



# REPORT

## Implementation and Capacity Development Meeting (Virtual Meeting N°15)

**Rome, Italy  
June 2021**

**IPPC Secretariat**

Required citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2021. *Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (Virtual Meeting No 15), June 2021*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2021



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

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

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

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

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

## Contents

REPORT IC VIRTUAL MEETING NO. 15 June 2021 .....	4
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. Review of meeting documents .....	4
3.2. Review of participants.....	4
4. Contributed resources.....	4
4.1. Discussion on contributed resources .....	4
5. List of implementation and capacity development topics .....	7
5.1. Review of <i>List of implementation and capacity development topics</i> , including priorities.....	7
6. Framework for standards and implementation.....	10
6.1. Proposed adjustments to the Framework for standards and implementation regarding implementation and capacity development topics.....	10
7. 2021 consultation .....	11
7.1. Discussion on the planning for the IC adoption of specifications for guides and training materials .....	11
8. Any other business .....	12
8.1. Selection of an IC member for the IC Team on Contributed Resources.....	12
8.2. Phytosanitary capacity evaluation in Senegal .....	12
8.3. Memorandum of understanding with COLEACP .....	12
8.4. International liaison regarding Fusarium wilt TR4 .....	12
8.5. Active e-fora requiring action or decision.....	12
9. Date and arrangement of the next meeting.....	12
10. Evaluation of the meeting process .....	12
11. Close of the meeting.....	12

## REPORT IC VIRTUAL MEETING NO. 15 JUNE 2021

### 1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as the “Secretariat” and the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) Chairperson, Dominique PELLETIER, welcomed all participants to the fifteenth virtual meeting of the IC (IC VM15).

### 2. Meeting arrangements

#### 2.1. Election of the Rapporteur

- [2] Ruth AREVALO MACIAS (Chile) was elected as the Rapporteur to the meeting.

#### 2.2. Adoption of the agenda

- [3] The IC agreed to consider five items under agenda item 8 (Any Other Business), regarding the selection of an IC member for the IC Team on Contributed Resources, resources mobilized to implement a Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) in Senegal, the memorandum of understanding with the Europe-Africa-Caribbean-Pacific Liaison Committee (COLEACP), international liaison regarding banana Fusarium wilt, and ongoing IC e-Fora. The agenda, as modified, was adopted and is attached to this report (Appendix 1).

### 3. Administrative matters

#### 3.1. Review of meeting documents

- [4] The following meeting documents, which are also posted on the IC restricted work area of the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP), were introduced:

- Agenda (VM15\_01\_2021\_Jun)
- Discussion on contributed resources (VM15\_02\_2021\_Jun)
- Review of list of ICD topics (VM15\_03\_2021\_Jun)
- Framework for standards and implementation (VM15\_04\_2021\_Jun)
- List of implementation and capacity development topics (VM15\_05\_2021\_Jun).

#### 3.2. Review of participants

- [5] All IC members and the representatives from the Technical Consultation Among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPOs) and Standards Committee (SC) were present. The IC noted that Olga LAVRENTJEVA (Estonia), the IC Regional representative for Europe, had resigned from the IC and welcomed Ringolds ARNITIS (Latvia), who was present at this meeting as her replacement as the IC regional representative for Europe.

### 4. Contributed resources

#### 4.1. Discussion on contributed resources

- [6] The Secretariat presented the paper for the discussion on contributed resources. The paper presented four options for streamlining the contributed resources process and raised several issues concerning the criteria for suitability of contributed resources.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> VM15\_02\_IC\_2021\_Jun.

[7] **Streamlining options.** The Chairperson invited the IC to comment on the options for streamlining the process, highlighting the need to strike a balance between the speed of the review process and the level of oversight.

