



REPORT

IC IRSS SUB-GROUP VIRTUAL MEETING

13 September 2018

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, 2017

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.

All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request or addressed to copyright@fao.org.

FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org.

2018-06-07: Report, Appendix 9, was slightly modified regarding NRO reporting.

Contents

I. T	THE 1st virtual MEETING OF THE IMPLEMENTATION AND CAPACITY COMMITTEE (IC) Sub-Group on Implementation and Review Support Syst	, , , _ , _ , _ , _ , _ , _ ,
1.	Opening of the Meeting	4
2.	Meeting Arrangements	4
	2.1 Election of the Rapporteur	4
	2.2 Adoption of the Agenda	4
3.	Administrative Matters	4
	3.1 Documents lists	4
	3.2 Participants lists	4
4.	Discussion on the IRSS Report	4
5. F	Proposals for the IRSS third cycle	5
6. <i>A</i>	Any Other Business	5
7. N	Next Meeting and discussions	5
AP	PPENDIX 1: Agenda	6
AP	PPENDIX 2: Documents list	7
AP	PPENDIX 3: Participants list	8
AP	PPENDIX 4: Revised Conclusions and Recommendations of the Triennial Review Report (2014-2017)	
AP.	PPENDIX 5: The IRSS third circle topics preliminary agreed by the IRSS Sub- prioritization	• •

I. THE 1ST VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE IMPLEMENTATION AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (IC) SUB-GROUP ON IMPLEMENTATION AND REVIEW SUPPORT SYSTEM (IRSS)

1. Opening of the Meeting

[1] The meeting was opened by the Secretariat. Dominique PELLETIER, the Lead of the Sub-group, provided short overview of the Agenda of the meeting.

2. Meeting Arrangements

2.1 Election of the Rapporteur

[2] Dilli Ram SHARMA, IC member, was elected the rapporteur of the meeting.

2.2 Adoption of the Agenda

[3] The agenda was adopted without amendments (APPENDIX 1).

3. Administrative Matters

3.1 Documents lists

[4] The list of documents is in APPENDIX 2 of the report.

3.2 Participants lists

[5] The list of participants is in APPENDIX 3 of the report. Three members of the Sub-group (Francisco GUTIERREZ, Samuel BISHOP and Juliet GOLDSMITH) were not able to attend the meeting due to other commitments and technical reasons. Dilli Ram SHARMA has attended the meeting partially.

4. Discussion on the IRSS Report

- The Sub-group Lead highlighted that the IRSS Triennial Implementation Review Report (2014-2017) provides valuable information, however future triennial reports should be clearer, exclude redundant parts and use more accessible language for general public to reach wider audience. It was mentioned that comments provided by the IC had not yet been incorporated in the Report.
- The IFU Lead noted that the target audience of the Report should be the IPPC community. The report is quite long and repetitive, instead of being focused so that IRSS work is more understandable to all contracting parties (CPs). Sections of the report such as Introduction, IPPS Strategic Framework, Implementation and Capacity Development Committee, Implementation of Core Phytosanitary Activities seem to be irrelevant for reporting purposes. National Reporting Obligations and other IPPC Secretariat activities should be a part of the Secretariat reports.
- It was underscored that recommendations and conclusions need revision to be focused on outcomes and outputs. Future IRSS surveys should be simple and manageable to secure the wide participation of contracting parties (CPs). The need to change approach to the IRSS and to consider it as one of the IPPC tolls irrespectively how activities are funded was raised.
- [9] The Sub-group thought that as resources are limited for revising the whole repot to keep the Report as it was presented by the IRSS staff except Conclusions and recommendations.
- [10] The Sub-group agreed:
 - To keep the Report as it was presented by the IRSS staff
 - To replace the Conclusions and recommendations section of the report with the new version developed by the Sub-group (APPENDIX 4 of the report)

