



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Standards Committee

**Virtual Focused Meeting
14–15 September 2021**

IPPC Secretariat

IPPC Secretariat. 2021. *Report on the virtual focused meeting of the Standards Committee, 14-15 September 2021*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). 33 pages. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

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

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

© FAO, 2021



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

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

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

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

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

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the meeting	4
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat and SC Chairperson	4
2. Meeting arrangements	4
2.1 Election of the Rapporteur	4
2.2 Adoption of the agenda	4
3. Administrative matters	4
4. Follow-ups from previous meetings	4
4.1 Review of <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i>	4
4.2 Discussions on the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 development agenda items	6
4.3 Proposal for a revised process for the development of phytosanitary treatments	12
5. Updates and enhancing synergies and areas of collaboration.....	14
5.1 Report from the International Year of Plant Health.....	14
5.2 Report from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit.....	15
5.3 Report from the Integration and Support Team of the IPPC.....	16
6. Technical panels: urgent issues	17
7. Any other business.....	17
8. Date and type of the next SC meetings.....	18
9. Recommendations to CPM Bureau, Strategic Planning Group or CPM-16 (2022)	18
10. Close of the meeting	18
Appendix 1: Agenda.....	19
Appendix 2: Documents list.....	21
Appendix 3: Participants list	22
Appendix 4: Proposed changes to the List of topics for IPPC standards (LOT) as discussed at this SC meeting and recommended to the CPM for the adoption	27
Appendix 5: Modifications proposed to the IPPC Standard Setting Procedure as adopted by CPM-11 (2016) (Appendix 07 of the CPM-11 report).....	30

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat and SC Chairperson

- [1] The Chairperson of the Standards Committee (SC), Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina) and the Standard Setting Unit Acting Officer-in-Charge for daily matters, Adriana MOREIRA, welcomed all participants to the SC meeting. A particular welcome was extended to the new SC member from Europe, Harry ARIJS (Belgium), who had replaced Olga LAVRENTJEVA (Estonia), who had resigned from the committee. The three observers were also welcomed, including the representative from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) and two regional representatives.
- [2] The following SC members were absent: Imad (M.E) Jrouh Al-AWAD (Jordan) and Xiaodong FENG (China).

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), agreeing to consider under agenda item 7 (Any other business) the selection of experts for the Expert Working Group (EWG) on the Annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*).

3. Administrative matters

- [5] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the 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.
- [6] The Secretariat informed the SC that the SC’s review of the draft ISPMs from the current consultation, which was due to close on 30 September, would start in the Online Comment System (OCS) on 18 October and would continue at the SC meeting on 15–19 November.

4. Follow-ups from previous meetings

4.1 Review of *List of topics for IPPC standards*

- [7] Sophie PETERSON (Australia) introduced the paper for this agenda item on behalf of the working group of SC members who had been tasked with reviewing the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (LOT) at the SC focused meeting in June 2021.¹
- [8] The working group had met virtually on 4 August 2021 and had discussed how to “clean up” the LOT and how to manage it in the future. The group had drawn up a list of criteria to use when deciding whether topics should be removed from the list. These included the age of the specification, the priority assigned to the topic, whether pending topics had been pending for a long period of time or were awaiting the outcome of a task force, and whether it had been possible to secure the required number of experts for the EWG. The group had concluded that these criteria could be used not only for the current review of the LOT but also at regular intervals in the future. The group had reviewed the LOT using these criteria, and the resulting proposed actions were presented to the SC for consideration.² The SC was also asked to consider how to capture these criteria for future use.

¹ 04_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep; SC 2021-06, agenda item 5.

² 04_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep, Appendix 1.

- [9] The SC Chairperson thanked Ms PETERSON and invited the SC to review and comment on the proposed actions for topics on the LOT.
- [10] ***Efficacy of measures (2001-001)***. The SC agreed to propose that this topic be removed from the LOT, but also proposed the inclusion of guidance on the efficacy of measures in the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001).
- [11] ***Revision of ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade): Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010)***. The SC recalled that it had already proposed the removal of this topic.³
- [12] ***Minimizing pest movement by sea containers (2008-001)***. The SC noted that, owing to difficulties in drafting guidance on such a broad pathway, the EWG had not been able to progress this topic and so the current status was “pending”, awaiting the outcome of the Sea Containers Task Force, the subsequent decision of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) and the potential revision of the CPM Recommendation on *Sea containers* (R-06). Given this situation, the SC agreed with the working group’s recommendation that the topic should be retained on the LOT with a status of “pending”, even though there will not be much progress in the near future. One SC member also commented on the value of having some pathway standards as well as commodity standards.
- [13] Following discussion on the parallel topic on air containers (see next topic, 2008-002), the SC proposed that, once the findings of the Sea Containers Task Force are known, the SC be tasked with reviewing the specification for the topic on sea containers (2008-001) and updating it if needed.
- [14] ***Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts (2008-002)***. The SC noted that, as with the topic on sea containers (2008-001), the recommendation from the working group was to keep this topic as “pending” status, awaiting CPM decision, which in turn was pending the outcome of the Sea Containers Task Force because of the synergies between the topics on sea containers and air containers.
- [15] As the specifications for both these topics were old (having been approved in 2008), the SC agreed with the working group’s comment that these specifications may need revision once the findings of the Sea Containers Task Force are known. The SC noted, however, that specifications should be general in scope and so even if a new pathway (e.g. a new pest) is discovered in relation to sea containers or air containers, this is not sufficient reason to update a specification. The SC discussed who should be responsible for updating the specifications if a revision is needed. They discussed whether the topic would need to be removed from the LOT until a contracting party could update the specification or whether the contracting party that had originally proposed the topic should be approached to do the update, but noted that the original contracting party may no longer be in a position to do this as the personnel may well have changed in the intervening time and the corporate knowledge lost. The SC concluded, therefore, that the update would probably need to be done by the SC, although the SC could perhaps approach regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) for assistance, especially in those regions for which the topic is particularly pertinent.
- [16] The SC therefore agreed with the recommendation from the working group that this topic be kept as “pending” status, awaiting CPM decision, and proposed that, once the findings of the Sea Containers Task Force are known, the SC be tasked with reviewing the specification and updating it if needed.
- [17] ***Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004)***. The SC agreed with the recommendation from the working group that this topic be removed, for the reasons given by the working group.
- [18] ***International movement of cut flowers and foliage (2008-005)***. The SC agreed with the recommendation from the working group that this topic be removed, for the reasons given by the working group.

³ SC 2021-07, agenda item 4.1.

- [19] **International movement of grain (2008-007).** The SC agreed with the recommendation from the working group that this topic be removed, for the reasons given by the working group.
- [20] **International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood (2008-008).** The SC agreed with the recommendation from the working group that this topic be removed, for the reasons given by the working group.
- [21] **Supplement Guidance on the concept of probability of transfer to a suitable host and establishment as used in a pest risk analysis for quarantine pests to ISPM 11 (2015-010).** The SC agreed with the recommendation from the working group that this topic be removed from the LOT, and recommended that the EWG for the Reorganization of Pest Risk Analysis Standards (2020-001) should consider addressing the issue as part of the review of ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*).
- [22] **Topics for which no change is recommended.** The SC noted that the following topics were under development and so agreed with the recommendation from the working group that no change be made to them on the LOT:
- *Use of specific import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006);*
 - *Revision of ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) (2009-002);*
 - *Pest risk management for quarantine pests (2014-001);*
 - *Requirements for the use of chemical treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-003);*
 - *Requirements for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure (Revision to ISPM 18) (2014-007);*
 - *Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (Annex to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood)) (2015-004).*
 - *Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export (2015-011)*
 - *Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014)*
 - *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (Annex to ISPM 38: International movement of seeds) (2018-009).*
- [23] The SC agreed that the Secretariat would work with the working group of SC members to adjust the SC paper, taking account of the outcome of this SC meeting, for submission to CPM-16 (2022). The SC noted that the paper would include a description of the criteria used to review the LOT.
- [24] The SC:
- (1) *agreed* to propose changes to the *List of topics for IPPC standards (LOT)* as discussed at this SC meeting (Appendix 4) and *recommended* to the CPM that the proposed changes be adopted;
 - (2) *agreed* that the Secretariat would work with the working group of SC members who had been tasked with reviewing the LOT⁴ to prepare the paper for CPM-16 (2022) on the recommended changes to the LOT.

