



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (Virtual Meeting No 7)

**Rome, Italy
21 October 2020**

IPPC Secretariat

Required citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2020. *Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (Virtual Meeting No 7), 16-19 November 2020*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

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, 2020



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 (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.....	4
2. Meeting Arrangements	4
2.1 Election of the Rapporteur	4
2.2 Adoption of the agenda.....	4
3. Administrative Matters.....	4
3.1 Documents list	4
3.2 Participants list.....	4
4. IC subgroup: IRSS and programme	4
4.1 Update on activities of IC subgroup: IRSS and proposed work plan	4
5. Any Other Business.....	9
5.1 Selection of IC representative for the CPM Focus Group on Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems	9
5.2 Proposed process for the selection of the IC Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson	9
5.3 IC contributions to the ePhyto Solution.....	10
5.4 Selection of the IC lead for pest risk analysis e-learning.....	11
6. Date and Arrangement of the Next Meeting	11
7. Evaluation of the Meeting Process	11
8. Close of the Meeting	11
AppendiCes.....	12
Appendix 1: Agenda	12
Appendix 2: List of documents.....	13
Appendix 3: Work plan for the IC sub-group on the IRSS.....	14

1. Opening of the Meeting

- [1] The IC Chairperson, Ms Olga LAVRENTJEVA, and the Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU) lead, Mr Brent LARSON, welcomed all participants to the seventh virtual meeting of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) scheduled to update the IC on activities of the IC Sub-group on Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) and discuss proposed work plan.

2. Meeting Arrangements

2.1 Election of the Rapporteur

Mr Ahmed M. ABDELLAH (Egypt) was elected as the Rapporteur to the meeting.

2.2 Adoption of the agenda

- [2] The IC agreed to add the following items under agenda item 5 (Any Other Business):
- Selection of IC representative for the CPM Focus Group on Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems
 - Proposed process for the selection of the IC Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson
 - IC contributions to the ePhyto Solution,
 - Selection of the IC lead for pest risk analysis e-learning.
- [3] The agenda¹, as modified, was adopted and is attached to this report as Appendix 1.

3. Administrative Matters

3.1 Documents list

- [4] The List of documents was introduced and is attached to this report as Appendix 2.

3.2 Participants list

- [5] For IC virtual meetings, the participant list would no longer be annexed to the report but a precision will be made on IC members who could not attend the meeting. For the IC VM07, expected Mr Dilli Ram SHARMA (Nepal) and Mr Christopher John DALE (Australia) all the other IC members attended this meeting.

4. IC subgroup: IRSS and programme

4.1 Update on activities of IC subgroup: IRSS and proposed work plan

- [6] Mr Dominique PELLETIER (Canada), IC lead for the IC Sub-group on the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS), presented the update on the Sub-group's activities². He reminded the IC that the IRSS is a system for the review of, and support for, matters relating to implementation, rather than a system for three things - implementation, review and support. He introduced the members of the Sub-group and directed the IC to the web pages for the IRSS and the separate page for the IRSS Sub-group³. The last meeting had been in November 2019, where it had been agreed to recommend three

¹ VM07_01_IC_2020_Oct

² VM07_02_IC_2020_Oct

³ IRSS webpage: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/implementation-review-and-support-system/>; webpage IC Sub-group IRSS: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/capacity-development-committee/ic-sub-group/ic-sub-group-for-implementation-and-review-and-support-system-irss/>

new topics to the IC for approval⁴. These had been subsequently approved by the IC in November 2019:

- *Study on developing guidance on risk-based border management (2019-13, priority 1)*
- *Study on the utility of IPPC diagnostic protocols (2019-14, priority 1)*
- *Study on the global participation and resulting involvement in the IPPC community (2019-15, priority 1).*

[7] He reported that the following projects had been finalized:

- Evaluation of the implementation programme pilot on pest surveillance (2018-60, priority 1)
- Review of the implementation proposals from the call for topics and evaluation of the feasibility of their implementation (2018-61, priority 1)
- Analytics support to the Sea Containers Task Force for survey design, implementation and analysis of results (2018-51, priority 1).

