Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

International Plant Protection Convention

REPORT

Standards Committee

Virtual Focused Meeting
13–14 April 2021

IPPC Secretariat

IPPC Secretariat. 2021. *Report on the virtual focused meeting of the Standards Committee, 13-14 April 2021.* Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). 25 pages. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

[1] The SC Chairperson, Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), opened this first focused meeting of the Standards Committee (SC) and welcomed all participants.

[2] The IPPC Standard Setting Unit (SSU) Acting Officer-in-Charge for daily matters, Adriana MOREIRA, also welcomed everyone and introduced a new member of staff, Erika MANGILI ANDRÉ, who joined the SSU in January as an in-kind contribution from Brazil and is expected to spend two years with the IPPC Secretariat. She also thanked the SSU staff for their dedication and for their organization of the various standard setting meetings.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Election of the Rapporteur

[3] The SC elected Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) as Rapporteur.

2.2 Adoption of the agenda

[4] The SC adopted the Agenda (Appendix 1) and agreed that the possibility of involving "silent observers" in future SC meetings would be discussed under agenda item 7 (Any other business).

3. Administrative matters

[5] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as "Secretariat") introduced the documents list (Appendix 2) and the participants list (Appendix 3). The Secretariat invited participants to notify the Secretariat of any information that required updating in the participants list or was missing from it.

4. Draft specification for approval for first consultation

4.1 Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001)

[6] The Steward, Masahiro SAI (Japan), introduced the draft specification and supporting documentation.[1]Since the November 2020 meeting of the SC, the draft specification had been reviewed by the SC through the Online Comment System (OCS), with 69 comments being submitted by SC members. The Steward and the Assistant Stewards, Joanne WILSON (New Zealand) and Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ (Costa Rica), had revised the draft specification based on these comments, but there were some points that required further discussion and resolution by the SC.

[7] The Steward highlighted four issues for discussion by the SC:

- **The numbering of the reorganized ISPM.** The Steward explained that the numbering of the new ISPM was outside the scope of the specification itself, but was a matter for SC decision. The new ISPM could either be assigned a new number or take the number of one of the ISPMs that it incorporates (ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*) or ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*)) with the other one being revoked. The FAO Legal Office had advised that there are no legal issues with any of these options.
- **Title of the specification.** One SC member had pointed out in the OCS review that the current title is a task rather than a title for the specification, but as the title had been agreed by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) Bureau, acting on behalf of the CPM, the Steward proposed that it be retained for now and reviewed by the SC following comments received from consultation.
- **The approach for the reorganization of pest risk analysis standards and the formation of the expert working group.** Prompted by suggestions from some SC members during the OCS review, the Steward proposed that a small group, under the SC, be established to develop a draft

[1] 2020-001; 04_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr; 05_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr.

overarching ISPM before the expert working group (EWG) begins its tasks. He also proposed that the EWG consist of two subgroups: one to develop annexes on Stage 1 (initiation) and Stage 2 (pest risk assessment) of pest risk analysis (PRA), and the other to develop an annex on Stage 3 (pest risk management). The Steward proposed that each EWG subgroup consists of six to eight experts.

- **Assigning a priority to the topic.** The Steward explained that no priority had been assigned to the topic when it was added to the work programme. He suggested that, given the importance of the topic, the SC recommended that the topic be assigned priority 1.

[8] The SC Chairperson thanked the Steward and invited the SC to comment on the issues raised by the Steward.

Title and number of the reorganized ISPM

[9] **The numbering of the reorganized ISPM.** Some SC members expressed a preference for retaining ISPM 2 and revoking ISPM 11, as a low ISPM number would serve to showcase the importance of this foundational standard. Some other SC members preferred to retain ISPM 11 and revoke ISPM 2, as this would minimize the number of changes to be made (e.g. the title could stay the same) and because ISPM 11 is the most used ISPM on PRA so NPPOs have greater familiarity with it. A few SC members said that either of these options would be acceptable. However, as there was no consensus and a decision on this was not needed urgently, the SC agreed to defer any further consideration and have a deeper discussion once the draft specification had been developed further.

[10] **Title of the specification.** The SC noted that although the title represents a task rather than the title of the eventual ISPM, it makes the intent of the specification very clear. The SC therefore agreed to continue with the current title for now.

Formation of the expert working group

[11] The SC had an extensive discussion about how best to organize the work involved in developing the reorganized standard. They considered the relative merits of having one EWG versus two EWGs (or EWG subgroups), the number of experts, and who would develop the overarching part of the standard.

[12] **Merits of one EWG.** Some SC members expressed the view that one EWG would be sufficient as the aim of the topic is to reorganize the PRA standards, not to revise them, so the amount of work involved would not require two groups to do it. Having one EWG would also mean that the whole process would be integrated and would allow cross-fertilization of ideas between participants having expertise in different stages of PRA.

[13] **Merits of two groups.** Some SC members thought that the size and complexity of the overall task and the extensive range of skills required could be better accommodated by having two groups. One SC member recalled the amount of time it had taken the technical panel to reorganize the fruit fly standards, which had not involved any redrafting other than ink amendments, although later in the meeting another SC member clarified that the work had involved only a few individuals. Another SC member noted that although there is a draft text on the pest risk management stage of PRA (draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001), the SC had already raised some concerns that needed addressing, so there was still much work to be done on it. A further SC member commented that there should be no problem dividing the work between the two groups because Appendix 1 of the draft specification already identified into which part of the reorganized standard existing ISPM text would go.