4.2 Discussions on the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 development agenda items

- [25] At its meeting in July 2021, the SC had assigned a focal point (“SC champion”) for the three IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 development agenda items that the Standard Setting Unit had been assigned to coordinate: commodity- and pathway-specific ISPMs, developing guidance on the use of third-party entities, and diagnostic laboratory networking.⁵ The SC had agreed that each SC champion would lead a small group of other SC members to develop ideas on how to progress the respective

⁴ SC 2021-06, agenda item 5.

⁵ SC 2021-07, agenda item 5.1.

development agenda items. At this meeting, the SC considered the discussion papers produced by the three groups.

Commodity- and pathway-specific ISPMs

- [26] The SC champion, Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom), referred SC members to the discussion paper on this development agenda item.⁶ Acknowledging how challenging it is to translate a strategic document into something that has actual deliverables that are going to meet the objectives, the small group of SC members had come up with some broad ideas of areas that could help to support this development agenda item. The SC champion invited comments from the SC on the points made in the paper.
- [27] **Streamlining development of diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments.** The SC considered the first issue discussed by the small group of SC members: the recommendations from the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) and the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) on streamlining the standard setting process for the development of diagnostic protocols (DPs) and phytosanitary treatments (PTs).
- [28] The Secretariat commented that, even if no decisions are needed from the CPM, it would still be worthwhile keeping the CPM informed about the direction of thought and what proposals might come to the CPM in future. The SC champion suggested that as there were no concrete proposals at the moment, it might be more appropriate to submit a version of this paper, based on the SC's discussions at this meeting, to the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) for their awareness, rather than submitting a paper to the CPM. The SC Chairperson noted that agenda item 4.3, which focused on the streamlining of the PT development process, would also be of relevance.
- [29] The SC noted that, in addition to streamlining the PT process, there may be a need to review the terms of reference (i.e. Specifications) for the technical panels. This could include consideration of the approach that the TPPT should take to evaluate treatments that have a history of use by contracting parties but for which efficacy data are not available, as the TPPT does not currently have a procedure for such evaluation. Similarly, consideration could also be given to how to evaluate measures that are systems approaches, where the overall efficacy relates to the approach as a whole, but the different component steps may each have a different efficacy. Systems approaches would therefore need to be evaluated in a different way to "silver-bullet" end-point treatments.
- [30] The SC discussed the issue of treatments that lack sufficient efficacy data. One SC member cautioned against encouraging the harmonization of such treatments, but the SC champion reminded the SC that the purpose of commodity standards is to provide contracting parties with potential tools to consider, rather than to harmonize those tools. He suggested that the focus should be on the efficacy of potential measures or on combining approaches (i.e. applying systems approaches), because if the evidence threshold for efficacy data was always high (as in Probit 9), very few treatments would ever be adopted. He commented that it is possible to have treatments with lower efficacy, provided the efficacy is clearly stated, and that lower efficacy is also an important part of systems approaches.
- [31] One SC member commented that, when looking for alternatives to methyl bromide treatments, countries should be considering pest free areas and other tools that are already available, not just alternative treatments. The SC champion commented that methyl bromide is a good example of a treatment where there is no like-for-like alternative, so moving to a systems approach is the only possibility. The SC Vice-Chairperson supported the provision of more information on alternative approaches to the use of methyl bromide.
- [32] The SC champion wondered whether there was a way of making more use of regional standards, and one SC member commented that as these are usually multilateral, they are not likely to give rise to the same concern that historical treatments do.

⁶ 11_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep.

- [33] **Phytosanitary treatment search tool database.** The SC considered the suggestion, made by the small group of SC members, to develop an online search tool for DPs along similar lines to the one developed recently for PTs, so that the available information would be more easily accessible.
- [34] The Secretariat briefly introduced the online search tool for PTs and explained that it currently covers only those PTs that are adopted by the CPM, but the aim is to expand it to include other treatments such as regional protocols. The Secretariat noted that care would need to be taken to distinguish between those treatments that had been adopted by the CPM and those that had not. The SC champion expressed reservations about adding treatments that had not been adopted by the CPM, recalling the lengthy discussions within the predecessor committee to the IC about posting non-IPPC material on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP); his recollection was that the legal advice obtained was that if something was on the IPP then it could be considered as adopted.
- [35] In addition to making information on DPs more easily available, the SC also noted the need to assess whether contracting parties are using the CPM-adopted DPs and whether the DPs are fit for purpose. The SC recalled that a survey on the use of DPs is currently a topic under the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS). The Secretariat confirmed that this topic has now been assigned a priority 1 status and an expert is being hired to conduct the study. The study is expected to start at the end of September and the SC would be kept informed of progress.
- [36] One SC member commented that the speed with which the science of diagnostics advances can result in DPs quickly becoming out of date. This means that some countries may stop using them. Countries also often disagree about the equivalence of protocols. The member therefore suggested that the TPDP could perhaps look at the protocols being used and assess their equivalence.
- [37] The SC noted that the proposed streamlining of the standard setting process should allow DPs to be developed more quickly to keep pace with the advancing science, but that there was also a need to consider how to update adopted DPs. The SC noted that feedback from contracting parties would be needed to identify which need DPs need updating. The Secretariat also emphasized the importance of understanding the needs of contracting parties before considering what DP format would best meet those needs.
- [38] **What should the first meeting of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards look like?** The SC considered the issues listed by the small group of SC members for possible consideration by the first meeting of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS).
- [39] The Secretariat confirmed that the intention is to issue a call for experts for the TPCS soon, so that the SC could agree the selection of experts before CPM-16 (2022). This would allow the first meeting of the TPCS to be held shortly after CPM-16 has taken place if any of the new topics added to the LOT by CPM-16 are for commodity standards. As at the first day of this SC meeting (14 September), only three topics had been submitted in response to the Call for Topics, one of which was for a commodity standard, but the call was due to close the following day (15 September 2021).
- [40] The Secretariat also reminded SC members that the TPCS would need to follow the tasks set out for it in its specification (TP 6). These were generic, however, and did not include the detail suggested in the discussion paper, such as the call for papers and case studies.
- [41] In addition to the potential items identified in the discussion paper for the first meeting of the TPCS, SC members suggested the following issues for consideration by the TPCS:
- how to identify options for phytosanitary measures for specific commodities or to address specific pests;
 - the process for adding new pests or measures to existing commodity standards;
 - the process for removing measures from commodity standards (noting that this may need to be done quickly);

- how to evaluate information supplied by contracting parties submitting proposals for commodity standards and how to seek further information if the information provided with the submission is insufficient.

[42] One SC member recalled that in the draft over-arching standard – the draft ISPM on *Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008) – the TPCS is tasked with developing criteria for evaluating confidence in the measures included in commodity standards, and referred SC members to the SC-7 report where this was discussed.⁷

[43] **How to prioritize the development of specific commodity standards?** The SC Chairperson queried whether it was feasible for the TPCS to establish some criteria for this, and whether the decisions regarding priorities should be made by the SC or the CPM.

[44] One SC member suggested that the criteria used to evaluate submissions to the Call for Topics could be used as a starting point and extrapolated to commodity standards. This would therefore include considering the global need for the standard, the feasibility of implementation, how many countries would benefit, the commercial value of the commodity, and so on. The SC Chairperson commented, however, that this could mean that certain commodities, such as propagation material, would never stand the chance of having a commodity standard because there is not enough trade in that commodity compared to, for example, commodities for consumption.

[45] One SC member suggested that priority could perhaps be given to commodities that are pathways for emerging pests, and another member suggested that regions relevant to the emerging pests could be consulted, as they would be aware of the pertinent issues. The SC acknowledged the complexities involved when considering measures for emerging pests, as all possible hosts need to be considered and the pests move from region to region. One SC member highlighted the need for pest risk assessment.

[46] The SC Chairperson asked the SC whether prioritization should be an issue to be considered by the TPCS at its first meeting, but there were no specific responses to this.

[47] **The next step.** The SC agreed that the SC discussion paper would be revised by the small group of SC members to take account of the discussions at this SC meeting and then submitted to the CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the Strategic Framework. It was noted that the focus group would be holding its second meeting in the week after this SC meeting, with its third meeting to be held in early October (date to be confirmed). The SC agreed that, with support from the Secretariat, the aim would be to submit the paper to the second meeting of the focus group.

Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities

[48] Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) briefly introduced the issues discussed by the small group of SC members assigned to this development agenda item.⁸ The group had met virtually on 3 August 2021. They had discussed the SC's role in implementing this development agenda item and considered that providing a member to the CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the Strategic Framework, and conveying the SC's ideas through that member, would be a good way forward. They had drawn up a list of suggested actions for consideration by the SC. These actions included: adopting an ISPM (or ISPMs) and guidance on authorization of third-party entities to perform phytosanitary actions, including the possibility of annexes to ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*); exploring confidence in authorization programmes and how this could be increased internationally (including conducting an IRSS study, holding an international workshop, exploring the possibility of providing information on certification programmes for authorized entities, developing a training programme, and awareness raising); and providing capacity development resources to assist national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) wishing to start using a third-party entity model. The group had noted that the concept of authorization of third-party entities is used in other spheres of government, such as for verifying or assuring the safety of aircraft. The group had also

⁷ SC7 2021-05, agenda item 4.1

⁸ 08_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep.

discussed how to engage stakeholders, how collaboration with the IC on this development agenda item would work, and how to measure the impact of the implementation of this development agenda item.

- [49] The SC Chairperson thanked the Mr CÔTÉ and invited comments from the SC.
- [50] **Annexes to ISPM 45.** Referring to the suggested action to consider the development of new annexes to ISPM 45, one SC member suggested that it would be more beneficial to develop implementation guides, because annexes would have to be general in scope and guides would also be easier to modify. The member also suggested that, when developing such materials, it could be a good idea to start with something that is common to many contracting parties, such as the use of authorized entities to perform treatments of wood packaging according to ISPM 15.
- [51] **Building confidence in the use of third-party entities.** Another SC member pointed out that the use of ISPM 45 by contracting parties is optional, so regardless of what is done to help NPPOs implement it, the aim should not be to get everyone to implement it. The member suggested that the focus should be on building the confidence of countries in the use of authorized entities rather than on encouraging countries to implement the standard. A further SC member commented on the need to raise awareness among contracting parties of how authorization of entities works, so that they can embrace the concept of such authorization.
- [52] **Engagement of the private sector.** The SC discussed the conclusion of the small group that there is no need yet to engage the private sector. One SC member commented that the wording could be confusing as it could imply that there is currently no engagement with regard to authorization of third-party entities whereas the private sector is already engaged in many countries (e.g. in implementation of ISPM 15). The member suggested that, to clarify this, the paper could include examples of private-sector use that is already happening. Speaking on behalf of the small group, Mr CÔTÉ explained that the group had felt that it was important to engage the private sector, but that first it would be good to have more discussion among NPPOs in light of the comments received from consultation. One SC member expressed disquiet about engaging the private sector in discussions about authorization because the decision on whether to engage the private sector, or indeed to use third-party entities at all, is entirely a matter for the NPPO. Both the SC Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson agreed with the conclusion of the small group that it was perhaps too early to propose having this kind of engagement with the private sector.
- [53] One SC member commented on the apparent disparity between, on the one hand, the views being expressed against engagement with the private sector, and, on the other hand, the fact that the EWG on the new annex to ISPM 38 (2018-009) would be drafting guidance in early October on systems approaches that are based on industry practices for the production of healthy seed and there has been significant interest in this new annex from the seed industry.
- [54] **Priority for the implementation guide.** Some SC members expressed support for the suggestion from the small group that the priority of the implementation guide *Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2018-040) should be changed from priority 1 to priority 2, as this guide would help countries understand the concept of third-party authorization and, if they chose, to implement it. One SC member suggested that it would be very helpful to include a section on stakeholder engagement in the guide, which would be preferable to IPPC bodies actively engaging with stakeholders. The SC noted that a third party could be other agencies or other levels of government, so any guidance should address “stakeholders” not necessarily just the “private sector”.
- [55] **IRSS study.** The SC discussed the proposal from the small group that a new IRSS study be conducted to review and gather information on the challenges faced when authorizing entities. The SC noted that this would be a second study, following on from the IRSS study that had already been published,⁹ but that the scope would be different from that of the previous study, focusing on the

⁹ IRSS Study 2020: *Authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions: an overview of the current use of authorization by national plant protection organizations*: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/88934>

challenges rather than being an overview of the current use of authorization. The SC noted that the report of the first study provided some recommendations on future study, but the Secretariat clarified that those recommendations would only be implemented if an IPPC body decided to act upon them. The Secretariat further clarified that the idea of the small group was that the new study would find out from countries what challenges they face with authorization and consider how these may be overcome.

- [56] **The next step.** The SC noted that, since the resignation of Olga LAVRENTJEVA from the SC, there were now only three SC members assigned to this development agenda item and there was no SC champion. The SC Chairperson called for an additional SC member to join the small group, but no one volunteered. Mr CÔTÉ volunteered to be the SC champion and suggested that it would be helpful if the Secretariat could arrange a short videoconference of the small group. The SC agreed that the small group would revise the paper and share it with the focus group.

Diagnostic laboratory networking

- [57] The SC champion, Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ, introduced the issues discussed by the small group of SC members assigned to this development agenda item.¹⁰ He explained that the CPM Bureau had allocated USD 40 000 for this development agenda item, which would fund the appointment of a consultant to work on it. The group had provided two examples of countries or regions using laboratory networks: in Brazil, there is a large network of laboratories, but it has been identified that one of the challenges is the time that it takes to send a live sample from one laboratory to another; and in the African region, there are some reference laboratories, including the one run by the Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Services. The group had considered what a diagnostic laboratory network would look like, including whether it would be at a national, regional or global level, whether it would incorporate an element of IPPC recognition, and whether it would include reference laboratories. Finally, the group had listed various questions for the SC to consider, including whether new standards or guidelines would be needed, issues concerning reference materials and reference collections, whether existing information on the concept of equivalence is sufficient, the accreditation of laboratories or methods, and the role of DPs adopted by the IPPC.
- [58] The SC Chairperson thanked the SC champion and invited comments from the SC. The SC champion added that although the need for diagnostic capacity is identified in the Strategic Framework, it would be good to have further suggestions on how to progress it, where to find resources, and so on.
- [59] **Recognition.** Referring to the part of the paper that mentioned IPPC recognition of laboratories, including reference laboratories, the SC noted that such recognition would be outside the scope of IPPC bodies: it would be both inappropriate and unachievable. The SC could ask the TPDP to provide certain services within their scope as a technical panel, but no more. One SC member commented that it was clear from the paper that there is not a common understanding of what is meant by “diagnostic laboratory networking” and suggested that it is simply referring to linking laboratories together, not recognizing them. The SC Chairperson pointed out that the Strategic Framework itself talks about having a network of recognized diagnostic laboratory services, but commented that this does not necessarily mean that the recognition is by IPPC bodies nor that it is individual laboratories that are recognized, as it could be the network that is recognized. One SC member suggested that perhaps one of the best uses of a diagnostic laboratory network would be to facilitate communication. A further SC member suggested that clarification on this issue could be sought from those countries who had proposed the diagnostic networks. The Secretariat suggested that the small group of SC members assigned to this development agenda item could perhaps adjust the paper (if preparing it for the focus group) to highlight the need to define the scope of diagnostic laboratory networking.
- [60] **Standards and guidance.** The SC Chairperson noted that one of the questions identified in the paper concerned the possible development of guidance or standards on laboratories, but he suggested that the focus should be on how to *build* the network rather than on providing standards or guidance for the

¹⁰ 09_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep.

laboratories themselves. One SC member commented that until the consultant has reported back, the SC is not in a position to provide any guidance.

[61] **Existing DPs.** The SC champion suggested that strengthening existing DPs could perhaps be considered as part of this development agenda item.

[62] The SC agreed that the small group of SC members would revise the paper and share it with the CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the Strategic Framework.

[63] The SC:

- (3) *agreed* that the small groups of SC members who had been assigned to work on the development agenda items at the July 2021 meeting of the SC¹¹ would, with support from the Secretariat, revise the SC discussion papers on these items for submission to the second meeting of the CPM Focus Group on the Implementation of the Strategic Framework;
- (4) *agreed* that the small group of SC members who had been assigned to work on the development agenda item concerning the use of third-party entities would, with support from the Secretariat, complete the submission form for an Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) study to review and gather information on the challenges faced when authorizing third-party entities;
- (5) *agreed* that Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) would be the focal point (“SC champion”) for the small group of SC members assigned to work on the development agenda item concerning the use of third-party entities.