[8] The IC lead then gave an update on the IRSS topics that were currently in progress and some upcoming priorities. The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as the “Secretariat”) have been working on three priority topics, involving a consolidated analysis of the 2012 and 2016 general surveys (2018-53, priority 1), a desk study on authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2018-55, priority 2), for which there had been a webinar on 19 October 2020, and a survey on the success of implementation of pest free areas (2018-50, priority 1). Upcoming priorities include:

- a study on risk-based border management (2019-13, priority 1),
- a study on the utility of diagnostic protocols (2019-14, priority 1),
- a desk study to catalogue phytosanitary treatments and
- the extent of their use (2018-56, priority 3), and three topics for which a priority has not yet been assigned on monitoring the impacts of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030, developing the third IPPC General Survey, and global involvement in the IPPC community. The last of these three topics will be embedded within the first.

[9] The IC lead then summarized the continuing work between the Secretariat and the Wageningen Centre for Development Innovation related to monitoring and evaluation (M & E). This includes a web page on monitoring and evaluation, a Theory of Change presented to the Strategic Planning Group in 2019, a literature review on monitoring and evaluation frameworks and implementation, a call for case studies (which is still ongoing) and the development of an M & E framework.

[10] Finally, the IC lead introduced the proposed work plan for the IRSS Sub-group, starting with efforts to secure funding given that the third cycle, funded by the European Union, is coming to an end. The proposed work plan included plans to meet at least four times a year, a call for new IRSS topics, consideration of how to support the IRSS as a day-to-day tool that the Secretariat can use rather than it being a series of projects, and work on four of the priority 1 IRSS topics already on the work programme:

- risk-based border management (2019-13),
- utility of diagnostic protocols (2019-14),
- impacts of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 (2018-52) and
- the third IPPC General Survey (2018-54) (pending adoption of the IPPC Strategic Framework (SF) (2020-2030).

[11] The IC lead then proposed the following four questions for consideration by the IC:

- (1) What have been the IRSS successes and what are some ways to improve it?

⁴ Report of IRSS November 2019 meeting: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/88350/>

- (2) What value do you see in embedding the IRSS as a tool for the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) and the Secretariat?
- (3) If you want the IRSS to be part of the regular work plan, how do you envision finding sustainable resources?
- (4) How do we brand the IRSS?

[12] The IFU lead drew the attention of the IC to the fact that although the SF had been endorsed, it had not yet been adopted because the CPM session in 2020 had been cancelled. Although the IRSS Sub-group could proceed on the basis of the endorsed version, the IFU lead expressed some reluctance in doing this. The status of the SF was due to be discussed at the Strategic Planning Group meeting in November 2020.

[13] The IFU lead then highlighted the following additional points for IC input or feedback:

- **Use of guides.** The IC had previously discussed the possibility of an IRSS study on the use of IPPC guides. To progress this, a member of the IC would need to put a proposal together for an IRSS topic submission and submit it to the IRSS Sub-group for review.
- **Good practice in monitoring and evaluation.** The calls for examples had received very few responses. The IFU lead encouraged IC members from Europe and New Zealand to try to persuade someone from their regions to participate in the study.
- **Funding priorities.** The rationale for developing a work plan even without funding in place is to set out what work is desired, set priorities, and then this can be used for Resource Mobilization activities when approaching potential donors. Guidance from the IC on priorities, for instance where there is more than one priority 1 topic, would be helpful.
- **Evaluation of the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP).** Much work has been done in the last year on improving access to materials on the IPP. Separate to this, the Secretariat have conducted a pilot study, applying the concept of “design thinking”, on how to use digital networking to deliver capacity development activities, especially in these COVID-19 times. One of the findings from this study is that national plant protection organizations need materials to help with “on boarding” when new staff start. The IFU lead therefore suggested that perhaps the IRSS could evaluate the presentation of materials on the IPP and provide recommendations on how to improve it further.

[14] The IC Chairperson thanked the IC lead for presenting the update and the IFU lead for sharing his ideas. In response to a request from the IC Chairperson, the Secretariat clarified that although the idea of a study on the use of guides had been suggested by an IC member, it may not have resulted in a formal IC decision, so perhaps the first step is for the IC to consider whether a separate study is needed or whether this could be part of the third IPPC General Survey; if the IC decides on a separate study, then a proposal would need to be submitted to the IRSS Sub-group. The IC Chairperson noted that the IC needs to decide how to move this matter forward.

[15] Before discussing the four questions posed above, the IC Chairperson invited the IC lead to summarize the purpose of IRSS and how it supports contracting parties and the Secretariat. The IC lead explained that the IRSS uses a collection of methods, including studies, surveys and monitoring discussions of various IPPC Secretariat organized meetings, that help to provide a snapshot of how the implementation of the IPPC and its standards is being performed and what are the needs of the IPPC Community. He also highlighted that, in contrast to the general call for topics for standards and implementation, the procedure for IRSS topic submissions allows submissions at any time.