[8] The options discussed were as follows:

- Option A – The Secretariat identifies two to three IC members who have expertise related to the submitted resource. These members review the resource and provide a summary of the results of their review to the IC, together with a recommendation. The IC then decides, either during an IC meeting or via e-decision, whether to post the resource.
- Option B – The IC Team on Contributed Resources pre-reviews five resources monthly and decides whether an IC review is needed, depending on the level of agreement: if all IC team members consider a resource is “unsuitable”, it is not posted; if all consider it suitable, it is posted without IC review; if there are differing opinions among IC team members, the resource is submitted to the IC for review. A summary of the IC team review results is shared with the IC for information twice a year.
- Option C – The entire IC is invited to review five selected resources on a monthly basis. If at least two IC members agree that a resource is suitable and no IC members consider the resource “unsuitable”, the resource is posted. The Secretariat consults the IC team monthly on the next steps for those resources that were not supported by two IC members or that were considered "unsuitable".
- Option D – The IC team pre-reviews five resources monthly and provides a summary of the results of their review to the IC, together with a recommendation. The IC then agrees which resources to post, either during an IC meeting or via e-Decision.

[9] In all the four options, the resources would be assessed against the established criteria for contributed resources.<sup>2</sup>

[10] The IC lead confirmed that the workload associated with reviewing the submitted resources varies enormously: some resources take a very short time, while others require much more work. Similarly, the proportion of submissions considered to be unsuitable varies between batches: sometimes three out of five resources may be unsuitable, but at other times all five might be accepted.

[11] **Comparing the options.** The IC noted that for Option A, IC members would have to be assigned for each new resource submitted, which would be complicated, time-consuming, and perhaps not necessary given that there is already an IC team in place.

[12] The IC noted that it currently takes two or three months to review five resources, which is too long. Option B improves this but still allows review by the whole IC if there are differences in opinion within the IC team.

[13] No IC members or representatives expressed a preference for Option C.

[14] The IC noted that Option D had the advantage of having a set, predictable number of resources to be reviewed each month and also gave the opportunity for review by both the IC team and the entire IC. It was also more agile.

[15] The IC noted that the options were not necessarily mutually exclusive. For example, the IC could follow Option B or Option D, but follow Option A if appropriate specialists were available.

[16] The IC lead confirmed that the main difference between Option B and Option D was the frequency of review by the IC team and the IC.

---

<sup>2</sup> Criteria for posting contributed phytosanitary resources on the IPP: [https://www.ippc.int/static/media/uploads/1.1.2\\_criteria\\_for\\_posting\\_contributed\\_resources\\_2019-05-31.pdf](https://www.ippc.int/static/media/uploads/1.1.2_criteria_for_posting_contributed_resources_2019-05-31.pdf)

