates would be easier for everyone to remember and plan around.

[44] One member highlighted the regional issues related to the change of length of commenting periods where the proposed 90 days could limit the regional discussions. He also noted that if the consultation periods are at the same time, there may be several ISPMs that countries should analyze within a short period of time which will put pressure on the resources of the NPPOs and RPPOs.

[45] The Secretariat recalled that for several years the commenting period lasted 90 days, and only in 2012 had the period been prolonged. The Secretariat also noted feedback from other Secretariat teams, particularly Capacity Development who organize the IPPC regional workshops had been asked if there were practical implications for their areas of work. They had confirmed that it would be feasible to adapt to the proposed time periods.

[46] The group felt that it was helpful to have the consultation periods at the same time and for the same length of time. They felt that it would not require too much adaptation as this would conform to how consultation used to be before the introduction of the 2012 changes to the procedure.

[47] The group discussed if all draft ISPMs (i.e. also DPs, PTs and terms) should be submitted for two consultation periods or only one.

[48] The group agreed that DPs are only submitted to the first consultation period, unless otherwise decided by the SC. All other drafts (including PTs and terms) should be submitted to two consultation periods. A second consultation period was felt to be useful for draft PTs since several draft PTs have been received formal objections over the past years.

[49] The group found that for terms, only those that had received comments in the first commenting period should be submitted to the second round of consultation but that this would ultimately be the decision of the SC and text was not added in this regard. The group agreed that terms would be processed



together with the normal ISPMs, whereas PT and DPs would follow separate processes for specific steps.

- [50] **Name of commenting periods.** The group agreed that the previous names had introduced significant confusion and the members were in favor of a more simplistic approach. The group therefore suggested to name them “First consultation”, “Second consultation” etc.. This would clarify that the consultations were related to different stages of the process.
- [51] **Purpose and type of comments.** The group discussed what type of comments should be solicited during the different consultations. Through the current process, four categories of comments (substantive, technical, editorial and translation) are submitted during the member consultation on draft ISPMs (Step 5 of the SSP), whereas, during the second consultation (Step 6), comments should refer to substantial concerns. However, all categories of comments previously mentioned (substantive, technical, editorial and translation) are also allowed during the second consultation periods in order to ensure simple errors are corrected.
- [52] The group did not find that the first consultation period should focus on one type of comments; it could negatively impact drafts that were only submitted to one period.
- [53] The group also found that any comment should be allowed during the second consultation although it was considered that comments should refer only to text revisions or new text proposals (other observations could be added in the “general comments” field). In this context, the group considered why there are normally significantly fewer comments during the current substantial concerns commenting period (e.g. 200 versus 1500 during member consultation). The group did not believe this was only due to restrictions laid out by the procedure (to focus on substantial comments only), but because the draft would have addressed many concerns raised in the first consultation before being submitted to the second consultation.
- [54] Nevertheless, the group stressed the need for countries to try to identify all their concerns during the first consultation. It would impede the work of the SC, should important substantial, technical or conceptual comments be received only late in the process. The group agreed that there may be situations where the SC would find it helpful to suggest that comments focus on specific points, concepts or paragraphs only. For this reason, the group agreed that the Secretariat based on directions by the SC may provide guidance for the types of comments that would be solicited for the specific drafts or consultation period.
- [55] A member queried whether the SC members are able to agree on the scientific merits of the comments received during consultation periods; or whether there are divergent views already on the science. It was explained that the SC should and does decide on this, although countries in some situations may not agree with the SC recommendation because there may be different scientific views.
- [56] It was explained that the SC can and often does consult experts (e.g. technical panels, EWG experts) as needed.
- [57] Changes to step 5 and step 6 were introduced to reflect that any comments were allowed at both consultation periods.
- [58] **Steward’s responses.** One member queried if the steward’s response to comments could be made public for CPs to clearly understand how their comment had been addressed. The group did not agree with this proposal because the SC would have to endorse all individual comments which would not be feasible (especially for the drafts that receive more than 1000 comments). Some Stewards have already expressed their discomfort with having their responses public before the SC had reviewed them. The Secretariat recalled that according to the CPM-3 (2008) provision on the availability of documents, steward’s responses are recorded in the SC or SC-7 reports.
- [59] As to the availability of responses to comments for draft DPs and draft PTs where the comments are not reviewed by the SC or SC-7, but by the TPs, the TP’s responses to comments are endorsed by the SC (via electronic means) and posted publicly.



[60] In this context, it was recalled that draft PTs and draft DPs are publicly posted only after the SC has reviewed them in an e-forum decision. Consequently, the CPM-3 (2008) decision on the availability of standard setting documents would need to be changed (Appendix 5).

[61] To reflect the above suggestions, changes in Stage 3, step 5 and Step 6 are suggested in Appendix 4.

### **Editorial team**

[62] According CPM-7 (2012) decision 20 on improving the IPPC Standard setting process, an editorial team should be created to help improve the quality of draft ISPMs. However, this decision had not been implemented as it was felt that it might add complexity to the Standard setting process and slow it down. In November 2014, the SC agreed that the creation of an editorial team should not be considered as a priority.

[63] The Group agreed that it was not feasible to include an editorial team in the Standard setting process due to the limited time available between consultation periods and SC meetings.

### **Clarification of the process after the second consultation (Step 6)**

[64] In November 2014, the SC agreed that, due to time constraints, it is practically infeasible to seek SC regional input after the SCCP closes (as stated in Step 6 of the SSP and in CPM-7 (2012) decision 2 on improving the IPPC Standard setting process.). It was noted that the stewards already provide a summary of responses to comments which serves to highlight the most important issues raised in the comments. The SC agreed to remove reference to regional input after the SCCP.