[16] The Secretariat added that the IRSS was initially set up to provide foresight capabilities to pre-empt disputes between contracting parties. Over time, however, it has become a series of ad hoc surveys and studies in response to information needs identified by contracting parties, rather than the horizon scanning that had been the original intention, so it has probably lost some of the foresight capabilities. The IC Chairperson thanked the Secretariat and noted the need to focus also on the original intention of the IRSS.

[17] The IC then broke into three groups to discuss the four questions posed by the IC lead. After each question, the nominated IC member from each group gave a brief summary of their group's discussion. Questions 3 and 4 were considered together.

What have been the IRSS successes and what are some ways to improve it?

[18] There was general support within the IC for continuation of the IRSS, recognizing its importance in supporting the CPM and other IPPC Secretariat activities.

[19] The following benefits and successes of the IRSS were highlighted by the breakout groups:

- IRSS outputs provide useful guidance on implementation work. They can also contribute to the development of CPM recommendations (e.g. as with the CPM recommendations on e-commerce and aquatic plants), ISPMs (e.g. ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*)), and the setting of priorities by the CPM and subsidiary bodies.
- The IRSS can conduct quick studies, alongside the more general longer studies. It is important that this ability is retained.
- The IRSS is a very democratic process that gives everybody, from both developed and developing countries, the chance to give their feedback. This gives value to the process.

[20] The breakout groups made the following comments regarding aspects that could be improved:

- The design of surveys could be improved. The surveys should benefit the whole of the IPPC community and should help in both developing standards and in their implementation by contracting parties.
- Participation in surveys needs to be improved (e.g. consider using input from IPPC Regional Workshops).
- There is a continuing need to communicate the importance of IRSS studies and surveys, because of the high turnover of NPPO staff and contracting party representatives to CPM and IPPC Regional Workshops.
- If foresight is to be included in the IRSS, it would be helpful to have tools that the IRSS Subgroup could use to evaluate the feasibility, adaptability and economic significance of proposals that are submitted.

[21] One breakout group also noted the importance of having clear terms of reference for items in the IRSS work plan, together with sufficient human resources to do the work.

[22] The IC Chairperson thanked everyone for their comments and highlighted the need to mention the benefits of the IRSS when communicating and justifying the need for it. The IC agreed that the following points should be added to the IRSS work plan:

- consider how to improve the survey design for the third IPPC General Survey
- consider how to improve communication about the IRSS, including educating those not familiar with it.
- consider how to increase participation in IRSS surveys
- consider how to do foresight activities
- consider distinguishing which topics are more important within priority categories.

What value do you see in embedding the IRSS as a tool for the CPM and the IPPC Secretariat?

[23] There was general support for embedding the IRSS as a day-to-day tool for use by the Secretariat and having base funding rather than it being funded only by projects. It was agreed that the IRSS should be used by the CPM and subsidiary bodies as a component in the development of standards and their implementation. The value of doing this was identified as follows:

- It will help support the development and implementation of standards and related activities by contracting parties:
 - By providing a means of engaging with contracting parties, it will help CPM bodies learn about the needs and practices of contracting parties, and help to identify the challenges that hinder implementation by contracting parties.
 - By providing information on what went well and what can be improved, it will allow the success or otherwise of activities to be tracked, which will help inform future improvements to the standards and how they are implemented.
- It will help with the implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework (2020-2030) and the ability to measure progress on its implementation.
- It will allow continued improvement of surveys and terms of reference for studies in the short, medium and long term. A well-designed tool can help in setting long-term measures.
- It will contribute to the visibility of information for contracting parties, including common messages that can be communicated via IPPC Regional Workshops.
- It will facilitate calls for topics and the prioritization of topics.

[24] It was noted that it was important to look at a range of tools and determine which are the best tools for each activity. With regard to surveys, it was noted that each survey needed its own structure and that, in order to encourage participation in the survey, the benefits of responding to the survey should be made clear to contracting parties. The value of standardizing surveys (e.g. having an agreed minimum structure and targeting a standard percentage of contracting parties) was also noted. The importance of having regular General Surveys was highlighted. Analysis of the two IPPC General Surveys conducted to date (in 2016 and 2018) should help inform the continued improvement of surveys and support activities.