4.3 Proposal for a revised process for the development of phytosanitary treatments

[64] The Steward for the TPPT, David OPATOWSKI (Israel), introduced this agenda item.¹² At its focused meeting in June 2021, the SC had considered whether PTs could be approved for adoption after the first round if no significant comments were made, and had assigned a small group of SC members, including the TPPT Steward, to develop a paper on this proposal.¹³ The Steward presented the resulting paper to the SC.

[65] The group had proposed that there be two criteria for PTs to be sent for adoption after the first consultation: that there be no “substantive” comments or no comments that result in a substantive change of the PT; and that there be no comment expressing disagreement with approving the PT for adoption. The group had drafted the corresponding changes that would be required to the Standard Setting Procedure to allow for these changes in the development of PTs¹⁴. They had suggested that the TPPT could make a recommendation to the SC, supported by the consultation comments and the TPPT responses, but that the final decision would rest with the SC.

[66] The SC Chairperson thanked the Steward and invited comments from the SC.

[67] There was a general consensus within the SC in support of the proposal to streamline the PT development process by having one consultation: it would speed up development, simplify the process and make it more agile. The SC noted, however, that the criteria used for deciding whether a comment is substantive need to be transparent; similarly, the reasons for not incorporating comments need to be clear and given in sufficient detail so that contracting parties can understand why comments have not been incorporated.

[68] The Steward confirmed that the responses to consultation comments would be published in the usual way when a draft PT is submitted to the CPM for adoption and contracting parties would be able to object in the same way as they do currently. He explained that one problem is that contracting parties

¹¹ SC 2021-07 agenda item 5.1, decision point 3.

¹² 10_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep.

¹³ SC 2021-06, agenda item 4.3.

¹⁴ 10_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep, Appendix 1.

sometimes submit comments as being “substantive” comments when they are not substantive but are, for example, editorial, but that the main issue in this context is whether the comment asks for a major change or results in a major change in the PT. The Steward referred to the SC paper, which gave some examples of substantive changes (a change to the treatment schedule, the target regulated article or the target pest), but commented that it is difficult to draw up criteria that cover all potential cases. The Secretariat confirmed that the comments from the first consultation would be reviewed by the TPPT, including whether the comments are substantive or not, and the responses would then be made available to the SC.

- [69] The IC representative to the SC expressed support for streamlining the process by having one consultation, but emphasized that there still needed to be the opportunity for a second consultation if there were significant comments.
- [70] One SC member suggested that the Steward for a given standard should filter out the substantive comments using the definition of a “substantive comment” in the OCS handbook, so there was no need for detailed criteria. The Secretariat, however, clarified that “substantive” comments in the proposed streamlining of the PT process do not refer to the “substantive” *types* of comments in the OCS (there could, for example, be a substantive technical comment), and suggested that it would be good to highlight this when describing the proposal to the CPM. The SC Chairperson pointed out that the difference between “substantive” and “substantial” was already dealt with in the SC paper (which used the word “significant” in the proposed changes to the Standard Setting Procedure).
- [71] The Secretariat acknowledged the difficulties in drawing up fixed criteria, but suggested that it would still be useful to have more comments on this from the SC: for example, could a comment that had significant implications for the *implementation* of the PT be deemed substantive?
- [72] One SC member commented that those who submit comments should provide technical justification for their comments, for instance by referring to research data. The Steward acknowledged that this could be incorporated into the paper describing the proposal, but added that if there was no technical justification for a comment, then this may be a reason for having a second consultation to allow this justification to be provided. So, upon reflection, it might be better not to incorporate it in the paper as it could complicate matters. He also noted that some substantive comments are specific to a particular country and hence would not change the PT even if there were several consultations.
- [73] In the light of the above discussion, the SC agreed with the proposals of the small group and agreed that the only changes needed to the SC paper were those that would make it appropriate for submission to the CPM (e.g. adjusting the background).
- [74] The SC:
- (6) *agreed* to propose modifications to the Standard Setting Procedure to allow the SC to recommend phytosanitary treatments for adoption by the CPM if no significant or major technical comments are made during the first consultation;
 - (7) *recommended* that CPM-16 (2022) adopt the modifications to the Standard Setting Procedure as proposed by the SC at this meeting (Appendix 5);
 - (8) *agreed* that the small group of SC members who had drafted this proposal¹⁵ would, with support from the Secretariat, prepare the CPM paper on it.

¹⁵ SC 2021-06, agenda item 4.3.

5. Updates and enhancing synergies and areas of collaboration

5.1 Report from the International Year of Plant Health

- [75] The Secretariat presented a report on activities carried out for the International Year of Plant Health (IYPH).¹⁶
- [76] The IYPH had ended on 1 July 2021 with a closing ceremony attended by approximately one thousand people globally. The final meeting of the IYPH International Steering Committee had been held the day after, on 2 July 2021.
- [77] Key IYPH global events such as the ministerial segment during CPM-15 (2021) and the International Plant Health Conference had been cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic, but this had been compensated for by a series of high-level webinars, organized and coordinated by the Secretariat's Integration and Support Team (IST).
- [78] The *Scientific review of the impact of climate change on plant pests*, which is considered to be one of the key IYPH legacies, had been launched at a high-level event on 1 June 2021, alongside a video on plant health and climate change. An IYPH webinar on *Climate change, plant health and biodiversity*, together with one on *Food systems and plant health* had been registered as independent dialogues to the United Nations (UN) Food Systems Summit on 29 and 30 June 2021, respectively.
- [79] During the IYPH, the IST had organized and coordinated various calls and contests and the winners of these were announced during the IYPH closing ceremony. The team had also coordinated and supervised the development and production of IYPH materials and contents in a range of different media and 1 750 plant health posts had been shared via FAO's social media accounts. Three IYPH advocates had been appointed, 29 postage stamps dedicated to plant health had been issued by countries, and three countries had minted IYPH commemorative coins. The IST is also actively supporting Zambia in the process of proclaiming the International Day of Plant Health through the FAO Conference and UN General Assembly.
- [80] The IST is currently working on the IYPH final report, which is expected to be out in October 2021, and preparing two webinars that will pave the way to the first International Plant Health Conference. The team will also be working on various recommendations from the IYPH International Steering Committee relating to the transition from the IYPH to the International Day of Plant Health and the search for a country to host the first International Plant Health Conference.
- [81] The SC Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for the report and reflected on the contribution that the IYPH had made to raising awareness of plant health issues. He invited the SC to comment.
- [82] The SC noted that the SC meeting next year, tentatively scheduled for 9–13 May 2022, will clash with the proposed day for the International Day of Plant Health, 12 May, and (if it goes ahead) the first International Plant Health Conference. Such a clash with the International Day is also likely to happen in future years. The SC Chairperson commented, however, that the activities of the International Day and the SC meeting will not overlap, and the Secretariat clarified that the International Plant Health Conference might not take place every year (e.g. it might take place every other year or every four years).
- [83] The SC:
- (9) *noted* the update on the International Year of Plant Health.

¹⁶ 05_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep.

5.2 Report from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit

- [84] The Secretariat presented an update from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU) of the Secretariat,¹⁷ pointing out that this did not cover matters reported to the SC in July.
- [85] Further to the decision of CPM-15 (2021) to defer the adoption of the revised IC terms of reference and rules of procedure to allow more time for review, the IFU had liaised with those parties who had requested this deferral. The proposed modifications would be presented to the next SPG meeting, to be held in October 2021, with a view to proposing the revised text for adoption at CPM-16 (2022). The modifications requested include nominating the RPP0 and SC representatives to the IC as permanent observers rather than as IC members, and transferring the responsibility for oversight of dispute avoidance and settlement processes from the IC to the CPM Bureau.
- [86] The CPM Bureau had now agreed that revision of the dispute avoidance and settlement procedures should begin, and it is intended that the revised procedure be prepared and presented to CPM-16 (2022) for adoption.
- [87] The IC had approved the creation of an IC Team on Banana Fusarium Wilt (TR4).
- [88] Three new guides and training materials had been released so far in 2021: the *Pest status guide*; the *Prevention, preparedness and response guidelines for Spodoptera frugiperda*; and the Beyond Compliance Tools. The revised *Surveillance guide* is due for publication in October 2021. There are plans to hold four webinars to promote the use of these new guides. Development of the e-Learning courses under the Common Market for Southern and Eastern Africa (COMESA) project continues, with two courses (on *Pest risk analysis* and *Export certification*) nearing completion and the other two (on *Surveillance and reporting obligations* and *Inspection*) in the initial stages of development.
- [89] Six draft specifications for IPPC guides and training materials and the Terms of Reference for the IC Sub-group on National Reporting Obligations had been submitted to consultation from 1 July to 31 August 2021. The compiled comments had been posted to the IPP.
- [90] Work on the proposed evolution of the IRSS to a “sustainable system” continues. A study had been carried out and feedback on the draft text of the study report was currently being incorporated. An executive summary would be discussed during the next SPG meeting in October and after that in November during the IC meeting, with a view to presenting the reviewed proposal to CPM-16 (2022) for adoption.
- [91] The SC Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for the report and invited the SC to comment.
- [92] One SC member expressed support for the SC representative on the IC not being an IC member, as it would not be feasible for someone to cover the functions of both committees. The Secretariat clarified that the request to update the terms of reference was from the CPM Bureau and the idea had been to align the terms of reference with those of the SC. The SC Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the rules of procedure for the Standards Committee are clear that a representative from the IC may participate in the SC as an *observer*.¹⁸
- [93] With regard to the IC Team on Banana Fusarium Wilt (TR4), the Secretariat offered to share the list of members and the terms of reference with the SC.
- [94] The Secretariat confirmed that the four e-learning courses that are due to be finished by May 2022 will only be available in English, but could be translated into other languages if support for this were secured from partner organizations.
- [95] The SC:

