



# **REPORT**

## **Task Force on Topics**

**Virtual meeting**

**4-6 October 2021**

**IPPC Secretariat**

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

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
4.	2021 Call for Topics: a review of submissions for new topics.....	4
5.	Standards .....	5
5.1	2021-002_NZ_Revision of ISPM 26 Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (2021-010).....	5
5.2	2021-003_APPPC_ISPM XX International Movement of Mango Fruit (2021-011)	5
5.3	2021-004_JP_Requirements for the use of diagnostic testing laboratories (2021-012) .....	6
5.4	2021-010_JP_New Annex 1 “Field inspection” to ISPM 23 (2021-018) .....	7
5.5	2021-012_PPPO_Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid (2021-020) .....	7
6.	Implementation resources.....	8
6.1	2021-001_CA_Guide on Performing Audits in the Phytosanitary Context (2021-009) .....	8
6.2	2021-016_UA_Development of authorization programme for use of fumigation (2021-024).....	9
7.	Diagnostic protocols.....	10
7.1	2021-005_EG_Diagnostic Protocol for <i>Bactrocera zonata</i> (Saunders, 1842) (2021-013) .....	11
7.2	2021-006_NZ_Diagnostic protocol for <i>Dickeya</i> spp. on potato (2021-014).....	11
7.3	2021-007_NZ_Diagnostic protocol for <i>Heterobasidion annosum</i> (2021-015).....	11
7.4	2021-008_NZ_Diagnostic protocol for <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> (Fall Armyworm) (2021-016).....	11
7.5	2021-009_NZ_Diagnostic Protocol for <i>Drosophila suzukii</i> (2021-017).....	11
7.6	2021-014_KE_ <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> (2021-022).....	12
7.7	2021-017_CN_Tomato brown rugose fruit virus (2021-025).....	12
8.	Follow up on the incomplete submissions.....	12
8.1	2021-011_LK_Field Certification for export oriented fruits (2021-019).....	12
8.2	2021-015_KE_ISPM 31 - Methodologies for sampling of consignments (2021-023) .....	12
8.3	2021-013_KE_Methodology for Field Sampling (2021-021).....	13
9.	Recommendations to the SC and IC.....	13
10.	Any other business.....	13
10.1	Streamlining the TFT preliminary assessment online form .....	13
11.	Close of the meeting .....	14
	Appendix 1: Agenda.....	15
	Appendix 2: Documents list.....	17
	Appendix 3: Participants list .....	18
	Appendix 4: Tables of the TFT recommendations.....	20

## 1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as "Secretariat") opened the 2021 Task Force on Topics virtual meeting (TFT) on behalf of the Secretariat and welcomed all participants.
- [2] Due to the absence of the TFT Chairperson (Ms Marica GATT), the TFT elected Mr Steve CÔTE (Canada) as the TFT Chairperson for this meeting.

## 2. Meeting arrangements

### 2.1 Election of the Rapporteur

- [3] The TFT elected Mr Lalith Bandula KUMARASINGHE (New Zealand) as Rapporteur.

### 2.2 Adoption of the agenda

- [4] The TFT adopted the Agenda (Appendix 1).

## 3. Administrative matters

- [5] 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.

## 4. 2021 Call for Topics: a review of submissions for new topics

- [6] The Secretariat introduced the paper for this agenda item<sup>1</sup>. By the end of the 2021 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation (4 May – 15 September 2021)<sup>2</sup>, the Secretariat received 14 complete and three incomplete (without draft specifications for proposed standards and IPPC guides and training materials) topic submissions (seven standards, three implementation resources, and seven diagnostic protocols (DPs) in total) from eight IPPC contracting parties and two regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs). The Secretariat attempted to follow up with the submitters of the incomplete submissions. However, at the time of the meeting, draft specifications hadn't been submitted.
- [7] Five out of seven TFT members provided detailed preliminary assessments and scorings of complete topic submissions using the online forms. TFT members did not review their country submissions. This thorough assessment was intended to facilitate the discussions at the meeting and form the basis of the TFT recommendations to the Standards Committee (SC) and the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC).
- [8] Some TFT members noted that the three incomplete submissions were missing a lot of information, making it hard to understand the topic without an open-ended interpretation. Still, they recognized that not all contracting parties have the capacity to prepare complete topic submissions. Hence, highlighting the importance of securing topic submissions from the countries that submitted incomplete proposals, the TFT members suggested that the Secretariat extend the submission deadline to those countries, offer assistance for submitters to elaborate their topics, and provide examples of successful submissions.
- [9] The Secretariat followed up with the submitters as requested, and two missing draft specifications for proposed standards were submitted during the TFT meeting.
- [10] One TFT member asked whether the TFT members whose countries submitted the proposals may contribute to the discussions. The TFT agreed that the discussions should first be among the TFT members who reviewed the submission, and then if there are questions, the submitter could be asked to answer them or provide clarifications if required.

