



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

2019

Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards

Rome, Italy

17–21 June 2019

IPPC Secretariat

FAO. 2019. *Report of the meeting of the Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards, 17–21 June 2019*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). 36 pages. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

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, 2019



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

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

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

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

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

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Opening of the Meeting | 5 |
| 1.1 Welcome | 5 |
| 2. Meeting Arrangements | 5 |
| 2.1 Election of the Rapporteur | 5 |
| 2.2 Adoption of the agenda | 5 |
| 3. Administrative Matters | 5 |
| 4. Terms of Reference | 5 |
| 5. Background..... | 6 |
| 5.1 Report of the first meeting of the Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards | 6 |
| 5.2 CPM-14 (2019) outcomes | 6 |
| 5.3 Standards Committee and CPM Bureau discussions | 7 |
| 5.4 CPM Bureau. | 7 |
| 5.5 EFSA discussion papers | 7 |
| 5.6 Discussion paper from Japan..... | 7 |
| 5.7 Beyond Compliance tools | 8 |
| 5.8 and 5.9 Draft APPPC standards on mango fruit and chilli seed..... | 8 |
| 6. Development of text for the draft ISPM | 9 |
| 6.1 Reference documents | 9 |
| 6.2 Development of text for the draft ISPM..... | 9 |
| 7. Commodity standards process | 15 |
| 7.1 Criteria for identifying measures and including them in commodity standards | 15 |
| 7.2 Role, function and terms of reference for a new technical panel | 17 |
| 7.3 Process for identifying or obtaining PRAs on pests linked with commodities to provide pest lists | 18 |
| 7.4 The Standard setting process..... | 19 |
| 7.5 Further details on processes that will be used to develop commodity standards, taking into account comments from the Bureau, SC and IC | 20 |
| 8. Conclusions and recommendations | 20 |
| 8.1 Summary report for Bureau and SPG | 22 |
| 9. Other Business | 22 |
| 10. Close of the Meeting..... | 22 |
| Appendix 1: Agenda..... | 23 |
| Appendix 2: Documents list | 25 |
| Appendix 3: Participants list | 26 |
| Appendix 4: Terms of reference..... | 29 |
| Appendix 5: Draft specification for the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards | 32 |
| Appendix 6: Information to be sought in Calls for information for pests and measures related to prioritized topics | 35 |
| Appendix 7: Criteria for inclusion in the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i> | 36 |

1. Opening of the Meeting

1.1 Welcome

- [1] The Chairperson, Mr Greg WOLFF (Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) Bureau member), opened the meeting and welcomed all participants to the second meeting of the Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards. He looked forward to a productive week and explained that this should be the final meeting of the focus group, so it was important to ensure that all tasks were covered.
- [2] Mr Stephen BUTCHER (CPM Bureau member) and the IPPC Standard Setting Unit Lead, Mr Avetik NERSISYAN, also welcomed participants.
- [3] The participants introduced themselves briefly.

2. Meeting Arrangements

2.1 Election of the Rapporteur

- [4] The focus group elected Mr Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom) as the Rapporteur.

2.2 Adoption of the agenda

- [5] The Chairperson reviewed the agenda and the focus group adopted it (Appendix 1).

3. Administrative Matters

- [6] The Chairperson introduced the Documents list (Appendix 2) and advised the group that three additional papers had been received: a technical report from the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)¹, to be considered under agenda item 5.4, and two draft standards from the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC), to be considered as agenda item 5.7 (draft regional standards on *International movement of fresh mango fruit (Mangifera indica) fruit*² and *Phytosanitary procedures for chilli seed*³).
- [7] The Chairperson introduced the Participants list (Appendix 3) and noted that Mr Peter THOMSON (New Zealand) and Mr Liang WEI (China) were unable to attend the meeting.
- [8] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as the “Secretariat”) had circulated a link to a document on **local information**⁴ prior to the meeting.

4. Terms of Reference

- [9] The Chairperson introduced the terms of reference of the focus group, as approved by the CPM Bureau (hereafter referred to as the “Bureau”) following the Fourteenth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-14) in April 2019 (Appendix 4). He highlighted that the report and draft concept standard from this meeting will be presented to the Bureau and the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) at their respective meetings in October 2019, and the SPG will make recommendations on the focus group’s findings. The Standards Committee (SC) and the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) will then be invited to review the draft CPM paper and the draft concept standard at their respective November 2019 meetings, before they are finalized by the Bureau and presented to CPM-15 (2020) for approval for consultation.
- [10] In addition to the tasks assigned to it under its terms of reference, the focus group also decided to provide a recommendation to the Bureau on the process for the development of the draft concept standard.

¹ 14_FGCP_2019_Jun

² 15_FGCP_2019_Jun

³ 16_FGCP_2019_Jun

⁴ Local information for meeting participants: Rome, Italy: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1034/>

- [11] The Chairperson highlighted the need to learn lessons from previous commodity standards, including those concerning the involvement of industry groups in consultations. While recognizing the potential merits of such involvement, the focus group commented that it would perhaps be premature to pursue this at present, as development of commodity and pathway standards was still at a very early stage, and that industry involvement might be more appropriate once individual commodity and pathway standards are under development. In the meantime, it might be useful to explain to industry that it is only an overarching standard that is being developed at the moment and to provide information on the consultation process while being realistic about the timelines. (For potential involvement of industry groups at the drafting stages, see agenda item 7.)

5. Background

5.1 Report of the first meeting of the Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards

- [12] The focus group noted the report of the first meeting of the Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards, held on 3–5 October 2018⁵. The Chairperson commented that extracts of text from the report (e.g. from sections 5.1, 7.1 (relating to not imposing obligations) and 7.2) could be used when drafting the part of the concept standard relating to principles. He highlighted the following points: the commodity and pathway standards were designed to be a starting point for negotiations; they would neither impose any new obligations on importing countries nor undermine the need for pest risk analysis (PRA); individual commodity and pathway standards would be annexes of the concept standard; inclusion of pest lists would not provide technical justification for regulation of those pests; and the standards should cover intended use but not diversion from intended use. Text from section 7.3 of the focus group's first meeting report could be used as a framework for the Requirements section of the concept standard. The vision for role and use of commodity and pathway standards, as provided in section 8, could also be very helpful, not only when considering the contents of the standard but also for the possible governance processes. The Chairperson highlighted the need for a permanent steward, to be drawn from the SC, and for dedicated governance support, but also that there was a need for flexibility (e.g. allowing for industry representatives to be observers for a particular commodity group). He also commented that the process for developing commodity and pathway standards would need to be much quicker than the current Standard setting procedure; the standards, once adopted, would need to be open for review; and the membership of the technical panel drafting the standards would also need to be dynamic.

5.2 CPM-14 (2019) outcomes

- [13] The Chairperson outlined the outcomes of CPM-14 (2019) in relation to the ongoing discussions on commodity and pathway standards⁶. The key concerns had been over sovereign rights and the need not to undermine the need for PRA. The European Union had offered EUR 300 000 in a co-funding arrangement and had invited other donors to also pledge support. The CPM had noted the potential benefit to the development of trade from promoting the development of commodity and pathway standards. In relation to the latter point, the focus group Chairperson recalled that the IPPC includes trade facilitation among its objectives.
- [14] The focus group recognized that some of the text on principles in the focus group paper presented to CPM-14 (2019)⁷ could be drawn upon when drafting the concept standard. The comments on this paper

⁵ Report of the first meeting of the Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87048/>

⁶ Extract from CPM-14 report: 05_FGCP_2019_Jun; full CPM-14 report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/cpm/cpm-reports/>

⁷ CPM 2019/27: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/86987/>

submitted to CPM-14 by COSAVE (from Spanish: *Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur*), would also be useful as source text⁸.

- [15] In the light of the concerns expressed by some contracting parties, the focus group noted that there may be value in undertaking a study to attribute a specific value to commodity and pathway standards in terms of financial savings to import, but it would better to defer any decision on this until the concept standard and a few individual commodity standards have been adopted and it is clear whether there are still concerns.

5.3 Standards Committee discussions

- [16] The SC Chairperson presented a paper outlining the outcomes of the discussions on commodity and pathway standards at the May 2019 meeting of the SC⁹. These discussions had included the relative merits of a new technical panel versus an expert working group (EWG) model or simply establishing a “coordination group”, possible transitional arrangements that might be used for the concept standard, and the need to include industry participation after the initial stage. While recognizing that the focus group is within the scope of the Bureau, the SC had expressed support for the development of commodity and pathway standards being under the mandate of the SC, with a permanent stewardship arrangement.

5.4 CPM Bureau discussions

- [17] The Bureau members present gave an update on the Bureau meeting held on 10–14 June 2019. The terms of reference for the focus group, as agreed at CPM-14 (2019), had been tabled and no amendments had been made. The Bureau had also discussed the inclusion in commodity and pathway standards of measures which are currently in use in international trade, how to identify which to include, and how to present the confidence with which they can be used. Supporting data may include whether a PRA has been conducted, efficacy data, and whether at least one contracting party uses it as an option (and if so, how long it has been used).