¹⁷ 06_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep.

¹⁸ Rules of procedure for the Standards Committee, Rule 7 (in *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*).

(10) *noted* the update from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit of the IPPC Secretariat.

5.3 Report from the Integration and Support Team of the IPPC

- [96] The Secretariat presented an update from the IST.¹⁹ Achievements of the IYPH were reported separately under agenda item 5.1.
- [97] The IST had coordinated and organized internal Secretariat meetings, CPM Bureau meetings, IYPH International Steering Committee meetings, the SPG meeting and CPM-15 (2021). The team had also coordinated the establishment of the CPM focus groups on Communication, on Climate change and Phytosanitary Issues, and on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 Development Agenda Items, agreed by CPM-15 (2021), and the focus groups had already had their first meetings.
- [98] The IST continues to support the communication aspects of the prevention pillar of the FAO Global Action on Fall Armyworm Control and had coordinated the study on the impact of climate change on plant pests and its subsequent publication, referred to under agenda item 5.1.
- [99] Information management activities had included maintaining and updating the IPP and the IYPH website, including online tools. Work to improve the IPP, based on the recommendations of the external company engaged to review the website, was ongoing, and a consultant had recently been appointed to improve the structure and accessibility of the website.
- [100] The IST had continued to implement and develop the IPPC Publications Plan and to produce and implement the communications plan for the CPM and the headline news and announcements. Many advocacy materials had also been produced, particularly in relation to IYPH, which had been the focus for the last 18 months. The team is working on an IPPC communication strategy, which is being developed under the auspices of the newly established CPM Focus Group on Communications.
- [101] With regard to liaison and partnership activities, the IST is working on the IPPC Partnership Strategy following the comments made during the SPG meeting in 2020, and this would be discussed at the SPG meeting in October. The IST continues to participate in activities with other FAO divisions. It attends weekly calls of the “biodiversity communication flotilla”, which is an initiative that brings together all the biodiversity-related international conventions. It also liaises with the Secretariat of the UN Committee on World Food Security and with the FAO Right to Food Team on plant health and food security, which has resulted in the inclusion of IPPC and plant health-related considerations in the approved text of voluntary guidelines on food systems and nutrition. The IST had organized a side event at the 47th Session of the Committee on World Food Security, in collaboration with the FAO Right to Food team.
- [102] Finally, the IST had coordinated the organization of the 2021 IPPC regional workshops and is also coordinating the organization of the Technical Consultation Among RPPOs (TC-RPPOs) meetings scheduled for October and November 2021.
- [103] The SC Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for the report and invited the SC to comment. There were no comments.
- [104] The SC:
- (11) *noted* the update from the Integration and Support Team of the IPPC Secretariat.

¹⁹ 07_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Jul.

6. Technical panels: urgent issues

Technical Panel for the Glossary

- [105] The Secretariat explained that as Olga LAVRENTJEVA, who had resigned from the SC, had been the Russian language expert on the TPG and the TPG Steward, there was now a need to open a call for a Russian language expert and to select a new steward.
- [106] The Secretariat informed the SC that the former Steward, Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France), was willing to be the Steward. Some SC members expressed support for the selection of Ms BOUHOT-DELDUC, but highlighted the need for succession planning to avoid having to rely on former SC members to be the TPG Steward.
- [107] The SC recalled that the TPG prefers its members to be members of the SC. The Secretariat recalled that historically the TPG Steward was one of the language experts on the panel and also confirmed that at the moment, following the resignation of Ms LAVRENTJEVA, there are no SC members on the panel. One SC member commented that this absence of SC members illustrated why there was a need for succession planning, because the work of the panel is critical to the work of the SC and so it is important that it includes SC members.
- [108] The SC Chairperson invited the SC to propose an SC member to take on the role of TPG Steward. The Secretariat commented that, for the moment, there is support from the Assistant TPG Steward and Ms BOUHOT-DELDUC, both of whom are very experienced members of the panel, so any new member of the TPG would be supported in their role. The SC was unable, however, to find an SC member to take on the role of Steward.
- [109] The SC:
- (12) *requested* that the Secretariat open a call for an expert on the Russian language to join the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG);
 - (13) *selected* Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) as Steward of the TPG on a temporary basis and *agreed* to open a discussion in 2022 to select an SC member to replace her.

7. Any other business

- [110] The Secretariat presented a summary of the e-decision on the selection of experts for the EWG on the Annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38. The summary of the e-decision (e-decision 2021_eSC_Nov_01) had been posted on the IPP. Fourteen complete nominations had been received and the Secretariat had sent invitations to the eight experts ranked highest by the SC. The SC agreed to select these experts as follows (seven members plus one invited expert):

Member	Ms Nedilskyj (Argentina)
Member	Ms Grimault, European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) (France)
Member	Mr Randall (New Zealand)
Member	Ms Osterbauer (USA)
Member	Mr Uematsu (Japan)
Member	Dr Tshikhudo (South Africa)
Member	Mr Schenk, EPPO (Netherlands)
Invited expert	Ms Langens (International Seed Federation).

- [111] The Secretariat informed the SC that the EWG would take place from 7–15 October 2021.

- [112] The SC:

- (14) *selected* experts for the EWG on the Annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 as discussed at this meeting.

8. Date and type of the next SC meetings

- [113] The next SC meeting will be a focused meeting scheduled for 3–4 November 2021 (FM 2021/05). The agenda will include the submissions made to the Call for Topics, some updates and some aspects of the 2022 SC work programme (e.g. EWGs). The SC November meeting is scheduled for 15–19 November 2021 (2021/05) and will concentrate on reviewing the draft ISPMs that are to go for adoption to CPM-16 (2022). Both meetings will be held in virtual mode. The Secretariat also reminded SC members again about the forthcoming review of draft ISPMs on the OCS.
- [114] The Secretariat gave an update on the number of submissions to the Call for Topics: 12 submissions had now been received – of which six were for standards, five for DPs and one for a guide – and a further three submissions were pending.
- [115] The Secretariat confirmed that the deadline for observers at SC meetings is usually one month before the meeting, but more information would be available when invitations are sent to SC members.

9. Recommendations to CPM Bureau, Strategic Planning Group or CPM-16 (2022)

- [116] The SC noted that the following will be recommended to CPM-16 (2021):
- *List of topics for IPPC standards* (to agree changes in the status of topics) (see section 4.1 of this report);
 - revisions to the Standard Setting Procedure (for adoption) (see section 4.3 of this report).

10. Close of the meeting

- [117] The SC Chairperson thanked all participants for their contributions and support, and then closed the meeting.