[65] The group agreed that it was not feasible to include this step in the Standard setting process due to time constraints.

[66] Consequent changes to Step 6 are proposed in Appendix 4.

### **Formal objections before CPM (Stage 4, Step 7)**

[67] In the current procedure, when a draft ISPM had been previously included on the agenda of the CPM, received a formal objection and then returned to the SC for consideration, the SC could decide to forward the draft ISPM to the CPM again with no option for a formal objection and requesting the CPM to adopt the standard via a vote.

[68] The Group discussed whether the possibility of submitting formal objections should be eliminated from the procedure. Several members stressed that the CPM had clearly stated that it preferred not to vote on standards, and they pointed out that putting forward standards for adoption, while providing the opportunity to block, would inherently be contrary to the idea of consensus. Formal objections were also felt to contradict the Convention that states that a standard may be blocked via a vote where 1/3 of the CPM votes against. Currently, a formal objection is accepted from one CP which means that one CP alone may block the adoption. The current formal objection procedure was also felt to deprive the CPM of the possibility to consider and discuss the concerns.

[69] Comparisons were made to other standard setting organizations to understand if good practices could be identified that would be applicable to the IPPC. The group found that there were some principles (e.g. consensus based adoption) that the IPPC had in common with other standard setting organizations, but that there were no known procedures used by other organizations which the IPPC would benefit from.

[70] The group acknowledged that CPs should be provided the opportunity to object should they not be in agreement with the adoption of a standard. Likewise, other CPs should be allowed sufficient time to consider the objection, and finally the procedure should allow for discussions during the CPM meeting, providing for a possibility for the objection to be lifted before or during the CPM meeting. For this reason, the group agreed that a CP may submit an objection in advance to the CPM meeting but that efforts should be made to reach consensus before or at the CPM meeting. It was pointed out

that this procedure would not limit the right of CPs to object to the adoption of a standard during the CPM meeting.

- [71] The Group considered clarifying that it would be expected from CPs that every effort be made to reach agreement or solve the objection before or at the CPM meeting. The Secretariat explained that efforts are normally done on an *ad hoc* and informal basis before standards are processed for adoption. The group discussed whether this could be formalized as a step in the process. One member was suggesting that these consultations may subvert the regular Standard setting process, which has been designed to take account of all countries' views. Meetings between few CPs may provide opportunities for those countries to have a greater influence on the content of the draft standard.
- [72] The group could not find appropriate wording that would not somehow restrict the CPM in its possibilities. It was stressed, nevertheless, that it was felt appropriate for the objecting CP to have to clarify in plenary the technical justifications of their objection. For this reason, text was added to the procedure to clarify that any objection would be presented to the CPM as soon as they are received and the CPs, at the CPM meeting would decide on the way forward, and if possible, address the concerns. The group felt that it was critical that the CPM would provide more concrete guidance for the SC if the draft is returned to the SC.
- [73] The Group agreed that CPs should submit their objections to the IPPC Secretariat three weeks in advance (instead of two weeks) allowing more time to try to solve the objection and seek consensus, but also allowing CPs more time to understand and analyze the objection. This proposal was made to emphasize the group's strong conviction that discussion and consensus building efforts should be a key priority for the IPPC community.
- [74] The group considered using the term "concern" instead of "formal objection" but found that it could potentially trigger the submission of many types of comments, also not actual objections, which the CPM would not have the capacity to deal with, unless there would be evening sessions foreseen for these discussions. The group suggested using the term "objection" because "formal" was understood to be in relation to formalities (i.e. "formal objection" could mean that a procedure had not been followed correctly; whereas an objection must be technically justified). The group also felt that CPs know the meaning of "objections" whereas it could create confusion introducing a new term.
- [75] One member argued that it should be the CPM to decide on whether a concern was technically justified according to the *Criteria to help determine whether a formal objection is technically justified*<sup>6</sup>. He did not feel it was feasible that this was the mandate of the SC. Other members felt that the SC would be the only body with the scientific knowledge to determine whether an objection was technically justified, and that it would be assumed that the SC would only recommend draft standards for adoption when the committee was sure that the draft was scientifically and technically correct. However, the group preferred that the SSP was not explicit in this regard.
- [76] As to repeated formal objections on the same standard, the group did not find that there should be a special procedure in this regard; the CPM would decide in any case.
- [77] In this context, the group discussed whether adding another step to the SSP providing for another round of consultation on draft standards which had been submitted for adoption, received an objection and modified by the SC. Some members felt that this would ensure that CPs feel more included in the process and were better aware of how their objections were addressed. The group found that the SC would always be in a position to send drafts for additional consultations if deemed necessary, and did not wish to add this as another step.
- [78] One member queried what happens if a CP objects to a DP adopted by the SC on behalf of the CPM during a CPM session. The FAO Legal Officer explained that the CP would not be able to revert the adoption by the SC (on behalf of the CPM). The objection on DPs would need to be submitted during notification period (Stage 4, Step 7).

---

<sup>6</sup> The Criteria was approved by CPM-8 (2013)

- [79] The group felt it was appropriate to delete mention of voting on standards from the SSP.
- [80] The text of Stage 4, Step 7 was modified to reflect the decisions above.

