



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Expert Working Group On Revision of ISPM 4

Virtual Meeting

7–11 December 2020 and 11–14 January 2021

IPPC Secretariat

Required citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2021. *Report of the virtual Expert Working Group meeting on the Revision of ISPM 4, 9-1 December 2020 and 11-14 January 2021* 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, 2021



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 | 5 |
| 1.1 | Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat | 5 |
| 1.2 | Introduction to the standard setting process and the role of participants | 5 |
| 2. | Meeting arrangements | 5 |
| 2.1 | Selection of the Chairperson | 5 |
| 2.2 | Election of the Rapporteur | 5 |
| 2.3 | Adoption of the agenda | 5 |
| 3. | Administrative matters | 5 |
| 4. | Background..... | 5 |
| 4.1 | Overview of Specification 58 and ISPM 4 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>)..... | 5 |
| 4.2 | Overview of IPPC pest free area programme..... | 7 |
| 4.3 | Implementation Review and Support System survey on ISPM 4 | 8 |
| 4.4 | Considerations and outcomes expected for the revision of ISPM 4..... | 9 |
| 5. | Review of discussion papers and studies..... | 9 |
| 5.1 | Proposals for the revision of ISPM 4 (United States of America) | 9 |
| 5.2 | Pest free concepts: degrees of freedom and revision of ISPM 4 (United States of America)..... | 11 |
| 5.3 | Proposals for the revision of ISPM 4 (Australia) | 12 |
| 5.4 | Proposals for the revision of ISPM 4 (Canada)..... | 13 |
| 5.5 | Pest free areas in Mexico: fruit fly case study..... | 14 |
| 6. | Development of text for the draft ISPM | 14 |
| 6.1 | Brainstorming session to develop the revision..... | 14 |
| 6.2 | Identification of other relevant standards | 18 |
| 6.3 | Provision and review of information on establishment and maintenance of pest free areas..... | 18 |
| 6.4 | Review of the sections on surveillance for establishment and maintenance of pest free areas..... | 18 |
| 6.5 | Requirements for establishment, maintenance, suspension and reinstatement of pest free areas | 20 |
| 6.6 | Provision for phytosanitary measures to regulate the movement of commodities in pest free areas | 25 |
| 6.7 | Guidance to assist the management of pest free areas | 26 |
| 6.8 | Information on the use of buffer zones | 26 |
| 6.9 | Key requirements that could be used by contracting parties when implementing the revised ISPM 4..... | 27 |
| 6.10 | Possible operational and technical implementation issues..... | 27 |
| 6.11 | Effect of the revision on the protection of biodiversity and the environment..... | 28 |
| 6.12 | Review of all references to ISPM 4 in other ISPMs | 28 |
| 7. | Any other business..... | 29 |
| 8. | Close of the meeting..... | 29 |
| | Appendix 1: Agenda..... | 30 |

Appendix 2: Documents list 32

Appendix 3: Participants list 34

[1] Although originally scheduled to finish on 11 December, the Expert Working Group (EWG) decided that they would need to reconvene in January 2021, to finish the tasks assigned to them. This report covers both the December and January sessions of the EWG meeting.

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

[2] The Standard Setting Officer, Adriana G. MOREIRA, of the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the Secretariat”) opened the meeting and welcomed all participants to the meeting of the Expert Working Group on the Revision of ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) (2009-002). The Secretariat noted that this was the first time an EWG had been held in virtual mode. Looking forward to the tasks ahead, the Secretariat explained that the aim was to produce a draft revision that could, in due course, be presented to the Standards Committee (SC) in May 2021.

[3] The participants all introduced themselves.

1.2 Introduction to the standard setting process and the role of participants

[4] The Secretariat gave a presentation summarizing the standard setting process, including the operation of EWGs and the roles of the participants at EWG meetings.¹

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Selection of the Chairperson

[5] The EWG selected Harry ARIJS (European Commission) as Chairperson.

2.2 Election of the Rapporteur

[6] The EWG selected Thomas Kimeli KOSIOM (Kenya) as Rapporteur.

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

[7] The EWG adopted the Agenda (Appendix 1).

3. Administrative matters

[8] The Chairperson referred to the Documents list (Appendix 2) and the Participants list (Appendix 3).

[9] The Secretariat referred to the guidance on virtual meetings, and asked participants to notify the Secretariat if any information in the participants list needed updating or was missing from it.

4. Background

4.1 Overview of Specification 58 and ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*)

Overview of Specification 58

[10] The Steward, Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America), introduced Specification 58 (*Revision of ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas)*).²

[11] She emphasized that ISPM 4 is a *general* standard for the use of pest free areas (PFAs). There are other standards of direct relevance to PFAs, such as ISPM 10 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*) and ISPM 29 (*Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence*), but ISPM 4 is the cornerstone. She highlighted that the specification sets out eleven tasks for the EWG, the first of which is to identify relevant standards, and noted that, as well

¹ 04_EWG RevISPM4_2020_Dec.

² Specification 58: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/2368/>.

as those ISPMs of direct relevance, the EWG may also need to consider ISPMs such as ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*) and ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*).

- [12] Referring to the tasks related to the drafting of requirements, the Steward noted that there is now a template for ISPMs, which includes an Outline of requirements that summarizes the requirements set out in the standard. She drew the attention of the EWG to Task 7 on the use of buffer zones, which is not covered by the current ISPM 4, so the EWG would need to decide how to approach it. Regarding Task 8 on reviewing key requirements that could be used by contracting parties, she commented that this might include requirements, for example, about reporting to trading partners, not just about establishing and maintaining PFAs.
- [13] The Steward confirmed that Task 9 and Task 10 are standard tasks that occur in all specifications for ISPMs. She clarified that the implementation issues identified in Task 9 are not included in the draft standard but are considered by the SC, who forward the issues they consider to be relevant to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC). She emphasized that the ISPM does not need to include very specific requirements, because a very comprehensive implementation guide was published by the IPPC in 2019 (see agenda item 4.2) and this provides supplementary guidance to the ISPM. The Steward confirmed that the EWG needed to draft some text for Task 10, on impacts of the ISPM on biodiversity and the environment, but suggested that this be done last. The section on impacts on biodiversity and the environment is now included in all ISPMs.
- [14] The Chairperson thanked the Steward and invited comments.
- [15] The EWG noted that, in relation to Task 1 of the specification, other ISPMs that support ISPM 4 include ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*), ISPM 22 (*Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*), ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*), ISPM 35 (*Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) and ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*), in addition to ISPM 10 and ISPM 29. The EWG also noted that the experience of “protected zones” in the European Union may be of relevance to Task 2, and that Viet Nam has an example of a PFA being suspended, which might inform the drafting of requirements on suspension in Task 4.
- [16] The Steward clarified that the text on biodiversity and the environment (Task 10) is not reviewed externally, but is usually only a short paragraph and examples could be found in recent ISPMs, including the revision of ISPM 6.
- [17] The Secretariat reiterated that the main task for the EWG was to produce a draft standard, and suggested that the EWG start from scratch, rather than working on the existing ISPM 4 text. To do this, it would be necessary to go through the various tasks in Specification 58.

Overview of ISPM 4

- [18] The Steward introduced the current ISPM 4,³ drawing the attention of the EWG to the following points:
- Title – Although it was not a specific task for the EWG, the EWG could review the title of the ISPM as part of the drafting process.
 - Scope – The Scope section delimits what the standard covers and what it does not.
 - Outline of requirements – This is an abstract of the standard.
 - Background – This section is not in the current ISPM 4, but is now included in all new and revised ISPMs and explains why the standard was drafted.
 - Requirements – In the current ISPM 4, these are divided into General requirements and Specific requirements.
 - Terminology – The standard includes a definition of “pest free area” that is now in ISPM 5 so does not need to be included in the revised ISPM 4, but the EWG may wish to review it to see

³ ISPM 4: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/614/>.

whether they wish to propose a modification. Also, the term “audit” appears in the Outline of requirements, but not later in the standard, where the phrase “checks” is used instead, so the EWG may wish to review this as well; the terminology should be aligned with the draft ISPM on *Audit in a phytosanitary context* (2015-014).

- Other ISPMs – There are many references to surveillance, including to the corresponding standard, ISPM 6, but as ISPM 6 has since been revised, it will be important to review these parts of the existing text. The EWG may also wish to consider the draft revision of ISPM 8 (2009-005) that is being submitted to the Fifteenth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-15 (2021)) for adoption.

[19] The Secretariat added that ISPM 4 was one of the first standards adopted, and referred to the annotated ISPM template and to more recent standards, such as the revised ISPM 6, for the current types of sections included in ISPMs.

[20] The Chairperson thanked the Steward and invited comments from the EWG. The EWG noted the need for ISPM 4 to be stronger and to reflect the reality of what happens in practice.

4.2 Overview of IPPC pest free area programme

[21] The IC lead for pest free areas, Ruth ARÉVALO MACÍAS, introduced the IPPC Pest Free Area Programme and, in doing so, provided an introduction to pest free areas and the process of establishing them.

[22] The objective of the programme is to support national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) when establishing and maintaining PFAs, pest free places of production (PFPPs), pest free production sites (PFPSs) and areas of low pest prevalence (ALPPs). It has been funded by Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, the European Commission and the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries in Japan, and is a good example of a collaborative approach.

[23] The main product of the programme has been the IPPC *Guide on establishing and maintaining pest free areas* (hereafter referred to as “the PFA guide”), which was published in 2019.⁴ This was presented at another component of the programme: the *IPPC international symposium for pest free areas (PFAs) and surveillance*, held in Japan in 2019.⁵ The objective of the symposium was to raise awareness of the phytosanitary framework for PFAs and surveillance, and also the IPPC and the International Year of Plant Health (2020). It also aimed to provide a platform for presenting and promoting specific PFA and surveillance initiatives. The most important aspect, however, was to reinforce partnerships and collaboration between contracting parties, regional plant protection organizations and stakeholders.

[24] Before introducing the guide itself, the IC lead summarized the rationale for establishing PFAs and the factors that contribute to pest movement and establishment, and highlighted the challenges faced by tropical and subtropical countries that have ideal conditions for producing high-value export commodities but have to address increasingly stringent requirements for exports. She recalled the regulatory framework for PFAs and ALPPs, including Article 6 of the World Trade Organization Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement) and Article IV of the IPPC, the latter relating to the responsibilities of an NPPO. She listed 16 ISPMs that are related to PFAs and ALPPs:

- Eleven relate to the establishment phase (Phase 3): ISPM 4, ISPM 6, ISPM 8, ISPM 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*), ISPM 10, ISPM 22, ISPM 25 (*Consignments in transit*), ISPM 26, ISPM 29 and ISPM 35.

⁴ *Guide on establishing and maintaining pest free areas*: <http://www.fao.org/3/ca5844en/CA5844EN.pdf>.

⁵ *IPPC international symposium on pest free areas and surveillance*: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/symposia/symposium-on-pfas-and-surveillance/>.