---

<sup>1</sup> 04\_TFT\_Tel\_2021\_Oct.

<sup>2</sup> Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation web page: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-and-implementation/call-for-topics-standards-and-implementation/>

## 5. Standards

### 5.1 2021-002\_NZ\_Revision of ISPM 26 Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (2021-010)

- [11] The Secretariat introduced a summary<sup>3</sup> of the information submitted by the four TFT members who reviewed the topic using the preliminary assessment online forms. The proposed standard “Revision of ISPM 26 Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies” was submitted by New Zealand (2021-010), so the TFT member from New Zealand did not review the submission.
- [12] One TFT member expressed interest in the topic, particularly the aspect of developing criteria for recognizing when an incursion has occurred. He questioned the statement that ISPM 26 is too open to interpretation and the statement about ISPM 26 not responding adequately to the needs of countries that do not have fruit flies. Finally, he highlighted the recent reorganization of the fruit fly standards (ISPMs 26, 30, 35 and 37), which entailed extensive coordinated work between the now disestablished Technical Panel on Fruit Flies (TPFF), the SC, and several countries from different FAO regions.
- [13] Another TFT member explained that ISPM 26 does not provide clear guidance in identifying when it is an outbreak versus incursion for specific fruit fly species. Also, ISPM 26 does not give detailed guidance on how many generations are needed to declare that an outbreak has been eradicated. Finally, he noted that each country makes different interpretations since the requirements set in ISPM 26 are too open and broad, therefore limiting its versatility.
- [14] Some TFT members suggested that guidance for specific species of fruit flies should be in an annex rather than in the body of ISPM 26 since fruit fly standards have recently been revised and since ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) defines the terms “incursion” and “outbreak.”
- [15] The TFT agreed on the following:
- (1) TFT recommended considering the topic submission.
  - (2) TFT recommended material – standard.
  - (3) TFT score – 3,5.
  - (4) TFT recommended priority – 3.
  - (5) TFT recommended the SC consider this topic as an annex to ISPM 26, considering the recent reorganization of the fruit fly standards (ISPMs 26, 30, 35 and 37).

### 5.2 2021-003\_APPPC\_ISPM XX\_ International Movement of Mango Fruit (2021-011)

- [16] The Secretariat introduced a summary<sup>4</sup> of the information submitted by five TFT members via the preliminary assessment online forms. The proposed standard “ISPM XX Commodity-Based Standards for Phytosanitary Measures, Annex X International Movement of Mango (*Mangifera indica*) Fruit” was submitted by the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) (2021-011).
- [17] The TFT members highlighted the importance of mango exports to several countries and broad regional support. They also noted that the topic is well-developed and the only commodity standard proposal submitted during the 2021 Call for Topics. Since this proposal fits with IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030<sup>5</sup> strategic objectives and the developmental agenda item “Commodity- and pathway-specific ISPMs,” the TFT decided to set the highest priority (1).
- [18] The TFT agreed on the following:
- (1) TFT recommended the SC considering this topic submission.

---

<sup>3</sup> 05\_TFT\_Tel\_2021\_Oct.

<sup>4</sup> 06\_TFT\_Tel\_2021\_Oct.

<sup>5</sup> Strategic Framework for the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) 2020–2030:  
<http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb3995en/>

- (2) TFT recommended material – standard.
- (3) TFT score – 4,6.
- (4) TFT recommended priority – 1.