Appendix 1: Agenda

N	Agenda item	Document number / link	Presenter / (IPPC Secretariat support)
1.	Opening of the Meeting		
1.1.	Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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_Sep	Chairperson
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1.	Documents list	02_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	MUSHEGYAN
3.2.	Participants list	03_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep SC membership list	MUSHEGYAN
4.	Follow-ups from previous meetings		
4.1.	Review of List of topics for IPPC Standards	04_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	PETERSON / (CASSIN)
4.2.	Discussions on the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 development agenda items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commodity- and pathway-specific ISPMs - Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities - Diagnostic laboratory networking 	11_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep 08_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep 09_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	BISHOP / (MOREIRA / SHAMILOV) CÔTÉ / (SHAMILOV / KISS) GONZÁLEZ / (MOREIRA / MANGILI / CASSIN)
4.3.	Phytosanitary treatments (PTs): Proposal for a revised process for the development of PTs	10_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	OPATOWSKI / (KISS)
5.	Updates and enhancing synergies and areas of collaboration		
5.1.	Report from IYPH	05_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	MAZZUCHELLI
5.2.	Updates from the Implementation and facilitation Unit (IFU) of the IPPC Secretariat	06_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	KOUMBA
5.3.	Updates from the Integration and support team (IST) of the IPPC Secretariat	07_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	DENG
6.	Technical Panels urgent issues		
6.1.	Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Call for experts - TPG Steward 	–	SHAMILOV
7.	Any other business		
7.1.	Selection of experts for the EWG on the Annex Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009) to ISPM 38	–	SHAMILOV

Next meetings dates and types		
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- 3-4 November 2021: Tentative: Standards Committee: Focused meeting 2021/04- 15-19 November 2021: Tentative: Standards Committee meeting 2021/05	Secretariat / Chairperson
9.	Recommendations to CPM Bureau, SPG or CPM-16 (if any)	Chairperson
10.	Close of the meeting	Chairperson

Appendix 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
Meeting documents			
01_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	2.2	Agenda	2021-08-09
02_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	3.1	Documents list	2021-09-07
03_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	3.2	Participants list	2021-09-07
04_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	4.1	Review of List of topics for IPPC Standards	2021-09-07
05_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	5.1	Report from IYPH	2021-09-07
06_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	5.2	Updates from the Implementation and facilitation Unit (IFU) of the IPPC Secretariat	2021-09-07
07_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	5.3	Updates from the Integration and support team (IST) of the IPPC Secretariat	2021-09-07
08_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	4.2	Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities	2021-09-07
09_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	4.2	Diagnostic laboratory networking	2021-09-07
10_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	4.3	Phytosanitary treatments (PTs): Proposal for a revised process for the development of PTs	2021-09-09
11_SC_FM_Tel_2021_Sep	4.2	Commodity- and pathway-specific ISPMs	2021-09-09

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

Links	Agenda item	Document link
SC membership list	3.2	SC membership list
Next meetings dates and types	8	Tentative: Standards Committee: Focused meeting 2021/05 Tentative: Standards Committee meeting 2021/05

Appendix 3: Participants list

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

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Africa Member	Ms Alphonsine LOUHOARI TOKOZABA Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'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) CPM-15 (2021) 2 nd term / 3 years	2024
✓	Africa Member SC-7	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) 2 nd term / 3 years	2022
✓	Africa Member	Mr Theophilus Mwendwa MUTUI Acting Director, Technical Services Division. National Biosafety Authority, Pest Control Products Board (PCPB) Building, Loresho, off Waiyaki way P.O. Box 28251-00100 Nairobi KENYA Tel: +254 20 267 8667 Mob: +254 725 294445	mutuitm@yahoo.com	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Africa Member	Mr Prudence Tonator ATTIPOE Deputy Director, Head Plant Quarantine Division. Ministry of Food and Agriculture P.O. Box AM 94 Amasaman-Accra GHANA Tel: 0209793292, 0262235397	tonattipoe@yahoo.co.uk	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	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 Mob: (+66) 8 9128 6488	rakkrai@yahoo.com chonticha.r@doa.in.th	CPM-14 (2019) 1 st term / 3 years	2022

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	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	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Asia Member SC-7	Mr Masahiro SAI Senior Researcher (Head of Section) Planning and Coordination Section, Research Division Yokohama Plant Protection Station Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) JAPAN Tel: +81-45-211-7165	masahiro_sai670@maff.go.jp	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 2 nd term / 3 years	2024
	Asia Member	Mr Xiaodong FENG Deputy Director of the Division of Plant Quarantine, NATESC Ministry of Agriculture No. 20, Maizidian Street, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100125 CHINA Tel: (8610)59194524	fengxdong@agri.gov.cn	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 2 nd term / 3 years	2024
✓	Europe Member	Mr Harry ARIJS European Commission, DG Sante G-1, Plant Health Rue Froissart 101, 6/60 1040 Brussels BELGIUM Tel: +3222987645	Harry.ARIJS@ec.europa.eu	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	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) 1 st term / 3 years	2022
✓	Europe Member SC-7	Mr Samuel BISHOP Plant Health Policy team Room 11G35 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs National Agri-Food Innovation Campus Sand Hutton York North Yorkshire UNITED KINGDOM YO41 4LZ Tel: +44 (0) 2080262506 Mob: +44 (0) 7827976902	sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 2 nd term / 3 years	2024

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	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) CPM-15 (2021) 4 th term / 3 years	2024
✓	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) 1 st term / 3 years	2022
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member SC-7	Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ Pest Risk Analyst 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) CPM-15 (2021) 2 nd term / 3 years	2024
✓	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) 3 rd term / 3 years	2022
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal Av. Presidente Bulnes 140, 4 th floor, Santiago, CHILE Tel: + 56-2 234 5120	alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gov.cl	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 3 rd term / 3 years	2024
✓	Near East Member	Ms Maryam Jalili MOGHADAM Head of Phytosanitary and Plant Quarantine Bureau, Plant Protection Organization, Agriculture Ministry. No.24, the Eastern first floor, Eastern Shahrokh Alley, Mordad Street, Golha (flowers) Square, Fatemi Square, Tehran. Postal code: 1413973143 IRAN Cel: 00989126049255	marypaya@yahoo.com jalili@ppo.ir	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Near East Member SC-7	Mr Nader ELBADRY Phytosanitary Specialist, Central Administration of Plant Quarantine, 6 Michel Bakhom St., Dokki, Giza, EGYPT Tel: +201096799493	nader.badry@gmail.com	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
	Near East Member	Mr Imad (M.E) Jrouh AL-AWAD Director Assistant of plant protection & Phytosanitary Department / Ministry of Agriculture. JORDAN Tel: 0096265686151 Ext. 309 Mob: 00962795363297	alawademad@yahoo.com	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Near East Member	Mr Mohamed Lahbib BEN JAMÂA Direction of Plant Health and Control of Agricultural Inputs, 30, Rue Alain Savary, 1002-Tunis. TUNISIA Mob: +216.98.265.525	benjamaaml@gmail.com	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	North America Member SC-7	Ms Marina ZLOTINA IPPC Technical Director USDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) 4700 River Rd, 5c-03.37 Riverdale, MD 20737 USA Tel: 1-301-851-2200 Cell: 1 -301-832-0611	Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 3 rd term / 3 years	2024
✓	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	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	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) 1 st term / 3 years	2022
✓	Southwest Pacific Member SC-7	Ms Sophie Alexia PETERSON Director, Pacific Engagement and International Plant Health Australian Chief Plant Protection Office Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment AUSTRALIA Tel: (+61) 2 6272 3769 Mob: +61 466 867 519	sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Southwest Pacific Member	Mr David Boas TENAKANAI General Manager- Technical & Advisory Division, National Agriculture Quarantine & Inspection Authority (NAQIA) P. O. Box 741, Port Moresby, NCD, PNG PAPUA NEW GUINEA Tel: (675) 3136900 Mob: (675) 74482319	DTenakanai@naqia.gov.pg dtenakanai@gmail.com	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024

Role	Name	Email address
IC / Observer	Mr Ahmed M. Abdellah ABDELMOTTALEB	bidoeng@yahoo.com
Observer / USA	Ms Barbara SPANGLER	barbara.r.spangler@usda.gov
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
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	Mr Descartes KOUMBA Agricultural Officer	Descartes.Koumba@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Arop DENG Integration and Support Team Lead	Arop.Deng@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Riccardo MAZZUCHELLI Public Information Specialist	Riccardo.Mazzucchelli@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	John GILMORE Agricultural Officer	John.Gilmore@fao.org

Appendix 4: Proposed changes to the List of topics for IPPC standards (LOT) as discussed at this SC meeting and recommended to the CPM for the adoption

[1] The table presented in this appendix demonstrates the SCs agreement (in red) to the proposed actions for each topic, as developed by the SC working group, for submission to CPM-16 for their adoption.