[14] **Relative amounts of reorganization and revision.** In terms of the amount of revision needed, the SC Chairperson clarified that the main focus was reorganization, with (as already noted) Appendix 1 of the draft specification already identifying which parts of the existing ISPMs would go where in the new standard, but that there would also be an element of revision. The SC returned to this question when reviewing the draft specification itself, in relation to the possible future revision of guidance relating to Stage 2 of PRA.

[15] **Integration and continuity in a two-group solution.** The SC noted that if there were to be two groups, developing different parts of the reorganized standard, it might be a good idea to have at least one member in common to both groups, to ensure an integrated approach (if working parallel) or continuity (if working sequentially).

[16] The Secretariat encouraged the SC to consider the timing of the work and whether, if there were more than one group, it would be better for them to work in parallel or sequentially, noting that as the work is likely to take longer than the usual work of an EWG, changes in personnel may well be needed over the course of the work (e.g. if people change jobs). Some SC members commented that working in parallel would save time. One SC member suggested that, instead of working in parallel, there could be a call for experts for the first part of the work (e.g. Stages 1 and 2 of PRA, plus the sections on living modified organisms, etc.), and then once that EWG has completed its work, the SC could assess it and then a second call could be made for experts to work on Stage 3 of PRA and risk communication. The Steward explained that he had envisaged a three-step, sequential approach, with an SC subgroup working first on the overarching part of the standard, then one EWG subgroup addressing Stages 1 and 2 of PRA, followed by a second EWG subgroup addressing Stage 3.

[17] **Who will address the overarching part of the standard?** The SC Chairperson highlighted that, as well as the annexes, the SC also needed to consider how the overarching part of the standard would be developed: whether a subgroup of the SC would do this, or the Steward together with the Assistant Stewards. One SC member commented that if there were to be an SC subgroup, then perhaps only one EWG would be needed.

[18] **Other options.** The SC considered whether one solution might be to have one EWG, but for it to be larger than usual (e.g. to have ten experts). Another solution suggested was to have two groups meeting at the same time, but subsequently meeting together. One SC member observed that there appeared to be consensus that different experts might be needed to address different parts of the reorganized standard, and that it was mainly a matter of what these groups were called: "subgroups" of the EWG or EWGs in their own right.

[19] **Stewardship.** The SC noted that, regardless of the option chosen, there would be just one Steward, supported by two Assistant Stewards.

[20] **Conclusion.** The SC finally concluded that, to ensure an integrated approach and to maximize efficiency, the best approach was to have one EWG, but that the EWG should have more than the usual number of experts as members so that the broad range of expertise required could be covered. The SC agreed that the EWG should develop the whole standard, including the overarching part of the standard and the annexes, and so should have collective expertise in all stages of PRA. The SC agreed that there was no need for the specification to specify how the EWG should organize its work, and that the EWG should have the freedom to decide whether to work on the whole content of the standard together or whether to divide the work up among EWG members according to their specific expertise. The SC noted that, whereas in some countries the different stages of PRA are handled by different experts, this was not the case in all countries and so there are some individuals who have expertise across all stages of PRA.

Review of the draft specification

[21] **Reason for revision of the standard.** The Steward suggested that a new paragraph be added, regarding the numbering of the reorganized standard and any revoking of existing PRA standards, but the SC agreed that as no decision had yet been made on the title or numbering, this paragraph could not be added at this stage.

[22] The SC added a footnote to explain why the decision about reorganization of the PRA standards had been taken by the CPM Bureau rather than the CPM itself.

[23] **Integrating pertinent sections of existing material to develop the text of the standard.** With regard to the annex on Stage 3 of PRA, the SC added text to refer to the discussion points raised by the SC regarding the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001).

[24] **Possible future revision of guidance on Stage 2.** The SC agreed that the intention of this task was to recognize the fact that, during the course of their work, it is possible that the EWG might identify parts of the guidance on Stage 2 that merit revision. However, because the main focus of the topic was reorganization, not revision, such information would need to be recorded for future use rather than the actual text concerned being revised. To avoid confusion and to avoid the EWG spending too much time on this task, the SC considered whether to delete the task and rely on the EWG recording such issues in the EWG report (as is often the case), but agreed instead to amend the wording and move it further down the list of tasks to reduce its prominence.

[25] **Potential implementation issues.** The Secretariat clarified that the normal process is that the EWG forwards potential implementation issues to the SC, who considers them and decides which to forward to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC). The task relating to this is standard text, common to all specifications. The SC noted that there was no need to mention the IC in the task because the task is a task for the EWG, and the discussion of which issues to forward to the IC is a task for the SC, not the EWG. The SC Chairperson assured the IC representative, however, that the SC would forward those issues it considers appropriate to the IC.

[26] **Review of references to the ISPM under revision in other ISPMs.** The SC Chairperson confirmed that this is a task for the EWG. The Secretariat confirmed that the Secretariat supports the EWG by providing a working paper related to this task.

[27] **Expertise.** As the SC had agreed that the EWG should be given the freedom to choose how best to organize their work, they deleted all references to subgroups from this section of the draft specification.

[28] The SC recognized that the scope of risk communication is wider than communication about phytosanitary measures, and amended the text accordingly.

[29] The SC increased the maximum number of experts from eight to ten, in line with their decision to have a larger group than usual. The SC considered whether to retain the minimum as six, given the difficulties sometimes experienced in attracting sufficient experts for EWGs, but considered that this should not be a problem for this topic and so agreed to a minimum of eight.

[30] The SC agreed not to add anything about how the EWG should organize its work, but noted that the Steward could explain at the start of the EWG meeting that it is up to the EWG to decide whether and how to divide the work up among EWG members.