- Eight relate to the maintenance phase (Phase 4): ISPM 4, ISPM 8, ISPM 9, ISPM 10, ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*), ISPM 25, ISPM 26 and ISPM 35.
- Five relate to market access (Phase 5): ISPM 7 (*Phytosanitary certification system*), ISPM 13 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*), ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*), ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) and ISPM 31 (*Methodologies for sampling of consignments*).

[25] Turning to the related concepts of pest free area, pest free place of production, pest free production site and area of low pest prevalence, the IC lead then referred to the ISPM 5 definitions of these terms and explained how these concepts differ in terms of the size of the area to which they relate, the size of any associated buffer zone, the time frame, the management arrangements, and the consequences of the target pest being found. For example, PFAs are large-scale, applying to a whole country or part of a country, with a large buffer and maintained for years, whereas PFPPs operate farm by farm for one or a few growing seasons, and PFPSs are a subset of PFPPs.

[26] Finally, she introduced the guide itself. It is currently available only in English and its aim is to help NPPOs understand the principal requirements for PFAs, PFPPs, PFPSs and ALPPs. It describes the five phases of establishing and maintaining pest free areas – initiation, programme development, establishment, maintenance, and market access – and provides a decision tree. There is also information on review and audit, possible constraints to programme development, and a range of case studies. Using the decision tree to illustrate the process, she outlined the various steps that an NPPO would need to take to establish and maintain a pest free area, and highlighted those points where the process differed depending on whether the ultimate end point was a PFA, PFPP, PFPS or ALPP. She referred to the role of surveillance, the need to assess the economic and technical feasibility of applying control, the phytosanitary measures that may be applied to suppress (in an ALPP) or eradicate (in a PFA, PFPP or PFPS) the target pest, the pest risk management options associated with the different phases of the process (eradication in the establishment phase, and containment and exclusion in the maintenance phase), and the steps involved in declaring and recognizing a pest free area on a bilateral basis, to secure market access. She also explained how the establishment and maintenance of ALPPs, where the aim is suppression rather than eradication, differs from the process with PFAs, including the possible application of systems approaches. She finished the outline of the guide by giving an example of one of the case studies contained within it: Chile, a fruit fly free country since 1995.

[27] In conclusion, the IC lead noted that PFAs have been established in a number of countries, but mostly for fruit flies. She highlighted the importance of assessing technical and economic feasibility when selecting options to mitigate pest risk, and that the process of establishing and maintaining PFAs does require research to develop methods and a lot of cooperation between the NPPOs of exporting and importing countries. She noted, however, that ALPPs and the systems approach offer possibilities to produce (and export) from areas that are not pest free.

4.3 Implementation Review and Support System survey on ISPM 4

[28] The Secretariat gave a summary of the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) survey on ISPM 4, which was published in 2012.⁶ This study had been initiated in 2011, prompted by a request from the Standards Committee. A mini-questionnaire had been devised and had been administered to 177 contracting parties in seven FAO regions, with 28 of these contracting parties providing feedback. Even though nine years have passed since the study was conducted, it still provides some useful information and recommendations. These include a summary of the reasons given by respondents on why ISPM 4 is either partially or not implemented at all, and pertinent aspects or situations experienced by NPPOs which are perceived *not* to have been covered by ISPM 4. For example, gaps identified by respondents include the fact that ISPM 4 does not describe the boundaries of an area or the inspection measures required. The survey respondents also indicated what additional guidance or tools would be

⁶ IRSS survey on ISPM 4: <https://www.ippc.int/en/irss/activities/20/>.

necessary to improve the implementation of ISPM 4, although several of these have been addressed since with the publication of the PFA guide. The Secretariat suggested that the EWG may wish to consider the gaps and additional guidance identified when drafting the revised ISPM 4.

[29] The Secretariat also confirmed that the results of a recent IRSS pest free areas survey will be published in 2021.

4.4 Considerations and outcomes expected for the revision of ISPM 4

[30] The Steward noted that there were no further considerations that she wished to add at this stage, but thanked the IC lead for her presentation (agenda item 4.2). She drew attention in particular to the importance of avoiding duplication between the draft standard and the guide, and noted the useful list of relevant standards identified in the IC lead's presentation.

[31] The Secretariat recalled the various specific suggestions for the revision of ISPM 4 raised during the IRSS survey, and noted that these should also be included in the considerations and expected outcomes of this meeting.

5. Review of discussion papers and studies

5.1 Proposals for the revision of ISPM 4 (United States of America)

[32] Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America) presented the proposals from the United States of America,⁷ drawing the attention of the EWG to the following points:

- The revised ISPM 4 should use the current ISPM template, the writing style as specified in the *IPPC style guide* and the terminology as defined in ISPM 5.
- The Outline of requirements needs redrafting so that it is a summary, but some of the information in the current Outline or requirements could perhaps be moved into the new Background section.
- Some of the text in the General requirements and the Specific requirements sections is too broad and needs clarifying.
- There is no guidance in ISPM 4 about under what circumstances a PFA is needed or not needed. Both ISPM 6 and the draft revision of ISPM 8 (2009-005) allow for general surveillance being sufficient to prove that a PFA is not needed if the pest has never existed in the country before, so this could be mentioned in the revised ISPM 4.
- It is important that the importing country does not set phytosanitary import requirements that exceed its appropriate level of protection, so the requirements for pest risk analysis (PRA) in decision making need to be included in the revised ISPM 4. (Although PRA also includes economic assessments, these are already covered by the PFA guide, so do not need to be included in the revised ISPM 4.)
- There are no specific requirements in ISPM 4 for regular status updates when maintaining a PFA, and the verification requirements are also ambiguous.
- The revised ISPM 4 should include some guidance on contingency plans in case of pest outbreaks, as in ISPM 26 in relation to fruit flies.
- The EWG should consider whether harmonization of surveillance methods and diagnostic tools (or recognition of their equivalence) could lead to multilateral recognition of a PFA in those situations where a country exports to other countries with similar conditions suitable for establishment of the target pest on the same commodities.

[33] The EWG expressed general agreement with the proposals from the United States of America and discussed some of the issues raised.

[34] **Scope.** The EWG noted that the framework created by the standard needs to be more inclusive, taking account of PFAs established for reasons other than export (e.g. to support domestic trade of staple crops

⁷ 05_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec.

or to protect endangered species), not just those established for export, and that it should represent the reality of the situation in countries. In some countries, for example, the concept of regional pest freedom is used, which is not as highly regulated as country freedom.

- [35] **Reporting requirements.** The EWG noted that under bilateral arrangements there is no consistency in the reporting requirements (i.e. when to report and how frequently). So, it would be a good idea to include guidance on reporting requirements in the revised ISPM.
- [36] **Level of evidence required.** The EWG considered whether there should be more solid justification for a PFA within a country than for a pest free country where there has never been any report of the pest. It was noted, for example, that there can be strict requirements regarding internal movement within a country or region, and yet some of the statements from exporting countries on pest freedom may not be supported by solid evidence. In this regard, the EWG noted that ISPM 6 explains under what circumstances surveillance can be limited to general surveillance and under what circumstances specific surveillance is appropriate, and the new requirements in the draft revision of ISPM 8 (2009-005) specify that a country should provide evidence that it has searched for the pest, even if only using general surveillance; it is not sufficient to just say that the pest has never been found there. So, when drafting the revised ISPM, it would be useful to check the requirements in ISPM 6 and the draft revision of ISPM 8 (2009-005), and then either include a cross-reference to them if the guidance contained therein is sufficient, or, if it is not sufficient, add whatever text is not covered by ISPM 6 and ISPM 8.
- [37] The EWG noted that, in situations where a particular pest has never been recorded in the whole of the region, a PRA would not be needed. The EWG would need to check whether guidance on this is provided in the PFA guide. The EWG acknowledged, however, that sometimes a pest may not be known in a country until the country looks for it.
- [38] **Economic considerations and a risk-based approach.** Other issues highlighted for consideration when drafting the revised ISPM included economic considerations (e.g. it might be too expensive to the growers to have a PFA), and the question of whether the requirements of an importing country exceed what is appropriate for the level of risk. The EWG noted that the approach to date has often not been risk-based.
- [39] **Overlap with the PFA guide.** The EWG noted that, even though duplication between the PFA guide and the standard needed to be avoided, the EWG would need to consider carefully what needed to be captured in the standard, which is the more binding document, rather than just cross-referencing to the guide.
- [40] **Commodities.** The EWG noted that the paper from the United States of America had referred to multilateral recognition of a PFA for the same pests and *commodities* because commodities are relevant to the pathway for certain pests. For example, a pest may be associated only with the leaves of apples, not the fruit, and a commodity such as green banana in Japan is not known to be a host for fruit fly. Hence, when commodity standards are developed in future, PRA will need to be based on the commodity rather than the area. If the PRA determines that the pest cannot become established, then the question is really whether a PFA is needed for the area, or whether an ALPP would be a more appropriate risk management option. It all depends on the risk.
- [41] **Relationship between the concepts of PFA, PFPP and PFPS.** The EWG considered whether PFAs include PFPPs and PFPSs, and whether the requirements for PFPPs and PFPSs should be included in the draft revision of ISPM 4 or not. The EWG noted that if a country is free of the target pest, then every place of production and production site should also be free of the pest. However, PFPPs or PFPSs are usually established only if a country does not have recognition as a pest free country. The requirements for PFPPs and PFPSs may also be different to a PFA and involve, for example, more specific testing or buffer zone requirements. So, the requirements for PFAs cannot necessarily be applied to PFPPs and PFPSs and the two concepts – PFA and PFPP/PFPS – are different. Having said that, the concepts are linked because the process of establishing a PFA usually takes many years, but it could start with a PFPS, then a PFPP, and finally a PFA. In some situations, it might not be feasible to have a PFA as the

ultimate goal, so PFPPs or PFPSs might be as far as the country can go. The EWG noted that they would be looking at ISPM 10 regarding PFPPs and PFPSs as part of the drafting process, and returned later in the meeting (agenda items 6.1, 6.5 and 7) to the question of whether to gather together into one standard the requirements for PFAs, PFPPs and PFPSs.

5.2 Pest free concepts: degrees of freedom and revision of ISPM 4 (United States of America)

[42] Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America) presented a paper from the United States of America on pest free concepts.⁸

[43] She started by introducing the concept of degrees of freedom. Pest freedom relies on sampling concepts, and needs to take account of statistical considerations and differences in the sampling protocol used. All sampling methods have some associated uncertainty and can provide a certain level of statistical confidence, but different procedures will have different probabilities of detecting different pests. The concept of pest freedom in relation to consignments is defined in Annex to the IPPC:

This is to certify that the plants, plant products or other regulated articles described herein have been inspected and/or tested according to appropriate official procedures and are considered to be free from quarantine pests specified by the importing contracting party and to conform with the current phytosanitary requirements of the importing contracting party, including those for regulated non-quarantine pests.

[44] However, the requirement that a consignment is “free from quarantine pests” is inconsistent with the SPS Agreement and with the real world. To help resolve this, ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) explains that “free from” does not mean absolute freedom in all cases but rather that quarantine pests are believed not to be present based on the procedures used for their detection or elimination. So, “free from” depends on the procedure used, in terms of its sensitivity and intensity (effort applied), and on the level of uncertainty (variability and statistical error) associated with the results.

