



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

IMPLEMENTATION AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT MEETING (VIRTUAL MEETING N°5)

**Rome, Italy
22 July 2020**

IPPC Secretariat

Contents

1.	Opening of the Meeting	3
1.1	Opening by the IFU Team lead and welcome by the IC Chairperson	3
2.	Meeting Arrangements	3
2.1	Election of the Rapporteur	3
2.2	Adoption of the Agenda.....	3
3.	Administrative Matters	3
3.1	Documents list	3
3.2	Participants list.....	3
4.	Update on project Rolling out Systems Approach Globally.....	3
4.1	Remarks from the Project manager.....	3
4.2	Remarks from the Lead Technical Officer	3
4.3	Presentation of Beyond Compliance Tools.....	4
4.4	Discussions on the Tools and the status report of the project.....	4
5.	Any other business.....	5
6.	Date and arrangement of the Next Meeting.....	5
7.	Evaluation of the meeting process	5
8.	Close of the Meeting.....	5

1. Opening of the Meeting

1.1 Opening by the IFU Team lead and welcome by the IC Chairperson

- [1] The IC Chair thanked the participants for joining the Fifth IC virtual meeting dedicated to the update on the implementation status of the project Rolling out Systems Approach Globally: Sharing tools for enhanced application of Systems Approach and market negotiation on plant pest risk (MTF/INT/336/STF) for which the IC stands as the Steering Committee.
- [2] She mentioned that arrangement for the future IC meetings will be discussed at the end of the meeting.

2. Meeting Arrangements

2.1 Election of the Rapporteur

- [3] Ms Faith NDUNGE (Kenya) was elected as Rapporteur for this meeting.

2.2 Adoption of the Agenda

- [4] The Agenda¹ was adopted without modifications and is attached to this report as Annex 1.

3. Administrative Matters

3.1 Documents list

- [5] The List of Documents is attached to this report as Annex 2.

3.2 Participants list

- [6] The List of Participants is attached to this report as Annex 3.

4. Update on project Rolling out Systems Approach Globally

4.1 Remarks from the Project manager

- [7] Ms Megan QUINLAN (Project manager) from the Imperial College London thanked the IC for the opportunity to report on this project. She reminded the IC that Beyond compliance² is a project funded by the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF), the IPPC Secretariat is the implementing agency and Imperial College London is providing technical services for the implementation of the project. The project is intended to contribute to increased opportunities for international trade and improved market access negotiations through the use of systems approach and Beyond Compliance Tools (Tools). She informed IC that a previous project had been undertaken in India and as a result an e-book was prepared.

4.2 Remarks from the Lead Technical Officer

- [8] Ms Ketevan LOMSADZE, the Lead Technical Officer (LTO) of this project reminded the IC that there are three main outputs committed to this project:
- Practical tools that demonstrate predicted efficacy of alternative plant health risks management measures produced for promising trade cases from developing countries
 - Systems approach tools more broadly accessible, in particular to developing countries
 - Countries assisted in market access negotiations for plant products
- [9] The project has three parallel tracks in order to deliver the outputs:
- Refinement of Tools
 - Training and validation of at least four future Facilitators

¹ VM05_01_IC_2020_Jul

² Beyond Compliance project: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/beyond-compliance-project/>

- Support the implementation of at least four Trade Cases for demonstrating and embedding the use of the Tools and validating the Trainees as Facilitators.

4.3 Presentation of Beyond Compliance Tools

- [10] Ms Megan QUINLAN presented the Tools, specifically the Production Chain and the Decision Support for Systems Approach (DSSA). She also highlighted some issues related to confidentiality and trade sensitive information s that might arise when using and managing the Tools.
- [11] She explained that the Production Chain can be used by the exporter or importer country NPPO along with other stakeholders to show the trade partner the chain of production, available and selected measures against the pest risk, by using an easily understandable diagram. Equally, it is an effective communication Tool for an NPPO to use with domestic stakeholders who either need to carry out or document some of the activities or are interested in what will be required.
- [12] She presented two examples of trade cases (Capsicum chain in Uganda and asparagus chain in Peru) and demonstrated the flexibility of this Tool. She also highlighted that the Tool could be used not only for consignments, but for pathways such as sea containers.
- [13] The DSSA was also presented. The DSSA allows users in importing or exporting countries to transparently identify and rate potential options for pest risk management that could help with the formulation of pest risk management plans. Specifically, the DSSA supports evaluation and development of a Systems Approach to pest risk management, as defined in ISPM 14 *The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*. The Excel based DSSA generates graphs from the compilations of the inputted data or opinion to support discussion and decision making. Users are asked for additional information to add to the compiled case data, regarding efficacy and uncertainty as well as more details on measures.
- [14] Ms Megan QUINLAN summarized the information presented in the paper³ and invited the IC to provide feedback on the Tools and discuss action items as presented in the paper. She informed IC that a group of 12 people had completed the Beyond compliance training. She noted that they did not have many trade cases. She noted that most trade cases had started.