5.5 EFSA discussion papers

- [18] The focus group member from the European region introduced two papers produced by EFSA in readiness for the European Union Regulation on plant health¹⁰ that will come into effect from December 2019. The first, published in the EFSA Journal¹¹, provides guidance on the methodology to be followed when performing a commodity risk assessment for high risk commodities. The second, a technical report¹, sets out the information contracting parties would need to provide to EFSA in order for EFSA to conduct a PRA and for import into the European Union to take place.

5.6 Discussion paper from Japan

- [19] The focus group member from Vietnam introduced a discussion paper on commodity and pathway standards submitted by Japan¹². The paper provided detail and comment for agenda item 6 on the drafting of the concept standard, including proposals that the purpose of commodity and pathway standards as agreed by CPM-14 (2019) be included in the standard, the requirements clarified, and criteria be included for the selection of pests and related phytosanitary measures and for the selection of topics for commodity and pathway standards. For agenda item 7, the paper provided comment on the

⁸ CPM 2019/CRP/07: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87079/>

⁹ Extract from report of May 2019 SC meeting: 04_FGCP_2019_Jun; full report of SC meeting: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/standards-committee/>

¹⁰ Regulation (EU) 2016/2031 of the European Parliament of the Council of 26 October 2016 on protective measures against pest of plants, amending Regulations (EU) 228/2013, (EU) 652/2014 and (EU) 1143/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Council Directives 69/464/EEC, 74/647/EEC, 93/85/EEC, 98/57/EC, 2000/29/EC, 2006/91/EC and 2007/33/EC. *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 317: 4–104

¹¹ 12_FGCP_2019_Jun (EFSA Panel on Plant Health *et al.* (2019). Guidance on commodity risk assessment for the evaluation of high risk plants dossiers. *EFSA Journal*, 17(4): 5668.)

¹² 10_FGCP_2019_Jun

process for developing commodity and pathway standards, including the concept standard and individual commodity and pathway standards. After introducing the paper, she commented that the term “phytosanitary measures” should be used as defined in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*), and that measures should be selected from options that do not require special facilities and equipment and so can be implemented by each country, subject to bilateral agreement between importing and exporting countries. In terms of the process for standard development, she also proposed that the existing Standard setting procedure be used, as for adoption of ISPMs (International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures).

- [20] The focus group Chairperson added that the Japanese paper also supported the establishment of a permanent steward and a new technical panel.
- [21] The SC Chairperson pointed out that similar issues to those expressed by Japan were also shared by other contracting parties, too.

5.7 Beyond Compliance tools

- [22] The Secretariat introduced a paper¹³ giving an overview of the decision tools developed under the Standards and Trade Development Facility’s initiatives “Beyond Compliance” and “Beyond Compliance Global”. These tools had been designed to support the design, evaluation and understanding of a systems approach to protecting plant health, the first tool being based on a “production chain” of actions from pre-planting to export and the second tool providing a template spreadsheet to organize and represent the details of measures.
- [23] The focus group acknowledged the difficulties in using these types of tools, with some countries not being in a position to apply such approaches because of lack of information, and noted that it would be useful to know about actual examples of the use of such tools by contracting parties.

5.8 and 5.9 Draft APPPC standards on mango fruit and chilli seed

- [24] The focus group member from New Zealand introduced the draft regional standards on *International movement of fresh mango (Mangifera indica) fruit*² and *Phytosanitary procedures for chilli seed*³ from the APPPC region. He explained that the two draft APPPC standards had presented different challenges. For the mango fruit standard, drafting information on pests had been quite straightforward and the only challenge had been the sections relating to measures (e.g. whether to include measures that are not widely used). The drafting of the standard on chilli seed had been more complex. The standards contained no obligations except for the usual obligation to undertake PRAs. The pests listed included those known not to be associated with the commodity, but with a requirement that contracting parties regulating these as quarantine pests should justify why such pests were deemed to be quarantine pests. He expressed his view that countries deciding not to adopt a measure contained in the standard should give a technical justification for that decision.
- [25] **Effectiveness of measures and reliability of data.** The two draft APPPC standards prompted a discussion among the focus group about the reliability of data used to evaluate the effectiveness of measures. One focus group member raised the possibility of using a similar approach to that used in ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) which has a section on reliability of data. Another focus group member recalled, however, that that section in ISPM 8 has proved to be quite controversial and has attracted many country comments during consultations on previous ISPMs where the drafts had included this information, so he suggested that although the ISPM 8 approach might be useful to help frame thinking about the concept standard, it might be better for the new technical panel to discuss this rather than putting it in the concept standard itself (see agenda item 7.2 regarding a new technical panel.)
- [26] **Model commodity standard.** The focus group recognized that the draft APPPC standard on mango fruit, if developed along the lines outlined in this meeting, could provide a good example (or model) for the structure of a commodity standard. Although the technical details of the documents were not

¹³ 13_FGCP_2019_Jun

discussed, the group suggested that the APPPC region be invited, through Mr Stephen BUTCHER, to consider the findings of this focus group in further development of their draft mango fruit standard. An updated draft of the mango fruit standard would be a valuable reference as part of the documentation supporting the concept standard.

6. Development of text for the draft ISPM

6.1 Reference documents

[27] The Secretariat had circulated a link to the *IPPC style guide* and associated guidance material¹⁴ prior to the meeting.

6.2 Development of text for the draft ISPM

[28] Drawing on the material discussed at this meeting and at its first meeting, the focus group discussed the various components of the overarching concept standard and developed these into a draft text. Issues raised are recorded in this report under the relevant section headings, under agenda items 6.2 and 7.

6.2.1 Structure and format

[29] **Concept standard.** In considering the structure of the concept standard, the focus group referred to section 7.2 of the report from the first focus group meeting and the structure of ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*) and ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*). The following structure was applied to the draft concept standard, subject to amendment via email correspondence within the focus group after the meeting:

INTRODUCTION

Scope

References

Definitions

Outline of Requirements

BACKGROUND

IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

PRINCIPLES

REQUIREMENTS

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

PURPOSE AND USE

SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

Scope

Description of the commodity

Pests

Phytosanitary measures

VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

References

CITERIA FOR INCLUSION OF MEASURES IN COMMODITY STANDARDS

EVALUATION OF MEASURES.

[30] **Commodity and pathway standards.** The focus group considered the format of the commodity and pathway standards, using adopted diagnostic protocols (DPs) and the draft APPPC standards on mango

¹⁴ *IPPC style guide* and annotated templates: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/development-standards/>; ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/622/>; Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology: 06_FGCP_2019_Jun

fruit and chilli seeds as examples. The focus group member from New Zealand pointed out that these draft APPPC standards were early drafts and had not yet been through consultation, but that the two different commodities had resulted in two slightly different formats.

- [31] There was some support within the focus group for using a format similar to that of the draft APPPC standard on mango fruit, although it was also suggested that the format of phytosanitary treatments (PTs: annexes to ISPM 28) could also provide a suitable model. An important point to consider was the level of detail to be included in the standards, as the draft mango fruit standard is quite detailed whereas annexes to ISPM 28 are very concise.

6.2.2 Terminology

- [32] **Use of the term “pathway”.** The focus group discussed the specific use of “pathway” in this concept standard and the commodity and pathway standards that follow. The focus group concluded that the standards under consideration are not intended to apply to pathways in the broad sense (conveyances, etc.), so the group recommended that “commodities” rather than “commodities and pathways” be used, as the ISPM 5 definition for commodities includes articles.

- [33] **Phytosanitary measures.** The focus group noted that care will need to be taken during the various drafting stages of the concept standard to ensure consistency in the use of the terms “phytosanitary measure” and “measure” as per the usage decided upon in this meeting. (See Phytosanitary measures in section 6.2.7 of this report.)

6.2.3 Introduction, background and biodiversity sections

- [34] **Scope and Outline of requirements.** There was some discussion over whether, in the Scope, “options for phytosanitary measures” is acceptable or whether it should be “options for measures” or “options for consideration by contracting parties as phytosanitary measures”, but the group decided to refine the text via email after the meeting.

- [35] **References.** The focus group noted that a reference to the IPPC (1997) would need to be included in the References section of the draft concept standard, as they included a citation to the Convention in the main part of the text.

- [36] **Background.** The focus group noted that the Background section should include text on relevant history and the strategic value of the standard. The focus group confirmed that the main intention of the commodity standards is to support the development of technically justified phytosanitary import requirements that will facilitate safe trade, rather than being to harmonize measures.

- [37] **Impacts on biodiversity and the environment.** The focus group questioned the value of the biodiversity section continuing to appear in ISPMs and agreed to recommend to the Bureau that this is given further consideration.

6.2.4 Principles

- [38] **Avoiding duplication.** The focus group noted that commodity standards should include commodity-specific requirements but not repeat generic requirements from other ISPMs.

- [39] **Regulated pests.** The focus group decided that regulated pests would be clarified under the section on Principles.