[31] **Participants.** The Secretariat clarified that this section should specify the number of people who comprise the EWG, including (if appropriate) the number of SC members and any invited experts. The purpose of this section is to be transparent about who is involved and what their role is, given that these EWGs are closed sessions and do not allow observers.

[32] The SC agreed that a former member of the EWG on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) may be invited to join the EWG, to ensure continuity, as well as the Assistant Stewards for the PRA reorganization.

[33] The IC representative on the SC asked whether it would be possible for an IC member to participate in the EWG. One SC member expressed concern about whether this would set a precedent for all future EWGs and queried what the role of the IC member would be and what value they would add. The SC Chairperson recalled the discussions at previous SC meetings about involving the IC from the beginning of the development of a standard, but acknowledged that the input from the IC member might differ between standards and their role might be more obvious for some EWGs than others. The Steward of the draft revision of ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) (2009-

002) confirmed that an IC member had recently participated in the EWG for that draft standard as an invited expert and had made a valuable contribution. The Secretariat suggested that, should the SC decide to invite an IC member to take part in the EWG, this should be in the role of an invited expert. Invited experts participate in the meeting, can contribute papers, and are invited on the basis of their specific expertise. The SC agreed that participation for an IC member should be encouraged, but that it should be optional and decided on a case-by-case basis for each EWG, so amended the draft specification to say that an IC member *may* be invited.

[34] **References.** The SC moved the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) to the section on Discussion papers, given its draft status. The SC added ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary* terms) to the References section.

[35] **Appendix 1.** The SC considered whether Appendix 1 of the draft specification – which consisted of a detailed breakdown of the sections in PRA-related ISPMs and where they would be placed in the new, reorganized standard – should be included in the specification when sent for consultation or just provided to the EWG for reference. The SC agreed to remove it from the draft specification, but listed in the section on Discussion papers.

Priority for the specification

[36] The SC considered the priority for the draft specification on *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) and agreed to priority 1.

[37] The SC:

(1) *noted* the comments made by SC members regarding the numbering of the reorganized ISPM (whether to create a new ISPM, revise ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*) and revoke ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*), or revise ISPM 11 and revoke ISPM 2) but *agreed* to defer any further consideration until the draft specification is developed further;

(2) *agreed* to retain the present title of the draft specification on *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001), pending comments from the first consultation;

(3) *agreed* that the Expert Working Group for the Reorganization of Pest Risk Analysis Standards (2020-001) should consist of eight to ten members, who would deal with the whole content of the reorganized pest risk analysis standard, and *acknowledged* that the EWG would be free to choose how best to organize its work, including – if it saw fit – assigning small groups of EWG members to work on specific parts of the standard;

(4) *approved* the draft specification on *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001), as modified in this meeting, for first consultation (Appendix 4);

(5) *recommended* to CPM-16 (2022) that priority 1 be assigned to the topic *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001).

5. Selection and nomination of the SC members

[38] The Secretariat presented the paper on this agenda item.[2]

[39] **Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7).** The SC agreed that David KAMANGIRA (Malawi) would be the SC representative for Africa on the SC-7.

[40] **Task Force on Topics.** The Secretariat explained that a replacement was needed for the former Task Force on Topics member Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (Canada), who had left the SC. The SC agreed to select Steve CÔTÉ (Canada), to join the other two SC representatives.

[2] 06_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr.

[41] **IPPC regional workshops in 2021.** The SC Chairperson confirmed that the workshops would be held in virtual mode. The SC agreed that the following SC members would represent the SC at the IPPC regional workshops in 2021:

- Regional workshop for Africa: David KAMANGIRA (Malawi) (lead), Alphonsine LOUHOUARI TOKOZABA (Republic of Congo);
- Regional workshop for Asia: Masahiro SAI (Japan) (lead), Gerald Glenn PANGANIBAN (Philippines), Sophie PETERSON (Australia), Joanne WILSON (New Zealand);
- Regional workshop for the Caribbean: Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina) (lead), Hernando Morera GONAZÁLEZ (Costa Rica);
- Regional workshop for Europe and Central Asia: Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy);
- Regional workshop for Latin America: Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina) (lead), André Felipe C.P. da SILVA (Brazil), Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ, Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile);
- Regional workshop for the Near East and North Africa: Nader ELBADRY (Egypt);
- Regional workshop for the Pacific: Sophie PETERSON (Australia) (lead), Joanne WILSON (New Zealand).

[42] The SC:

(6) *agreed* to the membership of the SC-7 as presented in the participants list (Appendix 3);
(7) *selected* Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) as an SC representative on the Task Force for Topics;
(8) *agreed* to the selection of SC members to represent the SC at the 2021 IPPC regional workshops as discussed in this meeting.

6. Strategic discussions

6.1 CPM-15 (2021) outcomes – key issues

[43] The SC Chairperson summarized the outcomes of CPM-15 (2021).[3] He also explained that the SC would be invited to select a representative to sit on the CPM Focus Group on Implementation Plans for the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030, and that a new SC champion would be needed for the Framework for Standards and Implementation, to replace the former SC champion Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (Canada) who was no longer on the SC.

[44] The SC:

(9) *noted* the CPM-15 (2021) update;
(10) *selected* Andre Felipé C.P. da SILVA (Brazil) as the SC representative for the CPM Focus Group on Implementation Plans for the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030;
(11) *selected* Nader ELBADRY (Egypt) as the SC champion for the Framework for Standards and Implementation.