[45] When applied to an area, the degree of freedom associated with phytosanitary measures must always be complemented by explanations of the relevant conditions in order to be meaningful. For example, there should be clear agreement on the sampling techniques and statistical methods used for confirmation of PFAs. Otherwise, the conclusion can be open to challenge and misinterpretation.

[46] Summing up, Marina ZLOTINA highlighted that there are three closely related concepts: strength of measures (if high risk, there need to be strong measures); the need for a rational relationship (measures should be consistent with the risk); and pest prevalence (the converse of absence, but a sliding scale and never absolute). Her key message was that nothing can assure absolute freedom; the method used will determine the degree of freedom.

[47] She then posed the following questions to the EWG:

- What does zero tolerance mean in relation to establishment of PFAs?
- If the pest is found in a PFA, how does it affect trade, particularly specific pathways?
- How much evidence is needed to declare a pest absent?
- Consider the importance of methods for detection and surveillance in relation to pest freedom.

[48] The EWG then discussed some of the issues arising from the presentation.

[49] **Strength of measures.** The EWG noted that maintaining the absence of pest in a PFA is very difficult because the control measures or the buffer zone may not provide the protection needed, but if all elements in the area are under control measures, then that can help.

[50] **Zero tolerance.** The EWG acknowledged that although it is important to have pest freedom as the ultimate goal, in reality there is no such thing as zero tolerance as with trade there is always inherent risk. The EWG recalled that the wording in the model phytosanitary certificate (in the Annex to the

⁸ 06_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec.

IPPC) is appropriate as it says “considered to be free from” rather than “are free from”. The EWG noted that, rather than the draft standard going into detail about tolerance, it would be better to leave this to bilateral agreements, with the importing country setting the level of tolerance. The tolerance will depend on the commodities in question and the tools available, but even in PFAs the minimum requirements for export, such as inspection, will still apply (as per ISPM 12).

- [51] The EWG recognized that often discussion about PFAs is focused solely on export, but that it might be better to consider the PFA concept separately to the issues about export, rather than conflating the two. For example: What is required for a country to be called pest free? We may need risk-based statistical surveillance, but how far do we want to go? The EWG noted the need to balance the extra effort needed for a risk-based approach with the benefits resulting from it. The EWG considered, therefore, whether it is better to think about the level of confidence rather than zero tolerance, but noted that the approach would still need to be risk-based. The methods used could be referred to in terms of confidence, but it would not be possible to express this quantitatively, as much of the data are qualitative. Confidence would also need to be tied to the appropriate level of protection, which is the sovereign right of each contracting party to set. Where a country considered a particular pest to be very dangerous, then it would set a high level of protection and require a high level of confidence that the area was pest free.
- [52] The EWG noted that many of these nuances could be reinforced in the definitions of terms used in ISPM 4.

5.3 Proposals for the revision of ISPM 4 (Australia)

- [53] Craig HULL (Australia) presented the proposals from Australia,⁹ noting the overlap with the issues raised in the papers submitted by the United States of America, particularly the need for a risk-based approach to PFAs. He highlighted three main points:
- The current ISPM 4 was very good for its time, but lacks sufficient detail. There is no guidance in it on how to take a risk-based approach, and no guidance on how a country communicates to a trading partner about the regional differences in risk within its territory. This is important for countries such as Australia, where such regional differences exist. The current ISPM 4 also does not make clear how to achieve a satisfactory level of trust in the phytosanitary system to enable trade to occur.
 - In terms of the conceptual framework provided by ISPM 4 and the strategic framework into which it fits, how do the various ISPMs on pest freedom relate to one another? Will ISPM 4 be the core ISPM on PFAs, with greater detail as annexes for specific pest groups (e.g. ISPM 26 could become an annex of ISPM 4)? How does guidance on PFPPs, PFPSs and ALPPs fit in with ISPM 4?
 - The revised draft ISPM 4 should provide enough flexibility to take into account emerging technologies, new scientific evidence or environmental changes such as climate change that can affect pathways and the status of a PFA. This could be included in the annexes, if there are annexes for specific pests, or reference could be made to it in the core text of ISPM 4.

[54] The EWG then discussed some of the issues arising from the presentation.

[55] **Risk-based approach.** Craig HULL clarified that “risk-based approach” means that the measures being taken to establish and maintain the PFA are consistent with the pest risk associated with trading commodities out of that area.

[56] **Annexes to ISPM 4.** The EWG noted that specific-specific annexes would only be possible if there was multilateral recognition of the requirements for the species concerned, rather than bilateral recognition. Bilateral arrangements would be more suitable as case studies, but the PFA guide already includes several case studies, so there would be no need to include case studies as annexes to ISPM 4. The EWG noted that case studies in the guide can address the more detailed questions. Regarding the annexes to ISPM 4, the EWG recognized that there were different options: for example, the annexes could be for

⁹ 07_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec.

broad categories related to the sector (e.g. pests affecting horticulture, pests affecting forestry), for specific pests (e.g. fruit flies) or for broad pest groups (insects, fungi, etc.). The fundamental question to address is where the level of detail needs to sit. The EWG noted that the more guidance there is in the annexes, the greater the resulting harmonization and the lower the duplication of effort in bilateral discussions considering the same points.

[57] **Reorganization of PRA standards.** The Steward and the Secretariat clarified that, should the EWG wish to suggest a review of how ISPM 4 relates to other ISPMs, then this would need to be submitted for consideration by the SC. The EWG can make recommendations to the SC (e.g. how to reorganize the suite of PFA standards), and it would then need the CPM to agree to the principle. Any such proposal made by the EWG would need to identify which ISPMs would be incorporated into ISPM 4 and which to leave alone. The EWG decided to return to this matter later in the meeting.

5.4 Proposals for the revision of ISPM 4 (Canada)

[58] Naima AIT OUMEJJOUT (Canada) presented the submission from Canada, which provided responses to the specific tasks set out in Specification 58.¹⁰ She noted that the responses would be of most use when the EWG considered each of these tasks in detail, but highlighted the following general points:

- The scope of ISPM 4 needs to be reviewed and possibly broadened in the context of the new section on biodiversity and the environment.
- More detail could be given about phytosanitary measures and why certain measures are important; for example, why legislation is a prerequisite to the establishment and maintenance of PFAs, and why collaborative partnerships are important when dealing with large areas with many, diverse stakeholders.
- More guidance needs to be given about the importance of raising public awareness and how to go about this.

[59] **Legislation and the regulated status of a pest.** The EWG considered whether a country could make a statement about, or establish a pest free area for, a pest that is not regulated in that country. This could apply to a pest that has never been found in the area but is of concern to an importing country, and to an endemic pest that is known to be present but can be easily eradicated. The EWG noted that, in some countries at least, PFAs are established only for regulated pests. So, the country would need to demonstrate an economic impact of the pest in order to regulate it and establish a PFA. The current ISPM 4, however, does not cover how to approach pest free areas in relation to non-regulated pests.

[60] The EWG noted that sometimes a country may wish to make a statement on pest freedom for a part of the country rather than the whole country, because of the cost of establishing a PFA across the whole country and because there is only international-trade interest in a certain area. But then the question is how the country can ensure that the pest does not move with commodities from the rest of the country, where the pest may be present, unless measures are put in place, and for that you would need regulation.

[61] The EWG noted that legislation is not static and can be revised; for example, the legislation may have annexes that can be revised to add or remove pests if new evidence becomes available from pest risk assessment. Also, in large countries there may be several layers of legislation (federal, state, etc.), so a framework is needed to link these together. It is important that the legislation gives the NPPO the powers to take the necessary actions, for instance the right of inspectors to enter private property. However, the EWG noted that the pest may need to be regulated for such powers to apply.

[62] In terms of the text to go in the revised ISPM 4, the EWG agreed that the guidance on legislation would need to be general, rather than being related to specific pests. The guidance could outline the key potential provisions that need to be in the legislation for an NPPO to establish a PFA and to have the powers to inspect, detain, quarantine, apply phytosanitary measures, and so forth.

¹⁰ 08_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec.

- [63] With regard to specific pests, the EWG noted that although there was much material on PFAs for fruit flies, the revised ISPM 4 should apply to all types of pests and not focus too much on fruit flies.
- [64] **Communication.** The EWG noted that communication with the local community in a PFA is just as important as having the necessary legislation, to ensure that people understand the need for the actions and what the benefits will be. In large countries with legislation at both the state and national level, the measures on the ground are often the responsibility of states rather than the federal government (i.e. the NPPO), and it is important in these cases to also communicate where the authority lies.
- [65] **Accidental finds.** The EWG noted that notification of pest outbreaks is often not as a result of surveillance but of an accidental finding of a regulated pest. If the pest is not regulated, then there is the danger that the outbreak would be substantial before the NPPO became aware of it. However, the EWG acknowledged that, although guidance could be drafted about what to do following an accidental find (e.g. specific surveillance, PRA), this is a different matter to developing guidance on PFAs.
- [66] **Need for evidence.** The EWG noted that sometimes it is necessary to require some basic surveys to be done if a country says the pest is absent but has no evidence of this.
- [67] **Practical difficulties in achieving pest freedom.** The EWG acknowledged that achieving and maintaining zero detections of the target pest is very difficult. In less wealthy countries, lower income farmers may not have the resources to put in place all the necessary control measures to achieve pest freedom, so despite their best efforts, interceptions on imports may still occur. Furthermore, even if pest freedom is achieved for the target pest, it can be difficult to maintain, and even if pest freedom is achieved for one target pest, the country may still have problems with another target pest. So, it may not be possible to assure importing countries that the country is pest free. One possible way forward under such circumstances is to try to ensure that the commodities are free from pests (as a result of treatments, etc.), even if the country is not pest free.

5.5 Pest free areas in Mexico: fruit fly case study

- [68] The Secretariat presented four papers on fruit fly free areas in Mexico.¹¹ These papers were received in response to the call for studies and papers, and there were also some in Spanish that had been made available to the EWG.
- [69] Mexico had been the pioneer in being the first to establish an internationally recognized PFA. A huge, national eradication campaign had been conducted and a strategic plan for fruit flies had been developed. The role of natural barriers, environmentally friendly pesticides, internal quarantine systems, risk-based regulatory programmes and robust surveillance programme had all been recognized. The key messages from the experience in Mexico were that there is a need for an international, legal framework for establishing PFAs, and that surveillance and other phytosanitary measures are needed to be able to implement and maintain a PFA.
- [70] The Secretariat thanked the experts who had contributed the papers.
- [71] (Agenda items 5.6 to 5.8 were subsumed into this agenda item.)

6. Development of text for the draft ISPM

6.1 Brainstorming session to develop the revision

- [72] The EWG considered how to develop the draft revision of ISPM 4 and agreed that they would start from scratch, but still use some of the text from the current ISPM 4.

¹¹ 09_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec, 10_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec, 11_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec, 12_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec.