- [40] **Pest risk analysis.** The focus group noted that the IPPC (1997) and the World Trade Organization Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement) say that regulation of pests should rely on technical justification *such as* PRA; they do not say that regulation *must* include PRA. So, in drafting text on the basic principles, the focus group referred to “another comparable examination” as well as to PRA.

- [41] **Diversion from intended use.** The focus group recalled that diversion from intended use is to be excluded from the concept standard because it is outside of the scope of commodity standards. It was

pointed out that, for the same commodity but a different intended use, the pests may be the same but the measures may be quite different, so different standards would be needed. The focus group felt that diversion of use could, in future, be addressed elsewhere.

- [42] **Least restrictive measures.** One focus group member asked whether the concept standard should reaffirm the principle regarding least restrictive measures from the SPS Agreement or the IPPC. The group decided, however, that there was perhaps no need for this, because it was covered by the text they had already drafted that said that there were no extra obligations on importing countries.

6.2.5 Requirements

- [43] **Templates for individual commodity standards.** The focus group noted that the section on Specific requirements would act as a template for individual commodity standards.
- [44] The focus group also noted, however, that for ISPMs there is an annotated template that outlines what should be included in each section. The Secretariat clarified that this is provided as a resource to allow authors to create an ISPM in the correct format and with the correct styles applied, so if another of these were to be created for commodity standards it could be used in conjunction with the concept standard.
- [45] **Tense used.** Referring to ISPM 27 & ISPM 28, the group decided to use the present tense to describe the structure and outline content of the standards, reserving the term “should” only for NPPO requirements.
- [46] **Commodity-specific requirements.** One focus group member asked whether, to avoid a large number of examples being suggested during consultation on the concept standard, it is worth stating in it that commodity-specific requirements should be included in the individual standards. The focus group decided that examples could be included in a guidance manual instead of in the concept standard.

6.2.6 Purpose and use

- [47] In drafting this section, the focus group referred to the section on Purpose and use in ISPM 28.
- [48] The focus group confirmed that commodity standards should be considered when developing phytosanitary import requirements. These standards may be particularly useful during market access negotiations and in helping to facilitate safe trade.
- [49] The focus group drew up a list of benefits of commodity standards and decided that support and assistance to developing countries should be the first item in the list. They decided that other benefits to include were facilitation of bilateral trade negotiations and facilitation of safe trade, but that it would not be appropriate to include maintaining the influence of the IPPC as a benefit.
- [50] **Harmonization.** The question of whether measures and pest lists contained in the commodity standards would be deemed to be harmonized was raised at various points during the drafting of the concept standard. The Chairperson noted that, at its first meeting, the focus group had said that commodity standards would support harmonization of measures, and CPM-14 (2019) had subsequently identified harmonization of measures as contributing to the strategic value and purpose of commodity standards. He commented, however, that it had become clear in this meeting that the main intention of these standards is facilitation of safe trade. Also, as explained in the paper submitted by Japan, the inclusion of a measure in a standard on the basis of its use by contracting parties would not, by itself, indicate that it had international approval and had technical justification (except for those appearing in other ISPMs or regional standards). The focus group’s initial conclusion, therefore, was that the inclusion of a measure or pest list in a commodity standard would not automatically mean that it was harmonized, and so reference to harmonization should be omitted in the concept standard.
- [51] The focus group reviewed this decision later in the meeting. One focus group member commented that “harmonization” might be the wrong word to use and perhaps “recognized” or “agreed” would be better alternatives? One member expressed concern over measures that do not have efficacy data being included in commodity standards and commented that it should still be possible to provide evidence of

the effectiveness of measures, even if it is not experimental evidence collected under controlled conditions. Another member, however, pointed out that the ISPM 5 definitions of “harmonization” and “harmonized phytosanitary measures” have three elements – establishment, recognition and application – and that inclusion of measures in commodity standards would accomplish harmonization according to these definitions.

- [52] One focus group member commented that when a commodity standard is presented to CPM for adoption, it would only take one contracting party to raise an objection on the grounds that another pest needs adding, and the standard would not be adopted because it would be impossible to resolve this with all contracting parties within the short timeframe at CPM. The focus group recognized that this is part of the wider issue of the commodity standards being partway between standards and manuals and including “non-harmonized” measures. The Secretariat clarified that in some countries, ISPMs are adopted unamended into their law. A suggestion was made that the commodity standards could perhaps be appendixes rather than annexes to the concept standard. However, it was pointed out that this would mean that contracting parties would not need to apply the standards, whereas the intention is that they do. So, it needs to be clear in the concept standard that rather than these standards being the *starting point* of market access negotiations, they need to be *taken into account during* such negotiations.
- [53] On the basis of these discussions, the focus group revised their earlier conclusion and concluded that commodity standards would contribute to harmonization, but that the matter may benefit from further consideration by the SPG, SC and IC.
- [54] **Endorsement of phytosanitary measures.** The focus group recognized that further clarification was needed on what “endorsement” means in the context of commodity standards. The term “endorsement” was therefore not used in the draft text of the concept standard.

6.2.7 Specific requirements

- [55] **Scope of commodity standards.** The focus group agreed that commodity standards should refer to a clearly defined, individual commodity and its intended use, and should have a discrete set of pests and related measures. The commodity and intended use described should be sufficiently focused to avoid having to have several subcategories of the commodity in the commodity standard.
- [56] **Description of the commodity.** One focus group member commented that it is not necessary to give very detailed information on what to include in this section of a commodity standard, as this is essentially guidance for the technical panel drafting the standard and separate guidance may also be developed to support them.
- [57] The focus group noted that the commodity description should include any element of the production process that affects the pest risk (e.g. whether the commodity has been grown in a greenhouse or outdoors).
- [58] The focus group discussed whether these standards would be practicable for commodity classes or groups of commodities, such as “fresh fruits”. One member of the group explained the difficulties of doing this, as the pests and the measures are likely to be different for different commodities within the group, as well as the differences relating to the commodity itself (e.g. depending on what parts of the commodity are included and the intended use). A few members of the group supported the proposals from the first meeting of this focus group that the concept standard should allow for individual standards to have either a broad or a narrow scope, because what is appropriate will vary depending on the commodity or commodity group. The focus group concluded that, in considering a proposal for a standard, the Task Force on Topics (TFT) should consider whether the scope of the standard is practical and feasible, or whether it is too broad. It was also noted that market access negotiations are never on a broad commodity class, but are more specific.
- [59] The focus group confirmed that the Description section of a commodity standard should not only give the commodity that is the subject of the standard, but also the intended use of that commodity, because of the influence it has on the pest risk. There is no need, however, for there to be any further detail about

intended use in the commodity standard. In drafting the text, the group referred to text from ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*), ISPM 16 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: concepts and application*) and ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*). One member of the focus group commented that intended use can be very specific (e.g. baby corn packed in a clam shell for consumption), and sometimes the description can be very sophisticated, as certain commodities have a very specific intended use.

- [60] **Pests.** The focus group confirmed that commodity standards should consider pests but that the determination by the importing country of whether a pest is regulated must be based on technical justification.
- [61] In terms of criteria for inclusion of pests in commodity standards, the consensus of the focus group was that the pests to be included would be those that are both associated with the commodity as demonstrated by PRA or other technical justification *and* regulated by at least one contracting party. One focus group member expressed concern over the criterion that at least one contracting party regulates the pest and asked whether it should instead be that there is scientific justification for saying that the organism is a pest of the commodity; in which case, could reference to a contracting party be deleted and the text simply say that there is a PRA which shows that the pest is associated with the commodity? The focus group decided, however, to keep the criterion of one contracting party.
- [62] The focus group discussed whether the PRA (or other technical justification) would need to be publicly available or whether it could simply be provided to the technical panel drafting the standard or exchanged between trading partners. One focus group member commented that the critical issue is that the PRA or justification is available, but another member pointed out that countries may be reticent to use measures based on evidence that they have not seen. The focus group agreed that, should there be a guidance manual on commodity standards, it should encourage contracting parties to release PRA and other technical justification information into the public domain, but that in the concept standard “as demonstrated by PRA” would be sufficient as this implies that the information has been made available.
- [63] Opinions among the focus group members initially differed on whether commodity standards should include pests known not to be associated with the traded commodity. One member was of the view that the standards should only cover pests known to be associated with the commodity. Other members, however, pointed out that it is useful to include pests known not to be associated with the traded commodity, to help avoid contracting parties regulating pests without technical justification (e.g. a contracting party should not regulate pests that are found on the leaves of mango but never on the fruit, if only the fruit is moved). A suggestion was made that the list of pests known not to be associated with the traded commodity could be given in an appendix rather than in the main part of the standard, as appendixes are not a prescriptive part of a standard and are for reference purposes only. In the end, the focus group decided to simply say that pests known to be associated with the plant species but known not to be associated with the traded commodity *may* be included in commodity standards. The focus group recognized that to avoid such pest lists being too long, the search criteria would need to be carefully defined. It was noted, however, that the search would be limited to regulated pests if it were a list of pests known not to be associated with the traded commodity *and* regulated by at least one contracting party.
- [64] It was suggested that, for clarity, the species name of the commodity and the precise commodity being traded (e.g. fruit) should be given (e.g. “pests associated with *Mangifera indica* for propagation but not with the traded commodity, mango fruit”).
- [65] One member of the focus group suggested that there should be correspondence between the pests listed and the measures listed. The Chairperson recalled that, at its first meeting, the focus group had discussed having a table with measures in one column and the pests that can be addressed with these measures in another column.