### Consensus within the SC

- [81] The issue of consensus within the SC was discussed in the November 2013 and November 2014 SC meetings. In particular, it was mentioned that an ISPM which had been previously presented for adoption but had been formally objected to, could be blocked if the the SC could not get consensus to forward the draft to CPM for a vote. In November 2013, the SC indicated that although it would not be appropriate for the SC to block the potential adoption of a standard, the SC should continue to work by consensus. The Group fully supported that the SC should continue to work by consensus.
- [82] The FAO Legal Officer highlighted the CPM rule of IPPC Art XII that all efforts should be made for reaching consensus; also SC rules of procedures provide for standards to be agreed on by consensus. She pointed out that CODEX Alimentarius also prefer to adopt standards via consensus and that CODEX has developed instruments for facilitating consensus. Methods include informal meetings, redefining the scope of the subject matter; and cutting out issues that influence the possibility to reach consensus. She noted that the CPM may decide to develop something similar.
- [83] One member queried whether the CPM delegation to the SC for the adoption of DPs also implied the application of the CPM decision making rules, including voting rules, to the adoption of DPs by the SC. The FAO Legal Officer informed the group that the CPM voting rules would not be applicable to the SC because the SC has its own decision making rule for approval of standards. Should the SC not reach consensus on a DP, the latter would not be adopted.
- [84] The group felt it was necessary to ensure that cases where the SC may not reach consensus the issue would be escalated to the CPM for their consideration. The group discussed whether this would only apply to draft ISPMs, but agreed to leave the possibility open for the SC to escalate any issue of major importance to the development of standards, even if unlikely that it would happen.
- [85] The group agreed that the opinions that may diverge from the majority opinion be recorded in the SC and CPM reports, outlining the technical reasons for the minority opinion.
- [86] For this reason, the group proposed, based on the CPM Bureau rules of procedure, the following modifications to Rule 6 of the Rules of Procedure of the SC:

Rules of Procedure for the SC

Rule 6. Approval

Approvals relating to specifications or draft standards are sought by consensus. Final drafts of ISPMs which have been approved by the SC are submitted to the CPM without undue delay.

Situations where consensus is required but cannot be reached shall be described in the meeting reports detailing all positions maintained and presented to the CPM for discussion and appropriate action.

### Fast process for minor technical updates to adopted ISPMs

- [87] In Step 7, a process had been set up for technical revisions of adopted DPs. The Secretariat proposed that a similar “fast process” for minor technical updates to adopted ISPMs be included. Minor technical updates would consist for instance of corrections of technical errors or inaccuracies and updates to reflect new scientific information. When the SC (directly or after proposal by a TP) identify the need for a minor technical update to an adopted ISPM, the SC could present the update to the CPM for adoption. When NPPOs or RPPOs would identify the need for a minor technical update to an adopted ISPM, they would be invited to liaise with the SC members from their region and ask them to present their proposal to the SC for consideration.

[88] The group agreed that the SC should be able to technically update standards when errors were identified and suggested the SC to decide on criteria for deciding what should be a minor technical update.

### Practical issues

[89] The group discussed potential practical issues related to the proposed changes. They found that most issues had been addressed in the discussions and that the proposed changes would streamline the procedure and increase the possibility of dialogue and consensus building.

[90] One member mentioned the issue of “predictability” as something that needs to be considered. He felt that CPs may not always know well in advance when they will need to provide input into the Standard setting process. The Secretariat noted that with the proposed changes for having both consultation periods at the same time, this should help the situation. It was acknowledged that the development of DPs may create confusion in terms of knowing when drafts are coming out for commenting. However, the Group noted that this is only temporary (because there is a very high number of DPs being developed and submitted for member consultation for the next few years) and will resolve itself once the many DPs have been adopted.

## 6. Revision of the IPPC Standard Setting Procedure

### 6.1 Development of SC background paper

[91] The group agreed that the Secretariat should use this report to develop the SC background paper.

### 6.2 Proposed revision of the IPPC Standard setting procedure

[92] The proposed revisions to the SSP as agreed in this meeting are presented in Appendix 4 and present also the minor changes to steps 5, 6 and 7 in relation to phytosanitary treatments (PTs) and diagnostic protocols (DPs) as agreed by the SC November 2014 (task 10).

[93] The group noted that the revised SSP would be appended without track changes but that the SC would be presented with a version where the changes will be evidenced.

### 6.2 SC Recommendations

[94] The group invited the SC to:

- (1) *consider* the issues mentioned in the report as justification for the proposals for revision to the IPPC Standard setting procedure.
- (2) *review* Appendix 4 to this document, *agree* that proposed changes be incorporated in the IPPC Standard setting procedure and *recommend* them to the CPM for adoption.
- (3) *invite* the CPM to agree that the SC regional input after the second consultation (as currently described in CPM-7 (2012) decision 2 on improving the IPPC Standard setting process) and the creation of an editorial team not feasible (decision 20) and should not be implemented.
- (4) *invite* the CPM to adopt the revised table for “Provisions for the availability of standard setting documents” as presented in Appendix 5.
- (5) *consider* any other issues needing CPM decisions as a result of the proposed revision of the IPPC Standard setting procedure.
- (6) *establish* criteria to help determine what a minor technical update on adopted ISPMs is (Stage 4, Step 7) for recommendation for adoption by CPM.
- (7) *agree* to the proposed changes of rule 6 of the SC rules of procedure and recommend the proposed change to CPM for adoption (see *Consensus within the SC*
- (8) When the CPM has adopted the revision to the SSP, *ask* the Secretariat to review all IPPC related procedures and make consequential changes according to the revisions to the SSP.