General structure

- [73] The EWG started by discussing the general structure of the draft standard. The EWG recalled the suggestion made earlier in the meeting about combining all the PFA-related standards into one standard, with annexes to facilitate the organization of the standard, so that all the information about pest free areas is gathered together in one place. However, noting that this would be a matter for the SC (and ultimately the CPM), and that it would be a lengthy process involving a new specification and a new EWG, the EWG recognized that they needed to focus on the tasks assigned to them under Specification 58. After finishing those tasks, the EWG may also be in a better position to decide whether to make a recommendation to the SC about reorganization of the PFA standards and, if so, to draw up a proposal of how such a reorganization might look and provide a robust justification. The EWG therefore proceeded to consider the revision of ISPM 4, working on the assumption that the other PFA standards would still continue to exist as separate standards.
- [74] The EWG considered the general structure of the standard, referring to the structure of the existing ISPM 4 and the structure of ISPM 26, and decided to start drafting the text of the standard, section by section.

Introduction

- [75] **Scope.** The EWG used the existing ISPM text as a starting point. Recalling their earlier discussion, they discussed whether to refer to the use of PFAs to protect staple crops for the benefit of the local economy. However, as ISPMs are mostly concerned with the international movement of commodities, rather than domestic movement, the EWG agreed to review later on whether to include this in the Scope or in the Background section.
- [76] The EWG thought that the phrase “to support justification for phytosanitary measures taken by an importing country for protection of an endangered PFA” in the current ISPM 4 required clarification. They thought that the term “endangered PFA” was confusing, as presumably all PFAs are endangered. They therefore used the Glossary term “endangered area” instead. Also, they amended the phrase to refer to the phytosanitary measures *required* by the importing country, not *taken*, as the measures to establish and maintain a PFA would be taken by the exporting country where the PFA is situated.
- [77] The EWG noted that PFAs were used not only for the certification of plants, but also for maintaining the phytosanitary security of an area. In situations where an importing country specifically requires a PFA, the PFA may be used to support the scientific justification of measures required by the importing country for protection an endangered area.
- [78] The EWG recognized that the wording of the draft Scope needed improving so that the intended meaning was clear, but noted that the IPPC editor would be able to work on this with the Steward at the editing stage.
- [79] **References.** The EWG recalled that ISPMs cited in the text should not be included in the References section as a generic statement, with a link to the Adopted Standards page of the IPP, is included instead.
- [80] **Definitions.** The EWG noted that although the current ISPM 4 includes a definition of “pest free area” at the start of the standard, under the Outline of requirements section, this is because the original ISPM 4 predates ISPM 5. The definition of “pest free area” is now in ISPM 5. Although it could help the reader to understand the standard if the definition of “pest free area” were to be given at the start of the standard, the EWG acknowledged that ISPM 5 definitions are not included in standards and that a general statement referring to ISPM 5 is given instead. The EWG therefore agreed just to use the standard text about definitions.
- [81] **Outline of requirements.** The Secretariat clarified that this section performs the function of an abstract or executive summary, so it may repeat some information from the main body of the standard, but not too much. The EWG considered whether to say that a PFA is a measure that is “least trade restrictive”, but acknowledged that a PFA is a strong measure and so not necessarily least trade restrictive. They therefore described it as facilitating safe trade.

Background

- [82] The EWG noted that the Background is a new section, now included in all ISPMs, which explains why the standard was drafted. The Secretariat and Steward clarified that it should not contain any requirements. The EWG discussed whether it could include other considerations that may be useful for NPPOs when implementing the standard, but are not requirements, and decided to proceed on this basis. In drafting the Background, the EWG drew upon material in ISPM 6 and the draft revision of ISPM 8 (2009-005).
- [83] **Purpose of PFAs.** The EWG considered whether the purpose of PFAs should be described in the Background section, or as the first subsection of the Requirements, or in the form of a general introductory paragraph under Requirements. They decided to put it in the Background, as the description of the purpose would not contain any requirements.
- [84] Recalling their earlier discussion about the scope of the standard, the EWG referred to the use of PFAs for purposes other than supporting international trade. They also included some concrete examples, such as “to safeguard an area of strategic plant production”.
- [85] **International legislative framework.** To set the international legislative context, the EWG included reference to the IPPC (i.e. the Convention) text in the draft Background and considered whether to refer to the SPS Agreement as well. However, they decided that reference to the IPPC was sufficient as this specifically provides for PFAs. The EWG also included reference to ISPM 1 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*), which outlines the SPS principles that are relevant to the IPPC.
- [86] **Types of PFA.** The EWG incorporated some of the text from the Outline of requirements section of the current ISPM 4, including the bulleted list of three types of PFA: an entire country, an uninfested part of a country in which a limited infested area is present, or an uninfested part of a country situated within a generally infested area. They omitted the text that is in parentheses in the introductory stem to the bulleted list in the current ISPM 4 (“from an entire country which is pest free (to a small area which is pest free but situated in a country where that pest is prevalent”), to avoid duplication with the bulleted list.
- [87] The EWG considered whether to add a fourth type – an uninfested part of a country where the pest status in the rest of the country is unknown – to cover situations where a large country, for example, wishes to make one state a PFA but not to conduct surveillance in the rest of the country. However, the EWG decided to omit it, as in large countries all states would usually be asked for their pest status reports anyway.
- [88] The EWG noted that the three types of PFAs represent the *results* of a PFA programme rather than necessarily the starting point, as in most cases countries need to conduct eradication to make an area pest free.
- [89] When reviewing the draft text later in the meeting, the EWG removed references to “types” of PFAs and referred instead to “situations”, to avoid confusion as “types” could imply that different measures are required for the different types.
- [90] **Reason for the revised standard.** The EWG recalled that, according to the ISPM template, the Background section of revised ISPMs should also include relevant information on the reasons for and scope of the revision. The Secretariat clarified that this had not been done in the recent revisions of ISPM 6 and ISPM 8, so if the EWG felt that it was not necessary to give reasons in the Background of this draft standard, the EWG could give its opinion on this to the SC, for SC decision. In the end, however, the EWG drafted some text, drawing upon the wording in Specification 58. The EWG also referred to the harmonization of requirements resulting from implementation of the standard, which could facilitate the recognition of PFAs by contracting parties.

Impacts on biodiversity and the environment

[91] (See agenda item 6.11.)

Requirements – outline structure

[92] The EWG discussed whether to split the Requirements into General requirements and Specific requirements, but decided not to as this would make it easier for the reader to navigate the standard.

[93] The EWG decided to use the following outline structure, which is based on that of ISPM 26, noting that it could be amended as drafting progressed:

- Characterization of the PFA
 - Target pest
 - Commercial and non-commercial hosts present in the area
 - Delimitation of the area (i.e. maps, GPS coordinates, descriptions, etc.)
 - Other relevant information (e.g. climate)
- Establishment of the PFA (this is a list of actions required to bring a PFA into force)
 - Surveillance activities prior to establishment
 - General surveillance
 - Specific surveillance
 - Controls on the movement of regulated articles
 - Buffer zones if appropriate (if geographical characteristics are not sufficient)
 - Domestic declaration of pest freedom (including appropriate legislation)
- Maintenance of the PFA
 - Surveillance of the maintenance of the PFA
 - Corrective action plans, including response to an outbreak
 - Delimiting surveillance to determine the infested area
 - Increased surveillance in the affected part of the PFA
 - Implementation of control measures
 - Criteria for reinstatement or provisions for suspension or loss of PFA
- Verification and periodic review
- Communication
- Market access.

[94] The EWG acknowledged that in the PFA guide surveillance comes before the Establishment phase, but noted that the structure or content of the standard should not be dictated by that of the guide and that, if necessary, the guide could be revised in future to align with the revised standard.

[95] The EWG noted that the elements in the General requirements section of ISPM 26 (public awareness, documentation, supervision) would probably be better coming later in the revised ISPM 4, but decided to continue to work with the above structure and then see whether there were any elements from ISPM 26 that needed adding.

[96] The EWG's elaboration of the requirements is reported under agenda items 6.4 to 6.8.

[97] **Operational plans.** The EWG considered whether to have a subsection on operational plans somewhere in the draft standard, as an NPPO would need an action plan setting out the steps to be taken, the structure of committees and so forth. They decided, however, that as the operational plan could cover the entire PFA process from start to finish, these elements could simply be referred to at the appropriate point in the standard rather than having a separate section. They noted that the standard could give general

guidance highlighting that a particular aspect should be included in the operational plan, but there was no need to go into the specifics.

[98] **Systems approaches.** The EWG considered whether to refer to systems approaches in the Requirements, but noted that systems approaches are usually associated with production practices and movement of commodities, rather than the establishment and maintenance of PFAs. Recalling that systems approaches are only relevant to ALPPs according to the PFA guide, the EWG concluded that the standard should not refer to systems approaches.

[99] **Use of “should”, “must”, “may”.** Referring to the *IPPC style guide*, the Steward highlighted that the term “must” should only be used when referring to technical procedures and similar situations, and should not be used to express a level of obligation; requirements in ISPMs are usually expressed using the term “should” instead. The Secretariat highlighted that, in addition to requirements, the standard may also give more general guidance on possibilities for NPPOs, where there is an element of choice over what the NPPO does; in these situations, “may” is the appropriate term to use (“the NPPO may conduct this activity”).

6.2 Identification of other relevant standards

[100] To fulfil task 1 of Specification 58, the EWG recalled the ISPMs identified earlier in the meeting (agenda items 4.1 and 4.2): ISPM 4, ISPM 5, ISPM 6, ISPM 7, ISPM 8, ISPM 9, ISPM 10, ISPM 13, ISPM 14, ISPM 15, ISPM 22, ISPM 23, ISPM 25, ISPM 26, ISPM 29, ISPM 31, ISPM 35 and ISPM 37.

[101] The EWG noted that ISPM 8 was of particular relevance, as determination of pest status is the first step in establishing a PFA. In the PFA guide, it is assumed in the initiation stage that the pest status has already been determined as per ISPM 8. In general, cross-references to ISPM 8 should be sufficient in the draft revision of ISPM 4, rather than repeating information from ISPM 8. However, the EWG noted that there may be a need to say something about the various options for “absence”.

[102] **Referring to the PFA guide in the standard.** At various points in the meeting, the EWG raised the possibility of including reference to the PFA guide (e.g. in relation to the need for an operational plan) in the standard. However, they concluded that although a guide may refer to a standard, a standard should not refer to a guide.

6.3 Provision and review of information on establishment and maintenance of pest free areas

[103] To fulfil task 2 of Specification 58, the EWG referred to agenda items 4.2, 4.3 and 5.

6.4 Review of the sections on surveillance for establishment and maintenance of pest free areas

[104] To fulfil task 3 of Specification 58, the EWG drafted text on surveillance for inclusion in the draft standard, noting that surveillance was required for both the establishment and maintenance of a PFA.

Establishment phase

[105] **General and specific surveillance.** The EWG referred to ISPM 6 and the draft revision of ISPM 8 (2009-005) regarding the circumstances under which general surveillance is required and those under which specific surveillance is required. The Steward highlighted that guidance that is already given in other standards should not be repeated in the draft revision of ISPM 4 – just a cross-reference.