- [66] In summary, the focus group concluded that:
- commodity standards should include a table of pests associated with the commodity, with corresponding measures used to control those pests
 - all measures presented in the standards should be included in the table of pests
 - when relevant, commodity standards may also contain information on pests known not to be associated with the traded commodity.
- [67] The focus group decided that, as “hitch-hiker” pests are not associated with the commodity, the standards would not consider contaminating pests as defined by ISPM 5.
- [68] **Phytosanitary measures.** The focus group discussed whether this section should refer to “phytosanitary measures” or “pest risk management options”. One focus group member emphasized the importance of being clear that these are options (i.e. they are not imposed) and recalled that measures are not “phytosanitary measures” (ISPM 5 definition) until they are set as phytosanitary import requirements by a contracting party. It was noted that “pest risk management options” is a term particularly associated with PRAs. The group decided to refer to “options for phytosanitary measures”.
- [69] One focus group member suggested that, in commodity standards, a description be provided of each measure, to include how it works, criteria that support it, how it was evaluated, and confidence in the measure. The group discussed whether this information would be too detailed to go in the commodity standard but decided that the draft concept standard could say that measures should be sufficiently described to indicate their use and practical application. Where necessary, additional information may be provided in an appendix.
- [70] Regarding combinations of measures, one member of the focus group commented that a phytosanitary measure can either be an independent measure or a systems approach, so it is not possible to have a combination of phytosanitary measures as the combination itself is a phytosanitary measure. The focus group acknowledged that it is possible to omit “phytosanitary” and refer instead to a “combination of measures”.
- [71] The focus group recalled that, because the intention for commodity standards is to provide options, bridging the gap between a standard and a manual by providing information for contracting parties to consider, it is possible that measures such as systems approaches where information is sparse can still be included in the standards and then subsequently reviewed as knowledge and experience increases. This prompted the question of whether generic measures such as pest free areas and systems approaches should be added to the concept standard, instead of being in individual commodity standards. In the draft concept standard, the focus group added text to say that consideration should be given to including measures present in adopted standards or currently used in trade.
- [72] The focus group noted that measures included in commodity standards could be considered for inclusion in other relevant standards under development or revision.
- [73] **Verification of compliance.** The focus group discussed a range of interpretations of the term “assurance” and the possible alternative of using “verification of compliance”. Should the commodity standard include methods for verifying compliance, where the specific characteristics of the commodity mean that specific methods are needed? One member of the focus group suggested that this could perhaps be part of the description of the measure. It was suggested, however, that this does not need to be in the commodity standard and instead references could be made to other ISPMs that deal with verification (e.g. ISPM 7 (*Phytosanitary certification system*)). One member of the group raised a concern that the verification information would only be available to the two parties in a bilateral negotiation, so references to other ISPMs would be irrelevant, but another member disagreed that it would be irrelevant. The focus group decided to omit text on assurance, but include reference to ISPMs providing information on verification of compliance. Verification of compliance information could be included in the list of information sought in a Call for information on pests and measures.

- [74] **References (in commodity standards).** The focus group confirmed that all information on pests and measures included in the standard should be referenced.

6.2.8 Annexes or independent ISPMs?

- [75] **Annexes.** The focus group agreed that commodity standards should be annexes under the concept standard, the exception being commodity standards on seeds or wood, which could possibly be annexes of ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) or ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*), respectively. The focus group agreed to recommend that the adoption process be the same as for PTs.
- [76] **Separate standards on measures.** The focus group agreed to encourage the new technical panel responsible for commodity standards to provide guidance to the SC on possible future standards on individual measures (equivalent to ISPM 28, but for measures), where there are sufficient data on the effectiveness of those measures to support it. This would allow detailed, rigorously reviewed standards on individual measures to be built up over time, instead of the detail being in the commodity standards themselves. The focus group noted, however, that inclusion of a measure in a commodity standard should not be dependent on it being recognized in a separate measures standard.

7. Commodity standards process

7.1 Criteria for identifying measures and including them in commodity standards

7.1.1 Criteria for inclusion of measures in the standards

- [77] The focus group drew up a list of categories of evidence upon which to base the inclusion of measures in a commodity standard (e.g. evidence from use in trade, experimental evidence, PRA, international or regional standards, bilateral agreements). The group initially decided that measures adopted in ISPMs should be included, and measures in regional standards should be considered for inclusion, in commodity standards, although decided ultimately not to distinguish between international and regional standards in this way. One focus group member pointed out that there are measures applied for domestic pests (experience from domestic use) that could also be considered for inclusion.
- [78] Another member queried which category of criteria new measures would fit into when, for example, a new treatment is being proposed. The focus group thought that they would probably fit under “experimental evidence”, but noted that this could benefit from further clarification.
- [79] The focus group also noted the need to consider the practicability or feasibility of a measure, before accepting its inclusion in a commodity standard (e.g. some countries may not be able to fumigate for eight months in a year).
- [80] It was suggested that, at a certain point, the IPPC Secretariat could issue a Call (e.g. one general Call for measures and other Calls for specific commodity standards), so responses to Calls for measures need to be considered as part of the evaluation process.
- [81] One member of the focus group suggested that measures applied successfully to manage non-compliance should be considered. The focus group included this, but noted that it would be difficult to analyse it and also to differentiate whether it is a “new measure” on its own or as a consequence of non-compliance only and thus an additional measure.
- [82] It was noted that many countries have “best management practices”, so these could be useful sources of information for domestic use of measures.

7.1.2 Evaluation of measures

- [83] The focus group discussed how to give guidance on the assessment of confidence in measures. It was noted that it was important not to be overly prescriptive. There was some discussion over whether efficacy should be covered in the concept standard and the focus group acknowledged that, if efficacy were to be covered, it would not be feasible for the technical panel to scrutinize efficacy data to the same degree as when treatments are considered by the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT).

One focus group member suggested that the concept standard should set guidelines on what should and should not be considered in determining confidence in the measures. Criteria could include, for example, the number of contracting parties using the measure and the number of years the measure has been in use. The suggestion was made that perhaps inclusion of the measure in a PRA could be the first step in identifying measures, and then the list of potential measures could be narrowed down depending on the number of contracting parties using the measure. One focus group member queried the need for and usefulness of guidance on confidence levels in the concept standard, as some of the criteria suggested could be interpreted as indicating the “popularity” of the measure (e.g. more countries using a measure) rather than the actual “confidence” in the measure. It was pointed out, however, that the intended purpose of commodity standards is only to provide information on measures that meet certain criteria, not to set requirements about measures or give recommendations. In this context, if a measure has been used by many countries over many years, a contracting party is likely to have more confidence in that measure than one that has only been used by one contracting party for a few years.

- [84] One focus group member suggested that commodity standards could perhaps include a statement of intent for each measure (e.g. to minimize the probability of establishment of a specified pest).
- [85] Another member mentioned that reliability of data is slightly different from confidence, and that reliability is usually considered when evaluating treatments. The focus group recalled their discussions earlier in the meeting about the table of information on the reliability of data in the draft revision of ISPM 8.
- [86] The focus group acknowledged that it was difficult to categorize measures, but that the measures included in the commodity standards would only be examples and not an exhaustive list. The group highlighted, however, that confidence will depend on the rigour of supporting analyses and may be increased if there are cumulative sources of information (while noting that the possibility of including historical measures, such as historical treatments, should not be excluded). It was noted that confidence would be increased if the measures are used in a diverse range of countries or ecoregions and if application of the measures results in there being fewer interceptions.
- [87] It was pointed out that, apart from adopted ISPMs, there is no definitive information that says that a particular measure is effective. Just because several contracting parties use a measure does not mean that it is a harmonized measure – it just means that it is an option and other criteria need to be examined. Contracting parties need to make their own assessments, and no one criterion is sufficient in itself to provide confidence in a measure. (See also the discussion on harmonization in section 6.2.6 of this report.)
- [88] One member of the focus group commented that although it is important to have rigorous criteria (e.g. scientific evidence from research) for selecting measures, even simple measures could easily be enriched with further detail.
- [89] Another member pointed out that we should not presume how contracting parties will use the information in the standards. The standards will be partway between a normal standard and a manual, as the measures are not endorsed but are selected on the basis of criteria and are available for contracting parties to choose from, and so are for information. Hence, it is important to get the criteria for selection right.
- [90] One focus group member suggested that, if options to manage pest risk are to be presented in commodity standards, it is important that the effectiveness of those measures can be demonstrated, as contracting parties can use this information in their bilateral negotiations.
- [91] The focus group confirmed that measures should be assigned to *three* categories (*high, medium and low*), to provide some consistency between commodity standards and for simplicity. This gives the technical panel the freedom to decide how to assign measures to these categories but avoids over-complication. It was pointed out that the use of “high”, “medium” and “low” could imply qualification of the measures, so the group decided that each category should be accompanied by an explanatory description. The group also confirmed that this section of the concept standard comprises instructions

for the new technical panel when assigning measures to categories according to confidence level; it is not guidance that will be included in the commodity standards themselves.