- [17] The general consensus within the IC was that either Option B or Option D would be suitable, with Option A also having value in some cases. The IC noted that one potential problem with Option D was that participation by IC members in e-Fora and e-Decisions, although improving, was still low. A suggestion was made that perhaps the frequency of such online reviews by the IC could be quarterly rather than once a month.
- [18] Considering the various points made, the IC agreed to a modified version of Option D, with summaries to be sent by the IC team to the IC quarterly rather than monthly, and with the possibility of inviting individual IC members with pertinent expertise to review particular submissions where appropriate.
- [19] **Resources developed by RPPOs.** The IC noted that some RPPOs were reluctant to submit their technical resources as contributed resources to the IPP because the resources had already been developed according to their own processes, so it seemed unnecessary to have to put them through the IPPC contributed resources process as well.
- [20] The IC noted that one possible solution to this could be for the IC to review the criteria that RPPOs use for developing such resources, rather than reviewing resources individually. This would provide a means of “fast-tracking” the approval of resources that had already been subject to a suitable development process, rather than essentially repeating the same process. When it submits a resource, a contributing organization could submit the process it followed as well submitting the resource itself.
- [21] The IC noted that contributed resources already have a disclaimer associated with them on the IPP, making it clear that they are not official IPPC documents. The Secretariat commented, however, that it is still useful for the IC to have at least some oversight of these documents. The Chairperson agreed.
- [22] The IC considered whether the IC should categorize resources submitted, depending on the contributing organization and its processes, and then streamline the process for those resources. The IC recognized, however, that it was important not only to be fair to everyone, but also to be seen to be fair: it would not be a question of preferentially treating certain organizations but of having a common process to review the criteria used by organizations, so that any organization’s process could be reviewed in this way and, if the criteria were met, resources developed through that process could be fast-tracked. Another suggestion considered was to have a streamlined process for certain types of documents, rather than for certain organizations.
- [23] The IC noted that, if the IC agreed to a fast-track process, the procedure for review of contributed resources would need to be amended to give the criteria for the processes used by other organizations and list the organizations that met these criteria. This would provide transparency but still allow resources to be posted more quickly. The Chairperson suggested that perhaps the IC team on Contributed Resources could review the procedures of other organizations.
- [24] **Review by technical panels.** The IC considered the proposal that the IC could discuss with the SC the possibility of the respective technical panels being involved in the review process for diagnostic resources and pest factsheets, and for treatment resources. The IC agreed that this would be a good idea as this was where the appropriate technical expertise resided.
- [25] **Pest risk analysis documents.** The IC considered the proposal that pest risk analysis documents focusing on specific pests or pathways and for bilateral documents could be excluded from the contributed resources on the IPP as it is questionable whether they are really globally applicable. The IC agreed that such documents should be excluded.
- [26] **Resources recommended by working groups.** The IC considered whether, when a working group recommends a resource during the development of an IPPC guide or training materials, such resources need to go through the same process of review as other contributed resources. The IC agreed that if the resource had been reviewed by a working group against the same criteria, then there was no value in requiring it to be reviewed by another group.

[27] **Technical resources that are not primarily phytosanitary.** The IC agreed that, as not all technical resources recommended by international organizations are primarily phytosanitary in content, it would be helpful to clarify the review criteria for such resources.

[28] **Languages.** To ensure that submitted resources can be reviewed by the IC or multiple experts, the IC noted that the Secretariat may need to focus on collecting technical resources in selected languages only. The IC agreed that, where this is the case, at least three to five experts may be identified by the Secretariat to review technical resources written in languages other than English; but if English versions of these resources are provided, only the English version would be reviewed.

[29] The IC:

- (1) *agreed* to amend the review process for contributed resources, so that the IC Team on Contributed Resources pre-reviews five resources monthly, the IC reviews the outcome quarterly and approves which resources to post on the IPP, and individual IC members with pertinent expertise can be invited to review individual submissions where appropriate;
- (2) *agreed* that the IC Team on Contributed Resources would consider a fast-tracked process for reviewing contributed resources from RPPOs, whereby the resource-development procedures of these regional organizations could be reviewed and, if judged to be acceptable, any submissions developed using those procedures could be fast-tracked through the IPPC contributed resources review process;
- (3) *invited* the SC to consider whether the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols could be involved in the review process for diagnostic resources and pest factsheets submitted as contributed resources to the IPP, and the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments for treatment-related resources, and *agreed* to these changes in the review process, subject to approval from the SC;
- (4) *agreed* that the criteria for suitability of contributed resources be amended to:
  - exclude PRA documents focusing on specific pests or pathways, and bilateral documents,
  - include technical resources, reviewed and recommended by working groups developing IPPC guides and training materials, as long as they were also reviewed using the criteria for suitability of contributed resources,
  - include criteria for resources that are not primary phytosanitary technical resources (recommended by other international organizations),
  - prioritize resources in selected languages, if necessary;
- (5) *agreed* that the general disclaimer on the contributed resources page of the IPP be amended to clarify that the responsibility for the posted resources lies with the author, not the IPPC Secretariat;
- (6) *requested* that the Secretariat revise the criteria for suitability of contributed resources to reflect the discussion and the decisions made at this meeting.

## 5. List of implementation and capacity development topics

### 5.1. Review of *List of implementation and capacity development topics, including priorities*

[30] The Secretariat presented the papers for the review of the *List of implementation and capacity development topics*.<sup>3</sup> The list distinguished between topics that were being actively worked on, topics recommended for deletion, pending topics, and topics for which there had not yet been any action.