## **7. Next Steps**

- [95] The Secretariat explained that the outcomes from this meeting would be submitted to the SC for their consideration. The proposed changes to the SSP would be recommended to CPM-11 (2016).

## **8. Close of the Meeting**

- [96] The Group acknowledged that the group was appropriately composed for the review of the SSP, but that having the meeting during the SC-7 week had not the right forum. It was also noted that SC-7 had not had sufficient time to complete the review of ISPMs.
- [97] The Chairperson thanked the participants for their valuable input and good discussions, and closed the meeting.

**APPENDIX 01 – Agenda**

**13-15 May 2015**  
**Canada Room A356/7, FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy**  
*13 May start time: 09:30 hrs*  
*Daily Schedule: 09:00-12:00 and 13:00-17:00*

<b>GENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>
<b>1. Opening of the meeting</b>		
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	-	LARSON
1.2 Election of the Chairperson	-	LARSON
1.3 Election of the Rapporteur	-	CHAIRPERSON
1.4 Adoption of the Agenda	01_SSPRevision_2015_May	CHAIRPERSON
<b>2. Administrative Matters</b>		
2.1 Documents List	02_SSPRevision_2015_May	MOREIRA
2.2 Participants List	03_SSPRevision_2015_May	MOREIRA
2.3 Local Information (refer to the 2015 May SC Local Information document)	<a href="#">IPP link to local information</a>	MOREIRA
<b>3. Updates from the Standards Committee Meeting</b>		CHAIRPERSON
<b>4. Background</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Background on the revision of the Standard Setting procedure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPM-7 (2012)</li> <li>• 2014 SC May</li> <li>• 2014 SC November</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	10_SSPRevision_2015_May	LARSON
<b>5. Analysis of the implementation of the CPM-7 (2012) IPPC Standard Setting Procedure</b>		
5.1 Review of the tasks for the SC-7 in reviewing the IPPC standard setting procedure	04_SSPRevision_2015_May	LARSON / CHARD
5.2 Discussion of the IPPC standard setting procedure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion paper from IPPC Secretariat</li> <li>• Discussion paper from Australia</li> <li>• Discussion paper from Canada</li> <li>• Discussion paper from USA</li> <li>• Discussion paper from Japan</li> </ul>	07_SSPRevision_2015_May 05_SSPRevision_2015_May 09_SSPRevision_2015_May 06_SSPRevision_2015_May 08_SSPRevision_2015_May	
<b>6. Revision of the IPPC standard setting procedure</b>		
6.1 Development of SC background paper 6.2 Proposed revision of the IPPC Standard Setting procedure	-	CHARD
<b>7. Next steps</b>		CHAIRPERSON
<b>8. Close of the meeting</b>		CHAIRPERSON



**APPENDIX 02 – Documents list***(Updated: 2015-04-17)*

DOCUMENT NUMBER	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED
01_SSPRevision_2015_May	1.4	Agenda	2015-04-16
02_SSPRevision_2015_May	2.1	Documents List	2015-04-16
03_SSPRevision_2015_May	2.2	Participants List	2015-04-17
04_SSPRevision_2015_May	5.1	Review of the tasks for the SC-7 in reviewing the IPPC standard setting procedure	2015-03-03
05_SSPRevision_2015_May	5.2	Discussion of the IPPC standard setting procedure - Australia	2015-04-07
06_SSPRevision_2015_May	5.2	Discussion of the IPPC standard setting procedure - USA	2015-04-07
07_Rev01_SSPRevision_2015_May	5.2	Discussion of the IPPC standard setting procedure – The IPPC Secretariat Standard Setting Team (with various SC members inputs and FAO Legal Services review)	2015-04-15
08_SSPRevision_2015_May	5.2	Discussion of the IPPC standard setting procedure - Japan	2015-04-07
09_SSPRevision_2015_May	5.2	Discussion of the IPPC standard setting procedure - Canada	2015-04-07
10_SSPRevision_2015_May	4.0	Background on the revision of the Standard Setting procedure	2015-04-16

## APPENDIX 03 – Participants list

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates confirmed attendance at the meeting.

Members not attending have been taken off the list.

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed <sup>7</sup>	Term expires
✓	Africa Member SC-7	<b>Ms Ruth WOODE</b> Deputy Director of Agriculture Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate Ministry of Food and Agriculture P.O.Box M37 Accra <b>GHANA</b> Tel: (+233) 244507687	<a href="mailto:wooderuth@yahoo.com">wooderuth@yahoo.com</a>	CPM-8 (2013) 1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years  (2)	2016
	Asia Member SC-7	<b>Mr D.D.K. SHARMA</b> Additional, Plant Protection Advisor (Plant Quarantine) Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine & Storage - Department of Agriculture & Cooperation Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India, N. H. – IV, Faridabad (Haryana), 121001 <b>INDIA</b> Tel: + 91 129 2418506 (Office) Mobile: + 91 8901326967 Fax: + 91 129 2412125	<a href="mailto:ddk.sharma@nic.in">ddk.sharma@nic.in</a>	CPM-8 (2013) 1st term/3 years  (1)	2016
✓	Europe Member SC-7	<b>Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK</b> Wojewodzki Inspektorat Ochrony Roslin I Nasiennictwa w Lublinie ul. Diamentowa 6 20-447 Lublin <b>POLAND</b> Tel: (+48) 81 7440326 Fax: (+48) 81 7447363	<a href="mailto:p.wlodarczyk@piorin.gov.pl">p.wlodarczyk@piorin.gov.pl</a>	CPM-7(2012) 1st term/3 years  (0)	2015