7.2 Role, function and terms of reference for a new technical panel

[92] As background information for the focus group discussions, the Secretariat had circulated a paper giving an overview of the work of the technical panels¹⁵, this also noting that the focus group's recommendations may have an impact on the roles, processes and terms of reference of existing technical panels. Relevant points from this were referred to in response to questions during the meeting.

7.2.1 Creation of a new technical panel

[93] The Chairperson summarized the outcome of CPM-14 (2019) and the feedback from the SC and in the paper from Japan. While some concerns had been expressed about the possible establishment of a new technical panel, there appeared to be a general consensus in favour of it.

[94] The consensus within the focus group was also in favour of a new technical panel, and the group agreed that a recommendation should be made to CPM-15 (2020) to establish one. One member voiced a note of caution as he anticipated that, in the future, most of the standards would be commodity standards and so the technical panel could effectively be taking on the role of the SC. However, it was pointed out that the governance arrangements can be reviewed and changed in future, should the need arise. Some members of the focus group noted that the TPPT should be separate from the new panel, to ensure that emphasis is given to treatments that have efficacy data and can be adopted as annexes to ISPM 28. The focus group noted that creating a new technical panel does not preclude having expert drafting groups (EDGs), as these can be called for specific topics as needed. It was also emphasized that the new technical panel should not become a global default panel for conducting PRAs.

[95] The focus group agreed that the new technical panel should be on commodity standards (Technical Panel on Commodity Standards), not on phytosanitary measures, because the panel will review the pest lists in commodity standards as well as the measures.

[96] The Secretariat outlined how the governance processes currently in operation differ between, for example, "true" ISPMs, DPs, PTs and terms considered by the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) for inclusion in ISPM 5. In the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP), for example, the main drafting work is undertaken by DP drafting groups. In contrast, the TPG assists the work of the SC as needed, rather than necessarily drafting a standard, as the latter is usually done via an EWG for the SC.

[97] One focus group member commented that, for this new approach, there may be merit in being more innovative in, for example, how the information available from countries is used. He noted that, for some commodities, the relevant information will not be available at the time that the corresponding standard is being developed, so inputs from the technical panel members will be needed and will be highly relevant.

[98] The focus group agreed that the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) should be separate from the TPPT and TPDP, should have the option to call for EDGs, and should have a steward from the SC. The focus group recognized that it would probably be too much work for the Steward of the TPCS to be on each drafting group, but perhaps a member of the panel should always be on the drafting group? It was clarified that the panel should make recommendations to the SC on topics and drafting groups, but it is then up to the SC to discuss and decide, at least in the early stages of this process, because under the established Standard setting procedure the SC is responsible for appointing EDGs.

[99] The focus group agreed that the TPCS should be responsible for assessing measures to be included in commodity standards, and for creating criteria for inclusion of measures in the standards.

¹⁵ 09_FGCP_2019_Jun

[100] One focus group member pointed out that, because of the need to review and update these standards, a technical panel with *permanent* work would be needed, this being different to the TPG.

7.2.2 Specification for the technical panel

[101] The Secretariat highlighted that the TPCS would need a specification and referred the focus group to the specifications for the current technical panels. The focus group drafted a specification for the panel (Appendix 5).

[102] **Tasks.** It was noted that the TPCS would support the SC regarding Calls for information on pests and measures, although there was no need to include this in the tasks in the specification as the Calls happen anyway. It was also suggested that, in addition to Calls for information, the panel should also be continually looking for information on measures. Later in the meeting, however, the focus group agreed that the new technical panel should only work on information provided to it and should not have an active role in seeking other information.

[103] The focus group agreed that the TPCS should consider how best to manage data used to evaluate which phytosanitary measures are included in commodity standards and other adopted IPSMs, so that there could be an online search tool identifying target pest, commodity and measures.

[104] The focus group noted that in the specification for each current technical panel, there is a task to consider the implementation of standards by contracting parties and to provide information and possible recommendations to SC. The group recognized the importance of implementation but discussed whether this task is suitable as a task for the TPCS. It was decided to leave the task in the draft specification, at least for the time being, but to use the term “use” rather than “implementation” as commodity standards are just providing options from which contracting parties can choose.

[105] **Expertise.** The group listed the expertise that panel members should bring to the TPCS. These included pest risk management and the development and management of phytosanitary import requirements, selection and implementation of phytosanitary measures for use in trade, development of regional and international standards, and assessment of pest lists. One member of the focus group suggested having a biostatistician on the panel, but another member commented that it might be better if an economist post was created within the Secretariat. The focus group decided that expertise in biostatistics or economics is not needed on the panel itself.

7.3 Process for identifying or obtaining PRAs on pests linked with commodities to provide pest lists

[106] **Calls for information.** The focus group agreed to recommend that, as well as the existing general Call for topics, there would be a general ongoing request for information on aspects relating to commodity standards, including experience of related measures; in addition to this, a specific Call for information on pests and measures could be made whenever a topic is prioritized, using the existing IPPC process. The focus group recommended that if the contents, pests or measures in a standard require review, this should be addressed on a priority basis by the TPCS.

[107] The focus group drafted a list of the types of information to be sought during Calls for information on a specific prioritized topic (Appendix 6). The Call would specify the commodity and its intended use, and submitters would be asked to limit their submissions to this. It was noted that where a measure appears in a relevant ISPM or regional standard (one of the items on the list) this indicates international or regional endorsement of the measure concerned.

[108] The focus group emphasized that this list is intended as guidance to the TPCS, but that it should be recognized that information from all categories may not always be available. The list is not intended for inclusion in the concept standard itself.

[109] One member of the focus group queried how evidence should be provided, as some countries are reluctant to provide data. The Chairperson wondered whether a workshop on this issue might be helpful, if funding were available.

7.4 The Standard setting process

[110] The Secretariat had circulated details of the Standard setting process (SSP)¹⁶ prior to the meeting, and answered questions on this at various points during the meeting.

7.4.1 Calls for topics

[111] The focus group agreed that there should be just one Call, to be part of the existing biennial Call for topics submitted by national and regional plant protection organizations (a joint call for the SC and the IC). The focus group noted that there is an established process for Calls for topics, with the TFT undertaking the first screening based on a set of established criteria. The TFT recommendations are then forwarded to the SC and IC, who make recommendations to the TFT, who then submit proposals to CPM, alongside comments from the Bureau. It was emphasized that it is the main committees (the SC and IC) who review the topic proposals, with the TFT acting as a facilitator. The focus group acknowledged that developing standards on broad commodity classes increases the complexity of the Standard setting process, but agreed that the existing arrangements for Call for topics were sufficient for commodity standards. The focus group noted, however, that additional criteria could be added to the Call, as for example suggested in the paper submitted by Japan¹².

[112] The focus group agreed to recommend that the Steward for the TPCS be part of the TFT.

[113] The focus group drew up a draft list of criteria for the TFT to consider when prioritizing topics to be submitted to CPM (Appendix 7), including the suggestions made in the paper from Japan¹².

[114] This list is not intended for inclusion in the concept standard itself.

[115] One member of the focus group commented that the volume of information alone should not determine the prioritization, but the Secretariat confirmed that established criteria for Calls for topics address this.

[116] The focus group recognized that the concept standard would act as the specification (also as a template) for all commodity standards. It was pointed out, however, that although the current process for specification would therefore not apply, some type of input needs to be sought from countries proposing new commodity standards during the Call for topics. This would also facilitate and speed up the process for the development and adoption of these standards.

[117] **Summary of process.** The Chairperson summed up the focus group's conclusions about the recommended governance process:

[118] Call for topics → TFT (including Steward of TPCS) → SC or IC → TFT → CPM → SC or IC → TPCS develops the standard

[119] Under this process, there would be a permanent steward from the SC on the TPCS. The TPCS would have the flexibility to decide whether to draft the standard themselves or whether an EWG is needed. If the latter, they would recommend this to the SC and if the SC decided to create an EWG, a steward for this would be appointed, who is preferably a member of the TPCS or the steward of the TPCS.

[120] There was some discussion about the term “Steward” of the TPCS as this could imply that this person stewards each draft standard. Members of the focus group commented that perhaps another term could be used instead, but the Secretariat reminded them that “steward” is the term used for technical panels.

7.4.2 Review and revision of commodity standards

[121] The Chairperson highlighted that, given the dynamic nature of pest risk and knowledge about the effectiveness of measures applied, each standard must be open for review. The focus group noted, however, that such review is part of the ISPM development process rather than being a requirement for contracting parties, so any guidance on the review process might be better placed in guidance about processes rather than in the Requirements section of the concept standard.