6.2 SC meetings in 2021: virtual and focused meetings

[45] The Secretariat confirmed that SC meetings would need to continue in virtual mode for the rest of 2021 and proposed a series of "focused SC virtual meetings", in addition to the major May and November SC meetings, for the SC to deliver its work plan.[4] The focus of the May and November meetings would be on draft ISPMs.

[46] The SC considered the proposed dates and tentative agendas for the 2021 SC meetings.

[47] The SC noted that the proposed schedule was demanding and that there were some potential clashes between the proposed SC meeting dates and other meetings, and with the commenting period in

[3] 08_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr.

[4] 07_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr.

September. Given the other commitments of SC members, particularly at the year end, the SC considered whether the December meeting could be cancelled and the agenda items dealt with by e-decision, or whether it would be better to add an extra day onto the main November meeting, to replace the December meeting. The SC acknowledged, however, that although this extra "day" might only need to be short, there was already a two-day meeting tentatively scheduled for early November, so having five days in mid-November could be too much. The SC noted the need to avoid long meetings as these can be particularly challenging for those SC members in parts of the world where the time of the meetings is very late at night. They recalled that it was for this reason that they had decided to hold the November 2020 virtual meeting as four shorter sessions rather than three longer sessions.

[48] The SC agreed to remove the December meeting from the schedule and to keep the other dates as tentative, to be reviewed at the SC May meeting.

[49] The SC:

(12) *agreed* the tentative schedule of SC meetings in 2021, with the exception of the meeting in December (Appendix 5), and *requested* that the Secretariat reassign the agenda items from the December meeting to either e-decision or an earlier virtual meeting.

7. Any other business

7.1 IC representatives and their role in expert working groups

[50] The Secretariat presented a paper seeking the SC's approval for IC members to participate, as invited experts, in the expert working group (EWG) meetings planned for 2021.[5] The Secretariat explained that according to the "Guidelines for the composition and organization of EWGs" (see *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*, section 6.1),[6] observers are not allowed but other qualified representatives can participate, for instance the host country, member of the Bureau, or others as invited experts.

[51] The SC considered the proposal, noting that the IC had already selected its prospective representatives.

[52] The SC Chairperson clarified the difference between an *invited expert* and an IC *representative*. Invited experts are invited to contribute inputs specific to the topic under consideration, and often it is specific expertise that is sought; the role of an IC representative would be to listen to the discussion and provide a view from an implementation perspective. The Secretariat added that, according to the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*, an invited expert is not a *member* of the EWG. The SC noted that if they agreed to inviting IC *representatives* onto EWGs, the procedure manual would need to be updated.

[53] One SC member commented that, depending on the topic in question and the expertise of the individual IC members, the IC may wish to put forward an invited expert for some EWGs but an IC representative for others. The SC representative on the IC expressed the view that IC members nominated by the IC to participate in EWGs should act as representatives not as invited experts, although this did not stop other individuals also being proposed as experts if they had specific, relevant expertise. Another SC member suggested that, as there are far fewer IC members than SC members and they already have a large work programme, it would perhaps be better to leave it to the IC to decide what any one individual can contribute in terms of their role – invited expert or representative. The SC Chairperson concurred that it would be better to leave it to the IC to decide. The Secretariat recalled that the IC had also commented that its members would not necessarily always wish to attend the EWG meeting, but may just prefer to follow the work of the EWG, depending on the topic.

[5] 09_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr.

[6] *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting* (2020–2021): https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85024/

[54] The SC considered the text amendment that would be needed to the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting* and agreed that the following bullet point would need to be added to section 6.1:

- may be attended by an IC representative

[55] The SC considered whether to add "as an IC representative" or "as an invited expert" at the end of this bullet point, but agreed not to, so that the specific role of the IC member could be decided by the IC on a case-by-case basis.

[56] The Secretariat said they would check with the FAO Legal Office that this amendment to the procedure manual was acceptable, and if there were any consequential changes, the Secretariat would bring the issue back to the SC for further consideration. The Secretariat also suggested that the CPM Bureau be informed.

[57] The SC:

(13) *agreed* to the participation of the following representatives from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) at the upcoming EWG meetings:

- EWG on the Annex *Criteria for determining host status of fruits to fruit flies based on available information* (2018-011) to ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*): Lalith Bandula KUMARASINGHE (New Zealand),
- EWG on the Annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification for seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*): Thorwald GEUZE (The Netherlands);

(14) *agreed* that the role of IC members on EWGs may be as invited experts or IC representatives;

(15) *requested* that the Secretariat update the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting* as agreed at this meeting to allow an IC representative to attend an EWG, and present this to the CPM Bureau for noting, and *agreed* to include this in future specifications for the development of ISPMs;

(16) *agreed* to defer to a future SC meeting consideration of the best approach for inviting experts to participate in any future EWGs, taking into consideration the eventual return of face-to-face meetings.

7.2 Silent observers at SC meetings

[58] Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America) asked whether, to encourage a wider understanding of standard setting processes, some additional staff from national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) could attend the SC May meeting as "silent observers". These extra observers would not participate in discussions and the SC member from the NPPO concerned would be responsible for the conduct of the extra observers. The Secretariat clarified that, under the current rules, each contracting party and regional plant protection organization (RPPO) is entitled to one observer, who may participate in discussions. The SC Chairperson welcomed the idea, but commented that formal requests to the Secretariat would be needed.

[59] The SC agreed to the proposal, with some SC members also making it clear that this should only apply to virtual meetings.