<sup>7</sup> Bracketed number indicates the Criteria used for prioritizing participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat when Statement of Commitment was signed (0) no funding, (1) airfare only, (2) full funding (<https://www.ippc.int/publications/criteria-used-prioritizing-participants-receive-travel-assistance-attend-meetings>)

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed <sup>7</sup>	Term expires
✓	Latin America & Caribbean Member  SC-7	<b>Mr Alexandre MOREIRA PALMA</b> Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supply Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D Anexo B, Sala 326 Brasilia DF 70043900 <b>BRAZIL</b> Tel: (+55) 61 3218 2850	<a href="mailto:alexandre.palma@agricultura.gov.br">alexandre.palma@agricultura.gov.br</a> ;	CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years	2015
	Near East Member  SC-7	<b>Mr Gamil Anwar Mohammed RAMADHAN</b> Head of Plant Quarantine Department (Director) General Department of Plant Protection Department Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation Sana'a <b>REPUBLIC OF YEMEN</b> Tel: 0096701563328 (Office) 00967733802618 (Mobile) 00967770712209 (Mobile)	<a href="mailto:dr.gamel_ramadan@yahoo.com">dr.gamel_ramadan@yahoo.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:Anvar.gamel@mail.ru">Anvar.gamel@mail.ru</a> ;	CPM-8(2013) 1st term/3 years  (2)	2016
✓	North America Member  SC-7	<b>Ms Marie-Claude FOREST</b> National Manager and International Standards Advisor Plant Protection Division International Phytosanitary Standards Section Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 <b>CANADA</b> Tel: (+1) 613-773-7235 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7204	<a href="mailto:marie-claude.forest@inspection.gc.ca">marie-claude.forest@inspection.gc.ca</a> ;	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) CPM-9 (2014) 3rd term/3 years (0)	2017
✓	Pacific Member  SC-7	<b>Mr Jan Bart ROSSEL</b> Director International Plant Health Program Office of the Chief Plant Protection Officer Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry <b>AUSTRALIA</b> Tel: (+61) 2 6272 5056 / 0408625413 Fax: (+61) 2 6272 5835	<a href="mailto:Bart.Rossel@agriculture.gov.au">Bart.Rossel@agriculture.gov.au</a> ;	CPM-6 (2011) CPM-9 (2014) 2nd term / 3 years	2017

*Others*

	Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	SC Chairperson	<b>Ms Jane CHARD</b> SASA, Scottish Government Roddinglaw Road Edinburgh EH12 9FJ <b>UNITED KINGDOM</b> Tel: (+44) 131 2448863 Fax: (+44) 131 2448940	<a href="mailto:jane.chard@sasa.gsi.gov.uk">jane.chard@sasa.gsi.gov.uk</a> ;
✓	CPM Bureau Member	<b>Mr John GREIFER</b> Assistant Deputy Administrator Plant Protection and Quarantine Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Department of Agriculture 1400 Independence Ave., South Building Washington DC 20250 <b>USA</b> Tel: (+1) 202 799 7159	<a href="mailto:john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov">john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov</a> ;
✓	External Professional	<b>Andrew SCHUSTER</b> Flat 21 Building 46, Marlborough Road, SE18 6TA London <b>UNITED KINGDOM</b> Tel: (+44) 772 91 5 1296	<a href="mailto:andrew.schuster@icloud.com">andrew.schuster@icloud.com</a> ;
✓	FAO Legal Services	<b>Ms Marta PARDO</b> FAO Legal Officer Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome <b>ITALY</b> Tel: + 39 06 570 53022	<a href="mailto:Marta.Pardo@fao.org">Marta.Pardo@fao.org</a>
✓	FAO Legal Services	<b>Ms Adriana BONOMO</b> FAO Legal Officer Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome <b>ITALY</b> Tel: + 39 06 570 56876	Adriana.Bonomo@fao.org
✓	Near East Member (SC member and SC-7 representative for this meeting)	<b>Mr Kamaleldin Abdelmahmoud Amein BAKR</b> Quarantine Director  Plant Quarantine Department Direction Khartoum North, Industrial Area P.O.BOX 14 <b>SUDAN</b> Phone: +249 913207800 Fax: +249 185 337462	<a href="mailto:kamalbakr91@yahoo.com">kamalbakr91@yahoo.com</a> ;

✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Brent LARSON</b> Standard Setting Officer International Plant Protection Convention Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome <b>ITALY</b> Tel: + 39 06 570 55809	<a href="mailto:Brent.Larson@fao.org">Brent.Larson@fao.org</a>
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Adriana MOREIRA</b> Standard Setting Programme Specialist International Plant Protection Convention Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome <b>ITALY</b> Tel: + 39 06 570 55 809	<a href="mailto:Adriana.Moreira@fao.org">Adriana.Moreira@fao.org</a>
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Eva MOLLER</b> Standard Setting International Plant Protection Convention Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome <b>ITALY</b> Tel: + 39 06 570 52855	<a href="mailto:Eva.Moller@fao.org">Eva.Moller@fao.org</a>
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms C�line GERMAIN</b> Standard Setting Consultant (in-kind contribution from France) International Plant Protection Convention Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome <b>ITALY</b> Tel: + 39 06 570 54468	<a href="mailto:Celine.Germain@fao.org">Celine.Germain@fao.org</a>

## APPENDIX 4 – Proposed changes to the IPPC Standard setting procedure adopted by CPM-7 (2012)

### INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION STANDARD SETTING PROCEDURE (ANNEX 4.3 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

(Prepared by the SC-7 plus group, May 2015. Proposed changes are shown with track changes)

The process for the development of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) is divided into four stages:

- ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ Stage 1: Developing the [List of topics for IPPC standards](#)  
~~\_\_\_\_\_International~~  
~~\_\_\_\_\_Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) standard setting work programme~~
- Stage 2: Drafting
- Stage 3: ~~Member~~Cconsultation for draft ISPMs
- Stage 4: Adoption and publication.