¹⁶ 07-FGCP_2019_Jun, 08-FGCP_2019_Jun

[122] The focus group discussed the process that would be required when new information means that an existing standard needs to be reviewed or revised. In the current Standard setting process, there are some types of things that can be changed without going to CPM, so there is some degree of precedence for updates, but the changes in question here would be more than this. The focus group recognized that even the addition of a pest would not be considered a minor change as this can be a sensitive issue. The focus group therefore agreed to recommend that CPM-15 (2020) consider a change to the Standard setting process to allow for review of commodity standards, and that when a standard is under review an indication is given on the International Phytosanitary Portal¹⁷ that the standard is under review and also which part of the standard and why.

[123] The focus group agreed that the SC and other relevant bodies should consider the following:

- A process to maintain and update these standards will need to be further considered by the SC and other bodies, in particular when the standard is under review and related information needs to be presented to stakeholders.
- Existing commodity standards will require revision after the new commodity standards approach has been adopted.
- When a standard requires revision, a new adoption process should be considered to minimize the time required for the revision to occur; the SC should determine whether the revision requires CPM approval or can be adopted by SC.

[124] The adoption process for commodity standards should follow the normal IPPC procedure.

[125] **Information useful for review of standards and future standards.** It was suggested that if contracting parties choose not to apply measures in a commodity standard, they should be encouraged to inform the TPCS, giving the reasons why, so that the standard can be reviewed and improved. Also, when a measure is in a new ISPM, it would be useful to log it so that it can be available for inclusion in other commodity standards. (See also the task on managing data for an online search tool, in section 7.2.2 of this report.)

7.5 Further details on processes that will be used to develop commodity standards, taking into account comments from the Bureau, SC and IC

[126] **Drafting the concept standard.** Members of the focus group agreed that the focus group should remain responsible for supporting the development of the concept standard.

[127] **Drafting the commodity standards.** The focus group suggested that, for the first commodity standards, the TPCS should draft the standards; then, as the process becomes more established, drafting groups could perhaps be used. If the subject matter is very specific, an EWG might be needed (with the Call for the EWG being the responsibility of the SC), but if not as specific the TPCS may be able to draft the standard without additional experts. Flexibility is therefore needed.

[128] **Industry involvement.** The focus group noted that there is substantial experience within industry. The group agreed that, where there are international bodies related to the commodity, they should be invited as observers to the drafting group. It was also suggested that research groups such as the International Forestry Quarantine Research Group and the Phytosanitary Measures Research Group could be involved, with their input feeding into the IPPC process rather than having such groups as part of the process itself.

8. Conclusions and recommendations

[129] The focus group considered that they had addressed the tasks given to them by the CPM.

¹⁷ International Phytosanitary Portal: <https://www.ippc.int/en/>

[130] In terms of general conclusions and recommendations, the focus group made the following recommendations:

- The standards under consideration by the focus group do not apply to pathways in the broad sense, so the standards should be referred to as “commodity standards”.
- Commodity standards should be annexes under the concept standard. Commodity standards on seeds or wood could alternatively be annexes of ISPM 38 or ISPM 39, respectively.
- A new technical panel, the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS), should be established, with a permanent Steward from the SC. The focus group recommends that CPM-15 establishes this panel. In the meantime, the focus group members should remain responsible for supporting the development of the concept standard.
- The membership of the TFT should be expanded to include the Steward of the TPCS.
- For the first commodity standards, the TPCS should draft the standards; then, as the process becomes more established, drafting groups could be used as needed. The TPCS should have the option to recommend Calls for EDGs to the SC.
- The TPCS should be responsible for assessing measures to be included in commodity standards, and for creating criteria for inclusion of measures in the standards.
- The scope of a commodity standard, in terms of the commodity and its intended use, should be sufficiently focused so that the standard is practicable, feasible and does not need to have several subcategories of the commodity.
- Commodity standards should include a table of pests associated with the commodity, with corresponding measures used to control those pests, and, when relevant, they may also contain information on pests known not to be associated with the traded commodity.
- There should be a general ongoing request for information on aspects relating to commodity standards and, in addition to this, a specific Call for information on pests and measures whenever a topic is prioritized.
- It is recommended that CPM-15 (2020) consider changing the Standard setting process to allow for commodity standards to be reviewed promptly when needed.
- The TPCS should be encouraged to provide guidance to the SC on possible future standards on individual measures (in a similar way to PTs), where there are sufficient data on the effectiveness of those measures to support it.
- The adoption process for commodity standards, and for standards on phytosanitary measures, should be the same as for annexes to ISPM 28 (i.e. PTs).
- It is recommended that the Bureau give further consideration to the value of the section in ISPMs on “Impacts on biodiversity and the environment”.
- It is suggested that the APPPC be invited, through APPPC member Mr Stephen BUTCHER, to consider the findings of this focus group in further development of the draft APPPC mango standard.
- The following aspects should be forwarded to the IC for consideration in any guidance manual that might be produced:
 - diversion from intended use
 - contracting parties should be encouraged to release PRA and other technical justification information into the public domain.
- The TPCS should consider how best to manage data used to evaluate which phytosanitary measures are included in commodity standards and other adopted IPSMs, so that there can be an online search tool for target pest, commodity and measures.
- There may be benefit, once a few commodity standards are in use, in undertaking a study to attribute a specific value to commodity standards in terms of financial savings to import.

8.1 Summary report for Bureau and SPG

[131] The Chairperson and Rapporteur confirmed that they will produce a paper summarizing the meeting, to be presented to the Bureau and SPG meetings scheduled to be held on 7–11 October 2019 and 8–10 October 2019, respectively.

[132] The Bureau and SPG meeting reports are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal¹⁸.

9. Other Business

[133] **Funding.** The focus group noted that at CPM-14 (2019), the European Union had indicated that they would support activities related to the development of commodity and pathway standards by making a financial contribution of EUR 300 000 in the 2019–2021 period, in a co-funding arrangement.

[134] The focus group member from New Zealand informed the group that New Zealand would contribute USD 50 000 to IPPC for work on commodity and pathway standards, with the intention for the organization of an international conference in 2020 on this topic.

[135] The focus group welcomed the news of these two contributions. The need for adequate funding for work on development of commodity standards was highlighted and the group strongly encouraged other contracting parties to contribute. The focus group asked the Secretariat to provide an indication of the cost of, for example, holding a workshop, operating a technical panel or funding a full-time equivalent post within the Secretariat.

[136] A member of the governance team in the Secretariat joined the meeting briefly, to explain the procedures regarding financial contributions.

10. Close of the Meeting

[137] The focus group agreed that after the meeting it would communicate via email, and would investigate the best way to video conference if needed.

[138] The focus group highlighted that further consideration needs to be given to:

- the possible need for a guidance manual
- content related to commodity standards for inclusion in the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*
- a possible annotated template for commodity standards.

[139] The Chairperson thanked all participants for their work during the week and closed the meeting.

¹⁸ Bureau meeting reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/bureau/>; SPG meeting reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/strategic-planning-group/>

Appendix 1: Agenda**Second Focus Group Meeting on Commodity and Pathway Standards****17–21 June 2019****FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy****AGENDA**

| AGENDA ITEM | DOCUMENT NO. | PRESENTER |
|--|---|------------------|
| 1. Opening of the meeting | | |
| 1.1 Welcome by IPPC Secretariat | - | NERSISYAN |
| 1.2 Welcome by the Chairperson / Bureau | - | WOLFF/ BUTCHER |
| 2. Meeting Arrangements | | |
| 2.1 Election of the Rapporteur | - | Chairperson |
| 2.2 Adoption of the Agenda | 01_FGCP_2019_Jun | Chairperson |
| 3. Administrative Matters | | |
| 3.1 Documents List | 02_FGCP_2019_Jun | Chairperson |
| 3.2 Participants List | 03_FGCP_2019_Jun | Chairperson |
| 3.3 Local Information | Link to local information | Chairperson |
| 4. Terms of reference | 11_FGCP_2019_Jun | Chairperson |
| 5. Background | | |
| 5.1 Report of the 1 st Focus Group Meeting on Commodity Standards | Link to the 1st FG meeting report | WOLFF |
| 5.2 CPM-14 outcomes | Link to CPM-14 report Link to CPM-14 paper Link to CPM-14 CRP 05_FGCP_2019_Jun | BUTCHER |
| 5.3 Standards Committee (SC) discussions | 04_FGCP_2019_Jun | FERRO |
| 5.4 CPM Bureau discussions: update | - | WOLFF/ BUTCHER |
| 5.5 EFSA discussion paper | 12_FGCP_2019_Jun 14_FGCP_2019_Jun | BISHOP |
| 5.6 Discussion from Japan | 10_FGCP_2019_Jun | HA |
| 5.7 Beyond Compliance Tools | 13_FGCP_2019_Jun | MOREIRA |