---

<sup>3</sup> VM15\_03\_IC\_2021\_Jun, VM15\_05\_IC\_2021\_Jun.

- [31] The Secretariat informed the IC that work was underway to transfer the list from a spreadsheet format to an online database on the IPP, in the same way as the *List of topics for IPPC standards* is available online. Finally, the Secretariat reminded the IC that topics can only be added or deleted from the list by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), but the IC can change the priorities of topics as well as recommend additions and deletions of topics to the CPM.
- [32] The list of topics identified the stage that each topic had reached in the development process. The Secretariat confirmed that there are six stages in the development of IPPC guides and training materials.<sup>4</sup>
- [33] The Secretariat confirmed that the main consequence of having insufficient human resources to work on a guide is simply a delay in the publication of the guide or training material, although sometimes the delay might result in a loss of funding.
- [34] The IC reviewed all the entries in the list of topics, noting those that were being actively worked on and considering what changes were needed for the rest.
- [35] **Topics recommended for deletion.** One IC member expressed surprise that the topic on *Pest diagnostics* (2016-015) was still on the list, given that the IC had conducted a rigorous review of the list of topics the previous year, and there was no other information on this topic other than a title. The IC agreed that this and all the other topics proposed for deletion should be recommended to CPM-16 for deletion. Several of the topics recommended for deletion are programmes, awareness materials or tools and are therefore outside the scope of what is considered to be IPPC Guides and training materials.
- [36] **Pending topics.** The IC noted that both the Guide on *Assessing the risk of introduction of pests with seeds* (2018-036) and the Guide on *Pest risk management* (2017-047) were both pending decisions on the reorganization of pest risk analysis standards, the draft specification for which (2020-001) had been approved by the SC in April 2021 for consultation in July 2021 and should remain pending.
- [37] The IC noted that the portal on *Plant health surveillance* (2015-015) was a legacy of the IC–SC review of surveillance and was awaiting a resource being developed by Australia. The Secretariat suggested that the product being developed by Australia could be treated as a contributed resource rather than developing an IPPC resource for this topic. The IC noted that this topic was on the agenda for discussion by the IC at their November 2021 meeting and thought it should be deleted.
- [38] **Status and priority level of the remaining topics.** The Secretariat confirmed that the Guide on *Surveillance of Xylella fastidiosa* (2018-037) and the Guide on *Inspection of consignments for Xylella fastidiosa* (2018-038) were dependent on the work of the Focus Group on Pest Outbreak and Response Systems, but more should be known within the next few months about whether *Xylella fastidiosa* will be one of the pests prioritized by the focus group. In the meantime, the IC agreed that these topics should be changed to pending.
- [39] The Secretariat informed the IC that funding was available for the Guide on *Risk-based inspection on imported consignments* (2018-022) from Korea via the IPPC Multi-donor Trust Fund (MDTF), so work could begin on it if the IC changed it to priority 1. The IC noted that although there is a contributed resource on this subject produced by the North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO), the scope of the IPPC guide would be wider to meet the needs of all regions, so a separate IPPC guide is justified.
- [40] The Secretariat suggested that the Guide on *Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2018-040) be changed to priority 1, given that the standard on this subject had now been adopted. To complement this guide, the Secretariat also suggested that IC members encourage their respective

---

<sup>4</sup> Specified in *Procedure manual for implementation and capacity development*: stage 1: topic selection; stage 2: development of a specification; stage 3: establishment of the working group; stage 4: development of the product; stage 5: publication and language versions; and stage 6: periodic update.



contracting parties to submit a proposal during the call for topics for a guide on audits, as a draft standard on *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014) is currently under development.

[41] The Secretariat confirmed that there was no direct funding currently available for the topic *PCE facilitators training* (2014-008), but that the CPM Bureau had granted some money for related work on the PCE, including a new training module, and the PCE facilitators training kits would need to be ready by the time this related work was completed. The Secretariat therefore suggested moving this topic to priority 1, but clarified that the actual work on the topic would not start until 2023, as the draft specification would not go for consultation until 2022. There was still time, therefore, to secure funding.

