



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (Virtual Meeting No 10)

**Rome, Italy
20 January 2021**

IPPC Secretariat

Required citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2020. *Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (Virtual Meeting No 10), 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, 2020



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

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

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

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

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

Contents

1. Opening of the Meeting.....	4
2. Meeting Arrangements	4
2.1 Election of the Rapporteur	4
2.2 Adoption of the agenda	4
3. Administrative Matters.....	4
3.1 Documents list	4
3.2 Participants list.....	4
4. IC e-Decisions	4
4.1 Review of IC e-decision summary for 2020.....	4
5. Design-Thinking Study	5
5.1 Presentation of the results of the design-thinking study.....	5
6. Selection of Observers	8
6.1 Selection of observers to invite to the IC meetings on ICD projects	8
7. Any Other Business	9
7.1 Plant health officer training, Curriculum (2017-054).....	9
7.2 CPM recommendation on sea containers	9
7.3 Membership of e-commerce working group.....	10
7.4 Membership of IC Team on contributed resources	10
8. Date and Arrangement of the Next Meeting.....	10
9. Evaluation of the Meeting Process.....	11
10. Close of the Meeting.....	11
Appendix 1: Agenda.....	12
Appendix 2: IC e-decisions (forums) presented between November 2019 and December 2020....	13
Appendix 3: Selection of experts for the Working Group for the e-Commerce Guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles (2017-039)	14

1. Opening of the Meeting

- [1] The IC Chairperson, Mr Dominique PELLETIER, welcomed all participants to the tenth virtual meeting of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC), and the Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU) lead, Mr Brent LARSON, introduced a new member of the IFU staff, Ms Elene GOGNADZE.

2. Meeting Arrangements

2.1 Election of the Rapporteur

- [2] Ms Kyu-Ock YIM (Republic of Korea) was elected as the Rapporteur to the meeting.

2.2 Adoption of the agenda

- [3] The IC agreed to consider the following items under agenda item 7 (Any Other Business): a change of priority for the topic on *plant health officer training curriculum* (2017-054), a request from the Sea Containers Task Force for a revision to a CPM (Commission on Phytosanitary Measures) recommendation, membership of the e-commerce working group, and membership of the IC Team on contributed resources. The agenda, as modified, was adopted and is attached to this report (Appendix 1).

3. Administrative Matters

3.1 Documents list

- [4] The List of documents was introduced as follows:
- Meeting Agenda (VM10_01_IC_2021_Jan)
 - Presentation of the results of Design Thinking Study (VM10_02_IC_2021_Jan)
 - Review of IC e-decisions summary for 2020 (VM10_03_IC_2021_Jan)
 - Selection of observers to invite for discussions on Projects (VM10_04_IC_2021_Jan)

3.2 Participants list

- [5] All IC members and the representatives from the Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) and Standards Committee were present except for: Ms Olga LAVRENTJEVA (Estonia).

4. IC e-Decisions

4.1 Review of IC e-decision summary for 2020

- [6] The Secretariat presented a summary of e-decisions made between November 2019 and December 2020¹. The number of e-decisions had been greater than usual, owing to the virtual mode of working. Only five out of the 17 e-decisions had a response rate of 50 percent or more, with the maximum response rate being 72 percent. Nine IC members had only responded to 1–5 e-decisions. The Secretariat reminded the IC about the standing e-forums, encouraged IC members to participate in them, and made the following suggestions for consideration for improving the level of response: reminding IC members about the e-forums that are not closed or the standing e-forums at the close of the IC meetings; creating an IC WhatsApp group; encouraging the IC lead for each topic to lead the related e-decision; and undertaking individual follow-up.
- [7] The IC Chairperson emphasized that it was important that IC members participated in e-decisions, but did not think it was appropriate to follow-up on an individual basis at this point in time, given the challenges faced by everyone because of the COVID-19 pandemic, but was not excluding to do so, should the situation remain unchanged. The IFU Team lead clarified that e-decisions were not optional

¹ VM10_03_IC_2021_Jan

for IC members, but welcomed suggestions from IC members as to how the Secretariat could make it easier for IC members to respond.