[25] One IC member suggested that the benefits of the IRSS be presented to the CPM, and approval sought from the CPM to embed the IRSS into the day-to-day work of the IPPC Secretariat to support the CPM and its subsidiary bodies. The IC Chairperson responded that a clear message that is understandable to everyone needs to be developed first.

[26] The IC agreed that the IC Sub-group on IRSS should modify their work plan to take account of the points arising from this discussion.

If you want the IRSS to be part of the regular work plan, how do you envision finding sustainable resources? How do we brand the IRSS?

[27] Comments and suggestions on funding included the following:

- It is important to incorporate activities into a work plan and to allocate budgets, including a minimum (baseline) budget and a budget to cover the cost of implementing activities.
- A fixed portion of the Secretariat budget could perhaps be reserved for IRSS activities, together with a fixed staff member, plus a variable portion for specific IRSS topics.
- Specific activities could include surveys on particular issues (as with the survey on utility of diagnostic protocols that is currently in the list of IRSS topics).
- It is important to assign priorities to activities. Funding for prioritized topics could then be sought by looking for interested donors and convincing them of the benefits, also highlighting the links to the IPPC.
- A review of the findings of previous surveys may help identify relevant stakeholders and interested donors who can fund particular activities.
- The Multi-Donor Trust Fund might also play a role in financing IRSS activities.
- The IRSS needs to be embedded in existing procedures, to ensure that monitoring of implementation is a regular part of activities. This will need more sustainable funding. To help secure donors, it may be useful to identify countries that are interested in certain activities.

[28] Regarding branding and the wider issue of how to promote the IRSS, the following suggestions were made by the breakout groups and in the discussion that followed:

- There needs to be a clear message of what the IRSS is for.
- A good way to promote the IRSS would be to develop a “Frequently Asked Questions”, including the question of what we would lose as a community if the IRSS was no longer available.
- Activities such as webinars could be used to promote the results of IRSS studies and surveys, as these are a fast way to report such results and allow reactions to be captured.
- As contracting parties and funders do not necessarily understand what the IRSS is, it could perhaps be renamed to give it a more meaningful title that reflects its scope and that everyone can readily understand. A logo could perhaps be developed, associated with the new title.
- Standardizing surveys may help with branding the IRSS.

[29] The IC agreed that the IC Sub-group on IRSS’s work plan be modified to take account of these comments.

[30] The discussion then returned to topic proposals for the IRSS, and specifically the suggestion of a topic to evaluate the use of guides. The IC lead for the IRSS Sub-group clarified that the Sub-group reviews proposals but does not write them, so a member or members of the IC would need to write the proposal.

[31] The IC:

- *noted* the update from the IC Sub-group on the IRSS
- *thanked* Ms Sally JENNINGS (New Zealand) and Mr Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom) for their work on the IC Sub-group on the IRSS
- *requested* that the Secretariat open an e-forum to call for a member or members of the IC to draft a proposal for an IRSS topic on the use of IPPC implementation and capacity development guides
- *approved* the work plan for the IC Sub-group on the IRSS (Appendix 3) and requested the IC Sub-group to refine it based on comments from this meeting.

5. Any Other Business

5.1 Selection of IC representative for the CPM Focus Group on Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems

[32] The Secretariat clarified that the IC needed to select one member to represent the IC on this CPM Focus Group, but that other IC members may still submit their nominations by responding to the call for experts which is open until 15 November 2020. Under this call, individual experts will be selected on the basis of their expertise.

[33] The IC:

- *selected* Ms Olga LAVRENTJEVA (Estonia) as the IC representative on the CPM Focus Group on Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems.

5.2 Proposed process for the selection of the IC Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

[34] The IFU lead explained that, although the IC rules of procedure state that “The chairperson and vice-chairperson of the IC are elected by its members and serve for a term of three years with the possibility of re-election on acceptance of the CPM Bureau”,⁵ there is not an agreed process for such elections, and certainly not under pandemic restrictions. As the current IC Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson were appointed for three years starting in December 2017, their terms are ending and new appointments will need to be made at the next IC meeting, to be held on 25 November 2020. The Secretariat had therefore drawn together a proposal for an election procedure, based on the IC rules of procedure, the

⁵ IC terms of reference and rules of procedure: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85672/>

procedure used by Codex Alimentarius bodies, and advice from FAO Governing Bodies Servicing. The IFU lead introduced the proposal to the IC for discussion and feedback, this including such matters as eligibility to stand for nomination, calls for nominations, and selection and voting procedures. He commented that advice from FAO was that if there was more than one person nominated for a position, then it would be better to discuss this among IC members with the aim of reaching a consensus, to avoid the need for a vote. Regarding voting procedures, he was still awaiting advice from the FAO Governing Bodies Servicing if an election by secret ballot was possible in a virtual meeting and if so, how would it be conducted. He finished his presentation by highlighting that this is just a proposal at this stage and that ultimately it will need approval by the FAO Governing Bodies Servicing.