[60] The SC:

(17) *agreed*, pending confirmation from the FAO Legal Office, to allow additional representatives from national plant protection organizations to observe virtual meetings of the Standards Committee as "silent observers", having no participation in the meeting, and *requested* that the Secretariat present this decision to the CPM Bureau for noting.

7.3 World Trade Organization sanitary and phytosanitary workshop proposal on risk assessment, risk management and risk communication

[61] The Secretariat drew the attention of SC members to the proposal by the Canadian delegation to the World Trade Organization Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Committee) to consider holding a workshop on risk assessment, risk management and risk communication on 12–13 July 2021. SC members were invited to submit their comments and suggestions on this proposal to the Secretariat.

[62] The SC:

(18) *encouraged* SC members to send their comments and suggestions on the possible SPS Committee workshop on risk assessment, risk management and risk communication to the Secretariat by 20 April.

8. Evaluation of the meeting process

[63] The Secretariat invited all SC members and observers to complete the evaluation of the meeting via this link: https://forms.office.com/r/wwLS8JA8fT by 30 April 2021.

9. Close of the meeting

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

Appendix 1: Agenda

N	Agenda item	Document number / link	Presenter / IPPC Secretariat support
1.	**Opening of the Meeting**		
1.1.	Welcome - By the IPPC Secretariat - By the SC Chairperson		MOREIRA (OiC for SSU daily matters) **FERRO (SC Chairperson)**
2.	**Meeting Arrangements**		
2.1.	Election of the Rapporteur	–	**Chairperson**
2.2.	Adoption of the Agenda	01_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr	**Chairperson**
3.	**Administrative Matters**		
3.1.	Documents list	02_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr	MUSHEGYAN
3.2.	Participants list	03_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr SC membership list	MUSHEGYAN
4.	**Draft specification for approval for the first consultation**		
4.1.	**Reorganization of Pest Risk Analysis standards (2020-001)** Steward: Mr Masahiro SAI Assistant Stewards: Ms Joanne WILSON, Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ o Steward's notes o Compiled comments from OCS review	2020-001 04_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr 05_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr	**SAI, WILLSON, GONZÁLEZ** / KISS
5.	**Selection and nomination of the SC members**		
5.1.	o Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) o Task Force on Topics (TFT) o Regional Workshops (RWs)	06_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr_Rev1 (Also refer to SC membership list)	SHAMILOV / MUSHEGYAN
6.	**Strategic Discussions**		
6.1.	CPM-15 outcomes – key issues	08_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr Draft CPM-15 report	**FERRO** / MOREIRA
6.2.	SC meetings in 2021: virtual and focused sessions	07_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr	MOREIRA / MUSHEGYAN
7.	**Any other business**		**Chairperson**
7.1.	Participation of the IC members as invited experts to the EWG meetings	09_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr	MANGILI
8.	**Evaluation of the meeting process**	**Link to survey**	**Chairperson**
9.	**Close of the meeting**		**Chairperson**

Appendix 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
Draft specification for approval for the first consultation			
2020-001	4.1	Reorganization of Pest Risk Analysis standards (2020-001)	2021-03-30
Meeting documents			
01_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr	2.2	Agenda	2021-03-23 2021-04-02
04_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr	4.1	Steward's notes	2021-03-30
05_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr	4.1	Compiled comments from OCS review	2021-03-30
02_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr	3.1	Documents list	2021-04-02
07_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr	6.2	SC meetings in 2021: virtual and focused sessions	2021-04-02
03_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr	3.2	Participants list	2021-04-06
06_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr 06_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr_Rev1	5.1	Selection and nomination of the SC members	2021-04-06 2021-04-12
08_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr	6.1	CPM-15 outcomes – key issues	2021-04-06
09_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Apr	7.1	Participation of the IC members as invited experts to the EWG meetings	2021-04-07

Links	Agenda item	Document link
SC membership list	3.2, 5.1	SC membership list
Evaluation of the meeting process	8	Link to survey

Appendix 3: Participants list

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Africa Member	**Ms Alphonsine LOUHOUARI TOKOZABA** Ministère de l'Agriculture et del'Elevage, 24, rue KiéléTenard, Mfilou, Brazzaville, **REPUBLIC OF CONGO** Tel: +242 01 046 53 61 Tel: +242 04 005 57 05	louhouari@yahoo.fr; A.louhouaritoko@gmail.com;	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years (2)	2021
Africa Member	**Mr David KAMANGIRA** Senior Deputy Director and IPPC Focal Point Department of Agricultural Research Services Headquarters, P.O. Box 30779, Lilongwe 3 **MALAWI** Tel: +265 888 342 712 Tel: +265 999 122 199	davidkamangira1@gmail.com;	CPM-11 (2016) CPM-14 (2019) 2nd term / 3 years (2)	2022
Asia Member	**Ms Chonticha RAKKRAI** Director, Plant Quarantine Research Group, Plant Protection Research and Development Office, Department of Agriculture, 50 Phaholyothin Rd., Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok, 10900 **THAILAND** Tel: (+66) 2561 2537 Fax : (+66) 2561 2146 Mobile: (+66) 8 9128 6488	rakkrai@yahoo.com; chonticha.r@doa.in.th	CPM-14 (2019) 1st term/3 years (0)	2022
Asia Member	**Mr. Gerald Glenn F. PANGANIBAN** Assistant Director for Operations and Administration, Bureau of Plant Industry, 692 San Andres Street, Malate, Manila, **PHILIPPINES** Tel: +639153141568	gfpanganiban@gmail.com; gerald_glenn97@hotmail.com	**Replacement member for Ms Jayani Nimanthika WATHUKARA** CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years (2)	2021