- [8] One IC member commented that newly selected IC members who had been participating as observers until their term of appointment formally began might have been reluctant to participate fully in the IC e-decisions. The Secretariat clarified that this however was not the case as some of the best response rates to IC e-Decision there from some of the observers.
- [9] The Chairperson encouraged IC members to participate in e-decisions and e-forums, and the IC then reviewed the list of e-decision summaries to ensure they reflected the outcomes of the e-forum discussions.
- [10] The IC:
- (1) *agreed* the summary of Implementation and Capacity Development Committee e-decisions (forums) for 2020 as Appendix 2.

5. Design-Thinking Study

5.1 Presentation of the results of the design-thinking study

- [11] The Secretariat presented the paper on the results of the design-thinking study².
- [12] The Secretariat started by explaining the various constraints affecting implementation facilitation, including limited team resources within the Secretariat, diverse audiences, high turnover rates among staff in national plant protection organizations (NPPOs), the need for cost-efficient approaches, and the current travel restrictions due to the pandemic. Price Waterhouse Cooper (PwC) had therefore been commissioned to conduct a pilot study using design-thinking to identify how to leverage digital methods to efficiently deliver implementation and capacity development (ICD) phytosanitary activities at global, regional and national levels. It was a short project with a limited budget and timeframe: it had started in June 2020, ran for three months and involved two countries: Kenya and Madagascar. It was noted that the Design thinking approach is not meant to result in a statistically based study but rather the approach is to get some preliminary feedback, adjust accordingly and then monitor the impact, this is thought to be a very cost-effective way to gather user feedback quickly.
- [13] The study had started by defining the scope of the research through workshops and interviews with the Secretariat. The study then moved onto a series of interviews with NPPO staff from Kenya and Madagascar, with the aim of understanding the current users. Five types of staff were identified to be interviewed, based on the information from the IPPC Guide for Establishing an NPPO: the Head of the NPPO, the legislation lead officer, the surveillance lead officer, the diagnostics lead officer, and the field operations lead officer. This resulted in three “personas” (fictional stereotypes) being identified, each with different characteristics: “the politician” (represented by the Head of the NPPO), the “best in class” (represented by the surveillance officer or the legislation officer), and the “pragmatic” (represented by the diagnostic officer and the field operations officer). The Secretariat emphasized to IC members at this point in the presentation that personas are simply a creative decision-making tool and that the names of the personas are not of great significance.
- [14] The results of the NPPO staff interviews, and the personas identified, were used to draft a user’s training journey in various scenarios, for instance when a person first takes up a position with the NPPO. For each scenario, the sequence of steps taken by the person was described and, for each of these steps, the touchpoints (point of interaction with the IPPC Secretariat or ICD activities), pain points, needs, emotional curve and main challenges were identified. The study also identified some cross-cutting challenges (e.g. how to better capture users’ expectations, limited access to the Internet, how to efficiently alert NPPO staff on new or revised standards).