[106] The EWG noted that, according to the draft revision of ISPM 8 (2009-005), general surveillance is required in order to declare that a pest is absent, so this would apply even when the pest is unknown in the area or region – it is not sufficient just to state that the pest is absent. General surveillance may therefore be sufficient to establish a whole country as a PFA. However, the EWG considered whether specific surveillance would be required if a country wishes to recognize only part of the country as a PFA, as this would indicate that the rest of the country is not free of the pest and there could be

movements of the pest into the area. The EWG discussed whether to give specific guidance on this in the draft revision of ISPM 4, or just to refer to ISPM 6 and ISPM 8. They noted that, on the one hand, ISPM 6 does say that NPPOs should evaluate the reliability of information when conducting general surveillance, so this could be deemed to be sufficient guidance, but on the other hand, ISPM 6 is not specific about the requirements in relation to PFAs, including any difference between a pest free country and other PFAs. Recognizing that the latter is an important point to convey, which might also be relevant to regions within a large country, the EWG decided to include some text in the draft standard (even if it subsequently gets removed during the standard setting process) to say that, in certain cases, general surveillance could be sufficient if the NPPO has concluded that the information is reliable and relevant, for instance for the establishment of a pest free country.

- [107] **PFAs where the pest is already absent.** Early in the drafting process, the question arose as to whether to say in the standard that a PFA is not required if surveillance demonstrates that the pest is already absent. The EWG noted that, in some countries, PFAs are established in areas where the pest is already absent to clearly show to importing countries that the area is pest free and to keep it pest free; phytosanitary measures are put in place to ensure that infested host material does not come into the area. However, a PFA may not be required by an importing country if it is the whole country that is pest free (although the pest status would still need to be maintained). The EWG agreed that the standard needed to give clear guidance on the matter.
- [108] Returning to this question when discussing the Surveillance section, the EWG noted that although the PFA programme can include both areas that are *made* pest free and those that are *already* pest free, an alternative option for the latter is simply to declare the pest status as absent, based on PRA or general surveillance. If surveillance continues to show that the pest is absent, then this alternative option requires less effort and expense than setting up a PFA. The EWG recognized, however, that sometimes an importing country may expect more than what the exporting country deems is justified based on the local conditions, as the detail of what is required is a “grey area”. On the other hand, some exporting countries do not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate pest freedom, especially as historical information might not always be reliable. The EWG considered whether it would be helpful for the standard to distinguish between situations where the pest is unknown in an area and situations where it is presumed to be absent, but noted that this might involve too much complexity for the standard, as there are several possible scenarios.
- [109] The Chairperson noted that, if the work of the EWG in updating ISPM 4 is going to have added value, then this “grey area” about what level of justification is required for a PFA if the pest is already absent, is one of the main points to address. Giving clearer guidance in the standard could help countries to avoid wasting resources on unnecessary PFAs.
- [110] The Steward reiterated the need for surveillance and quality of evidence, referring to the draft revision of ISPM 8 (2009-005), where it says that a lack of information due to inadequate or insufficient surveillance does not constitute a basis for determining pest absence. Furthermore, she noted that, according to the categories of pest absence in the draft revision of ISPM 8 (2009-005), the category “absent: pest not recorded”, as proved by surveillance, would not require a PFA programme, but “absent: the entire country is pest free” requires the entire country to be maintained as a PFA.
- [111] The EWG noted again that there are many examples of exporting countries being required by importing countries to provide a statement of pest absence, based on surveillance, even where the local conditions mean that the pest concerned cannot establish. They acknowledged that sometimes this depends on the relationship between the countries.
- [112] Noting the critical role of PRA in determining pest status, the EWG decided to refer to the need for pest risk assessment in the draft standard, both in relation to determining the presence of hosts and in the subsection on Specific surveillance. They also noted that the draft revision of ISPM 8 (2009-005) contains a section on exchange of information between NPPOs.

- [113] **Delimiting surveys.** The EWG agreed that a delimiting survey would be needed to justify the boundaries of the area being proposed to be a PFA. The EWG considered whether surveillance should cover the *whole* territory of a PFA unless justification to do otherwise is provided, but noted that this might not be practicable in all cases. Also, the extent of the surveillance should be decided based on the pest risk, not based on an assumption that the surveillance covers the whole area. The EWG agreed, therefore, not to refer to the whole territory being surveyed.
- [114] The EWG noted that, in theory, the delimiting survey should be carried out before an area is delimited, but they recognized that in practice the area is often delimited before the delimiting survey, because the country wishes to export certain commodities or to protect trade from a particular area. The EWG therefore placed the guidance about delimiting surveys in the section on Establishment of the PFA rather than in the section on Delimitation of the area.
- [115] **Specific surveillance.** The EWG drafted text to say that specific surveillance is used to establish more reliable evidence for demonstrating pest absence in an area, and that the level of surveillance needed to justify a declaration of pest freedom should be informed by the pest risk assessment.
- [116] The EWG considered again whether a PFA is not required if surveillance indicates that the target pest is already absent. Recalling the categories used in the draft revision of ISPM 8 (2009-005), they concluded that if the pest status is “absent: never recorded” and this is supported by current scientific evidence, then establishing a PFA should not be required: the pest status by itself should be sufficient. The Chairperson noted, however, that this was likely to need further consideration by the SC.

Maintenance phase

- [117] **Frequency of surveillance.** The EWG considered the requirements regarding the frequency of surveillance. One suggestion considered was to say that surveillance should be conducted at least annually, but the EWG noted that the appropriate frequency would depend on the pest biology and the country concerned: a pest’s development may take more than a season in one country but in another there may be several generations in a year. On the other hand, if no guidance was given on frequency, then it would not be clear whether, for example, it would be acceptable to conduct surveillance only once every 17 years. The EWG agreed that reference could not be made to surveillance being at least annually, as this could lead some importing countries to require surveillance even when it was not justified, so agreed instead to say that the intensity of surveys should be risk based and should allow the appropriate level of protection to be achieved. As the appropriate level of protection would differ between contracting parties, the standard could not include further detail than this.
- [118] **Overlap with section on Establishment.** The EWG recognized the potential for overlap between the subsection on surveillance in the Maintenance section and the subsection on surveillance in the Establishment section of the draft standard, but tried to minimize duplication.

6.5 Requirements for establishment, maintenance, suspension and reinstatement of pest free areas

- [119] To fulfil task 4 of Specification 58, the EWG drafted text on the requirements for PFAs.

Requirements – introductory text

- [120] The EWG decided that the Requirements section should start by outlining the general concepts of PFAs, as these are not always well understood. The EWG acknowledged that there is much useful information in the PFA guide, but the standard does not need to follow the same structure as the guide or go into the same level of detail. However, it would be good if it could be structured so that it was easy for NPPOs to easily cross-refer to the guide. For example, initiation is a good concept to introduce, including the fact that determination of pest status comes before establishment, but there is no need to refer to all the many steps that are in the guide. Instead, the standard could start with a basic list of what is needed to establish a PFA, in broad terms rather than specific requirements.

- [121] **Basic requirements for a PFA.** The EWG included in the draft standard a bulleted list summarizing the basic requirements for a PFA (“systems to establish pest freedom”, “systems to maintain pest freedom”, etc.), drawing upon text from the Outline of requirements in the current ISPM 4. Although there could be some potential ambiguity in the term “system” (what is meant by “systems”, and what is the difference between “system”, “programme” and “plan”), the EWG agreed to retain “system” as it is a very broad term. The EWG considered whether “systems to maintain pest freedom” included the legal framework, but noted that the legislative framework could be mentioned explicitly later in the Requirements.
- [122] **Elements to consider when establishing a PFA.** The EWG drafted a bulleted list of elements that would need to be considered when establishing a PFA. These included the need for PRA, adequate national legislation, transparency towards trading partners in the event of outbreaks or changes in PRA, communication with the community affected by the establishment of the PFA, and assessment of the cost-benefits. Reference was made to ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) with regard to PRA. The EWG noted that the requirement for legislation needed to be mentioned early in the draft standard as it is a decision made before the establishment phase. The EWG considered whether a separate bullet point was needed for communication or whether it was covered by the bullet point on transparency, but agreed that it was better as a separate bullet point because the NPPO would need to develop a communication plan for stakeholders and communication also encompasses communication within an NPPO, as well as outreach to the public and other stakeholders. They noted that the term “transparency” is more about providing justification to importing countries, but communication is different and includes outreach. The EWG considered what the difference is between outreach and communication, and opted for “public awareness” instead of “outreach”. When referring to trading partners, however, the EWG recalled the ink amendments to ISPMs noted by CPM-12 (2017) to avoid use of the term “trading partners”, and decided to use “contracting parties” instead.
- [123] The EWG considered whether to expand the section to refer to the concept of managed risk, but agreed that this could be added at a later stage of the drafting if needed, for instance through country comments during consultation.
- [124] **Legislative framework.** The EWG drafted a short paragraph to elaborate on the need for adequate national legislation. They noted that there would be differences in the legislative structure between countries; for example, in large countries some authority (e.g. to enter premises) may be granted under state legislation rather than national legislation. The EWG included some examples of components of legislation, including the authority to carry out inspections and surveys, to apply suitable movement restrictions on host commodities, to establish a buffer zone as appropriate, and to prohibit movement of commodities or pathways. They noted that the standard should give guidance but not be too prescriptive, so agreed not to refer to the power to enter premises. They also agreed not to refer to the application of pesticides, as this would only be considered when a pest is present, but added a general reference to imposition of phytosanitary restrictions instead. For the latter, they decided to use “phytosanitary restrictions” rather than “phytosanitary measures” as the other measures listed earlier in the sentence were phytosanitary measures by definition. Later in the meeting, however, the EWG removed this whole paragraph, to avoid duplication with the bullet points listing the elements to be considered.

Requirements – initiation of a PFA

- [125] The EWG initially entitled this section “Determination of a PFA”, as in the current ISPM 4. However, they noted that the first step in the PFA process is to define the area being considered for pest freedom (i.e. to delimit it) and the target pest, not to “determine” the PFA. They noted that determination is a broader concept than defining or delimiting, and that when deciding on the boundaries of a PFA, the NPPO may evaluate a wider geographical area than the area which is ultimately proposed as a PFA.
- [126] In deciding what to use for the title of this section, the EWG considered the meaning of “determination” in this context, and what the difference is with “establishment”. One participant suggested changing “determination” to “defining”, and another suggested that “establishment” could refer to the whole PFA process, but the EWG noted that the process also includes maintenance of PFAs. It was noted that if

“determination” were to be defined in the standard, it would need including in the Definitions section. The EWG thought that the name of the section should refer to a concrete step in the PFA process and noted that, in practice, the first step is to propose or characterize a particular geographical area, and then conduct surveillance to confirm it is pest free. “Characterization of the PFA” was therefore considered, as in the outline structure suggested. In the end, however, the EWG decided to name the section “Initiation of a PFA”, as per Phase 1 of the PFA guide, with subsections for the various concrete steps within the initiation phase.