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Asia Member SC-7	**Mr Masahiro SAI** Senior Researcher (Head of Section) Risk Analysis Division Yokohama Plant Protection Station Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF**)** **JAPAN** Tel**:** +81-45-211-0375	masahiro_sai670@maff.go.jp;	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2021
Europe Member	**Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI** Servizio Fitosanitario DG Agricoltura Regione Lombardia Piazza Città di Lombardia 1 20124 Milano **ITALY** Tel: (+39) 3666603272	mariangela_ciampitti@regione.lombardia.it	CPM-14 (2019) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2022
Europe Member	**Mr David OPATOWSKI** Head, Plant Biosecurity, Plant Protection and Inspection Services (PPIS), P.O.Box 78,Bet Dagan, 50250 **ISRAEL** Tel: 972-(0)3-9681518 Mob.: 972-(0)506-241885 Fax: 972-(0)3-9681571	dopatowski@yahoo.com; davido@moag.gov.il;	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) CPM-12 (2017) 3rd term / 3 years (0)	2020
Latin America and Caribbean Member	**Mr André Felipe C. P. da SILVA** Federal Inspector Quarantine Division Ministry of Agriculture, Live Stock and Food Supply **BRAZIL** Tel: (61) 3218-2925	andre.peralta@agricultura.gov.br;	CPM-14 (2019) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2022
Latin America and Caribbean Member SC- 7	**Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ** Pest RiskAnalyst Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado 300 Sur de Teletica, Sabana Sur, San José, **COSTA RICA** Tel: +(506) 8660-8383	hmorera@sfe.go.cr;	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years (1)	2021

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Latin America and Caribbean Member SC Chairperson	**Mr Ezequiel FERRO** Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA Av.Paeso Colón 315 C.A. de Buenos Aires **ARGENTINA** Tel/Fax: (+5411) 4121-5091	eferro@senasa.gov.ar;	CPM-14 (2019) 3rd term / 3 years (0)	2022
Latin America and Caribbean Member	**Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE** Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal Av. PresidenteBulnes 140, 4th floor, Santiago, **CHILE** Tel: + 56-2 234 5120	alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl;	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) 2nd term / 3 years (0)	2021
Near East Member SC-7	**Mr Nader ELBADRY** Phytosanitary Specialist, Central Administration of Plant Quarantine, 6 Michel Bakhoum St., Dokki, Giza, **EGYPT** Tel: +201096799493	nader.badry@gmail.com	**Replacement member for Mr Abdulqader Khudhair ABBAS** CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years (2)	2021
Near East Member	**Mr Abdelmoneem Ismaeel ADRA ABDETAM** Manger of plant Quarantine and plant protection Directorate, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Khartum **SUDAN** Tel: +24991238939 / +249 912138939	ppdsudan@hotmail.com; moneem2018@outlook.com;	CPM-13 (2018) 1st term / 3 years (2)	2021
North America Member SC-7	**Ms Marina ZLOTINA** IPPC Technical DirectorUSDA-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;	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) 2nd term / 3 years (0)	2021

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
North America Member	**Mr Steve CÔTÉ** National Manager, International Phytosanitary Standards Plant Import/Export Division 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 **CANADA** Tel: (+1) 613-773-7368 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7576	Steve.Cote@canada.ca	**Replacement member for Mr Rajash RAMARTHNAM** CPM-11 (2016) CPM-14 (2019) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2022
Southwest Pacific Member	**Ms Joanne WILSON** Principal Adviser, Risk Management Plant Imports Group Ministry for Primary Industries. **NEW ZEALAND** Tel: +64 489 40528 Mob: +64 2989 40528	joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz	CPM-14 (2019) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2022
Southwest Pacific Member SC-7	**Ms Sophie Alexia PETERSON** Assistant Director | Plant Health Policy | Biosecurity Plant Division Department of Agriculture and Water Resources GPO Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601 **AUSTRALIA** Tel: (+61) 2 6272 3769 Mobile: +61 402 313 170	sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au;	**Replacement member for Mr Bruce HANCOCKS** CPM-12 (2017) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2020

Role	Name	Email address
IC / Observer	**Mr Ahmed M. Abdellah ABDELMOTTALEB**	bidoeng@yahoo.com
IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Adriana MOREIRA** Standard Setting Officer, OiC for SSU	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	**Mr Artur SHAMILOV** Standard Setting Officer	Artur.Shamilov@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Erika MANGILI ANDRÉ** Standard Setting Specialist	Erika.MangiliAndre@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Alejandra JIMENEZ TABARES** Standard Setting Assistant	Alejandra.JimenezTabares@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Aoife CASSIN** Standard Setting Associate	Aoife.Cassin@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Janka KISS** Standard Setting Associate	Janka.Kiss@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	**Mr Edgar MUSHEGYAN** Standard Setting Associate	Edgar.Mushegyan@fao.org

Role	Name	Email address
IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Karen ROUEN** Report writer	karen@karenrouen.com
IPPC Secretariat	**Mr Brent LARSON** Implementation and Facilitation Unit Lead	Brent.Larson@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	**Ms Natsumi YAMADA** Agricultural Officer	Natsumi.Yamada@fao.org

Appendix 4: Draft specification on Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001)

DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ISPM: Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001)

Status box

This is not an official part of the specification and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after approval	
Date of this document	2021-04-22
Document category	Draft specification for an ISPM
Current document stage	*To* 2021-07 consultation
Major stages	2020-07 CPM Bureau added topic *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. 2020-07 Standards Committee (SC) decided to open an e-forum to discuss and draft the specification for the topic (2020_eSC_Nov_09). 2020-10 SC commented on the draft specification via e-decision (2020_eSC_Nov_09). 2020-11 SC reviewed the draft specification. 2021-02 SC revised the draft specification via the Online Comment System. 2021-04 SC revised the draft and approved for consultation.
Steward history	2020-09 SC Masahiro SAI (JP, Lead Steward) 2020-09 SC Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ (CR, Assistant Steward) 2020-09 SC Joanne WILSON (NZ, Assistant Steward)
Notes	2021-04 Edited

Title

[1] Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001).