² VM10_02_IC_2021_Jan

- [15] The Secretariat explained that the main limitations to the study were the limited number of countries and interviews, particularly the lack of field officers that were interviewed, and the possible reluctance of interviewees to make any criticisms. These could be overcome by widening the study to include additional countries and additional staff, and by performing observations of NPPO staff in real-time.
- [16] The Secretariat summarized the key findings of the study. These included the fact that the pyramidal organization of NPPOs can limit engagement with ICD activities, Internet access can be a problem, there was very limited usage of IPPC training materials, and that virtual workshops would need to be interactive and take into account the fact that participants may have limited data access. One suggestion from the NPPO staff had been to have a simplified version of the training material, suitable for use in the field and for explaining guidance to farmers.
- [17] The Secretariat finished the presentation by outlining the next steps until March 2021. These included a further study by PwC (being progressed through another study) into how to improve the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP); the Secretariat setting up a WhatsApp channel with all NPPO heads; an introductory training on using the IPP; a newsletter; using LinkedIn to promote IPPC news, achievements, webinars and so forth; and looking at various ways of improving IPPC guides and training materials (e.g. translating them into the official FAO languages, creating simplified versions that could be provided in a printer compatible format or as an appendix to a guide). After this, until Sept 2021, steps include continuing the improvement of IPPC training materials (e.g. ease of use on smartphones, certificates from e-learning courses, development of IT tools on the IPP for readers to be able to share posts on a topic) and improving the access to e-learning courses. Ideally, as suggested by the IC, an expanded study could be considered which would include additional NPPOs from other regions.
- [18] The IC Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for the presentation and asked whether there had been any feedback from the two countries regarding the personas. The Secretariat replied that the NPPO staff in Madagascar had expressed broad agreement with the personas, although did wonder a little about “the politician”. For the Kenyan NPPO staff, the name of “the politician” did not reflect the intended concept, as a “politician” to them is someone engaged in politics. Also, the Kenyan NPPO did not experience the same problems with Internet connections in the field as in Madagascar.
- [19] In response to a further question from the Chairperson regarding the funding for the study, the IFU explained that the study was a response to the sudden cessation of many ICD activities at the start of the pandemic, when the IFU was forced to consider alternative ways of delivering ICD activities. Design thinking is a process that observes activities from the user perspective and then designs solutions based on that. The study had been funded using unspent travel money.
- [20] The IC Chairperson then invited questions from IC members. There was a general consensus that, despite the limited nature of the study, it had provided some interesting findings.
- [21] **The role of other players.** The representative of the RPPOs highlighted that although the study had focused on the IPPC Secretariat and NPPOs, other players, in particular academia, could contribute, either directly or indirectly, to advancing knowledge about plant health around the world. The Secretariat acknowledged that the study was very limited and the focus had been on how the Secretariat could improve its own training materials, not on a more holistic look at training activities across the world. Having said that, neither Kenya nor Madagascar had said anything about the role of universities. The Secretariat commented that the study could be enlarged, but it is perhaps also the role of NPPOs to liaise with other partners in their country. The representative of the RPPOs suggested that the IPPC Secretariat could think about how to leverage cooperation with institutions of higher learning to deliver ICD training.
- [22] Another IC member suggested that, should there be a future study, the methodology of the phytosanitary capacity evaluation tool could perhaps be used to identify relevant stakeholders, including private enterprises. The Secretariat confirmed that a chart had been compiled during the study to show the various stakeholders, but that it is the role of the NPPO rather than the IPPC Secretariat to talk directly to stakeholders. The Secretariat can, however, provide materials to facilitate this.

- [23] **The personas.** While acknowledging that many people would be able to recognize the three personas, a few IC members wondered about the wider applicability of the personas to other NPPOs; for example, whether the personas would apply equally to developing and developed countries, whether the number of people in the different personas varies; whether the positions represented by the personas differ (e.g. the national contact point may be the head of a technical division, not the head of the NPPO, and additional personas might be needed, represented by a technical expert and an inspector).
- [24] **The audience for IPPC training materials.** One IC member commented that although it is the Head of the NPPO or the “best-in-class” who engages directly with the IPPC Secretariat, the audience for some of the IPPC training materials is the “pragmatic”. Although it is the responsibility of the NPPO to train their staff, the IPPC Secretariat also needs to understand the needs of the audience for their training materials, not just the needs of the national contact point.
- [25] **Training courses.** One IC member suggested that, if not done already, the Secretariat could look at the training courses provided by the World Trade Organization; the member also offered to send the Secretariat details about a language training module that might be useful.
- [26] **Use of apps.** The IC noted that some organizations do not permit their staff to use WhatsApp, so other alternatives may need to be explored.
- [27] **The next steps.** One IC member recommended that the Secretariat not spend too many resources on repeating the same study, although the interviews could be extended to include additional countries. The member suggested that a future study could look at internal communication within the NPPOs. Another IC member suggested that if the study were going to expand, then it would be best to focus on the audience for IPPC training materials, and identifying personas for that group, rather than identifying different levels within the NPPO.
- [28] Looking beyond the study to implement the solutions identified in the study, one IC member commented that to realize this would require a long-term commitment in terms of funding.
- [29] The Chairperson commented that design thinking is a way of simplifying a complex problem and is a good approach, but he would be reluctant to commit resources to activities based on such a limited study.
- [30] The IFU lead clarified that, in design thinking, the idea is not to do a full scientific study, but just to get an idea of what the situation is. However, the IFU needed direction from the IC as to the next steps. The IFU lead gave some examples of aspects upon which the IC could provide direction:
- identifying the target audience for IPPC training materials (the IFU lead explained that IPPC training materials had been developed for Heads of NPPOs or policy makers to put in place policies and procedures for NPPO staff to help implement the IPPC, ISPMs and CPM Recommendations, but NPPO staff identified their needs differently)
 - how to raise awareness of ISPMs
 - whether the study should be expanded to, say, two countries per region
 - whether to expand the use of the phytosanitary capacity evaluation to showcase it also as a training tool (as this was identified by the two countries in the study as the main training tool)
 - whether to convert IPPC training materials into e-books.
- [31] One IC member asked whether, during development of IPPC training materials, NPPOs are consulted about who the target audience is. The member commented that the target audience for the surveillance and diagnostic guides, for example, are the technical staff not the Head of the NPPO. The IFU lead replied that this is the role of the IC members, to identify what the NPPOs in their region want. The Secretariat added that the target audience for training materials are identified in the outlines and by the working groups. However, there is a disconnect identified in the design-thinking study in that the IPPC Secretariat is obligated to communicate with the official national IPPC contact point, which is most often the Head of the NPPO, which means that the information about the materials does not always