- [127] The EWG noted that they would need to review the text throughout the draft standard to ensure that the use of “step”, “stage”, “phase” and “system” was consistent and that the meaning of these terms was clear.
- [128] **Target pest and area.** The EWG drafted a sentence about the first step being to characterize the target pest and the area being considered as a PFA. They considered whether “characterize” would be clearly understood in the context of the pest (e.g. does it simply mean to give the scientific name?) or whether “identify” would be better, given that “characterization” is used in PRA with a meaning specific to PRA. As the characteristics to be recorded about the pest included more than its identity, however, they concluded that it was better to use “characterize” but to expand on this to mention the specific characteristics required.
- [129] The EWG considered whether a PFA could exist for a new species that had not yet been given a scientific name. They concluded that if the species hadn’t been fully described and named, then contracting parties would not be able to regulate it as a quarantine pest and so there could not be a PFA for it. Once named, there needed to be at least one sufficiently sensitive, reliable method to identify the pest.
- [130] **Host plants present in the area.** In referring to the need to determine the presence of host plants, the EWG considered whether to use “commercial and non-commercial hosts” or “pathways”, but decided that as “pathways” implies movement, and movement is not considered until a later stage in the PFA process, it would be better not to refer to pathways at this point in the standard. They therefore decided simply to refer to “host plants”, as deemed an appropriate term to use in this section.
- [131] The EWG discussed whether, if the target pest is already known to be absent, the NPPO would still need to determine the presence of host plants, as when a country looks at setting up a PFA for a target pest, the country already knows what hosts they are trying to protect. However, the EWG noted that the local conditions may mean that some of the plants that are reported as being hosts of the target pest may not be susceptible to it in that locality. This means that NPPOs cannot rely on information from other countries about which plants are hosts and it is necessary to determine this specifically for each area. The EWG therefore concluded that determination of hosts was a part of the PFA process, but also added some text about host susceptibility depending on the local climatic conditions.
- [132] The EWG clarified that it is only the NPPO of the country in which the area is situated that determines the hosts – not the NPPO of the importing country.
- [133] **Delimitation of the area.** The EWG recognized the importance of natural barriers in preventing pest movement from one area to another, and that these barriers may often form the boundaries of PFAs. They also noted that the degree of isolation of the area should be taken into account when delimiting a PFA, and when determining the size of the buffer zone. If a high mountain or the sea formed the boundary, for example, a buffer zone would not be needed. They drafted some text to this effect. The EWG considered whether to refer to the biology of the pest in relation to delimiting a PFA, as in the current ISPM 4, but did not include any text on this.
- [134] The EWG drafted text to say that the PFA area should be defined specifically enough that it can be readily identified and communicated to those who need to know the boundaries of the PFA. They noted that the latter would include people living and working in the area, as well as other NPPOs and trading partners (contracting parties). The EWG considered whether to use the phrase “all relevant stakeholders” to refer to this range of people and organizations, “all relevant stakeholders including NPPOs” or “other NPPOs and other relevant stakeholders”, but noted that the meaning of “stakeholder” may not be clear

and may not translate well into other languages. They also decided that it was too early in the standard to refer to importing countries, as this part of the standard is describing what happens before trading begins. The EWG considered saying "... communicated in a transparent way", but concluded it was simpler just to say that the PFA needed to be readily identified; it was not necessary to go further than that. However, later in the meeting, they reviewed this decision and expanded the draft text to explain why it is important that the area can be readily identified; that is, for transparency when NPPOs are reporting to other NPPOs, and so that the public in the area know the precise boundaries.

[135] **Other relevant information.** In the draft outline structure being considered by the EWG, the subsection on Delimitation of the area was followed by one on Other relevant information, the latter to include reference to aspects such as climate. The EWG concluded, however, that as they had referred to natural barriers in relation to delimitation and to climate in relation to hosts, there was no need for a separate subsection on Other relevant information.

[136] **Economic considerations.** While recognizing the importance of NPPOs conducting a cost-benefit analysis before deciding to establish a PFA, the EWG acknowledged that this was outside the scope of a specific requirement in an ISPM. They therefore decided to retain the mention of economic considerations in the draft Background section, but not include this aspect in the Requirements.

Establishment of the PFA

[137] **Surveillance.** (See agenda item 6.4.)

[138] **Controls on the movement of regulated articles.** (See agenda item 6.6.)

[139] **Buffer zones.** (See agenda item 6.8.)

[140] **Declaration of pest freedom.** The EWG considered whether to refer to the declaration of pest freedom as the *domestic* declaration of pest freedom, to cover situations where there is no international trade (e.g. trade between states within a large country), but noted that there was no need to refer to domestic measures in an international standard. Also, if there is a change in the pest status of an area, the NPPO would need to notify the World Trade Organization, which implies that the declaration is an international declaration anyway. The EWG therefore referred to the *national* declaration of pest freedom.

[141] The EWG considered whether the status of the PFA should be *regularly* verified or *continuously* verified, and opted for the former, as "continuously" could imply 24-hour, round-the-clock verification. The EWG noted that the verification would be based on evidence of host presence, surveillance, and so on, but that it was better to put the detail about this in the section on maintaining a PFA rather than in the section on establishing a PFA.

Maintenance of the PFA

[142] **Legal framework.** The EWG drafted text regarding the legal provisions that a country would need to maintain a PFA. They considered whether to refer to the movement of "infested host material" or "regulated articles", and opted for the latter for consistency with the earlier subsection on Controls on the movement of regulated articles.

[143] The EWG considered whether a regulated article could move through an area if it was in secured packaging, but noted that this was certainly not permitted in some countries or regions.

[144] **Surveillance for the maintenance of the PFA.** (See agenda item 6.4.)

[145] **Data collection.** The EWG agreed that the length of time that records should be kept was a matter for the importing country, so it was better to leave this open in the draft standard rather than specifying a length of time. The EWG considered whether to also refer to the keeping of samples in this section, recalling that ISPM 6 does not give specific guidance on the length of time to keep samples. The EWG noted that samples are usually kept for only two or three years, whereas data are usually kept longer than this. However, as samples become irrelevant once the data are recorded, and as there is guidance

on samples in the PFA guide, the EWG concluded that there was no need to refer to samples in the draft standard.

- [146] **Notification of detection of the pest.** The EWG agreed that a reporting framework would be needed to ensure that findings of a pest would be immediately notified to the competent authority. They also agreed that the findings would need to be confirmed: for example, if the source of a finding is outside the NPPO's standard surveillance system, then the source of the identification would need to be checked.
- [147] The EWG discussed the various terms that may be used to describe the occurrence of a pest – “interception”, “detection”, “incursion”, “outbreak”, “finding” – and the differences between them. The EWG recalled that “incursion” is a subset of “outbreak” according to ISPM 5, and they agreed that “interception” is a form of “detection” related to import and to consignments. So, as these four terms are different (even if not mutually exclusive), the EWG agreed to refer to all four of them in the draft standard. The EWG considered the significance of a single finding of a pest and noted that in some countries a single detection can be enough to declare an outbreak, depending on the risk. Later in the meeting, however, they recalled that the draft revision of ISPM 8 (2009-005) puts the focus on whether the detection represents a population: “detection of a pest in an area, confirmed by surveillance not to represent a population, may not affect the pest status in the area”.
- [148] The EWG briefly considered whether to suggest to the SC that definitions be developed for “detection” and “finding”, or that the definitions of “incursion” and “outbreak” be reviewed, but did not pursue this further.
- [149] **Corrective action plans.** The EWG drafted text regarding the need for corrective action plans when the target pest is identified in a PFA. The text focused on actions to be taken in the event of a pest outbreak. The EWG agreed that there was no need to refer to incursions, as this was a subset of “outbreak”, and no need to refer to detection as if a pest is detected the NPPO would need to conduct surveillance to determine if the detection indicates that there is an outbreak.
- [150] The EWG agreed that pest status in the area should be determined according to ISPM 6 and ISPM 8, and noted that even if a pest is assessed not to be established, it might still have the potential to cause economic damage and hence corrective actions may still be needed. The EWG intentionally cited ISPM 6 before ISPM 8 in the draft standard because surveillance comes before determining pest status.
- [151] The EWG agreed that if a pest has been identified in a PFA an eradication programme should be activated, unless evidence indicates that there is no risk of the pest establishing or where the pest can be eliminated immediately.
- [152] **Increased surveillance in the demarcated outbreak area of the PFA.** The EWG agreed that a detection survey that was more intensive than usual would be needed within the outbreak area.
- [153] **Implementation of control measures.** (See agenda item 6.6.)
- [154] **Criteria for reinstatement or provisions for suspension or loss of a PFA.** The EWG drafted some guidance on the provisions for suspension or withdrawal of the PFA status and subsequent reinstatement after eradication, and agreed to refer to ISPM 9 in relation to establishing criteria for successful eradication. The EWG considered whether the PFA status would be temporarily suspended from just the demarcated area or the whole PFA, with both views being expressed by EWG members.
- [155] The EWG discussed how long the demarcated zone would need to be pest free, as shown by surveillance, before the PFA status could be reinstated or a decision made that eradication measures have been unsuccessful and the whole area can no longer be maintained as a PFA. However, they agreed that it is not possible to set a fixed time period in the standard and the timeframe was a decision for the NPPO. The EWG noted that, in the event of eradication being unsuccessful, the NPPO may decide to redefine the boundaries of the area to exclude the demarcated zone.

Verification and periodic review

- [156] The EWG drafted guidance on requirements for verification and periodic review. They noted that there was no need to mention the performance of mitigation measures, as this was part of the performance of the programme.
- [157] The EWG drafted text to explain the purpose of audit (to verify the correct implementation of the programme) and why traceability is needed (to allow the origin of regulated articles and compliance with phytosanitary requirements to be verified). The EWG clarified in the draft text that audit includes audit of administrative procedures. They acknowledged that this may raise the question of what are administrative procedures (e.g. record keeping), but concluded that it was best not to go into any detail.
- [158] The question was raised as to where results would be announced after verification, but the EWG agreed that text on this should form part of the Communication section of the standard rather than the section on verification.

Communication and stakeholder engagement

- [159] (See agenda item 6.7.)

Recognition of PFAs

- [160] The EWG agreed that guidance on bilateral recognition should refer to ISPM 29.
- [161] The EWG discussed the possibility of the Secretariat establishing and maintaining a depository for national information on PFAs for multilateral recognition, but were unsure whether this was a matter for the Requirements section of the standard, or whether it would be more appropriate to forward this as an implementation issue for consideration by the SC. They agreed to leave the text in the draft standard, at least for the time being.

Specific requirements

- [162] The EWG considered that there was no need to have a section on Specific requirements, as these requirements would depend on the type of pest so it would result in repetition within the standard. They acknowledged, however, that there could be value in having annexes to the standard on, for example, PFAs for different groups of organisms, or indeed integrating the existing ISPMs on PFAs as annexes to the revised ISPM 4. The Steward clarified that annexes were prescriptive parts of a standard, whereas appendices were not.

6.6 Provision for phytosanitary measures to regulate the movement of commodities in pest free areas

- [163] To fulfil task 5 of Specification 58, the EWG drafted guidance on the control measures required for both the establishment and maintenance of PFAs.

