

Findings of the survey: lists of regulated pests (ISPM19:2003) and Pest reporting (ISPM17:2002)

March 2014

Implementation Review and Support System of the IPPC

Background to the Evaluation and its Methodology

The generous support of the European Commission (EC) has allowed the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) to function on a project basis from 2011 through March 2014. The project aims to address discussions on the role of compliance in the IPPC and comes in response to a growing interest in the extent to which contracting parties are meeting their reporting obligations. This interest has been raised by donors, the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), and IPPC subsidiary bodies. CPM-3 (2008) agreed to take a cooperative, non-confrontational approach for reviewing contracting parties' implementation of the IPPC and its ISPMs and provide support to improve implementation. This option was selected as an alternative to measuring compliance, and the IRSS is the outcome of that decision.

Contracting parties to the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) have the obligation to establish, update and make available a list of regulated pests as per the provisions set forth in Article VII of the IPPC. Guidelines on how to establish, update and make available a list of regulated pests were adopted as ISPM 19:2003 (Guidelines on lists of regulated pests) at the fifth session of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM-5, 2003). Guidelines on reporting on these pests were agreed as ISPM 17:2002 (Pest reporting) at ICPM-4 (2002).

Based on the intent of the IRSS project, past Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) survey results, and IPPC subsidiary bodies' discussions, the CPM Bureau expressed an interest in the IPPC to renew efforts to strengthen NPPO's abilities to meet National Reporting Obligations (NRO). As a contribution to this renewed focus of work, the IRSS prepared a combined survey on ISPM19: 2003 (Guidelines on lists of regulated pests) and ISPM17: 2002 (Pest Reporting) in close consultation with the Standards Committee, Capacity Development Committee, Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement, and the CPM Bureau.

The objective of this survey is to gauge NPPOs understanding of the obligations and responsibilities described in the International Plant Protection Convention, specifically related to ISPM19: 2003 (Guidelines on lists of regulated pests) and ISPM17: 2002 (Pest Reporting) and to provide an initial input towards deeper NRO analysis of the state of IPPC reporting obligation implementation by NPPOs.

This review is intended to serve as an input towards the programme of work of the Capacity Development Committee, the Standards Committee, and particularly, the IPPC Secretariat's

National Reporting Obligations' team. It will also serve as an input towards the IRSS' triennial implementation review report which will summarize the 3 years of the projects' outputs and activities.

The methodology used to conduct the review included a questionnaire survey to which there were 51 contracting party responses. IPPC Secretariat and several members from the IPPC Subsidiary Bodies and the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) provided input on the design of the survey that covered content contained in ISPM19: 2003 (Guidelines on lists of regulated pests) and ISPM17: 2002 (Pest Reporting). The review is based on primary data from NPPO Contact Points and does not cover reporting obligation data found on the IPP.

It should be noted that some constraints arise when analysing contracting party data. In particular, possible misinterpretations of survey questions and language barriers may have affected the validity and quality of responses. Also, limited NPPO participation in this survey (28% of NPPO Contact Points) further constrains the validity of results.

Taking into account IPPC members as a percentage of the total IPPC members in each region, regions with the highest response rates from IPPC members include Africa (35% of total IPPC African contracting parties responded) Europe (28%) and Latin America and the Caribbean (32%). In spite of the availability of surveys in Russian and Arabic, very few survey responses were received in these languages.

This report includes the analytical results in their entirety as well as open-ended feedback from respondent NPPOs. Data has been screened to maintain contracting party anonymity and in particular, question 1 and question 2 below have been omitted for confidentiality.