- [35] The IC Chairperson thanked the IFU lead and the IC discussed the proposal.
- [36] In response to a question from an IC member, the IFU lead confirmed that as the Regional Plant Protection Organization (RPPO) representative and SC representative on the IC is not currently a full member of the IC and these representatives would not be eligible to nominate or vote in the election.
- [37] One IC member queried the process for seconding nominations, if nominations are sent only to the Secretariat. The IFU lead replied that it would be the responsibility of the person being nominated to find another IC member to support their nomination. Another IC member suggested that perhaps those interested in serving could circulate an email to other IC members, expressing their interest.
- [38] In response to a request from an IC member for the proposal document to be circulated to IC members, the IFU lead clarified that this could not yet be done as it was pending clearance from the FAO Governing Bodies Servicing. Another IC member commented that, while appreciating the need for such clearance, the IC needed to be able to go through the document before agreeing to anything and the matter was now urgent. In reply, the IFU lead said he would send another letter to FAO Governing Bodies Servicing, seeking an urgent resolution, and would copy the IC Chairperson into this letter. He also suggested that the IC Chairperson contact FAO Governing Bodies Servicing directly, to press for urgent action.
- [39] In response to a further question, the IFU lead highlighted that if there is a vote, then the FAO Governing Bodies Servicing has to administer it, because the IC is a subsidiary body of the CPM. In the event of a vote, the IFU lead would need to know two weeks in advance, so that he could notify the FAO Governing Bodies Servicing.
- [40] One IC member said that they thought the proposal was good, but that the IC should not limit the ways by which IC members propose themselves. In discussing this point further, the IC agreed that the best approach would be for the Secretariat to send an email to IC members inviting them to express their interest, and only if a consensus could not be reached would a vote be called.
- [41] The IC:
- *requested* that the Secretariat to send an “expressions of interest” email for the positions of IC Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson, with the aim of reaching a decision by consensus
 - *requested* that the IFU lead and the IC Chairperson both contact the FAO Governing Bodies Servicing emphasizing the urgent need for them to clear the proposed election procedure for IC Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson.

5.3 IC contributions to the ePhyto Solution

- [42] The IC Chairperson described how, at the October 2020 meeting of the Strategic Planning Group, the ePhyto group had presented an update on their activities and during the discussion that followed, the issue of participation in the governance of the ePhyto Solution had been raised. As part of this discussion, the IC Chairperson had commented on the potential role of the IC in ePhyto governance or in discussions about this topic, and she had subsequently sent a letter to the Secretariat lead of the ePhyto steering group (copied to all IC members), outlining how the ePhyto Solution and the IPPC community could benefit from the involvement of the IC in the discussion. However, although her intention had not been that the IC would take undertake oversight of ePhyto, comments and feedback she had received

indicated that that some contracting parties or participants may have misunderstood her message. She was therefore sharing the matter with the IC, and hoped that the IC would be involved in further discussions on the governance of ePhyto.

- [43] The IC Vice-Chairperson thanked the IC Chairperson for taking this initiative and reiterated the Chairperson's comments that the intention was not to interfere but rather to help improve the flow of communications with regard to implementation initiatives that are being developed by the ePhyto group. He noted that although the ePhyto group had given one verbal update to the IC, supplemented by some paper submissions at other meetings, the IC did not receive much information, so the letter was very timely in offering help.
- [44] One IC member added further thanks to the IC Chairperson, but also commented that it is hard to understand why ePhyto is not an implementation and capacity development issue, just like sea containers.
- [45] Another IC member highlighted that the ePhyto steering group is a very technical group, composed of technical specialists, and there is still a need for technical improvement of the system, so it might be too early for the IC to have a role in the governance of ePhyto. Once the system is running smoothly and most countries are participating, then maybe technical support from the steering group will no longer be required and there would be a move to a general governance model, in which case the IC would be the appropriate group. In the meantime, the IC still needs good communication with the ePhyto group (e.g. regarding the extent of its use by contracting parties).
- [46] By way of an update on some ePhyto developments, the Secretariat highlighted that the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) project approved by the IC in November 2019 (GCP /INT/387/COM FAO support to COMESA trade facilitation programme) has some elements within it that are indirectly linked to ePhyto activities. For example, it includes a study into the legal requirements for implementing ePhyto, which is mainly for the benefit of COMESA and hence African countries but also has more general applicability. It also includes a working group to build e-learning on the ePhyto system, which has become all the more important during the current pandemic. The Chairperson of the working group is from Kenya and is an expert in ePhyto.
- [47] The IC Chairperson thanked everyone for their comments and drew the discussion to a close.