Establishment phase

- [164] The EWG drew upon material from ISPM 26 to draft text on the controls that would be required on the movement of regulated articles. They noted that the text should be at a fairly high level, to avoid duplication with other standards and guidance.
- [165] The EWG considered whether the standard should present the controls as requirements (using “should”) or as options (using “may”), and noted that in many countries requirements can only be placed on regulated articles. They agreed that it was appropriate to use “should”.
- [166] The EWG agreed that although “regulated article” could theoretically refer to articles regulated for pests other than the target pest, it was acceptable simply to refer to “regulated article” as it would be clear that this referred to articles regulated for the target pest.

Maintenance phase

- [167] The EWG agreed that control measures would be needed to prevent the target pest spreading out of the demarcated outbreak area, for instance by controlling the movement of host commodities out of the demarcated area. The EWG considered whether it was practicable to prevent spread by natural dispersal, and noted that although it was not possible to stop the pest flying out of the area, there may be situations where it is possible to implement measures to reduce this (e.g. erection of nets).
- [168] The EWG considered whether to add guidance about the timing of such measures and the need for urgency, but concluded that this depends on the biology of the pest and such guidance is perhaps more appropriate for the PFA guide rather the standard.

6.7 Guidance to assist the management of pest free areas

- [169] To fulfil task 6 of Specification 58, the EWG drafted guidance on communication and stakeholder engagement, recognizing the importance of these activities in the management of a PFA.
- [170] **Communication requirements.** The EWG noted that the requirements for communicating about the existence of the PFA may be different to the requirements for communicating the supporting information (e.g. PRA data). The EWG agreed that the latter only needed to be available on request.
- [171] The EWG agreed that regular updates on the maintenance of the PFA, not just on its establishment, should be made available, but acknowledged that a balance needed to be struck to avoid overburdening NPPOs with reporting requirements. They agreed, therefore, that updates about PFA maintenance should only be on request.
- [172] **Outbreaks.** The EWG noted that relevant NPPOs need to be notified of any outbreaks.
- [173] **Stakeholders.** The EWG agreed that it was important for stakeholders to be engaged in the PFA programme, and therefore included an encouragement for NPPOs to establish partnerships with stakeholders.
- [174] **Raising public awareness.** The EWG clarified that public awareness raising is aimed at the general public, not farmers. The Secretariat recalled the earlier discussions of the EWG about the need for everyone living in the PFA to be aware of its boundaries and the implications of the PFA for them, and highlighted that the key questions are “What does the public need to know?” and “How can the public contribute?” The Secretariat also advised that it is important to be clear about what the *requirements* are with respect to public awareness raising. The EWG considered whether it was appropriate to set requirements for raising public awareness, and concluded that that the best approach was to *encourage* NPPOs to raise public awareness (this being the same approach used in ISPM 6). In drafting their text, the EWG drew upon the text on communication and stakeholder engagement in ISPM 6 and noted the various elements that may form a public awareness campaign (e.g. meetings, publications, mailouts, pamphlets, mail inserts, fact sheets, school kits, posters). The EWG also noted the importance of the public knowing how to report sightings of the pest, for general surveillance purposes.

6.8 Information on the use of buffer zones

- [175] To fulfil task 7 of Specification 58, the EWG drafted guidance on the use of buffer zones.
- [176] The EWG noted that the aim of a buffer zone is to prevent natural dispersal. Where natural barriers exist, a buffer zone may not be needed. Similarly, if the pest does not disperse by air but, say, only via tools and plant materials, a buffer zone may not be needed. Also, although a buffer zone may be used as a means of achieving pest freedom, pest freedom may also be achieved through eradication measures, so a buffer zone is not always needed to achieve pest freedom. The EWG agreed, therefore, that it should not be a requirement for all PFAs to have a buffer zone. For this reason, the subheading drafted by the EWG referred to “buffer zones, *if appropriate*”.

- [177] The EWG noted that the buffer zone is outside the PFA, but that it was not necessary to explain this in the draft standard as the ISPM 5 definition already says that a buffer zone is surrounding or adjacent to an area, which means that it must, by definition, be outside the area.
- [178] The EWG noted that if the whole country is a PFA, a buffer zone might not be possible as the country would not have control over the land beyond its borders. They considered whether, in such cases, a zone would be needed inside the outer perimeter of the PFA, which would be subject to enhanced controls, and noted that in some countries the buffer zone is inside the regulated area anyway. One EWG member suggested that NPPOs could also reach agreements with the NPPOs of neighbouring countries regarding buffer zones. The EWG concluded, however, that the standard did not need to go into detail about these situations and that the main principle to convey was that PFAs should be based on evidence, which should be based on the biology of the pest.
- [179] The EWG noted that the extent of the buffer zone would be determined by the NPPO of the exporting country (i.e. the country in which the PFA is situated), but in some cases would be agreed in collaboration with the NPPO of the neighbouring country.
- [180] The EWG agreed that the pest tolerance level would be determined by both the importing country and the exporting country, and the population of the pest should be verified by surveillance. They noted that surveillance of the buffer zone is the most important element in a buffer zone.

6.9 Key requirements that could be used by contracting parties when implementing the revised ISPM 4

- [181] (See agenda items 6.4 to 6.8.)

6.10 Possible operational and technical implementation issues

- [182] To fulfil task 9 of Specification 58, the EWG considered the implementation of the revised ISPM by contracting parties and the potential operational and technical implementation issues.
- [183] **Multilateral recognition.** Although there is an international standard for bilateral recognition of PFAs – ISPM 29 (*Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence*) – there is currently no mechanism for multilateral recognition. When drafting the revised ISPM, the EWG therefore included provision for an IPPC depository for multilateral recognition: pest free areas (PFAs) that have been established by an NPPO through use of globally accepted surveillance methodology and internationally approved diagnostic protocols could be included in the depository upon the request of that NPPO.
- [184] **Missing harmonized diagnostic and surveillance protocols.** The EWG noted that a lack of harmonized diagnostic or surveillance protocols may make it difficult to achieve recognition of PFAs if an importing country does not accept the protocols used by an exporting country. A lack of transparency about protocols may also result in the PFA not being recognized. The EWG noted that, in the absence of such harmonization, it is advisable for contracting parties to provide maximum transparency and obtain acceptance of the protocols and models used. These could include information on the life stages of the pest and the host plants, and how good the protocol is at detecting and identifying the pest (expressed in terms of statistical confidence).
- [185] **Adequacy of general surveillance.** The EWG discussed the issue of PFAs being established and maintained on the basis of general surveillance in certain cases, for instance where the NPPO wishes to establish a pest free country and concludes that the information obtained from general surveillance is reliable and relevant, or to maintain a PFA where the pest has never been introduced in the area, nor in the surrounding areas and where there have been no records of the pest presence in the area. However, the EWG noted that contracting parties may differ in their views about the limitations of general surveillance and whether there is a need for scientific evidence. Further guidance in implementation material (e.g. in a future revision of the pest free area guide or pest status guide) may help in these situations.

[186] **Pest risk assessment.** The EWG discussed whether it would be compulsory to have a pest risk assessment and acknowledged that pest risk assessment is specific to the endangered area and that pathways are not the same in all countries because commodities pathways differ between countries. It was concluded that the need for a pest risk assessment should be decided on a case by case.

[187] **Size of the buffer zone.** The EWG acknowledged the potential difficulties in determining the size of the buffer zone, as this will depend on the biology of the pest and the availability of the host plants. Further guidance in implementation material (e.g. in a future revision of the pest free area guide or pest status guide) may help in these situations.

[188] **Performance reviews.** The EWG included in the draft standard a requirement for a regular review of the performance of the PFA programme. They noted, however, that there might not be agreement between contracting parties about what these reviews should include or what standard of assurance the reviews are going to provide. Agreeing these technical details will help build trust between contracting parties, as will the audit and assurance elements of the programme, but communication about such issues of trust could be difficult.

[189] In the light of the above discussion, the EWG identified the following potential operational and technical implementation issues:

- a need for an IPPC depository to facilitate multilateral recognition of PFAs;
- a need for further diagnostic protocols, to reduce potential disagreements between contracting parties about the equivalence of different protocols;
- a need for further implementation guidance (e.g. in a future revision of the IPPC guide to pest free areas or the IPPC guide to pest status) on the circumstances in which general surveillance may be deemed sufficient evidence to support the establishment or maintenance of a PFA;
- a need for further implementation guidance on how to determine the size of the PFA buffer zone;
- a need for further implementation guidance on what a review of a PFA programme should include and how to build trust in the PFA between contracting parties.

[190] The EWG invited the SC to:

- (1) *consider* the above information on potential operational and technical implementation issues.
- (2) *consider* forwarding the discussions to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC), CPM Bureau and the Strategic Planning Group.

6.11 Effect of the revision on the protection of biodiversity and the environment

[191] The EWG noted that the current ISPM 4 is an old standard, which pre-dates the inclusion of the section on biodiversity and the environment which is now included in all new ISPMs. To fulfil task 10 of Specification 58, the EWG therefore considered whether the revision of ISPM 4 could affect the protection of biodiversity and the environment, and drafted some text based on the revised ISPM 6.

[192] The EWG invited the SC to:

- (3) *consider* the draft revision of ISPM 4, as elaborated during the meeting.

6.12 Review of all references to ISPM 4 in other ISPMs

[193] Regarding task 11 of Specification 58, the Secretariat referred to the paper listing the cross-references to ISPM 4 in other ISPMs.¹²

[194] The Steward confirmed that before the EWG she had checked all the cross-references identified in the paper and had not spotted anything that needed changing, but she would check them all again.

¹² 13_EWG RevISPM4_2020_Dec.

7. Any other business

[195] The EWG returned to two unresolved questions from earlier in the meeting.

[196] The first related to the definitions of “outbreak” and “incursion”, with one EWG member expressing concerns about whether the difference between the two terms was clear, but another member being of the view that the terms are two different concepts and relate to establishment of the pest. The Secretariat highlighted that in 2021 there would be a call for topics, through which subjects (terms) may be proposed for inclusion in the TPG work programme. The Secretariat encouraged EWG members to do this, if they felt there was a need.

[197] The second question related to the potential for annexes of the revised ISPM 4, and the associated reorganization of PFA standards. The Secretariat reiterated that, were this to happen, it would require a new specification and a new EWG.

[198] The EWG:

- (4) *agreed* that Craig HULL (Australia) would explore the potential for reorganizing the PFA standards, and would approach the member of the Standards Committee from his region to help progress this.

8. Close of the meeting

[199] The Steward thanked all participants and the Chairperson.

[200] The Secretariat invited all SC members and observers to complete the evaluation of the meeting via this link: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/WKXNBNJ> by 5 February 2021.

[201] The Chairperson and Steward commented on the lessons that might be learnt from this EWG for future EWGs held in virtual mode, noting that some tasks are more suitable for virtual mode than others and that face-to-face meetings avoid the need for some EWG members to work very late at night or early in the morning. The benefits of working together all in one room in a face-to-face meeting were also noted.

[202] The Secretariat explained the next steps to the EWG members, including the finalization of the meeting report, and thanked everyone for their contributions.

[203] The Chairperson thanked all participants for their contributions and closed the meeting.