reach the target audience. The study had shown that the materials themselves were well received by the target audience. The Secretariat commented that, if the IPPC Community is investing effort into developing training materials, then it is important to make sure that the target audience is informed of the materials existence. However, this may not present a big problem as some of the suggestions arising from the study, such as translating materials and making them smartphone friendly, are fairly straightforward to implement.

[32] The Chairperson highlighted the need to avoid reinventing guidance where resources are available in other institutions, and within NPPOs themselves. He also suggested that IPPC training material should be accessible from the same page of the IPP as the corresponding standards. The IFU lead confirmed that the latter is already in progress as Phytosanitary System landing page³ and reminded IC members that the contributed resources process is a way to have the IC review and approve existing guidance materials and if suitable for global use, have it posted on the IPP.

[33] The IC:

- (1) *noted* the results of the pilot study using the “design thinking” methodology
- (2) *agreed* that further consideration needed to be given to the “design thinking” methodology (including the potential scope of any follow-up study, the size of the sample, the applicability of the personas around the world, and the resources needed to deliver the activities suggested by the study) before any direction could be given to the Secretariat on the next steps
- (3) *agreed* to consider the next steps for the “design thinking” study at the next IC meeting.

6. Selection of Observers

6.1 Selection of observers to invite to the IC meetings on ICD projects

[34] The Secretariat presented the paper regarding which organizations would be invited to send an observer to the 2021 IC meetings on projects⁴. Given the virtual mode of IC meetings during the pandemic, there would be two dedicated IC meetings, IC-VM14 and IC-VM15 in May and June 2021 respectively, to which the observers would be invited.

[35] The IFU lead added that there would be a Call for ICD projects this year, and urged IC members to encourage submissions. In due course, IC members would then be assigned to review the submissions.

[36] The IC lead for the IC Team on projects, Mr Lalith KUMARASINGHE (New Zealand), agreed to work with the IPPC Secretariat to arrange a virtual meeting of the team, Mr Dominique PELLETIER (Canada) and Ms Kyu-Ock YIM (Republic of Korea), to discuss the next steps to be taken to organize the IC-VM14 and IC-VM15 sessions on projects.

[37] The IC then considered who to invite as observers to the 2021 sessions on projects. First, the IC agreed to invite those representatives who had attended the sessions in 2018 and 2019 (from CABI, the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture, Imperial College London, the FAO Plant Health Team, the Standards and Trade Development Facility and the World Trade Organization).