[42] The IC agreed that draft specifications should be developed for the topics moved to priority 1, ready for the 2022 consultation.

[43] The IC:

(7) *noted* the IPPC guides and training materials that are being worked on, their stage and anticipated completion date;

(8) *recommended* that, once they are completed, the following topics be recommended for deletion from the *List of implementation and capacity development topics* by CPM-16:

- Guide on *Pest status* (2017-048),
- Guide on *Plant pest surveillance* (2017-049),
- e-Learning course on *Pest risk analysis* (2020-002),
- e-Learning course on *Phytosanitary export certification system* (2020-003),
- training kit for *Fall armyworm prevention* (2020-010);

(9) *recommended* that the following topics be recommended to CPM-16 (2022) for deletion from the *List of implementation and capacity development topics*:

- Programme on *Sea containers* (2016-016),
- Programme on *Strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems* (2017-051),
- Awareness materials on *Management of plants and plant products carried by entry passengers* (2018-017),
- Procedure revision regarding *Dispute settlement* (1999-005),
- *PCE tool, modernization* (2017-052),
- *Pest diagnostics* (2016-015),
- Reference materials on *Designing plant quarantine laboratories* (2018-013);

(10) *agreed* that the status of the following topics remain as “pending”:

- Guide on *Assessing the risk of introduction of pests with seeds* (2018-036),
- Guide on *Pest risk management* (2017-047);

(11) *requested* that the Secretariat ask the IC lead for the Portal on *Plant health surveillance* (2015-015) whether the topic could be addressed by a contributed resource, and *agreed* that, if the IC lead agrees to it being a contributed resource, the topic should be recommended for deletion from the *List of implementation and capacity development topics*;

(12) *agreed* the following adjustments to status and priority levels:

- Guide on *Surveillance of Xylella fastidiosa* (2018-037), change to pending,
- Guide on *Inspection of consignments for Xylella fastidiosa* (2018-038), change to pending,
- Guide on *Risk-based inspection on imported consignments* (2018-022), change from priority 2 to priority 1
- Guide on *Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2018-040), change from priority 2 to priority 1
- *PCE facilitators training* (2014-008), change from priority 3 to priority 1;

- (13) *agreed* that the following three draft specifications should be developed for the 2022 consultation:
1. *Guide on Risk-based inspection on imported consignments (2018-022), priority 1,*
  2. *Guide on Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2018-040) , priority 1,*
  3. *PCE facilitators training (2014-008) ), priority 1;*
- (14) *requested* that the Secretariat update the list of topics based on the outcomes of this meeting.

## 6. Framework for standards and implementation

### 6.1. Proposed adjustments to the Framework for standards and implementation regarding implementation and capacity development topics

- [44] The Secretariat presented the paper which included the latest version of the *Framework for standards and implementation*, which incorporated decisions made by CPM-15 (2021).<sup>5</sup> The Secretariat noted that materials already published or expected to be published in the next few months had been moved from the “List of topics” category to either “Developed materials” or “Supporting documents” as appropriate.
- [45] The Chairperson invited comments from the IC. No comments were made.
- [46] The IC identified no gaps in the framework. Recalling the earlier suggestion about a guide on audit, the Secretariat suggested that it would be better if this were submitted first as a proposal for a topic, and then it could be added to the framework as a gap once it was agreed as a topic.
- [47] The IC recalled the decision by CPM-15 (2021) to establish a Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 Development Agenda Items, and noted that the Focus Group might find it helpful to use the *Framework for standards and implementation* as a basis for its work, including reviewing the latter to identify gaps. The IC agreed to recommend this idea to the Focus Group.
- [48] The IC:
- *noted* the updated version of the *Framework for standards and implementation* as presented to this meeting;
  - *requested* the Secretary to invite the CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework (2020–2030) to consider the *Framework for standards and implementation* as a basis for its work, and *agreed* that the IC representative on the focus group would help the Secretariat draft a paper on this, suggesting how the *Framework for standards and implementation* could be used by the focus group;
  - *agreed* that the *Framework for standards and implementation* should be amended to replace the old e-learning course on pest risk analysis with the new e-learning on *pest risk analysis* (2020-002);
  - *agreed* on the updates to the *Framework for standards and implementation* provided by the Secretariat regarding the ICD topics and acknowledge that further revisions would be provide by the Standards Committee regarding topics for standards and requested the Secretariat to submit it to the Strategic Planning Group for their review and agreement to recommend it for endorsement by CPM-16 (2022).