Reason for the revision of the standards

[2] Pest risk analysis (PRA) is a core process within the scope of the IPPC and an important science-based evaluation tool for national plant protection organizations (NPPOs). It is used to determine quarantine pests and to identify the phytosanitary measures that are appropriate to manage the risk of pest introduction and spread in a specified PRA area. Guidance for NPPOs on the evaluation of technical, scientific and economic evidence to justify their decisions is currently documented in ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*, adopted in 1995, revised in 2007) and ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*, adopted in 2001, revised in 2003, 2004 and 2013).

[3] ISPM 2 describes the overall process of PRA for pests of plants, with a particular focus on the initiation stage (Stage 1 of the PRA process). ISPM 11 describes the factors to consider when conducting a PRA to determine if a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest. The emphasis in ISPM 11 is on the integrated process for pest risk assessment and guidance on selection of pest risk management options (Stages 2 and 3, respectively, of the PRA process). In addition, this ISPM includes guidance on the analysis of risks posed by pests to the environment and biological diversity, the evaluation of potential risks to plants and plant products posed by living modified organisms, and the conduct of PRA for plants as quarantine pests.

[4] The revision and reorganization of the standards related to PRA was proposed following discussions on the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001). The following aspects were identified:

- the need to strengthen the draft ISPM with appropriate requirements on pest risk management;
- the need to integrate PRA standards for quarantine pests (ISPM 2, ISPM 11 and the draft ISPM on pest risk management) into one standard to avoid redundancy and ensure consistency.

[5] The Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) Bureau discussed the revision of PRA standards and recommended that they be integrated into one overarching standard on the PRA process, with an annex for each stage of PRA.[1] This approach is considered the best because it will ensure that PRA is viewed as a conceptual process composed of three different stages (each supported by a more comprehensive annex), and it will establish a framework that enables NPPOs to conduct PRA appropriately.

Scope

[6] This standard should establish a conceptual framework for PRA for quarantine pests within the scope of the IPPC and provide guidance on the PRA process.

[7] General guidance on the PRA process should be provided in the core text of the standard and detailed guidance on each stage of PRA (Stage 1. initiation, Stage 2. pest risk assessment, Stage 3. pest risk management) should be consolidated in the annexes to the standard: one annex for each stage.

[8] The standard should include general guidance on pest risk management, such as criteria related to the rational relationship between the pest risk and the strength of phytosanitary measures, harmonization, and equivalence of phytosanitary measures (as in ISPM 1 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*) and ISPM 24 (*Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures*)).

[9] Guidance on the analysis of risks posed by pests to the environment and biological diversity, the evaluation of potential risks to plants and plant products posed by living modified organisms, and the conduct of PRA for plants as quarantine pests should also be included in the standard.

[10] The standard should not include guidance on regulated non-quarantine pests, which is provided in ISPM 21 (*Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*).

Purpose

[11] The purpose of this standard is to facilitate harmonization of the different stages of the PRA process – initiation, pest risk assessment and identification of appropriate pest risk management options – and to support the rational relationship between the pest risk identified through pest risk assessment and the strength of the corresponding phytosanitary measures identified through pest risk management.

[12] This will be achieved by reorganizing ISPM 2, ISPM 11 and the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) into one standard. Revised text to improve guidance on the risk analysis process should be included where relevant.

[13] The new, reorganized guidance on the PRA process will help NPPOs to improve their implementation of this concept.

[1] CPM Bureau 2020-07 (virtual meeting), agenda item 9.2 (https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/88659/). The CPM Bureau, noting advice from the FAO Legal Counsel, acted on behalf of the CPM in 2020 as the CPM meeting had to be postponed because of the global COVID-19 pandemic.

Tasks

[14] The expert working group (EWG) should undertake the following tasks:

(1) Integrate pertinent sections of ISPM 2 and ISPM 11, and the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001), into one overarching standard outlining the main concepts of the IPPC framework on pest risk analysis, with more comprehensive guidance provided in annexes to the standard (one annex for each stage of the PRA process). Refer to the following outline as a proposed starting point for EWG discussion and drafting:

- Core text of the standard: overarching framework for PRA:
  - includes current Background and section 3 (Aspects common to all PRA stages) of ISPM 2 and other pertinent sections of ISPM 2,
  - includes current Annex 1 (Comments on the scope of the IPPC in regard to environmental risks), Annex 2 (Comments on the scope of the IPPC in regard to pest risk analysis for living modified organisms), and Annex 3 (Determining the potential for a living modified organism to be a pest) to ISPM 11,
  - seeks to maintain the original intent of the text but with streamlined descriptions (the original text being modified where needed in line with the structure of this reorganized standard, but without substantially revising the original requirements and guidance);
- (New) Annex 1. PRA Stage 1 (Initiation):
  - combines section 1 of ISPM 2 and section 1 of ISPM 11,
  - includes Stage 1 of current Annex 4 (Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests) to ISPM 11,
  - expected to involve no substantial revision of the original requirements and guidance of Stage 1 (the revision instead focusing on modification of the text for proper alignment with the structure of the new annex);
- (New) Annex 2. PRA Stage 2 (Pest risk assessment):
  - combines section 2.2 of ISPM 2 and section 2 of ISPM 11,
  - seeks to maintain the original intent of the text but with streamlined descriptions (the revision instead focusing on modification of the text for proper alignment with the structure of the new annex, with no substantial revision of the original requirements and guidance of Stage 2 expected),
  - includes Stage 2 of current Annex 4 to ISPM 11;
- (New) Annex 3. PRA Stage 3 (Pest risk management):
  - aligns elements of section 2.3 of ISPM 2, section 3 of ISPM 11 and the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) (Specification 63) considering the discussion points of the Standards Committee (SC) regarding the latter draft,
  - includes Stage 3 of current Annex 4 to ISPM 11.