[38] The IC then considered a list, compiled by the Secretariat, of institutions who may have ICD projects of interest. The Secretariat explained that the idea is to invite them to submit information on relevant projects; these would then be reviewed and representatives from those projects of interest would be invited to the IC-VM14 and IC-VM15 meetings. The IC agreed to the list and added three further institutions: Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), European Phytosanitary Research Coordination (EUPHRESKO) and Universal Postal Union (UPU).

[39] The IC:

³ Phytosanitary system page : <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/phytosanitary-system/>

⁴ VM10_04_IC_2021_Jan

- (1) *agreed* to invite representatives from CABI, the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture, Imperial College London, the FAO Plant Health Team, the Standards and Trade Development Facility and the World Trade Organization to attend the ICD project sessions (VM14 and VM15) as observers in 2021
- (2) *agreed* to invite the following institutions to submit information on projects related to pests or invasive alien plants, and then invite representatives of those projects of interest to attend the ICD project sessions (VM14 and VM15) as observers in 2021 – Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement (CIRAD), Centre international de hautes études agronomiques méditerranéennes (CIHEAM), Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), European Phytosanitary Research Coordination (EUPHRESKO), Europe-Africa-Caribbean-Pacific Liaison Committee (COLEACP), International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), International Forestry Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG), International Pest Risk Research Group (IPRRG), International Society for Plant Pathology, Phytosanitary Measures Research Group, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Universal Postal Union (UPU), World Bank, World Customs Organization (WCO) and World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE)
- (3) *agreed* to solicit projects from their regions to be submitted in response to the Call for ICD projects⁵.

7. Any Other Business

7.1 Plant health officer training, Curriculum (2017-054)

- [40] Ms Kyu-Ock YIM (Republic of Korea) informed the IC that funding had been secured from Korea directed for funding to the IRSS topic on *Risk based inspection of imported consignments Guide* (2018-022, priority 1), and to the ICD topic on *Plant health officer training, Curriculum* (2017-054, priority 2). In order for work to move forward on the above ICD topic, she requested the IC consider changing the priority from 2 to 1.
- [41] The IC agreed to change the priority for the ICD topic on *Plant health officer training, Curriculum* (2017-054) from 2 to 1, as funding was available.
- [42] The IFU lead confirmed that he would update the CPM paper⁶ on the list of ICD topics accordingly.

7.2 CPM recommendation on sea containers

- [43] The IFU lead informed the IC that the Sea Containers Task Force had recommended that the CPM recommendation on *Sea containers* (R-06) be revised to take account of the work done by the task force. As the task force comes under the oversight of the IC, the IC was being asked by the task force to recommend this revision to the CPM.
- [44] The IC agreed that the work for revisions to the CPM recommendation on Sea containers (R-06) would be useful and agree to request the CPM to initiate this revision. The IFU lead confirmed that he would update the CPM paper accordingly.

⁵ Call for Implementation and Capacity Development (ICD) projects: <https://www.ippc.int/en/calls/call-for-implementation-and-capacity-development-icd-projects/>

⁶ CPM2021/29 Adoption of the List of Implementation and Capacity Development Topics – Adjustments available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89375/>

7.3 Membership of e-commerce working group

- [45] The Secretariat gave an update on the e-forum that has been launched to select experts for the working group on development of the e-commerce guide. The call for experts⁷ had closed in December 2020 and an IC e-forum to select the experts had been launched with a closing date of 29 January. Six IC members had already responded, recommending that all the experts be invited to join the working group.
- [46] The IPPC Secretariat and IC Lead noted that although the candidates were from a wide geographical area, the NPPOs of developing countries were under represented. The IPPC Secretariat initiated the e-forum, while continuing to seek additional nominations, in order to initiate preparations for the first virtual meeting of the e-Commerce Guide WG, planned for 23 February 2021.
- [47] The IC agreed to the selection of all nominated experts and encouraged the Secretariat to secure additional experts from the NPPOs of Jamaica and Guyana and to request the World Customs Organization (WCO) Secretariat to nominate an observer to attend the meetings and contribute to the guide.
- [48] The IC also agreed that the Secretariat could close the e-forum on 20 January 2021, following the discussion above.