---

<sup>5</sup> VM15\_04\_IC\_2021\_Jun.

## 7.2021 consultation

### 7.1. Discussion on the planning for the IC adoption of specifications for guides and training materials

- [49] The Secretariat highlighted that that six draft specifications for guides and training materials are due to be submitted for consultation, together with the draft terms of reference for the IC Subgroup on National Reporting Obligations (NRO). There would be very little time, however, between the close of the consultation period and the date of the September IC meeting, which is when the draft specifications and corresponding consultation comments would be reviewed by the IC. The Secretariat therefore proposed that either the date of the IC meeting is changed from 15 September to 29 September, to allow a little more time for IC leads to review the consultation comments, or the draft specifications are discussed by e-forum instead of at an IC meeting. The Secretariat pointed out that as these specifications had only been considered by e-Fora and e-Decisions up to now, it might be helpful to discuss them at an IC meeting on this occasion.
- [50] The IC agreed that, as an interim arrangement, the IC responsibilities held by Olga LAVRENTJEVA (Estonia) should be transferred to her replacement, but that this could be reviewed in due course according to members' interests.
- [51] The Secretariat asked the IC whether it would be acceptable for the Sea Containers Task Force to be invited to comment on the draft specification for *Development and implementation of regulations and legislation to manage phytosanitary risks on regulated articles for NPPOs* (2018-008) and the IC agreed.
- [52] The Secretariat explained that, as a result of feedback from contracting parties and RPPOs the previous year, the timing of the 2021 consultation on draft specifications for IPPC guides and training materials had been adjusted to coincide with the consultation period for draft specifications for standards. This did mean, however, that there were 23 items due to be submitted for consultation in July 2021: the six draft specifications for IPPC guides and training materials, the draft terms of reference for the IC Subgroup on NROs, one draft CPM recommendation, eight draft ISPMs, six draft phytosanitary treatments and one draft diagnostic protocol. Recognizing the burden placed on contracting parties and RPPOs submitting comments, the Implementation and Facilitation Unit and the Standard Setting Unit had been working together to find ways to make the consultation process as smooth and easy as possible. This included creating presentations for regional workshops, rationalizing the naming of files in the OCS so their content is more obvious, and making sure that the links to the documents submitted to consultation are highly visible on the home page of the IPP. The Secretariat had considered having a consultation period to coincide with the notification period for diagnostic protocols in January, to ease the workload for the July consultation, but recognized that this would then mean that the consultation documents could not be considered at the IPPC regional workshops. The IC noted that those commenting can experience "consultation fatigue" if there are too many consultations and that the main consultation period that starts in July is the one that contracting parties and RPPOs are aware of most.
- [53] However, the IC Chairperson also indicated that having the consultation for draft Specifications for guide and training materials to be carried out at the same time as for ISPMs could help raise awareness of this work.
- [54] The IC:
- *agreed* that the September 2021 IC meeting would be held on 29 September 2021 and would include consideration of the draft specifications for guides and training materials;
  - *agreed* that, as an interim arrangement, Ringolds ARNITIS (Latvia) should be requested to take over the IC responsibilities held by Olga LAVRENTJEVA (Estonia) and requested the Secretariat to contact Ringolds ARNITIS to confirm his willingness.

- *invited* the Sea Containers Task Force to comment on the draft specification on *Development and implementation of regulations and legislation to manage phytosanitary risks on regulated articles for NPPOs (2018-08)* during the forthcoming consultation.