Proposed action	Reasoning	Table 2: Topics for EWGs, and TPPT (sorted by priority, drafting body, then status)								
		Topic No.	Current title	Priority	Drafting body	Added to the list	Lead Steward / TP Lead (Country, Date assigned)	Assistant Stewards (Country, Date assigned)	Spec No	Status
Remove SC agreed – suggested to add material to risk management draft	Priority 4 Pending Added 2001	2001-001	Efficacy of measures	4	EWG	ICPM 03 (2001)			8	00. Pending
Remove SC agreed	Removed at SC July 2021 meeting (due to the lack of data required to support treatments)	2006-010	Revision of ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade): Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade	2	EWG	CPM 01 (2006)	Ms. Marina ZLOTINA (US, 2016- 05)	Mr. Ezequiel FERRO (AR, 2016- 05)	31	04. Draft ISPM under development
Maintain as Pending (Awaiting CPM decision) SC agreed and proposed for the SC to update the Specification	Added 2008 Specification may need revision after SCTF findings provided	2008-001	Minimizing pest movement by sea containers	1	EWG	CPM 03 (2008)	Mr. Samuel BISHOP (GB, 2019- 05)	Mr. Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (CA, 2019-05)	51	00. Pending
Maintain Pending (Awaiting CPM decision) SC agreed and proposed for the SC to update the Specification	Added 2008 Specification may need revision after SCTF findings provided	2008-002	Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts	3	EWG	CPM 03 (2008)	Mr. Samuel BISHOP (GB, 2019- 05)		52	00. Pending
Remove (Reference to the IC for their consideration with other materials being developed). SC agreed	Added 2008 Specification may need revision, perhaps with reference to CPM Recommendation on Contaminant Pests and findings of the SCTF. Calls for EWG members have been made with little interest	2008-004	Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages	2	EWG	CPM 03 (2008)	Mr. Alvaro SEPULVEDA LUQUE (CL, 2016-05)	Mr. Pelenato FONOTI (WS, 2017 05)	55	03. Specification approved

Proposed action	Reasoning	Table 2: Topics for EWGs, and TPPT (sorted by priority, drafting body, then status)								
		Topic No.	Current title	Priority	Drafting body	Added to the list	Lead Steward / TP Lead (Country, Date assigned)	Assistant Stewards (Country, Date assigned)	Spec No	Status
Remove (The approved specification may be useful as a reference to NPPOs or the TPCS) SC agreed	Added 2008 This specification and draft ISPM will require revision given the recent work on Commodity Standards, as the topic is too broad in scope.	2008-005	International movement of cut flowers and foliage	4	EWG	CPM 03 (2008)	Ana Lilia MONTEALEGRE LARA (MX, 2012-04)	Ms. Esther KIMANI (KE, 2014- 11)	56	00. Pending
No Action	In progress	2008-006	Use of specific import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system)	4	EWG	CPM 03 (2008)	Mr. Ezequiel FERRO (AR, 2019-05)	Mr. Moses Adegboyega ADEWUMI (NG, 2016-05)	64	06. Draft ISPM to first consultation
Remove (The approved specification may be useful as a reference to NPPOs or the TPCS) SC agreed	Added 2008 This specification and draft ISPM will require revision given the recent work on Commodity Standards as the topic is too broad in scope	2008-007	International movement of grain	1	EWG	CPM 03 (2008)	Ms. Sophie PETERSON (AU, 2019- 05)	Shaza OMAR (EG, 2015-11)	60	00. Pending
Remove (The approved specification may be useful as a reference to NPPOs or the TPCS) SC agreed	Added 2008 This specification and draft ISPM will require revision given the recent work on Commodity Standards. Unsure if this has been consulted	2008-008	International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood	2	EWG	CPM 03 (2008)	Mr. Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (CA, 2017-05)	Ms. Marina ZLOTINA (US, 2015- 11)	57	04. Draft ISPM under development
No Action	In progress	2009-002	Revision of ISPM 4 Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas)	4	EWG	CPM 05 (2010)	Ms. Marina ZLOTINA (US, 2015-11)	Mr. David KAMANGIRA (MW, 2019-05)	58	06. Draft ISPM to first consultation
No Action	In progress	2014-001	Pest risk management for quarantine pests	2	EWG	CPM 09 (2014)	Ms. Joanne WILSON (NZ, 2019-05)	Ms. Marina ZLOTINA (US, 2019-05)	63	04. Draft ISPM under development
No Action	In progress through the TPPT	2014-003	Requirements for the use of chemical treatments as a phytosanitary measure	3	TPPT	CPM 09 (2014)	Mr. David OPATOWSKI (IL, 2017- 11)	Mr. Michael ORMSBY (NZ, 2016- 11)	62	04. Draft ISPM under development
No Action	In progress	2014-007	Requirements for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure (Revision to ISPM 18)	1	TPPT	CPM 09 (2014)	Mr. David OPATOWSKI (IL, 2016- 11)	Guy HALLMAN (-, 2020-10)	62	06. Draft ISPM to first consultation

Proposed action	Reasoning	Table 2: Topics for EWGs, and TPPT (sorted by priority, drafting body, then status)								
		Topic No.	Current title	Priority	Drafting body	Added to the list	Lead Steward / TP Lead (Country, Date assigned)	Assistant Stewards (Country, Date assigned)	Spec No	Status
No Action	In progress	2015-004	Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (Annex to ISPM 39: International movement of wood)	3	EWG	CPM 12 (2017)	Mr. Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (CA, 2019-05)	- HERMAWAN (ID, 2017-05)		03. Specification approved
Remove (Provide the approved specification as a reference for the EWG revising ISPM 11) SC agreed	Priority 4 Could this concept be addressed as part of the review of ISPM 11 or may become irrelevant due to the revision.	2015-010	Supplement on Guidance on the concept of probability of transfer to a suitable host and establishment as used in a pest risk analysis for quarantine pests to ISPM 11	4	EWG	CPM 11 (2016)	Ms. Marina ZLOTINA (US, 2016- 05)	Ms. Esther KIMANI (KE, 2016- 05)	68	03. Specification approved
No Action	In progress	2015-011	Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export	2	EWG	CPM 11 (2016)	Ms. Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (FR, 2016-05)	Mr. Masahiro SAI (JP, 2019-05)	67	07. Draft ISPM to second or subsequent consultation
No Action	In progress	2015-014	Audit in the phytosanitary context	1	EWG	CPM 11 (2016)	Mr. Alvaro SEPULVEDA LUQUE (CL, 2016-05)	Mr. Steve CÔTÉ (CA, 2020-11)	66	07. Draft ISPM to second or subsequent consultation
No Action	In progress	2018-009	Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (Annex to ISPM 38 International movement of seeds)	1	EWG	CPM 14 (2019)	Ms. Marina ZLOTINA (US, 2019-05)	Mr. Hernando MORERA-GONZÁLEZ (CR, 2019-05)		03. Specification approved

Appendix 5: Modifications proposed to the IPPC Standard Setting Procedure as adopted by CPM-11 (2016) (Appendix 07 of the CPM-11 report)

INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION STANDARD SETTING PROCEDURE (ANNEX 3 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES)

- [1] The process for the development of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) is divided into four stages:
- Stage 1: Developing the *List of topics for IPPC standards*
 - Stage 2: Drafting
 - Stage 3: Consultation for draft ISPMs
 - Stage 4: Adoption and publication.
- [2] Relevant Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM) / Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) decisions on many aspects of the Standard setting procedure have been compiled in the IPPC Procedure manual for standard setting, which is available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP, www.ippc.int).

STAGE 1: Developing the *List of topics for IPPC standards*

Step 1: Call for topics

- [3] The IPPC Secretariat makes a call for topics¹ every two years. Contracting parties (CPs) and regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) submit detailed proposals for new topics or for the revision of existing ISPMs to the IPPC Secretariat. Submissions should be accompanied with a draft specification (except for Diagnostic protocols (DPs)), a literature review and justification that the proposed topic meets the CPM-approved criteria for topics (available in the IPPC Procedure manual for standard setting). To indicate a global need for the proposed topic, submitters are encouraged to gain support from CPs and RPPOs in other regions.
- [4] A separate call for submissions for Phytosanitary treatments (PTs) is made.
- [5] The Standards Committee (SC), taking into account the IPPC Strategic Framework and the *Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics*, reviews the submissions. The SC reviews the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (including subjects), adding topics and giving each topic a recommended priority. This list is recommended to the CPM.
- [6] The CPM reviews, changes and adopts the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, including assigning a priority for each topic.
- [7] A revised List of topics for IPPC standards is made available.