5. Proposals for the IRSS third cycle

- [11] The Sub-group discussed the proposals of the IC, SC and CPM Bureau for the IRSS third cycle as it was presented in the summary paper prepared by the IC Lead for the IRSS Sub-group.
- [12] The Sub-group though that the following issues are not relevant to be included in the IRSS future work or would be dealt within other selected topics:
 - 1. Establish criteria to determine use and issues around the implementation of ISPMs and articles of the Convention the issue will be covered under the redesigning of the IRSS surveys included in the proposed list of topics
 - 2. State of plant protection in the world could be addressed through other mechanisms
 - 3. Environmental scan to inform future decisions overlaps with the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030
 - 4. Guidance for the implementation of fruit fly standards to be addressed through the collaboration with IAEA
 - 5. Potential implementation issues for draft ISPMs currently under Second and Subsequent Consultation there is already a mechanism in place through the first and second consultation on draft ISPMs
 - 6. Establishing the analytics framework for the IPPC website to better measure use patterns and inform site structure and priority content. This will help identify areas of interest and demand. The framework should integrate reports triggered from pre-set criteria and would benefit from input by SC, IC Bureau and the Secretariat the IPPC ISF unit deals with this task
 - 7. Identify and recommend ongoing performance measures that monitor and enable recording of the impact of IPPC activities to achieving UN SDGs. The measures would be implemented under the oversight of the IC and support reporting on the state of plant health in the world, as required by the Convention This was felt to be more a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) function and should be picked up by the IPPC Secretariat in their planned work on M&E
- [13] The Sub-group agreed:
 - On the preliminary list of topics for the IRSS third circle as provided in the APPENDIX 4 of this report.

6. Any Other Business

[14] No issues were raised under this agenda item.

7. Next Meeting and discussions

[15] The final proposal for topics for the IRSS third circle to be sent to the IC once the IC IRSS Sub-group reaches the final agreement on the topics and prioritizes them through electronic discussion.

APPENDIX 1: Agenda

	Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
1.	Opening of the Meeting		LARSON/ PELLETIER
2.	Meeting Arrangements		
2.1	Election of the Rapporteur		PELLETIER
2.2	Adoption of the Agenda	01_IC_IRSS Sub-group_2018_Sept	PELLETIER
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1	Documents lists	02_IC_IRSS Sub group_2018_Sept	LOMSADZE
3.2	Participants lists	03_ IC_IRSS Sub group_2018_Sept	LOMSADZE
4.	Discussion on the IRSS Report	26_IC_2018_May	PELLETIER
		27_IC_2018_May	ALL PARTICIPANTS
		07_IC_IRSS Sub-group_2018_Sept	
5	Proposals for the IRSS third cycle	04_IC_IRSS Sub-group_2018_Sept	PELLETIER
		05_IC_IRSS Sub-group_2018_Sept	ALL PARTICIPANTS
		06_IC_IRSS Sub-group_2018_Sept	
		07_IC_IRSS Sub-group_2018_Sept	
6.	Any Other Business		ALL PARTICIPANTS
7.	Date of the Next Meeting		PELLETIER

APPENDIX 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
01_IC_IRSS Subgroup_2018_Sept	2.2	Agenda	2018-09-11
02_IC_IRSS Sub group_2018_Sept	3.1	Document List	
03_ IC_IRSS Sub group_2018_Sept	3.2	Participant List	2018-09-13
04_IC_IRSS Sub- group_2018_Sept	5	Standards Committee (SC): Proposals for the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) New Project Cycle	2018-09-11
05_IC_IRSS Sub- group_2018_Sept	5	Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) Bureau: Proposals for the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) New Project Cycle	2018-09-11
06_IC_IRSS Sub- group_2018_Sept	5	Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC): Proposals for the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) New Project Cycle	2018-09-11
07_IC_IRSS Sub- group_2018_Sept	4	IC Sub-Group On IRSS Summary Of Comments From Summer 2018 Consultation On IRSS	2018-09-11
26_IC_2018_May	4	Implementation Review and Support System	2018-09-11
27_IC_2018_May	4	Report (end of 2nd cycle) submitted to June 2018 Bureau meeting for approval. Implementation Review And Support System (IRSS) Triennial Implementation Review Report (2014-2017)	2018-09-11

APPENDIX 3: Participants list

Role	Name, Organization, Address, Telephone	Email address
Bureau Representative	Ms Lois RANSOM Assistant Secretary, Plant Import Operations GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Ph.: (+61) 262723241 Mob.: (+61) 466327114	Lois.ransom@agriculture.gov.au
IC member (Lead)	Mr. Dominique PELLETIER Horticulture Program Specialist Canadian Food Inspection Agency Regulatory Cooperation Division T1-4 1400 Merivale Rd. Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0Y9 Canada Tel:(613) 773-6492	dominique.pelletier@inspection.gc.ca
IC Member	Ms. Sally JENNINGS Senior Policy Analyst Ministry for Primary Industries Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace, PO Box 2526, Wellington 6140, New Zealand Tel:+634 894 0431 Mobile:+63 29 894 0431 Fax:+64 4894 0742	ippc@mpi.govt.nz; sally.jennings@mpi.govt.nz
IC Member	Mr. Francisco GUTIERREZ Technical Director of Plant Health Plant Department, Belize Agricultural Health Authority Central Farm, Belmopan, Cayo District, CA Belize Tel:(+501) 824 4899/4872/4873 Mobile:(+501) 604-0319 Fax:(+501) 824 3773	francisco.gutierrez@baha.org.bz; frankpest@yahoo.com
IC Member	Mr. Dilli Ram SHARMA Director General Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture, Land Management and Cooperative Hariharbhawan, Lalitpur, Nepal Tel:+977 01 5521323 Mobile/Skype:+ 984 136 9615	sharmadilli.2018@gmail.com; kapilvastu.2073@gmail.com