5.4 Selection of the IC lead for pest risk analysis e-learning

- [48] The IC:
- *selected* Ms Faith NDUNGE (Kenya) to be the IC lead for the development of the Pest Risk Analysis e-learning (2020-002).

6. Date and Arrangement of the Next Meeting

- [49] The next virtual IC meeting will be held on 25 November 2020, at 14:00 Rome time (CEST).
- [50] The Secretariat also encouraged IC members to participate in the extra meeting of the Strategic Planning Group that is being held virtually on 10 November 2020.

7. Evaluation of the Meeting Process

- [51] After the meeting, the Secretariat will send IC members a link to a survey to evaluate the meeting.

8. Close of the Meeting

- [52] The IC Chairperson and the IFU Lead thanked everyone for participating in the discussions and closed the meeting.

APPENDICES**Appendix 1: Agenda****VIRTUAL MEETING N° 07 AGENDA***(Updated 2020-10-14)***COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES****IMPLEMENTATION AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (IC)****Start: 21- 10- 2020 at 08:00 (Rome)**

1.

	Agenda 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	VM07_01_IC_2020_Oct	LAVRENTJEVA
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1	Documents list	Link	KOUMBA
3.2	Participants list	Link	KOUMBA
4.	IC Sub-group: IRSS and Programme		
4.1	Update on activities of the IC Sub-group: IRSS and proposed Work plan	VM07_02_IC_2020_Oct	LARSON
5.	Any other business		LAVRENTJEVA / LARSON
5.1	Selection of IC representative for the CPM focus group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems		BRUNEL
6.	Date and arrangement of the Next Meeting		LARSON
7.	Evaluation of the meeting process		CZERWIEN
8.	Close of the Meeting		LAVRENTJEVA / LARSON

Appendix 2: List of documents**IMPLEMENTATION AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE****VIRTUAL MEETING****Documents List****(Updated 2020-01-14)**

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
VM07_01_IC_2020_Oct	2.2	Agenda	14-Oct-2020
VM07_02_IC_2020_Oct	4.1	Update on activities of the IC Sub-group: IRSS and proposed Work plan	14-Oct-2020

Appendix 3: Work plan for the IC sub-group on the IRSS

IC Sub-group on IRSS Work plan⁶

Although no secure funds⁷ have been allocated for the IRSS in 2021, if and when funds become available the following activities will be undertaken.

- The IC Sub-group on IRSS will work virtually and will try to set up at least four meetings per year, with the next meeting set for December 2020.
- A call for new IRSS topics will be made in early 2021 to the Bureau, IC, SC, RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat. These will be reviewed and those supported will be recommended to the IC.
- IC Sub-group on IRSS will have a general discussion on how to support the Implementation, Review and Support System as a “system” (as opposed to a series of projects), entrenched in the work of the CPM and the IPPC Secretariat and how to mobilize resources to support it in a sustainable fashion. A proposal will be formulated and presented to the IC, which may have to be presented to the CPM.

Further surveys and studies, all priority 1:

- Study on Developing Guidance on Risk-based Border Management (2019-13, Priority 1)
- Study on the Utility of IPPC Diagnostic Protocols (2019-14, Priority 1)
- Develop baseline measures to monitor the impacts of and record/report benefits of the Strategic Framework 2020-2030 (2018-52, Priority 1, pending adoption of the IPPC SF)
- Develop third IPPC General Survey (2018-54, Priority 1, pending the analysis of the two previous general surveys)

⁶ This version of the Work plan should be refined by the IC Sub-group on IRSS based on comments provided by the IC members during the meeting IC VM07.

⁷ Note, the IPPC Secretariat is in the process of approaching the EU to extend the EU IRSS 3rd cycle project to utilize funds that were unspent mostly due to COVID-19 travel restrictions.