7.4 Membership of IC Team on contributed resources

- [49] Ms Magda GONZALEZ ARROYO (Costa Rica), on behalf of the IC Team on contributed resources, proposed that IC members Ms Ruth AREVALO MACIAS (Chile) and Ms Stephanie BLOEM (Representative from the RPPOs) be asked to join the team. They both expressed a willingness to take on this role, and the IC agreed to this.
- [50] The IC:
- (1) *agreed* to change the priority for the Implementation and Capacity Development topic on *Plant health officer training, Curriculum* (2017-054) from 2 to 1.
 - (2) *recommended* to CPM-15 (2021) that the CPM recommendation on *Sea containers* (R-06) be revised to take account of the work done by the Sea Containers Task Force agreed to the selection of experts for the working group on the *e-Commerce Guide* (2017-039), as presented in Appendix 3 and agreed that additional experts from the NPPOs of Jamaica and Guyana and a representative from the World Customs Organization be invited to participate.
 - (3) *agreed* that Ms Ruth AREVALO MACIAS (Chile) and Ms Stephanie BLOEM (Representative from the RPPOs) join the IC Team on contributed resources.

8. Date and Arrangement of the Next Meeting

- [51] The next virtual IC meeting will be held on 24 February 2021, at 14:00 Rome time (CET).
- [52] The Chairperson explained that the intended focus of IC-VM11 had originally been the roadmap that the IC was developing in relation to the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030. However, the work on that had not progressed, and it had subsequently occurred to the Chairperson that a much simpler way to achieve more or less the same end would be to use the spreadsheet of ICD topics that the Secretariat had created, align the projects to the Strategic Framework and identify gaps. A short (e.g. three-page) document could then be developed to explain the spreadsheet, what it is trying to achieve, and what the IC is striving to achieve over the course of the next decade, all couched in the language of the Strategic Framework.
- [53] Ms Stephanie BLOEM (Representative from the RPPOs) asked to step down from the IC Team that was developing the roadmap, and the IC agreed that Mr Thorwald GEUZE (The Netherlands) would

⁷ Call for experts to develop a IPPC e-Commerce Guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles (2017-039) : <https://www.ippc.int/en/calls/call-for-experts-to-develop-a-ippc-e-commerce-guide-for-plants-plant-products-and-other-regulated-articles-2017-039/>

take her place, working with the IC Chairperson to develop the appropriate guidance document according to the new approach suggested by the Chairperson.

[54] In terms of the agenda items for IC-VM11 in February 2021, the IC agreed that this would be: SCTF Work Plan, following discussions on the Design-Thinking study, national reporting obligations work plan, Beyond Compliance update and work plan, and the e-commerce work plan. The IC recognized that there may be insufficient time for all four of these items, but agreed that the items would be considered in that order.

[55] The IC:

- (1) *agreed* that Mr Thorwald GEUZE (The Netherlands) would replace Ms Stephanie BLOEM (Representative from the RPPOs) to work with the IC Chairperson on the development of an appropriate guidance document for the IC vis-a-vie the IPPC Strategic Framework (2020-2030)
- (2) *agreed* the agenda for the next IC meeting (VM11) to be held on 24 February 2021.

9. Evaluation of the Meeting Process

[56] The Secretariat informed the IC that a link to a survey would be shared via email to evaluate the meeting, but that in future this may not be done every time, given the frequency of the meetings.

10. Close of the Meeting

[57] The IC Chairperson thanked everyone for participating in the discussions, encouraged all IC members to respond to e-decisions and also to contact him as needed. The IFU lead also thanked everyone and highlighted that in addition to the meeting surveys, IC members were welcome to email the Secretariat with suggestions about how to improve IC meetings.

[58] The IC Chairperson closed the meeting.