Role	Name Organization Address Talanhana	Email address
	Name, Organization, Address, Telephone	Email address
SC Representative	Mr. Samuel BISHOP International Plant Health Policy Lead Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs DEFRA, 11G35, National Agri'Food Innovation Campus, Sand Hutton, York, YO41 1LZ, United Kingdom Tel:+ 44 2080262506 Mobile:+ 44 7827976902	sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk; simon.anning@defra.gsi.gov.uk
RPPO Representative	Ms. Juliet Goldsmith Plant Health Specialist Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA) Letitia Vriesdelaan #10 Paramaribo, Suriname Mobile: +597-725-2922	juliet.goldsmith@cahfsa.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr. Brent LARSON Implementation and Facilitation Unit Lead IPPC Secretariat, FAO, AGDI Viale Delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Roma Italy Tel:(+39) 06-570-54915 Mobile:(+39) 340-699-9546	brent.larson@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms. Ketevan LOMSADZE Agricultural Officer IPPC Secretariat IPPC Secretariat, FAO, AGDI Viale Delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Roma Italy Tel:(+39) 06-570-53035	Ketevan.Lomsadze@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms. Masumi YAMAMOTO Phytosanitary consultant, IPPC Secretariat IPPC Secretariat, FAO, AGDI Viale Delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Roma Italy Tel:(+39) 06-570-50125	Masumi.Yamamoto@fao.org;

Recommendations of the Triennial Implementation Review Report (2014-2017)

APPENDIX 4: Revised Conclusions and Recommendations of the Triennial Implementation Review Report (2014-2017)

Conclusions and recommendations

The work of the IRSS in its second project cycle has further expanded IPPC's understanding of contracting parties' implementation challenges and successes. The outputs of the IRSS implementation review activities continue to contribute to the strategic direction of the CPM and its subsidiary bodies and allows the IPPC Secretariat to appropriately plan to help address implementation needs.

The flow on work of the IRSS, which includes development or review of international standards, development of implementation resources for capacity development and technical assistance help support national and regional implementation of the Convention and its ISPMs.

The overall outcomes of effective implementation of the Convention and its ISPMs are contracting parties with strengthening national phytosanitary systems which contributes to the IPPC mission:

To secure cooperation among nations in protecting global plant resources from the spread and introduction of pests of plants, in order to preserve food security, biodiversity and to facilitate trade.

For the lessons learned, both elements of success, areas for improvement and recommendations are provided for how the third project cycle of the IRSS can build on what has gone well and address challenges.

Lessons learned – elements of success

1. The IRSS continues to should work well-across the IPPC work programme and respective Secretariat units contributing to implementation-related activities, using both analytical and evaluation approaches. This can be seen by the engagement the IRSS has had with both the CDC and SC during the second project cycle and implementation review activities that have been undertaken in their interests. Additionally, the IRSS has undertaken activities on behalf of IPPC governance, such as IRSS studies previously mentioned.

There is a need to further enhance interaction and collaboration with RPPOs in the review and evaluation of implementation. Currently, RPPOs primarily contribute information on contracting party implementation in their regions through the TC-RPPOs forum. Although implementation topics often feature on the TC-RPPO agenda, more input and collaboration is required from RPPOs in-between sessions when IRSS activities are conducted. An example of this lack of contribution to IRSS studies when the IPPC Secretariat has sought regional case studies or input from RPPOs or response to IRSS surveys from a regional perspective.

Recommendation 1:

IRSS work programme to be more integrated and serve as an implementation tool to allow analysis across different work areas of the IPPC community to inform decision making process at all possible levels. Invite RPPOs, to start using IRSS functionalities. Although the project is integrated within the IPPC Secretariat work programme the project needs to be even more integrated as a cross-cutting mechanism to enhance collaboration between the two Secretariat technical units.

2. Strengthened focus on monitoring and evaluation has could provided multiple benefits to the IRSS project outcomes for the second cycle whole IPPC Community. The development of the IPPC M&E framework not only addresses recommendations made in the 2014 IPPC Enhancement Evaluation, but also has already enhanced internal collaboration of the Secretariat.