4.4 Discussions on the Tools and the status report of the project

- [15] One IC member asked for clarification as to whether the verification of activities undertaken includes evaluation along all the steps of the Production Chain.
- [16] Ms QUINLAN explained that verification is applied at certain points also known as “control points” to confirm that measures have been applied and to verify whether the pest risk has been reduced. For some crop's pest association, it is easy to do but for some other there is need to be creative.
- [17] The IC Vice-Chair noted that the report would benefit from adding background information in the introduction. He noted that some IC members are new and may not be familiar with the topic.
- [18] One IC observer highlighted the need to harmonize the technical terms used in the Tools with the ISPMs, particularly terms as agreed in ISPM 5 *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*. He also noted that these Tools are easy and comprehensive and support the pest risk management, but pest risk management is the third stage of PRA, so users need to understand the entire PRA process before using the Tool. The suggestion was made to be included it in the instructions on the use of Tools.
- [19] The LTO confirmed that there was an effort to use the terms as defined in ISPM 5, however that was not always possible due to the nature of Tools and invited the IC members to provide specific suggestions to improve the use of phytosanitary terms. One member informed the IC that she shared the Tools with staff members of her NPPO involved in the PRAs and colleagues considered the Tools very useful. She suggested that the Tools could assist staff of NPPOs who do not have PRA units to deal with PRAs. A question was raised what is the anticipated process under which importing countries

³ VM05_02_IC_2020_Jul

would discuss and agree on the systems approach developed by an exporting country with the use of Tools.

[20] Ms QUINLAN specified that the use of the Tools for PRA might not be the most appropriate as they do not provide information about the probability of establishment and spread for example. She noted that European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) has a very good online tool to assist with PRA. Tools as they stand now are meant to support the pest risk management and the outcomes of the use of the Tools form the basis for the market access negotiation between trading partners/countries.

[21] Ms QUINLAN highlighted that with the agreement of the STDF Secretariat the project team works on converting the Tools into an online version and making those widely available to all interested stakeholders through the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) using the same platform as ePhyto does. She mentioned that while the refinement of the Tools moves forward challenges are faced with the implementation of trade cases due to the COVID 19 developments and associated hardships of working remotely and convening stakeholders meeting.

[22] The IPPC Secretariat stressed that maintenance of the Tools, once made available online will be dependent on an adequate funding.

[23] An IC member suggested that in the future the Standards Committee (SC) could be asked to consider whether this tool could become an annex to ISPM 14 *The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*, so that CPs could use it to support market access.

[24] The issue of harvesting some information aggregated through the use of the Tools by NPPOs to support the IPPC mandate was raised. The IC thought that clearer and specific proposal should be developed by the project team and should be further discussed through the IC e-Forum. It was highlighted that due to the sensitivity of trade related information final decisions should be made by the CPM.

[25] The IC:

- (1) *Noted* the progress and challenges for implementing the project Rolling out Systems Approach Globally: Sharing tools for enhanced application of Systems Approach and market negotiation on plant pest risk (MTF/INT/336/).
- (2) *Agreed* to make the Beyond Compliance Tools accessible online.
- (3) *Agreed* that the project team to develop a proposal for mining some sections of the Tools for data to support the IPPC mandate with the note that the final decision rests with the CPM.
- (4) *Suggested* that the project status report to the IC be adjusted according to comments provided by the IC members and shared with the IC through e-Forum.

5. Any other business

[26] The IC discussed future meetings arrangements and decided that the next IC meeting would be held in September 2020.

[27] IPPC Secretariat informed the IC about the upcoming selection for experts to develop e-learnings on Pest Risk Analysis and Export Certifications and that a pilot study using Design Thinking to move forward the implementation work is currently taking place.

6. Date and arrangement of the Next Meeting

[28] The IC

- *Agreed* to meet on 23 September 2020 for the next virtual IC meeting.

7. Evaluation of the meeting process

[29] The IPPC Secretariat informed the IC that a survey on this meeting will be shared for evaluation purposes.

8. Close of the Meeting

[30] Ms Olga LAVRENTJEVA thanked all the participants and closed the meeting.

Annex 1 – Provisional Agenda

	rAgenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
1.	Opening of the Meeting		
1.1	Opening by the IFU Team lead and welcome by the IC Chairperson		LARSON/ LAVRENTJEVA
2.	Meeting Arrangements		
2.1	Election of the Rapporteur		LAVRENTJEVA
2.2	Adoption of the Agenda	VM05_01_IC_2020_Jul	LAVRENTJEVA
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1	Documents list	Link	KOUMBA
3.2	Participants list	Link	KOUMBA
4.	Update on project Rolling out Systems Approach Globally		
4.1	Remarks from the Lead Technical Officer		LOMSADZE
4.2	Remarks from the Project manager		QUINLAN
4.3	Presentation of Beyond Compliance Tools	VM05_02_IC_2020_Jul	QUINLAN / LEACH
4.4	Discussions on the Tools and the status report of the project	VM05_03_IC_2020_Jul	ALL
5.	Any other business		LAVRENTJEVA / LARSON
6.	Date and arrangement of the Next Meeting		LARSON
7.	Evaluation of the meeting process		CZERWIEN
8.	Close of the Meeting		LAVRENTJEVA / LARSON