(2) Consider how the content of the current Annex 4 (Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests) to ISPM 11 should be included in the reorganized standard. Options include incorporation into the body text, creation of an additional annex, or inclusion of an appendix or supplementary text that is referenced throughout (as per the references already used: "S1: the supplementary text on environmental risks" and "S2: the supplementary text on living modified organisms").

(3) If any parts of the original requirements and guidance on Stage 2 (Pest risk assessment) may require revision that is beyond the scope of this specification, identify the parts that need more clarity or improvement and propose a short outline of the review required, for future reference.

(4) Consider implementation of the revised standard by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the SC.

(5) Consider whether the revised standard could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft standard

(6) Review all references to the ISPMs under revision in other ISPMs, as well as references to other ISPMs in the ISPMs under revision, to ensure that they are still relevant and propose consequential changes if necessary.

Provision of resources

[15] Funding for the meeting may be provided from sources other than the regular programme of the IPPC (FAO). As recommended by ICPM-2 (1999), whenever possible, those participating in standard setting activities voluntarily fund their travel and subsistence to attend meetings. Participants may request financial assistance, with the understanding that resources are limited and the priority for financial assistance is given to developing country participants. Please refer to the *Criteria used for prioritizing participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat* posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) (see https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/).

Collaborator

[16] To be determined.

Steward

[17] Please refer to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* posted on the IPP (see https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards).

Expertise

[18] Experts with collective expertise in:

- pest risk assessment, preferably with experience in using or conducting PRA according to ISPM 2 and ISPM 11;
- pest risk management, including experience in evaluating and selecting pest risk management options according to the pest risk identified through the pest risk assessment;
- risk communication;
- the World Trade Organization Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement) and phytosanitary regulation.

Participants

[19] Eight to ten experts. A former member of the EWG on Guidance on Pest Risk Management (2014-001) and an IC member may be invited as invited experts. The Assistant Stewards may also be invited to participate.

References

[20] The IPPC, relevant ISPMs and other national, regional and international standards and agreements as may be applicable to the tasks, and discussion papers submitted in relation to this work.

ISPM 1. 2016. *Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

ISPM 2. 2019. *Framework for pest risk analysis*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

ISPM 5. *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

ISPM 11. 2019. *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

ISPM 21. 2019. *Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

ISPM 24. 2017. *Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

Discussion papers

[21] Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) for consideration by the EWG. The draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) and the "Detailed breakdown of sections of PRA related ISPMs"[2] should also be considered.

[2] SC 2021-05 (agenda item 4.1), paper 2020-001, Appendix 1.

Appendix 5: The tentative schedule of SC meetings in 2021

DATE / MEETING	TENTATIVE AGENDA	DEADLINE FOR REQUESTING INTERPRETATION
11-14 May 2021: SC	Revision and approval of draft ISPMs for first consultation period: - Revision of ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) (2009-002) - Use of specific import authorizations (Annex to ISPM 20: *Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) (2008-006) - Revision of ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) (2014-007) - 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5	9 April 2021
17-21 May 2021: SC-7	Revision and approval of draft ISPMs for second consultation period: - Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008) - Audits in the phytosanitary context (2015-014) - Focused revision of ISPM 12 in relation to re-export (2015-011) - 2019&2020 Amendments to ISPM 5	N/A
15-16 June 2021: SC Focused meeting	- Review of technical panels work: o Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) o Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) o Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) - Approval of summary of SC e-decisions - IRSS call for topics: SC's proposals	18 May 2021
13-14 July 2021: SC Focused meeting	- Discussions on the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 - Review of *List of topics for IPPC Standards* for IPPC Standards - Review of framework for standards and implementation	15 June 2021
07-08 September 2021: SC Focused meeting	Updates and enhancing synergies and areas of collaboration: - Implementation and Capacity development Committee (IC) - Updates from the various Implementation and Capacity development Committee (IC) groups and sub-groups to the SC that may impact the SC's work: o ISPM 15 guide o Sea Containers Task Force o IRSS o E-commerce o [Any other group/subgroup] - Report from IYPH - CPM-Bureau - TC-RPPOs - Updated from the Implementation and facilitation Unit (IFU) of the IPPC Secretariat - Updated from the Integration and support team (IST) of the IPPC Secretariat	10 August 2021
03-04 November 2021: SC Focused meeting	- Review of topics submitted from 2021 Call for Topics and recommendations from the Task Force on Topics	6 October 2021
15-18 November 2021: SC	Revision and approval of draft ISPMs for adoption by CPM-16: - Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008) - Audits in the phytosanitary context (2015-014) - Focused revision of ISPM 12 in relation to re-export (2015-011) - 2019&2020 Amendments to ISPM 5Approval of the Specification on PRA reorganization (tentative)	18 October 2021