Relevant Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM) / Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) decisions on many aspects of the standard setting process have been compiled in the IPPC Procedure Manual which is available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP, [www.ippc.int](http://www.ippc.int)).

#### STAGE 1: Developing the List of topics for IPPC standards

##### Step 1: Call for topics

The IPPC Secretariat makes a call for topics<sup>8</sup> every two years. ~~IPPC members~~Contracting parties (CPs)~~IPPC members~~<sup>9</sup> and Technical Panels (TPs) submit detailed proposals for new topics or for the revision of existing ISPMs to the IPPC Secretariat. Submissions should be accompanied with a draft specification (except for Diagnostic Protocols (DPs) and Glossary terms), a literature review and justification that the proposed topic meets the CPM-approved criteria for topics (available in the IPPC Procedure Manual). To indicate a ~~broader~~global need for the proposed topic, submitters are encouraged to gain support from ~~other IPPC members~~CPs in other ~~and/or~~regions.

[A separate call for submissions for Phytosanitary treatments \(PTs\) is made.](#)

The IPPC Secretariat compiles a list of the proposed topics from the submissions received. Submissions from previous years are not included, but ~~IPPC members~~they may ~~be~~re-submitted~~these~~, as appropriate.

The Standards Committee (SC), taking into account the IPPC Strategic Framework and the *Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics*, reviews the existing *List of topics for IPPC standards* and the compiled list of proposed topics. The SC recommends a revised *List of topics for IPPC standards* (including subjects), adding topics from the compiled list, deleting or modifying topics in the existing *List of topics for IPPC standards* as appropriate, giving each topic a recommended priority.

<sup>8</sup> ~~Calls for topics~~This is a call for~~include~~ "technical area", "topic", ~~and~~ "Diagnostic Protocol (DP)~~subject~~" and [Glossary term](#), see the *Hierarchy of terms for standards* in the IPPC [Standard Setting](#) Procedure Manual.

<sup>9</sup> ~~In annex 1 of the rules of procedure of the CPM, IPPC members are defined as: Contracting parties, National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs), Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) and relevant international organizations.~~



## Step 2: Adjustment and adoption of the List of topics for IPPC standards

The SC can recommend any adjustment to the List of topics for IPPC standards as needed.

The CPM reviews the *List of topics for IPPC standards* recommended by the SC. The CPM adjusts and adopts the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, including assigning a priority for each topic. A revised *List of topics for IPPC standards* is made available.

In any year, when a situation arises in which an ISPM or a revision to an ISPM is required urgently, the CPM may insert such a topic into the List of topics for IPPC standards.

### Stage 2: Drafting

#### Step 3: Development of a specification

The SC should be encouraged to assign a lead steward and one or ~~two~~ more assistants for each topic. These assistants could be from outside the SC, such as potential SC replacement members, former SC members, TP members or expert working group members.

The SC reviews the draft specification. The SC should endeavour to approve draft specifications for ~~member~~ consultation at the SC meeting following the CPM meeting when new topics have been added to the List of topics for IPPC standards.

Once the SC approves the draft specification for ~~member~~ consultation, the IPPC Secretariat makes it publicly available. The IPPC Secretariat solicits comments through the IPPC Online Comment System (OCS) from ~~and notifies~~ CPs, national plant protection services of non-CPs, RPPOs, relevant international organizations, and other entities as decided by the SC ~~IPPC members~~. The length of the ~~member~~ consultation for draft specifications is 60 days. The IPPC contact point or information point submits comments to the IPPC Secretariat using the OCS.

The IPPC Secretariat compiles the comments received, makes them publicly available and submits them to the ~~steward(s)~~ steward and SC for consideration. The specification is revised and approved by the SC and made publicly available.

#### Step 4: Preparation of a draft ISPM<sup>10</sup>

An expert drafting group (EDG) (i.e. ~~expert~~ working group (EWG) or TP) drafts or revises the draft ISPM in accordance with the relevant specification. The SC may request the IPPC Secretariat to solicit comments from scientists around the world to ensure the scientific quality of draft DPs. The resulting draft ISPM is recommended to the SC.

The SC or the SC working group established by the SC (SC-7) reviews the draft ISPM at a meeting (for a Diagnostic Protocol (DP) or Phytosanitary Treatment (PT), the SC reviews it electronically) and decides whether to approve it for ~~member~~ consultation, to return it to the steward(~~s~~) or an EDG or to put it on hold. When the SC-7 meets, comments from any SC members should be taken into account.

---

<sup>10</sup> This procedure refers to "draft ISPMs" and "standards" to simplify wording, but also applies to any part of an ISPM, including annexes, appendices or supplements.

### STAGE 3: ~~Member~~ Consultation and review ~~for draft ISPMs~~

Draft ISPMs are submitted to two consultation periods except for draft DPs which are submitted to one consultation period unless decided otherwise by the SC.