During the process of developing the framework the entire Secretariat has been involved, both through workshops to enhance IPPC's overall monitoring and evaluation competency and through working in a dedicated group of Secretariat staff to progress development of the framework. By coordinating work across the Secretariat units in a highly collaborate manner the IRSS has worked to strengthen the linkages between the units in the framework.

Recommendation 2:

Continue development of the M&E <u>framework</u> methodology to work toward enhancing contracting party implementation of the Convention and <u>progress towards</u> the IPPC Strategic Framework.

3. The achievement of activities under the project work plan during the second project cycle has also been attributable to having a dedicated human resource, who was hired one year into the cycle. Having a stable and sustainable staffing level for the IRSS <u>functionalities and activities</u> is fundamental for continuing to progress work towards having a greater understanding of contracting parties' implementation challenges and successes. It is essential to have a dedicated Consultant or similar human resource, in addition to staff support from the IPPC Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU) and other Secretariat staff when relevant.

Recommendation 3:

Ensure stable and sustainable human resourcing for the IRSS <u>functionalities and activities project</u>, in addition to staff support from the IFU and other relevant IPPC Secretariat staff.

4. Focusing on a specific implementation topic has allowed the IRSS to gain a comprehensive understanding of implementation challenges in a particular area, as prioritized by the CPM. The reflection of implementation—impediments of surveillance-related provisions of the Convention and certain ISPMs, under the Implementation pilot on surveillance has thus been based on past IRSS analyses and survey outcomes.—, as well as activities within the second project cycle, such as development of the IPPC M&E framework that will be used to measure the progress of the pilot project and how IPPC can include activities that are of greatest impact to contracting parties.

Recommendation 4:

The IRSS should continue to focus on implementation topics prioritized by CPM and also consider the next implementation programme topic to focus on after surveillance.

Recommendations of the Triennial Implementation Review Report (2014-2017)

5. Through the IRSS's involvement in the prevention and management of risks to plant health, under the FAO Foresight group and through conducting a questionnaire on contracting party emerging risks, the CPM and IPPC Secretariat have a greater understanding of emerging (potential) and critical (current) risks at the national, regional and global levels. This information helps the IPPC Secretariat, RPPOs and the CPM to prevent emerging risks negatively impacting on contracting party implementation.

Recommendation 5:

To <u>gather and analyse understand emerging issues of concerns</u> at national, regional and global levels work should continue to understand contracting parties plant health concerns <u>and to identify and qualify emerging issues.</u> (. It should be a priority to periodically identify emerging issues and undertake preparedness activities.

6. The IRSS has previously focused mainly on identifying contracting parties challenges to implementation of the Convention and ISPMs. However, to highlight the successes of implementation the project undertook analysis of the benefits of implementation in the IRSS study: *Analyzing the benefits of implementing the IPPC*. The outcomes of this study provide positive advocacy for the different benefits that can be realized through implementation, including the protection of global plant health, enhanced international cooperation, food security, environmental protection and facilitation of safe trade. The outputs of this analysis include the IRSS study itself, the side session that was delivered at CPM 12 and a factsheet highlighting the study outcomes. However there is a need for additional work to measure changes and conduct benefit analysis to better demonstrate the benefits of the implementation.

Recommendation 6:

Analysis of contracting party implementation successes should be continued to capture benefits of the IPPC implementation., looking at the benefits of implementation within the IPPC year themes leading up to the international year of plant health (IYPH) in 2020.

7. Contracting parties continue to underuse Tthe IRSS Helpdesk is not used. Following analysis of use and updating of its functionality to enhance user-friendliness and navigation, it was rolled out to contracting parties at the 2016 IPPC Regional Workshops. However, although it's promoted annually through the CPM and at regional workshops, it continues to be unused at very low level. Lack of use may be related to language restrictions, with the currently option only for English, or due to low awareness of its existence and availability to the IPPC community. Resources should not be spent on the help desk at this time. Efforts should be directed to developing new and/or promoting existing alternative assistance material.

Recommendation 7:

<u>To analyse the functionalities, usefulness and potential benefits of New ways to promote the use of the Helpdesk_, including its different functions, should to be explored to enhance awareness of its availability to the IPPC community, in addition to its current annual promotion at CPM and IPPC regional workshops.</u>

8. There is a need to further enhance interaction and collaboration with RPPOs in the review and evaluation of implementation. Currently RPPOs primarily contribute information on contracting party implementation in their regions through the TC-RPPOs forum. Although implementation topics often feature on the TC-RPPO agenda, more input and collaboration is required from RPPOs in between sessions when IRSS activities are conducted. An example of this lack of contribution to IRSS studies when the IPPC Secretariat has sought regional case studies or input from RPPOs or response to IRSS surveys from a regional perspective.