### **5.3 2021-004\_JP\_Requirements for the use of diagnostic testing laboratories (2021-012)**

- [19] The Secretariat introduced a summary<sup>6</sup> of the information submitted by five TFT members via the preliminary assessment online forms. The proposed standard “Requirements for the use of testing laboratories” was submitted by Japan (2021-012).
- [20] One TFT member noted that the topic is well developed, but the IPPC Guide to Delivering Phytosanitary Diagnostic Services (2016)<sup>7</sup> and the development agenda item of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 "Diagnostic laboratory networking" addresses all the concerns outlined in the proposal.
- [21] Another TFT member noted that the guide is based on ISO/IEC 17025 accreditation, but there is no requirement for national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) to follow it. He also added that several ISO standards apply, but they are not a requirement.
- [22] One TFT member noted the lack of necessity for the standard on this topic, given that the ISO standards exist and perhaps that the guide is sufficient now.
- [23] Another TFT member highlighted that in some countries, laboratories could work if they apply ISO standards, but it is not related to phytosanitary issues, and it is outside of the IPPC scope. Hence, considering the developed guide, that the proposed standard is not a solution for the lack of capacity in countries and that it is not clear what the standard is going to solve, he did not agree to have a standard on this topic. Finally, he noted that the proposed standard should not overlap with the guide.
- [24] Some TFT members noted that the standard would identify essential criteria, and it could be very brief by simplifying the key aspects that describe the minimum requirements. In addition, they stressed that elements in the guide could be added to the standard to assist developing countries.
- [25] Some TFT members also stressed that many countries do not implement ISO standards due to the lack of capacity and capability, and it is essential to look at the guide's scope and see if all the points in the proposed standard are covered in the guide.
- [26] The TFT members did not reach a consensus on the necessity of developing the standard on this topic (in particular requirements), given the unclear benefits of the proposed standard and the existence of the guide. As a result, it was not easy to decide which specific elements should be included in a standard.
- [27] The TFT suggested the SC discuss the topic, critically analyze the information in the guide to avoid overlap between it and the proposed standard, and consider the existence of ISO standards, the guide, and the development agenda item of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 "Diagnostic laboratory networking."
- [28] The TFT agreed on the following:
- (1) TFT didn't recommend considering this topic submission.
  - (2) TFT requested the SC to analyze this topic further, considering the existence of the IPPC Guide to Delivering Phytosanitary Diagnostic Services (2016) and the development agenda item of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 "Diagnostic laboratory networking."

---

<sup>6</sup> 07\_TFT\_Tel\_2021\_Oct.

<sup>7</sup> Guide to Delivering Phytosanitary Diagnostic Services: <http://www.fao.org/publications/card/en/c/CA6374EN/>

#### 5.4 2021-010\_JP\_New Annex 1 “Field inspection” to ISPM 23 (2021-018)

- [29] The Secretariat introduced a summary<sup>8</sup> of the information submitted by five TFT members via the preliminary assessment online forms. The proposed standard “New Annex 1 “Field inspection (including growing season inspection)” to ISPM 23 “Guidelines for inspection” was submitted by Japan (2021-018).
- [30] Some TFT members agreed to consider the topic submission since the proposal is appropriate and the field inspection is essential.
- [31] One TFT member questioned whether the commodity standards would cover this topic since some commodities are inspected in a particular way.
- [32] Another TFT member replied that it is good to have general guidance for field inspection since the development of individual commodity standards will take a long time to complete, and later they may include any particularities specific to that commodity.
- [33] TFT members agreed on this approach and supported the proposal to develop Annex 1 to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection).
- [34] The TFT agreed on the following:
- (1) TFT recommended the SC considering this topic submission.
  - (2) TFT recommended material – standard.
  - (3) TFT score – 3,8.
  - (4) TFT recommended priority – 2.

#### 5.5 2021-012\_PPPO\_Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid (2021-020)

- [35] The Secretariat introduced a summary<sup>9</sup> of information submitted by five of the TFT members via the preliminary assessment online forms. The proposed standard “Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid” was submitted by the Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO) (2021-020).
- [36] The TFT Chairperson noted that there was considerable support from several countries and the APPPC and that the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) has recently adopted the recommendation on Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation (R-09)<sup>10</sup>.
- [37] Some TFT members recalled that this issue was extensively discussed years ago, and it was decided to develop the CPM recommendation rather than a standard. They also stressed that the type of aid that countries may receive can be different and cannot be foreseen, and it would be challenging to address in a standard the general requirements for different types of aid to be applied within a mutual aid framework. However, the TFT members acknowledged the concerns expressed by several countries, many of which are small island nations, and wondered how to address them.
- [38] One TFT member recalled that the proposed appendices to the CPM recommendation were removed by CPM-15. These appendices listed the categories of different commodities potentially used to aid countries. He wondered whether a structure similar to ISPM 32 (Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk) could be prepared with broad material categories that could show a risk gradation.
- [39] Another TFT member explained that the appendices were removed because the categories were unclear, and the measures that were listed may not always have addressed the phytosanitary risks or not been

---

<sup>8</sup> 08\_TFT\_Tel\_2021\_Oct.

<sup>9</sup> 09\_TFT\_Tel\_2021\_Oct.