| AGENDA ITEM | | DOCUMENT NO. | PRESENTER |
|-------------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 5.8 | Draft regional mango standard (APPPC) | 15_FGCP_2019_Jun | BUTCHER |
| 5.9 | Draft regional chili seeds standard (APPPC) | 16_FGCP_2019_Jun | BUTCHER |
| 6. | Development of text for the draft ISPM | | Chairperson |
| 6.1 | Reference documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates (particularly Part 1, sections 2, 3 and 5) - ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) - Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology | Link to the IPPC Style Guide Link to ISPM 5 06_FGCP_2019_Jun | Chairperson / MOREIRA |
| 6.2 | Development of text for the draft ISPM | [to be prepared at the meeting] | Chairperson / ALL |
| 7. | Commodity and pathways standards process | | Chairperson |
| 7.1 | Criteria for identifying measures and including them in commodity standards | - | Chairperson |
| 7.2 | Role, function and terms of reference for a new Technical Panel | 09_FGCP_2019_Jun | Chairperson |
| 7.3 | Process for identifying/obtaining PRAs on pests linked with commodities to provide pest lists | - | Chairperson |
| 7.4 | The standard setting process (SSP): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation of the SSP - Current SSP text | 08_FGCP_2019_Jun 07_FGCP_2019_Jun | MOREIRA |
| 7.5 | Further details on processes that will be used to develop Commodity and Pathway standards taking in to account comments from Bureau, SC and IC | - | Chairperson / ALL |
| 8. | Conclusions and recommendations | | Chairperson |
| 8.1 | Summary report for Bureau/SPG | | BUTCHER / WOLFF |
| 9. | Other business | | Chairperson |
| 10. | Close of the meeting | | IPPC Secretariat / Chairperson |

Appendix 2: Documents list**Second Focus Group Meeting on Commodity and Pathway Standards****17–21 June 2019****FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy****DOCUMENTS LIST**

| DOCUMENT NO. | AGENDA ITEM | DOCUMENT TITLE | DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED |
|---------------------|--------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 01_FGCP_2019_Jun | 2.2 | Provisional Agenda | 2019-06-11 |
| 02_FGCP_2019_Jun | 3.1 | Documents List | 2019-06-11 |
| 03_FGCP_2019_Jun | 3.2 | Participants List | 2019-06-11 |
| 04_FGCP_2019_Jun | 5.3 | Standards Committee (SC) discussions | 2019-05-28 |
| 05_FGCP_2019_Jun | 5.2 | CPM-14 outcomes | 2019-05-29 |
| 06_FGCP_2019_Jun | 6.1 | Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology | 2019-05-29 |
| 07_FGCP_2019_Jun | 7.4 | The IPPC Standards Setting process | 2019-05-29 |
| 08_FGCP_2019_Jun | 7.4 | The IPPC Standards Setting process PPT | 2019-05-29 |
| 09_FGCP_2019_Jun | 7.2 | IPPC Technical Panels - Overview | 2019-05-30 |
| 10_FGCP_2019_Jun | 5.6 | Discussion paper from Japan | 2019-06-11 |
| 11_FGCP_2019_Jun | 4.0 | TOR Second Focus Group on Commodity Standards | 2019-06-11 |
| 12_FGCP_2019_Jun | 5.4 | EFSA discussion paper | 2019-06-11 |
| 13_FGCP_2019_Jun | 5.7 | Beyond Compliance Tools | 2019-06-14 |
| 14_FGCP_2019_Jun | 5.5 | EFSA Technical report | 2019-06-17 |
| 15_FGCP_2019_Jun | 5.8 | Draft-regional mango standard (APPPC) | 2019-06-17 |
| 16_FGCP_2019_Jun | 5.9 | Draft regional chili standard (APPPC) | 2019-06-17 |

| IPP LINKS: | Agenda item |
|---|--------------------|
| Link to local information | 3.3 |
| Link to the 1st FG meeting report | 5.1 |
| Link to CPM-14 report | 5.2 |
| Link to CPM-14 paper | 5.2 |
| Link to CPM-14 CRP | 5.2 |
| Link to the IPPC Style Guide | 6.1 |
| Link to ISPM 5 | 6.1 |

Appendix 3: Participants list**Second Focus Group Meeting on Commodity and Pathway Standards****17–21 June 2019****FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy****PARTICIPANTS LIST**

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

| Members | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------|--|--|
| | NPPO Or Organization | | Name, mailing, address, telephone | Email address |
| | Chile | Ms | Lilian Daisy Olate IBÁÑEZ Head of Pest Risk Analysis Section / Chile NPPO Av. Bulnes 140, floor 3 Santiago CHILE Tel: (+56) 223451457 (+56) 990893441 | Lilian.ibanez@sag.gob.cl |
| | China | Mr | Liang WEI Section Chief - Shandong Entry-Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau & Qingdao Customs RM 2005, ZhongShan Road No2 , Shinan Distr., Qingdao, 266000 CHINA Tel: (+86) 53280886109 Fax: (+86) 532-80886125 | Liangweiqd@qq.com |
| ✓ | COSAVE | Mr | Marcus Vinicius Segurado COELHO Plant Health Department Director – Brazil NPPO Director Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply of Brazil, Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D, Anexo B, Sala 304 BRAZIL Tel: (+55) (61) 3218-2716 Fax: (+55) (61) 3224-3874 | marcus.coelho@agricultura.gov.br |
| ✓ | UK / EPPO | Mr | Samuel BISHOP Head of International Plant Health Policy, Risk Co-ordination and Trade Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs National Agri-Food Innovation Campus Sand Hutton York North Yorkshire YO10 3 LA UNITED KINGDOM Tel: (+44) (0) 2080262506 Mob.: (+44) (0) 7827976902 | sam.bishop@defra.gov.uk |

| Members | | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------|--|--|
| | NPPO Or Organization | | Name, mailing, address, telephone | Email address |
| ✓ | Kenya | Mr | Thomas Kimeli KOSIOM Senior Inspector – Kenya plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) Kephis Headquarters, P. O. Box 49592-00100 Nairobi KENYA Tel: (+254) 720398083 | tkosiom@kephis.org |
| | New Zealand | Mr | Peter S. THOMSON Director, Plant and Pathways, Ministry for Primary Industries 147 Lambton Quay, PO Box 2526, Wellington 6140 NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 29 894 0353 | peter.thomson@mpi.govt.nz |
| ✓ | United States of America | Mr | Ronald A. SEQUEIRA Associate Deputy Administrator, Science and Technology / USDA -APHIS PPQ, Science and Technology USDA APHIS PPQ #5C03J, 4700 River Rd Riverdale, MD 20737 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Tel: (+1) 919 349 4425 Fax: (+1) 919 855 7480 | Ron.A.Sequeira@aphis.usda.gov |
| ✓ | Viet Nam | Ms | Thanh Huong HA Deputy Director of Plant Quarantine Division, Plant Protection Department 149 Ho Dac Di Street Dong Da district Hanoi City VIET NAM Tel: (+8424) 35334813 Fax: (+8424) 35330043 | ppdhuong@yahoo.com ; ppdhuong@gmail.com |
| ✓ | CPM Bureau Rep (New Zealand) | Mr | Stephen BUTCHER Manager Plant Imports, Plants & Pathways Directorate Ministry for Primary Industries Pastoral House 25 The Terrace PO Box 2526 Wellington 6140 NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 4 894 0478 Fax: (+ 64) 4 894 0662 Mob: (+ 64) 29 894 0478 | stephen.butcher@mpi.govt.nz |

| Members | | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|--|--|
| | NPPO Or Organization | | Name, mailing, address, telephone | Email address |
| ✓ | CPM Bureau Rep (Canada) | Mr | Greg WOLFF Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive, OTTAWA, ON. K1A 0Y9 CANADA Tel: (+1) 613 773 7060 Mob.: (+1) 613 325 2941 | greg.woff@canada.ca |
| ✓ | Standards Committee Rep – Chairperson (Argentina) | Mr | Ezequiel FERRO Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA Av, Paeso Colón 315 C.A. de Buenos Aires ARGENTINA Tel: (+5411) 4121-5091 Fax: (+5411) 4121-5091 | eferro@senasa.gov.ar |
| ✓ | Implementation Committee Rep - IC member | Ms | Faith NDUNGE Head biosafety and phytosanitary services Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Services P.O. Box 49592-00100, Nairobi KENYA Tel:+254722697674 Mobile:+254722697674 | ndungeq@yahoo.com ; fndunge@kephis.org |

IPPC Secretariat

| | Region / Role | Name, mailing, address, telephone | Email address |
|---|----------------------|--|--|
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat | Mr Avetik NERSISYAN Standard Setting Unit Lead | Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org |
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat | Ms Adriana MOREIRA Standard Setting Officer | Adriana.Moreira@fao.org |
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat | Ms Karen ROUEN IPPC Secretariat editor and report writer | Karen.Rouen@fao.org |

Appendix 4: Terms of reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOCUS GROUP ON COMMODITY AND PATHWAY STANDARDS - SECOND MEETING

(revised and approved by CPM Bureau June 2019)

Background

- [1] The Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) in its thirteenth session (CPM-13, 2018) has identified the need for further analysis on the purpose, benefits and use of commodity and pathway standards as the basis for guidance to the IPPC Standards Committee (SC) on their development, and to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) on their implementation.
- [2] CPM-13 requested the Bureau and Secretariat, develop Terms of Reference (ToR) for a small focus group, with geographical representation. At the CPM-14, it was agreed that the focus group would be reconvened adjacent to the June 2019 Bureau Meeting to draft a concept ISPM for commodity and pathway standards to be presented to CPM-15 (2020) for approval for consultation. The concept standard will:
- i. identify the purpose and scope of commodity and pathway standards
 - ii. determine the layout and format of the commodity and pathway standards
 - iii. capture principles and criteria for their development and use with reference to practical examples, and
 - iv. provide additional details on processes used to develop and use them taking into account comments from SC, IC and Bureau.