Recommendation 8:

Interaction and collaboration of RPPOs in IRSS activities needs to be promoted to ensure that regional needs and perspectives are understood, in addition to the current engagement of RPPOs on implementation at the annual TC RPPO meeting.

9. Overall oversight of the project has not been consistent through the second cycle. Although the TRG was initially intended to be the oversight group of the project, due to resource constraints the oversight function of the IRSS has primarily been undertaken by the CPM Bureau and the CDC. The work of the TRG was re-focused to provide a review function of the project activities for compilation of this report. The project would have benefited from a single oversight group for consistency of planning, review of work activities and guidance on prioritization of future work.

Recommendation 9:

Under any future project cycles, the oversight of the project should be undertaken by the new IPPC subsidiary body for implementation—the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) to ensure consistency in direction of the project and its activities.

10. Contracting parties continue to report a major implementation challenge is lack of financial resources. Although the need to identify, obtain and manage financial resources for contracting parties is outside the mandate of the IRSS, it was acknowledged that implementation could be significantly enhanced if contracting parties had sufficient resources to establish, manage and strengthen their phytosanitary systems. This is an area that will need continued attention through newereative approaches to resource mobilization.

Recommendation 10:

Contracting parties should to be provided with continued resource mobilization support to help them access funding to support implementation activities, such as promotion of the IPPC Guide to Resource Mobilization developed under the IRSS second cycle.

Final considerations

The second cycle of the IRSS has successfully built on the first project cycle to identify contracting parties' implementation challenges and successes. Additionally, significant progress has been made through undertaking applied activities that will facilitate implementation. The work of the IRSS is continually acknowledged by CPM and its subsidiary bodies as providing valuable input into the strategic direction of the IPPC and assisting in planning IPPC work programme activities appropriately, thus would benefit from being part of the IPPC Secretariat regular work programme.

Final recommendation:

It is recommended the IRSS be integrated into the <u>IPPC Secretariat</u> regular work programme of the <u>IPPC</u> and <u>funded through regular programme fund</u> not be dependent on solely extra budgetary resources.

APPENDIX 5: The IRSS third circle topics preliminary agreed by the IRSS Sub-group and their prioritization

N	Торіс	Priority	Comment		
Ι-	I - Assistance to IPPC Subsidiary bodies				
1.	Evaluation of the Implementation Program Pilot on Pest Surveillance		Subject to the request from the IC and SC to provide assistance		
2.	Review of the implementation proposals from the call for topics and evaluation of the feasibility of their implementation		Subject to the request from the IC		
3.	Validating issues submitted to the call for topics and measuring their impacts through gathering before and after data to assist with demonstrating the impact and value of the IPPC actions Evaluation of the impacts of resources developed in response to the call for topics through gathering baseline and progress data to assist with demonstrating the impact and value of the IPPC actions				
II ·	- IRSS Surveys and studies				
	Revision previously conducted of IRSSIPPC—conducted surveys to re-design and develop SOPs for future surveys that are meaningful and generate participation from CPs. Consolidated analysis of two previous IRSS surveys (2012-2013 and 2016) The third IPPC general IRSS—general survey EU proposal for a survey on the success of implementation of PFAs		Could serve as a pilot to measure a baseline of the implementation issue and then progress in ten years (impact of the implementation resource)		
	Desk study on the delegation of NPPO functions in the context of third party authorization		Comments from the first consultation on draft ISPM Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)		
	Desk study to catalogue available phytosanitary treatments and extend of their use		2016 SPG paper to inform content of the study		
	Aanalytics support to the Sea Container Task Force for survey design, s-implementation and analysis of results report		Subject to the SCTF request		

Develop baseline measures to monitor the impacts of and record/report benefits of the Strategic Framework 2020-30.	Areas of the Framework to be identified where initial data is neded			
III – Topics of potential interest of the IPPC community				
Antimicrobial Resistance	Final decision to be made after CPM 14			
IV – Pending				
Implementation of ISPM 24: Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures	IRSS study on Equivalence to be consulted for the final decision			
A structure for recording and reporting sterilising dosage for a range of pests using irradiation, as a global repository that could be automatically updated through inclusion of standardised metadata with research results - in partnership with IAEA. It would be good to make the information available to CPs as part of the treatments information on resources pages.	IAEA to be consulted as they might already have database			