## **8. Any other business**

### **8.1. Selection of an IC member for the IC Team on Contributed Resources**

[55] The IC:

- *agreed* that Nilesh Ami CHAND (Fiji) would join the IC Team on Contributed Resources.

### **8.2. Phytosanitary capacity evaluation in Senegal**

[56] The Secretariat informed the IC that the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) had agreed, as a pilot initiative, to fund a virtual PCE in Senegal.

### **8.3. Memorandum of understanding with COLEACP**

[57] The Secretariat informed the IC that work on finalizing the memorandum of understanding between the Secretariat and COLEACP was approaching completion, with the memorandum due to be signed imminently. The memorandum will provide the framework for ensuring COLEACP's support for the development of the e-learning supported by COMESA.

### **8.4. International liaison regarding Fusarium wilt TR4**

[58] Recalling the IC's decision to establish an IC Team on Fusarium wilt tropical race 4 (TR4), the Secretariat reminded IC members that the deadline for applications to be part of this team was in two days' time. In the meantime, the Secretariat had been liaising with the World Banana Forum regarding a global project on TR4 that the World Banana Forum is hoping to establish, and with the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division, who are also interested in this. An FAO group on TR4 management had been set up, along similar lines to the group working on fall armyworm but with less amplitude.

### **8.5. Active e-fora requiring action or decision**

[59] The Secretariat highlighted that the e-fora on the draft specification for the *Plant health officer training curricula (2017-054)* and the draft specification for the *Guide on contingency planning (2019-012)* were ongoing and encouraged IC members to contribute to these e-fora by the deadline of 11 June. The IC Chairperson also emphasized the importance of IC members contributing to the e-fora.

## **9. Date and arrangement of the next meeting**

[60] The next virtual IC meeting will be held on 29 September 2021 at 12:00 Rome time (CEST).

## **10. Evaluation of the meeting process**

[61] The Secretariat opened an online Zoom poll for IC members to provide feedback on the meeting.

## **11. Close of the meeting**

[62] The IC Chairperson and the IFU lead thanked everyone and the meeting was closed.

**APPENDIX 1****VIRTUAL MEETING N° 15 AGENDA***(Updated 2021-08-17)***COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES  
IMPLEMENTATION AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (IC)****Start:** 2021-06-09 at 22:00 (Rome, time)**Zoom link:** <https://fao.zoom.us/j/95072039148>**Meeting ID:** 950 7203 9148**Meeting Password:** 98145693

	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Document No.</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Opening of the Meeting</b>		
1.1	Opening by the IFU Team lead and welcome by the IC Chairperson		LARSON PELLETIER
<b>2.</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>		
2.1	Election of the Rapporteur		PELLETIER
2.2	Adoption of the Agenda	VM15_01_IC_2021_Jun	PELLETIER
<b>3.</b>	<b>Administrative Matters</b>		
3.1	Review of meeting documents	<a href="#">Link</a>	KOUMBA
3.2	Review of participants		KOUMBA
<b>4.</b>	<b>Contributed resources</b>		
4.1	Discussion on contributed resources	VM15_02_IC_2021_Jun	YAMADA GONZALEZ
<b>5.</b>	<b>List of ICD topics</b>		
5.1	Review of list of ICD topics, including priorities	VM15_03_IC_2021_Jun VM15_05_IC_2021_Jun	PETERSON
<b>6.</b>	<b>Framework for implementation and standards</b>		
6.1	Proposed adjustments to the Framework for implementation and standards regarding ICD topics	VM15_04_IC_2021_Jun	YAMADA NDUNGE
<b>7.</b>	<b>2021 Consultation</b>		
7.1	Discussion on the planning for the IC adoption of specification for Guides and training materials	Oral report	PETERSON
<b>8.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>		PELLETIER
8.1	Selection of an IC member for the IC Team on Contributed Resources		YAMADA
8.2	Phytosanitary capacity evaluation in Senegal		BRUNEL
8.3	International liaison regarding Fusarium wilt TR4		BRUNEL
8.4	Active e-fora requiring action or decision		KOUMBA
<b>9.</b>	<b>Date and arrangement of the Next Meeting</b>		KOUMBA
<b>10.</b>	<b>Evaluation of the meeting process</b>		CZERWIEN
<b>11.</b>	<b>Close of the Meeting</b>		PELLETIER / LARSON