Appendix 1: Agenda

| Agenda Item | Document No. | Presenter |
|---|---|--|
| 1. Opening of the Meeting | | |
| 1.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat Introductions | -- | MOREIRA / CASSIN |
| 1.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of the standard setting process Roles of the Participants | 04_EWG RevISPM4_2020_Dec | MOREIRA / CASSIN |
| 2. Meeting Arrangements | | |
| 2.1 Selection of the Chairperson | -- | MOREIRA |
| 2.2 Selection of the Rapporteur | -- | CHAIRPERSON |
| 2.3 Adoption of the Agenda | 01_EWG RevISPM4_2020_Dec | CHAIRPERSON |
| 3. Administrative Matters | | |
| 3.1 Documents list | 02_EWG RevISPM4_2020_Dec | CASSIN |
| 3.2 Participants list | 03_EWG RevISPM4_2020_Dec | |
| 3.3 Connections to Zoom and virtual meetings | Short guideline for participants | |
| 4. Background | | |
| 4.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of Specification 58 Overview of ISPM 4 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>) | Link to Specification 58 Link to ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) | ZLOTINA (Steward) |
| 4.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of IPPC Pest Free Area Programme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide on Establishing and Maintaining Pest Free Areas International Symposium on PFAs and Surveillance Presentation on the IPPC guide to IPPC Regional Workshops | Link to guide on Establishing and Maintaining Pest Free Areas Link to the International Symposium on PFAs and Surveillance Link to the presentation on the IPPC guide on PFA to IPPC Regional Workshops | ARÉVALO MACÍAS (IC Lead for PFA) / LOMSADZE (IPPC Secretariat) |
| 4.3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS): IRSS Survey - ISPM 4: <i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i> | Link to the 2012 IRSS survey on the ISPM 4 | YAMADA (IPPC Secretariat) / MOREIRA (IPPC Secretariat) |
| 4.4 Considerations and outcomes expected for the revision of ISPM 4 | -- | ZLOTINA (Steward) |
| 5. Review of discussion papers / studies | | CHAIRPERSON |
| 5.1 Proposals for the revision of ISPM 4 – USA | 05_EWG RevISPM4_2020_Dec | ZLOTINA |
| 5.2 Pest Free Concepts: Degrees of Freedom and Revision of ISPM 4 - USA | 06_EWG RevISPM4_2020_Dec | ZLOTINA |
| 5.3 Proposals for the revision of ISPM 4 – Australia | 07_EWG RevISPM4_2020_Dec | HULL |
| 5.4 Proposals for the revision of ISPM 4 – Canada | 08_EWG RevISPM4_2020_Dec | AIT OUMEJJOUT |
| 5.5 Pest Free Areas in Mexico: fruit fly case | 12_EWG RevISPM4_2020_Dec | IPPC Secretariat |

| Agenda Item | Document No. | Presenter |
|-------------|--|---|
| 5.6 | Study: Fruit Fly Free Areas in Mexico | 09_EWG RevISPM4_2020_Dec |
| 5.7 | Study: Area freedom in Mexico from Mediterranean fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae): a review of over 30 years of a successful containment program using an integrated area-wide SIT approach (Enkerlin et al., 2015) | 10_EWG RevISPM4_2020_Dec |
| 5.8 | Study: Five-year strategic plan 2008-2013 fruit flies of Mexico | 11_EWG RevISPM4_2020_Dec |
| 6. | Development of text for the draft ISPM¹³ <i>Reference documents:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates</i> - <i>ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)</i> - <i>Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology (in the Procedure Manual for Standard Setting)</i> | Link to the IPPC Style Guide Link to ISPM 5 Link to Procedure Manual for Standard Setting |
| 6.1 | Brainstorming session to develop the revision | -- |
| 6.2 | Identification of other relevant standards and whether information and concepts contained in those standards should be incorporated into the revision of ISPM 4 | -- |
| 6.3 | Provide and review information on establishment and maintenance of PFAs (including surveillance), considering experiences of contracting parties in implementing ISPM 4, including regulatory control of PFAs | -- |
| 6.4 | Review the sections on surveillance for establishment and maintenance of PFAs, taking into account ISPM 6 (Guidelines for surveillance), and make recommendations for improvements as appropriate | -- |
| 6.5 | Provide requirements for establishment, maintenance, suspension and reinstatement of PFAs | -- |
| 6.6 | Consider provision for phytosanitary measures to regulate the movement of commodities in PFAs | -- |
| 6.7 | Recommend guidance to assist in managing PFAs, including public awareness campaigns for all stakeholders in the supply chain (e.g. producers, merchants, shippers) | -- |
| 6.8 | Consider and provide information on the use of buffer zones | -- |
| 6.9 | Review key requirements for establishing and maintaining PFAs that could be used by contracting parties when implementing the revised ISPM 4 | -- |

¹³ IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/development-standards/>

Appendix 2: Documents list*(Documents are presented in the order of the document numbers)*

| DOCUMENT NO. | AGENDA ITEM | DOCUMENT TITLE | POSTED |
|--------------------------|-------------|---|---|
| 01_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec | 2.3 | Agenda | 2020-11-23 2020-11-24 2020-12-03 |
| 02_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec | 3.1 | Documents list | 2020-11-23 2020-11-24 2020-12-03 |
| 03_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec | 3.2 | Participants list | 2020-11-23 2020-12-02 |
| 04_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec | 1.2 | Presentation of the standard setting process | 2020-11-23 |
| 05_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec | 5.1 | Proposals for the revision of ISPM 4 – USA | 2020-11-23 |
| 06_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec | 5.2 | Pest Free Concepts: Degrees of Freedom and Revision of ISPM 4 - USA | 2020-11-23 |
| 07_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec | 5.3 | Proposals for the revision of ISPM 4 – Australia | 2020-11-23 |
| 08_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec | 5.4 | Proposals for the revision of ISPM 4 – Canada | 2020-11-23 |
| 09_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec | 5.6 | Study: Fruit Fly Free Areas in Mexico | 2020-11-23 |
| 10_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec | 5.7 | Study: Area freedom in Mexico from Mediterranean fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae): a review of over 30 years of a successful containment program using an integrated area-wide SIT approach (Enkerlin et al., 2015) | 2020-11-23 |
| 11_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec | 5.8 | Study: Five-year strategic plan 2008-2013 fruit flies of Mexico | 2020-11-23 |
| 12_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec | 5.5 | Pest Free Areas in Mexico: fruit fly case | 2020-11-24 |
| 13_EWG_RevISPM4_2020_Dec | 6.12 | Task 11 of the Specification 58: Revision of ISPM 4 | 2020-12-02 |

Documents links (presented in the order of the agenda items)

| Links | AGENDA ITEM |
|--|-------------|
| Short guideline for participants | 1 |
| Link to Specification 58 | 4.1 |
| Link to ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) | 4.1 |
| Link to IPPC guide on Establishing and Maintaining Pest Free Areas | 4.2 |
| Link to the International Symposium on PFAs and Surveillance | 4.2 |
| Link to the presentation on the IPPC guide on PFA to IPPC Regional Workshops | 4.2 |

| Links | AGENDA ITEM |
|--|-------------|
| Link to the 2012 IRSS survey on the ISPM 4 | 4.3 |
| Link to the IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates | 6 |
| Link to ISPM 5 | 6 |
| Link to Procedure Manual for Standard Setting | 6 |

Appendix 3: Participants list

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

(Last update: 2020-12-02)

| | Participant role | Name, mailing address, telephone | Email address |
|---|------------------|--|--|
| ✓ | Steward | Ms Marina ZLOTINA IPPC Technical Director/USDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) 4700 River Rd, 5c-03.37 Riverdale, MD 20737 USA Tel: 1-301-851-2200 Cell: 1 -301-832-0611 | Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov |
| ✓ | Member | Mr Craig HULL Assistant Director, Plant Sciences and Risk Assessment branch. Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment 7 London Circuit, Canberra ACT, 2601 Australia Tel: +61 2 6272 3544 | craig.hull@agriculture.gov.au |
| ✓ | Member | Naima AIT OUMEJJOUT Acting/Forestry and Horticulture specialist-Plant Import and Export Division-International Affairs Branch Canada/Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A0Y9 Canada Tel: 343-543-8340 | naima.aitoumejjout@canada.ca |
| ✓ | Member | Mohamed MAGDY Supervisor of Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) & Market Access Egypt / The Central Administration of Plant Quarantine (CAPQ) The National Plant Protection Organization of Egypt 6 Michel Bakhoum St., Dokki, Giza Egypt Tel: +2 01129477767 | moazsps2020@gmail.com |
| ✓ | Member | Harry ARIJS Deputy Head of Plant Health Unit, DG Health and Food Safety EU - European Commission Rue Froissart 101, room 6/60 +32 2 29 87645 | harry.arijs@ec.europa.eu |
| ✓ | Member | Thomas Kimeli KOSIOM Senior Plant Health Inspector Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (Kephis) 49592-00100 Nairobi Kenya Tel: +254720398083 | tkosiom@kephis.org |

| | Participant role | Name, mailing address, telephone | Email address |
|---|------------------|---|---|
| ✓ | Member | <p>Ha Thanh HUONG Deputy Director of Plant Quarantine Division, senior expert of plant quarantine and pest risk analysis (including risk assessment and risk management) and entomologist Vietnam/ Plant Protection Department of Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development Plant Protection Department, 149 Ho Dac Di street, Dong Da district, Hanoi city Vietnam Tel: +84 904340769; +84 24 35334813</p> | <p>ppdhuong@yahoo.com: ppdhuong@gmail.com</p> |
| ✓ | Member | <p>Jose Rafael HERNANDEZ Senior Risk Manager – Plant Pathology USA – USDA/APHIS 4700 River Rd. Unit 133 – Riverdale MD, 20737 USA Tel: +1-301-851-2206</p> | <p>Jose.R.Hernandez@usda.gov</p> |

OTHERS

| | Participant role | Name, mailing address, telephone | Email address |
|---|---|--|---|
| ✓ | Invited expert: Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) member | <p>Ruth AREVALO MACIAS Professional of the Phytosanitary Regulation and Certification Department Paseo Bulnes 140, Piso 3, Santiago Chile Tel: 56223451246</p> | <p>ruth.arevalo@sag.gob.cl</p> |

IPPC Secretariat

| | Region / Role | Name, mailing, address, telephone | Email address |
|---|------------------|--|---|
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat | <p>Ms Adriana MOREIRA Standard Setting Officer</p> | <p>Adriana.Moreira@fao.org</p> |
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat | <p>Ms Aoife CASSIN Standard Setting Associate</p> | <p>Aoife.Cassin@fao.org</p> |
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat | <p>Ms Ketevan LOMSADZE Implementation Facilitation Officer</p> | <p>Ketevan.Lomsadze@fao.org</p> |
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat | <p>Ms Natsumi YAMADA Agricultural Officer, Implementation Facilitation Unit of the IPPC Secretariat</p> | <p>Natsumi.Yamada@fao.org</p> |
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat | <p>Ms Karen ROUEN Report writer and editor</p> | <p>karen@karenrouen.com</p> |