Appendix 1: Agenda**VIRTUAL MEETING N° 10 AGENDA***(Updated 2021-01-13)***COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES****IMPLEMENTATION AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (IC)****Start:** 2021-01-20 at 08:00 (Rome, time)**Zoom link:** <https://fao.zoom.us/j/91922190985>**Password:** 132156

	Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
1.	Opening of the Meeting		
1.1	Opening by the IFU Team lead and welcome by the IC Chairperson		LARSON PELLETIER
2.	Meeting Arrangements		
2.1	Election of the Rapporteur		PELLETIER
2.2	Adoption of the Agenda	VM10_01_IC_2021_Jan	PELLETIER
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1	Review of meeting documents	Link	KOUMBA
3.2	Review of participants	Link	KOUMBA
4.	IC e-Decisions		
4.1	Review of IC e-Decision summary for 2020	VM10_03_IC_2021_Jan	KOUMBA
5.	Design thinking study		
5.1	Presentation of the results of the Design Thinking study	VM10_02_IC_2021_Jan	BRUNEL
6	Selection of observers		
6.1	Selection of Observers to invite to the IC meetings on ICD projects	VM10_04_IC_2021_Jan	BRUNEL
7.	Any other business		PELLETIER/ LARSON
8.	Date and arrangement of the Next Meeting		LARSON
9.	Evaluation of the meeting process		JIMENEZ
10.	Close of the Meeting		PELLETIER / LARSON

Appendix 2: IC e-decisions (forums) presented between November 2019 and December 2020

N°	E-decision number	IC decision (Forum)	Comments	Polls
1	2020_eIC_May_01	Approval of the IPPC Best Practice Guidance on Measures to Minimize Pest Contamination and Associated Leaflet	9	No
2	2020_eIC_May_2	Feedback on the revised CPM document "Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems"	5	No
3	2020_eIC_May_03	Approval of the Draft Outline and Submission Form for the IPPC e-Commerce Guide	12	No
4	2020_eIC_May_04	Provide comments to the Bureau and Secretariat updates	11	No
5	2020_eIC_May_05	Provide comments to the draft implementation plan proposed for the Guide on Establishing and Maintaining Pest Free Areas	22	No
6	2020_eIC_Nov_01	Adoption of the IC VM01 (General updates from CPM Bureau and IPPC Secretariat) Report	13	No
7	2020_eIC_Nov_02	Adoption of the IC VM02 (Draft of Implementation Plan for PFA Guide) Report	14	No
8	2020_eIC_Nov_03	Selection of experts to develop e-Learning material on Phytosanitary Export Certification System	11	Yes
9	2020_eIC_Nov_04	Selection of experts to develop e-Learning material on Pest Risk Analysis	10	No
10	2020_eIC_Nov_05	Outline for the e-Commerce Guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles (2017-039)	8	No
11	2020_eIC_Nov_06	Implementation Plans for the IPPC Guides	7	No
12	2020_eIC_Nov_07	Selection of experts for the Working Group for the IPPC Guide to support implementation of ISPM 15:Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade(2012-015, 2017-043 & 2018-012)	9	No
13	2020_eIC_Nov_08	Adoption of the IC VM04 (Implementation Plans continued discussions) Report	7	No
14	2020_eIC_Nov_09	Approval of the Global Shippers Forum (GSF) representative to the Sea Containers Task Force(SCTF)	8	No
15	2020_eIC_Nov_10	Adoption of the IC VM05 (Beyond Compliance) Report	7	No
16	2020_eIC_Nov_11	Adoption of the IC VM03 (ICD list of Topics) Report	1	No
17	2020_eIC_Nov_12	Adoption of the IC VM06 (Communication and planning / IC leads) Report	2	No

Appendix 3: Selection of experts for the Working Group for the e-Commerce Guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles (2017-039)

- [1] The IC agreed that the following nine experts be invited to the working group to develop the e-Commerce Guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles (2017-039):
1. Mr Nicolas AUÑON (Argentina)
 2. Mr. Alan BURNE (New Zealand)
 3. Mr Bruno GALLANT (Canada)
 4. Mr Cory MARKER (United States)
 5. Mr. Samuel McKeon (Australia)
 6. Mr. Xubin PAN (China)
 7. Ms Miia PASANEN (Finland)
 8. Mr. Mauricio RIBEIRO (Brazil, UPU)
 9. Mr. Shane SELA (World Bank Group)
- [2] The IC further agreed that the IPPC Secretariat should invite any additional experts nominated by Jamaica, Guyana and the WCO to participate in the WG.