**APPENDIX 2****IC VIRTUAL MEETING N° 15 - PARTICIPANTS LIST**

<b>Role/Organization</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Email address</b>
Chair	Mr Dominique PELLETIER	<a href="mailto:dominique.pelletier2@canada.ca">dominique.pelletier2@canada.ca</a>
Vice - Chair	Mr Chris DALE	<a href="mailto:chris.dale@agriculture.gov.au">chris.dale@agriculture.gov.au</a>
Member	Mr Thorwald GEUZE	<a href="mailto:t.geuze@nvwa.nl">t.geuze@nvwa.nl</a>
Member	Mr Lalith Bandula KUMARASINGHE	<a href="mailto:Lalith.kumarasinghe@mpi.govt.nz">Lalith.kumarasinghe@mpi.govt.nz</a>
Member	Mr Ringolds ARNITIS	<a href="mailto:ringolds.arnitis@hotmail.com">ringolds.arnitis@hotmail.com</a>
Member	Ms Kyu-Ock YIM	<a href="mailto:koyim@korea.kr">koyim@korea.kr</a>
Member	Mr Ahmed M. Abdellah ABDELMOTTALEB	<a href="mailto:bidoeng@yahoo.com">bidoeng@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:bidoeng@gmail.com">bidoeng@gmail.com</a>
Member	Ms Faith NDUNGE	<a href="mailto:ndungeq@yahoo.com">ndungeq@yahoo.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:fndunge@kephis.org">fndunge@kephis.org</a>
Member	Mr Nilesh Ami CHAND	<a href="mailto:pranavrchand@hotmail.com">pranavrchand@hotmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:nachand@baf.com.fj">nachand@baf.com.fj</a>
Member	Ms Magda GONZALEZ ARROYO	<a href="mailto:mgonzalez@sfe.go.cr">mgonzalez@sfe.go.cr</a>
Member	Ms Ruth AREVALO MACIAS	<a href="mailto:ruth.arevalo@sag.gob.cl">ruth.arevalo@sag.gob.cl</a>
Member	Francisco GUTIERREZ	<a href="mailto:francisco.gutierrez@baha.org.bz">francisco.gutierrez@baha.org.bz</a>
RPPOs Representative	Stephanie BLOEM	<a href="mailto:stephanie.bloem@nappo.org">stephanie.bloem@nappo.org</a>
SC Representative	Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE	<a href="mailto:alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl">alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl</a>

***Others***

<b>Role/Organization</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Email address</b>
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Brent LARSON	<a href="mailto:Brent.Larson@fao.org">Brent.Larson@fao.org</a> ;
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Sarah BRUNEL	<a href="mailto:Sarah.Brunel@fao.org">Sarah.Brunel@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Natsumi YAMADA	<a href="mailto:Natsumi.Yamada@fao.org">Natsumi.Yamada@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Descartes KOUMBA MOUENDOU	<a href="mailto:Descartes.Koumba@fao.org">Descartes.Koumba@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Barbara PETERSON	<a href="mailto:Barbara.Peterson@fao.org">Barbara.Peterson@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Denis ALLEX	<a href="mailto:Denis.Allex@fao.org">Denis.Allex@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Ewa CZERWIEN	<a href="mailto:Ewa.Czerwien@fao.org">Ewa.Czerwien@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Qingpo YANG	<a href="mailto:Qingpo.Yang@fao.org">Qingpo.Yang@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Leonardo SCARTON	<a href="mailto:Leonardo.Scarton@fao.org">Leonardo.Scarton@fao.org</a>