#### Step 5: ~~Member~~ First consultation ~~for draft ISPMs~~

Once the SC approves the draft ISPM for ~~member~~ the first consultation, the IPPC Secretariat makes it publicly available. The IPPC Secretariat solicits comments through the IPPC Online Comment System (OCS) from and notifies CPs, national plant protection services of non-CPs, RPPOs, relevant international organizations, and other entities as decided by the SC ~~IPPC members~~. The length of ~~member~~ the first consultation for draft ISPMs is ~~150-90~~ 90 days. The IPPC contact point or information point submits comments to the IPPC Secretariat using the OCS.

The IPPC Secretariat compiles the comments received, makes them publicly available and submits them to the ~~steward(s)~~ steward for consideration.

The ~~steward(s)~~ steward reviews the comments, prepares responses to the comments, revises the draft ISPM and submits them to the IPPC Secretariat. These are made available to the SC. Taking the comments into account, the SC-7 or TP (for draft DPs or draft PTs) revises the draft ISPM and recommends it to the SC.

For draft ISPMs other than draft DPs and draft PTs, responses to the major issues raised in the comments are recorded in the report of the SC-7 meeting. Once the SC-7 recommends the draft ISPM to the SC, the IPPC Secretariat makes it publicly available.

For draft PTs or draft DPs, once the SC has approved them and the responses to comments, the drafts and responses to comments are made publicly available. A summary of the major issues discussed by the SC for the draft DP or draft PT is recorded in the report of the following SC meeting.

Alternatively to approving the draft ISPM, the SC may for example return it to the steward or an EDG, submit it for another round of consultation or put it on hold.

#### Step 6: Second consultation

#### ~~Step 6: Review of the draft ISPM prior to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures meeting~~

~~Taking the comments into account, the SC-7 or TP (for DPs or PTs) revises the draft ISPM and recommends the draft ISPM to the SC. Once the SC-7 or TP recommends the draft ISPM to the SC, the Secretariat makes it available. Once the SC approves the draft ISPM for the second consultation, the IPPC Secretariat solicits comments through the IPPC Online Comment System (OCS) from CPs, national plant protection services of non-CPs, RPPOs, relevant international organizations, and other entities as decided by the SC to IPPC members for the substantial concerns commenting period and notifies IPPC members. The length of the second consultation substantial concerns commenting period for draft ISPMs is 120-90 days, and should focus their comments on substantial concerns. The IPPC contact point or information point submits the comments to the IPPC Secretariat using the OCS. The IPPC Secretariat compiles the comments received, makes them publicly available and submits them to the steward for consideration. The SC members should review comments submitted from their region and identify the comments deemed to be most important to the steward(s), accompanied by suggestions on how to address them.~~

The steward ~~(s)~~ reviews the comments, prepares responses to the comments, revises the draft ISPM and submits ~~them~~ the revised draft ISPM to the IPPC Secretariat. These ~~are~~ made available to the SC and the revised draft ISPM, other than draft PTs, -is made available to ~~IPPC members~~ CPs and RPPOs.

The SC reviews the comments, the steward's responses to the comments and the revised draft ISPM.

~~For draft ISPMs other than draft PTs, The SC reviews the comments, the steward(s)' responses to the comments and the revised draft ISPM. The SC provides a summary of the major issues discussed by the SC for the draft ISPM. These summaries are recorded in the report of the SC meeting. The SC decides whether to recommend the draft ISPM to the CPM, or to put it on hold, return it to the steward(s) or an EDG or submit it for another round of member consultation.~~

~~For draft PTs, once the SC has approved them and the responses to comments, the drafts and responses to comments are made publicly available. A summary of the major issues discussed by the SC for the draft PT is recorded in the report of the following SC meeting.~~

~~Alternatively to recommending the draft ISPM to the CPM, the SC may for example return it to the steward or an EDG, submit it for another round of consultation, or put it on hold.~~

~~for the notification period~~

~~The Secretariat should make the draft ISPM available in the languages of the organization as soon as possible and at least six weeks prior to the opening of the CPM meeting.~~

## **STAGE 4: Adoption and publication**

### **Step 7: Adoption**

- For draft ISPMs other than draft DPs:

Following ~~recommendation~~<sup>approval</sup> by the SC, the draft ISPM is included on the agenda of the CPM meeting. The IPPC Secretariat should make the draft ISPM presented to the CPM for adoption available in the languages of the Organization as soon as possible and at least six weeks prior to the opening of the CPM meeting.

If all CPs support the adoption of the draft ISPM, the CPM should adopt the ISPM without discussion.

~~All draft ISPMs presented to the CPM are subject to a formal objection<sup>11</sup>. If a contracting party (CP) has a formal objection does not support the adoption of the draft ISPM, the CP may submit an objection<sup>12</sup>. An objection must be accompanied the formal objection along with by the technical justification and suggestions for improvement of the draft ISPM and submitted to the IPPC Secretariat no later than 14 days<sup>3 weeks</sup> prior to the CPM meeting. CPs should make every effort to reach agreement before CPM. The objection will be added to the CPM agenda and the CPM will decide on a way forward, and the draft ISPM should be returned to the SC. If no formal objection is received, the CPM should adopt the ISPM without discussion. In exceptional circumstances, not including DPs and PTs, there should be an opportunity for the CPM Chair, in consultation with the SC Chair and the Secretariat, to propose a discussion of the formal objection at the CPM meeting with the aim that the formal objection can be lifted and the ISPM be adopted.~~

~~If the draft ISPM had been previously included on the agenda of the CPM and was subjected to a formal objection, the SC may decide to forward the draft ISPM to the CPM for a vote with no option for a formal objection.~~

<sup>11</sup> ~~A formal objection should be a technically supported objection to the adoption of the draft standard in its current form, sent through the official IPPC contact point. The IPPC Secretariat would not make any judgement about the validity of the objection—an objection with some technical discussion of the issue would be accepted as a formal objection.~~

<sup>12</sup> An objection should be a technically supported objection to the adoption of the draft standard in its current form, sent through the official IPPC contact point (Refer to the *Criteria to help determine whether a formal objection is technically justified* as approved by CPM-8 (2013), recorded in the IPPC Standard Setting Procedure Manual).