Step 2: Annual review of the *List of topics for IPPC standards*

- [8] Annually the SC reviews the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and recommends changes (including deletions, or changes in priority) to the CPM. In exceptional circumstances, in response to a specific need, the SC may recommend an addition to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

¹ This is a call for "technical area", "topic", "Diagnostic Protocol (DP)", see the *Hierarchy of terms for standards* in the IPPC Procedure manual for standard setting.

- [9] The CPM reviews the *List of topics for IPPC standards* recommended by the SC. The CPM changes and adopts the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, including assigning a priority for each topic. A revised *List of topics for IPPC standards* is made available.
- [10] In any year, when a situation arises in which an ISPM or a revision to an ISPM is required urgently, the CPM may add such a topic into the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

Stage 2: Drafting

Step 3: Development of a specification

- [11] The SC should be encouraged to assign a lead steward and assistant(s) for each topic. These assistants could be from outside the SC, such as potential SC replacement members, former SC members, technical panel (TP) members or expert working group members.
- [12] The SC reviews the draft specification. The SC should endeavour to approve draft specifications for consultation at the SC meeting following the CPM session when new topics have been added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.
- [13] Once the SC approves the draft specification for consultation, the IPPC Secretariat makes it publicly available. The IPPC Secretariat solicits comments through the IPPC Online Comment System (OCS) from CPs, RPPOs, relevant international organizations, and other entities as decided by the SC. The length of the consultation for draft specifications is 60 days. The IPPC contact point or information point submits comments to the IPPC Secretariat using the OCS.
- [14] The IPPC Secretariat compiles the comments received, makes them publicly available and submits them to the steward and the SC for consideration. The specification is revised and approved by the SC, and made publicly available.

Step 4: Preparation of a draft ISPM²

- [15] An expert drafting group (EDG) (i.e. expert working group (EWG) or TP) drafts or revises the draft ISPM in accordance with the relevant specification. The SC may request the IPPC Secretariat to solicit comments from scientists around the world to ensure the scientific quality of draft DPs. The resulting draft ISPM is recommended to the SC.
- [16] The SC or the SC working group established by the SC (SC-7) reviews the draft ISPM at a meeting (for a DP or PT, the SC reviews it electronically) and decides whether to approve it for consultation, to return it to the steward or an EDG or to put it on hold. When the SC-7 meets, comments from any SC members should be taken into account.

STAGE 3: Consultation and review

- [17] Draft ISPMs are submitted to two consultation periods except for draft DPs **and draft PTs** which are submitted to one consultation period unless decided otherwise by the SC.

Step 5: First consultation

- [18] Once the SC approves the draft ISPM for the first consultation, the IPPC Secretariat makes it publicly available. The IPPC Secretariat solicits comments through the OCS from CPs, RPPOs, relevant international organizations, national plant protection services of non-CPs, and other entities as decided by the SC. The length of the First consultation for draft ISPMs is 90 days. The IPPC contact point or information point submits comments to the IPPC Secretariat using the OCS. The IPPC Secretariat

² This procedure refers to "draft ISPMs" and "standards" to simplify wording, but also applies to any part of an ISPM, including annexes, appendices or supplements.

compiles the comments received, makes them publicly available and submits them to the steward for consideration.

- [19] The steward reviews the comments, prepares responses to the comments, revises the draft ISPM and submits them to the IPPC Secretariat. These are made available to the SC. Taking the comments into account, the SC-7 or TP (for draft DPs or draft PTs) revises the draft ISPM and recommends it to the SC.
- [20] For draft ISPMs other than draft DPs and draft PTs, responses to the major issues raised in the comments are recorded in the report of the SC-7 meeting. Once the SC-7 recommends the draft ISPM to the SC, the IPPC Secretariat makes it publicly available.
- [21] For draft PTs, the SC may recommend them for adoption by the CPM if no significant or major technical comments are made during the first consultation.
- [22] For draft PTs or draft DPs, once the SC has approved them and the responses to comments, the drafts and responses to comments are made publicly available. A summary of the major issues discussed by the SC for the draft DP or draft PT is recorded in the report of the following SC meeting.
- [23] Alternatively, to approving the draft ISPM, the SC may for example return it to the steward or an EDG, submit it for another round of consultation or put it on hold.

Step 6: Second consultation

- [24] Once the SC or SC-7 approves the draft ISPM for the second consultation, the IPPC Secretariat solicits comments through the OCS from CPs, RPPOs, relevant international organizations, national plant protection services of non-CPs, and other entities as decided by the SC. The length of the Second consultation is 90 days. The IPPC contact point or information point submits the comments to the IPPC Secretariat using the OCS. The IPPC Secretariat compiles the comments received, makes them publicly available and submits them to the steward for consideration.
- [25] The steward reviews the comments, prepares responses to the comments, revises the draft ISPM and submits the revised draft ISPM to the IPPC Secretariat. These are made available to the SC and the revised draft ISPM, other than draft PTs, is made available to CPs and RPPOs.
- [26] The SC reviews the comments, the steward's responses to the comments and the revised draft ISPM. For draft ISPMs other than draft PTs, the SC provides a summary of the major issues discussed by the SC. These summaries are recorded in the report of the SC meeting.
- [27] For draft PTs, once the SC has approved them and the responses to comments, the drafts and responses to comments are made publicly available. A summary of the major issues discussed by the SC for the draft PT is recorded in the report of the following SC meeting.
- [28] Alternatively, to recommending the draft ISPM to the CPM, the SC may for example return it to the steward or an EDG, submit it for another round of consultation, or put it on hold.

STAGE 4: Adoption and publication

Step 7: Adoption

- For draft ISPMs other than draft DPs:

- [29] Following recommendation by the SC, the draft ISPM is included on the agenda of the CPM session. The IPPC Secretariat should make the draft ISPM presented to the CPM for adoption available in the languages of the Organization as soon as possible and at least six weeks before the opening of the CPM session.
- [30] If all CPs support the adoption of the draft ISPM, the CPM should adopt the ISPM without discussion.

- [31] If a CP does not support the adoption of the draft ISPM, the CP may submit an objection³. An objection must be accompanied by technical justification and suggestions for improvement of the draft ISPM, which are likely to be acceptable to other CPs and be submitted to the IPPC Secretariat no later than 3 weeks before the CPM session. Concerned CPs should make every effort to seek agreement before the CPM session. The objection will be added to the CPM agenda and the CPM will decide on a way forward.
- [32] When the need for a minor technical update to an adopted ISPM is identified by a TP or the SC, the SC can recommend the update for adoption by the CPM. The IPPC Secretariat should make the update to the adopted ISPM available in the languages of the organization as soon as possible and at least six weeks prior to the opening of the CPM meeting. Minor technical updates to adopted ISPMs presented to the CPM are subject to the objection process as described above.
- For draft DPs:
- [33] The CPM has delegated its authority to the SC to adopt DPs on its behalf. Once the SC approves the DP, the IPPC Secretariat makes it available on defined dates twice a year and CPs are notified⁴. CPs have 45 days to review the approved DP and submit an objection, if any, along with the technical justification and suggestions for improvement of the approved DP. If no objection is received, the DP is considered adopted. DPs adopted through this process are noted by the CPM and attached to the report of the CPM meeting. If a CP has an objection, the draft DP should be returned to the SC.
- [34] When a technical revision⁵ is required for an adopted DP, the SC can adopt the updates to adopted DPs via electronic means. The revised DPs shall be made publicly available as soon as the SC adopts them. DPs revised through this process are noted by the CPM and attached to the report of the CPM meeting.

Step 8: Publication

- [35] The adopted ISPM is made publicly available.
- [36] CPs and RPPOs may form a Language Review Group (LRG) and, following the CPM-agreed LRG process⁶, may propose modifications to translations of adopted ISPMs.

³ An objection should be a technically supported objection to the adoption of the draft standard in its current form and sent through the official IPPC contact point (Refer to the *Criteria to help determine whether a formal objection is technically justified* as approved by CPM-8 (2013), recorded in the IPPC Procedure manual for standard setting).

⁴ For translation of DPs, contracting parties would follow the mechanism for requesting the translation for DPs into FAO languages posted on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/member-consultation-draft-ispms/mechanism-translate-diagnostic-protocols-languages/>).

⁵ A technical revision for DPs has been defined by the SC and is recorded in the IPPC Procedure manual for standard setting.

⁶ <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/standards-setting/ispms/language-review-groups/>