Process

- [3] The CPM paper presented to CPM-14 on the results of the first focus group on Commodity and Pathway standards and contracting party comments received during CPM-14 will form the basis of the work by the second meeting of focus group.
- [4] The focus group will meet on 17 - 21 June 2019 in Rome and complete the tasks outlined below. The report of this meeting will be presented to the Bureau during its meeting in 7-11 October 2019, and to Strategic Planning Group (SPG) during its meeting on 8 – 10 October 2019. The SPG will make recommendations on the findings of the second meeting of the focus group on the “governance process” and on the “concept ISPM for commodity and pathway standards”.
- [5] The SC and IC will be invited to review the draft CPM paper and the draft ISPM, at their November 2019 meetings, before it is finalized by the Bureau.

[6] Membership

- [7] The focus group is skills - and knowledge-based with geographical representation and it should be composed of:
- Maximum of 8 experts, and
 - At least one representative of the Bureau
 - One representative of the SC and one of IC.
- [8] Its membership should have collective experience and expertise in:
- the development and application of practical measures for managing phytosanitary risks;
 - the development and implementation of international and/or regional and national standards;

- undertaking pest risk analysis and the establishment of risk-based phytosanitary measures.

[9] Together with:

- a practical knowledge of production and trading pathways and processes for plants and plant products; ·
- a broader, global perspective of trade in plant commodities and the strategies and policies that impact the trade;
- understanding of commercial marketing and trading practices that impact or are impacted by phytosanitary requirements.

[10] The Bureau will decide the membership and make-up of the focus group.

Tasks

[11] The focus group will:

- i. consider the results of the first focus group on commodity and pathway standards, and comments received at CPM-14,
- ii. draft a concept standard on commodity and pathway standards,
- iii. provide further details on processes that will be used to develop Commodity and Pathway standards taking in to account comments from Bureau, SC and IC.

[12] The concept standard would be informed by analysis of practical examples drawn from the following or other options, considering the following:

1. The development and adoption of commodity standards for mango fruit for consumption and chilli seed by the APPPC
2. Other commodity and pathway standards under development or in use
3. The establishment of production systems that enable exports to multiple markets with harmonized import requirements
4. Identifying and describing common elements from existing import/export conditions or protocols for a number of plant products that are widely traded
5. Integrating new measures into existing pathways for new pests (e.g. control measures for *Tuta absoluta*)
6. Replacing existing pest control measures with integrated pest management options for specific or general pests
7. Topics that may be provided in response to the 2018 call for topics for standards and implementation
8. The development of harmonized phytosanitary measures to support the risk management of pests
9. Lessons learnt from previous and current attempts at developing commodity standards through the standard setting process.

Funding

[13] The organization that employs an IPPC meeting participant is responsible for funding the travel and daily subsistence allowance for that person to attend. If the employer is unable to allocate sufficient funds, participants are first encouraged to seek assistance from sources other than the IPPC Secretariat.

[14] Where such demonstrated efforts to secure assistance have been unsuccessful, requests for assistance (i.e. travel and subsistence costs) from the IPPC Secretariat may be made. However, any support is subject to available funds. The IPPC Secretariat will consider funding assistance for participants following IPPC criteria for funding. Full details on these criteria can be found on the IPP

<https://www.ippc.int/publications/criteria-used-prioritizing-participants-receive-travel-assistanceattend-meetings>).

Some references

- CPM-14 papers: <https://www.ippc.int/en/cpm---previous-years/cpm-14/>
- Report of first meeting of the focus group: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87048/>

Appendix 5: Draft specification for the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards

DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR: Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS) (2019-009)

Status box

| | |
|--|--|
| This is not an official part of the specification and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after approval | |
| Date of this document | 2019-07-23 |
| Document category | Draft specification for a technical panel |
| Current document stage | To CPM-15 for approval |
| Major stages | 2019-06 Focus group on commodity standards recommended adding to the work programme. |
| Steward history | n/a |
| Notes | This is a draft document 2019-07 Edited |

Title

[15] Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS) (2019-009).

Reason for the technical panel

[16] There is broad consensus that commodity standards based on scientific methods and evidence will support safe and streamlined trade to the benefit of contracting parties. The IPPC strategic framework 2020–2030 includes the development of commodity standards. In order to develop such standards and ensure that sufficient rigour, resources and focus can be provided, the Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS) was established in 202X.

Scope and purpose

[17] The Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS) develops and updates commodity standards within the framework of International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) XX [the concept standard] and develops guidance on related aspects.

Tasks

[18] The TPCS should undertake the following:

- (1) Draft commodity standards prioritized by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, either directly or with the support of invited experts or through expert drafting groups established by the Standards Committee (SC).
- (2) When drafting a commodity standard:
 - review existing pest risk analyses, existing phytosanitary measures and related information that may inform the development of the standard
 - evaluate technical information on relevant pests and phytosanitary measures and determine which pests and measures are to be included in the standard, using criteria established for this purpose in ISPM XX [the concept standard].
- (3) Ensure that draft commodity standards are consistent with the requirements and criteria in ISPM XX [the concept standard].
- (4) Ensure that there is consistency among commodity standards being developed and adopted under ISPM XX [the concept standard].
- (5) Review adopted commodity standards (either ISPMs or annexes to ISPMs), identify revisions needed and submit recommendations on these revisions to the SC.

- (6) Provide advice to the SC on subjects, topics and priorities for development of commodity standards.
- (7) Liaise as needed with the other technical panels under the Standards Committee (SC) (e.g. Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments, Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols, and Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine) and with the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee.
- (8) Liaise as needed with relevant stakeholders, including the private sector and academia, under the direction of the SC.
- (9) Support consultation and adoption of draft commodity standards by, for example, providing advice to the Steward, the SC and the IPPC Secretariat on appropriate responses to member comments relating to draft commodity standards.
- (10) Consider how to categorize and catalogue phytosanitary measures included in commodity standards, and those in other standards, for use in an online search tool for target pest, commodity and measure, cross-referenced to relevant sources of information.
- (11) When evaluating a phytosanitary measure for inclusion in a commodity standard, consider whether there is sufficient information to support it being proposed as a topic for the development of a specific ISPM.
- (12) Consider whether commodity standards could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft commodity standard.
- (13) Consider the use of commodity standards by contracting parties and identify potential impediments to operational and technical implementation. Provide information on these impediments, and possible recommendations on how to overcome them, to the SC.

Expertise

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

- pest risk management and development and management of phytosanitary import requirements
- selection and implementation of phytosanitary measures for use in trade
- development of regional and international phytosanitary standards
- assessment of pest lists.

Members

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

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

Steward

[22] The Steward of the TPCS, who shall be a member of the SC, will be assigned to the TPCS by the SC.

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

Provision of resources

[24] Funding for the meeting may be provided from sources other than the regular programme of the IPPC (FAO). As recommended by ICPM-2 (1999), whenever possible, those participating in standard setting activities voluntarily fund their travel and subsistence to attend meetings. Participants may request financial assistance, with the understanding that resources are limited and the priority for financial assistance is given to developing country participants. Please refer to the *Criteria used for prioritizing*

participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat posted on the IPP (see <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/>).

References

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

Discussion papers

- [26] Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) for consideration by the technical panel.

Appendix 6: Information to be sought in Calls for information for pests and measures related to prioritized topics

[27] The information submitted should be limited to the commodity and its intended use as requested in the Call. The Call is open for any information on:

- pests associated with the commodity, together with related references, using appropriate taxonomic nomenclature
- relevant references (technical or regulatory)
- relevant ISPMs or regional standards if applicable
- a detailed description of any measures used for specific pest–commodity combinations, accompanied by any supporting information for the measures (e.g. PRAs, interception data, efficacy data, when the measure was first used (“historical use”), host status)
- sampling methods used in determining the compliance of measures used for the commodity
- methods used to determine any efficacy data submitted
- common practices applied
- information on the direct use of measures (both pest specific and broad ranging)
- “generic” measures that may be effective against groups of pests
- information on the challenges faced when applying the measure.

Appendix 7: Criteria for inclusion in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*

[1] Criteria to include:

- multiple countries and regions recognize the necessity and usefulness of the topic
- the topic should benefit developing countries, as one of the main purposes of commodity standards is to provide support and assistance to developing countries
- the topic should contribute to food security
- the topic should contribute to plant health
- the topic should contribute to trade facilitation.