When the need for a minor technical update to an adopted ISPM is identified by a TP or the SC, the SC can recommend the update for adoption by the CPM. The IPPC Secretariat should make the update to the adopted ISPM available in the languages of the organization as soon as possible and at least six weeks prior to the opening of the CPM meeting. Minor technical updates to adopted ISPMs presented to the CPM are subject to the objection process as described above.

- For draft DPs:

~~For DPs, T~~ the CPM has delegated its authority to the SC to adopt DPs on its behalf. Once the SC approves the DP, the IPPC Secretariat makes it available on defined dates twice a year and CPs are notified<sup>13</sup>. ~~The notification period for approved DPs is twice a year on defined dates.~~ CPs have 45 days to review the approved DP and submit a ~~formal objection~~ objection, if any, along with the technical justification and suggestions for improvement of the approved DP. If no ~~objection~~ formal objection is received, the ~~SC, on behalf of the CPM, adopts the~~ DP is adopted. DPs adopted through this process are noted by the CPM and attached to the report of the CPM meeting. If a CP has a objection, the draft DP should be returned to the SC.

When a technical revision<sup>14</sup> is required for an adopted DP, the SC can adopt the updates to adopted DPs via electronic means. The revised DPs shall be made publicly available as soon as the SC adopts them. DPs revised through this process are noted by the CPM and attached to the report of the CPM meeting.

### Step 8: Publication

The adopted ISPM is made publicly available ~~and noted in the report of the CPM meeting.~~

~~IPPC members~~ CPs -and RPPOs may form a Language Review Group (LRG) and, following the CPM-agreed LRG process<sup>15</sup>, may propose modifications to translations of adopted ISPMs to be noted at the following CPM meeting.

<sup>13</sup> For translation of DPs, ~~members~~ contracting parties would follow the mechanism for requesting the translation for DPs into FAO languages posted on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/member-consultation-draft-ispms/mechanism-translate-diagnostic-protocols-languages/https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110995>).

<sup>14</sup> A technical revision for DPs has been defined by the SC and is recorded in the IPPC Standard Setting Procedure Manual.

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/standards-setting/ispms/language-review-groups/https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110770>

## APPENDIX 05 – Provisions for the availability of standard setting documents

Adopted by CPM-3 (2008), revised by CPM-4 (2009), revision proposed by the SC-7 Plus group, May 2015 for SC consideration and possible recommendation to the CPM for adoption. (*Changes are shown in track changes.*)

**Table 1.** Provisions for the availability of standard setting documents

	Type of document	Level of access <sup>16</sup>	Notes
<b>Expert drafting groups (EWGs, TPs)</b>	Working documents	relevant expert drafting group	As currently
	reports	not restricted (public)	Once approved by the expert drafting group
<b>Standards Committee: input</b>	agenda and list of participants	contracting parties, RPPOs and SC	
	list of SC documents	contracting parties, RPPOs and SC	Indicating who has access to each document
	draft ISPMs and draft specifications presented to the SC	contracting parties, RPPOs and SC	Duly marked as a draft and numbered as an identifiable version.
	<a href="#">Draft PTs and DPs presented to the SC</a>		<a href="#">Posted for the SC in e-decision forum; discussions reported in the following SC report</a>
	compiled member comments on draft specifications	contracting parties, RPPOs and SC	
	compiled member comments on draft ISPMs	not restricted (public)	
	compiled substantial comments on draft ISPMs <sup>17</sup>	not restricted (public)	
	detailed stewards' reactions to member comments	The SC only	
a summary of major issues discussed is produced (for both draft ISPMs and draft specifications) <sup>18</sup>	not restricted (public), as part of the SC report		

<sup>16</sup> "Contracting parties" means that the contact points and IPP editors of contracting parties will have access to the relevant work area and documents on the IPP. Bureau members currently have access to all restricted work areas on the IPP; the Bureau is therefore not mentioned here.

<sup>17</sup> With the CPM-7 adopted changes to the standard setting procedure and the new substantial concerns commenting period, documents related to this step is included in the table, although not part of the original provisions.

<sup>18</sup> CPM-4 (2009) report, paragraph 126. 6.

	Type of document	Level of access <sup>16</sup>	Notes
	other SC documents	Contracting parties, RPPOs and SC, or the SC only	This will be determined on a case by case basis. The SC will consider at its next meeting how this case-by-case decision will be made.
<b>Standards Committee: output</b>	all documents approved by the SC during its meetings	not restricted (public), as annexes to the SC report	Documents approved to be processed further are included as annexes to the SC report, and will therefore be available without restriction.
	SC report	Not restricted (public)	As currently
<b>Others</b>	Compiled list of detailed proposals for topics for inclusion in the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i>	Not restricted (public)	
	Any document whose access is restricted according to the above	Group concerned	In this case, an SC member or a contracting party could request access to the document. This document would be made available with the prior agreement of the SC and, if applicable, of the person or group preparing the document.