<sup>10</sup> CPM recommendation on Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation (R-09): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89786/>

specific to the risk. He agreed that the challenge is that it is very difficult to address the diversity of what may be included as humanitarian aid

- [40] Another TFT member proposed the development of an implementation resource that will offer guidance on different risk categories of goods.
- [41] The TFT Chairperson stressed that many contracting parties and RPPOs support this proposal, and the TFT should consider this when making a recommendation. He also recalled the discussion related to the proposal for a standard on diagnostic laboratories related to what should be requirements or what should be recommendations. In addition, the TFT Chairperson noted the challenge to develop requirements given the wide variety of products provided as aid during a humanitarian crisis. Finally, he reminded the TFT members that the TFT recommendations would be discussed by the SC and IC, where different points of view may be revealed.
- [42] Another TFT member recalled that CPM-15 report<sup>11</sup> indicates the disappointment of some countries about the decision to remove the appendices from the CPM recommendation and their intention to submit a proposal for a standard to address this issue during the 2021 Call for Topics.
- [43] One TFT member reminded the group that during an emergency, a country's biosecurity system may not be functional and that the impacted countries would like the various aid agencies to take on some of the responsibility and manage the risk off-shore.
- [44] Another TFT member noted that the tasks in the proposed draft specification are broad, which was the reason that it resulted in the development of the CPM recommendation. He added that one of the solutions could be the identification of specificities on commodities and related articles that are commonly provided for humanitarian aid.
- [45] While the TFT members recognized the importance of the topic, given the extensive scope of regulated articles, the TFT was unsure whether developing a standard was appropriate to address this issue.
- [46] The TFT agreed on the following:
- (1) TFT didn't recommend considering this topic submission.
  - (2) Recognizing the broad support by CPs to develop this topic, the TFT felt that it might be challenging to address this issue by developing the standard. The TFT recommends that the SC and IC representatives discuss this issue together to:
    - consider reducing the scope of the proposed topic to facilitate the development of a standard; or
    - consider changing the submission from a proposal to develop a standard to a proposal to develop an implementation resource; or
    - consider changing the topic submission to amend the existing CPM Recommendation no. 9 "Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation," rather than developing a standard.

## 6. Implementation resources

### 6.1 2021-001\_CA\_Guide on Performing Audits in the Phytosanitary Context (2021-009)

- [47] The Secretariat introduced a summary<sup>12</sup> of the information submitted by three TFT members via the preliminary assessment online forms. The proposed implementation resource, "Guide on Performing

---

<sup>11</sup> CPM-15 report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/cpm-sessions/>

<sup>12</sup> 10\_TFT\_Tel\_2021\_Oct.

Audits in the Phytosanitary Context,” was submitted by Canada (2021-009). Therefore, two of the TFT members did not provide written assessments of the topic.

- [48] The Secretariat informed the TFT that the guide on Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2018-040) is currently on the list of topics, its priority has been raised to one, and the draft specification is expected to be sent for consultation in 2022. Furthermore, the Secretariat emphasized the connection between authorization and audit and suggested that the two guides should be complementary. The Secretariat noted that the IC raised the priority of this guide once ISPM 45 (Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions) was adopted at CPM-15 and that the timing of this topic proposal is ideal as presumably, the ISPM on Audit in the Phytosanitary context (2015-014) (Priority 2), would be adopted at CPM-16.
- [49] Several TFT members supported this topic proposal as it is appropriate, well-developed, and will support the harmonized implementation of the ISPM on Audit in the Phytosanitary context and improve the understanding of the requirements of the audit process.
- [50] One TFT member suggested that the IC should avoid duplication between the Authorization and Audit guides.
- [51] Another TFT member noted that the approach and responsibilities of in-country versus out-of-country audits are different. He added that the Audit guide should clarify the difference between these two types of audits.
- [52] TFT members supported the proposal and recommended that the IC consider the topic submission. However, the IC should consider the scope of the guide on authorization and avoid duplication with the guide on audits.
- [53] The TFT agreed on the following:
- (1) TFT recommended the IC considering this topic submission.
  - (2) TFT recommended material – implementation resource.
  - (3) TFT score – 4,67.
  - (4) TFT recommended priority – 1.
  - (5) TFT recommended the IC consider linkages with the guide on Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2018-040), considering cross-referencing to avoid duplication.

## **6.2 2021-016\_UA\_Development of authorization programme for use of fumigation (2021-024)**

- [54] The Secretariat introduced a summary<sup>13</sup> of information submitted by five TFT members via the preliminary assessment online forms. The proposed implementation resource, “Development of authorization programme for use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure under ISPM 45,” was submitted by Ukraine (2021-024).
- [55] Some TFT members noted that although the idea was interesting and could be an annex to ISPM 45, the submission was missing information, undeveloped elements, and unclear details made it hard to understand the main problem and identify the appropriate actions to address the issues.
- [56] The Secretariat informed the TFT that there is an ISPM 15 guide on wood packaging material (2017-043) that's being developed right now, and as part of that, the working group decided to develop a manual on fumigation that is specific to wood packaging material, but it may provide some information about the authorization of entities to carry out the fumigation and about how NPPOs provide oversight

---

<sup>13</sup> 11\_TFT\_Tel\_2021\_Oct.

of fumigation treatments. Finally, the Secretariat noted that some countries could only build national legislation if an international standard is in place.

[57] Some TFT members also stressed that the guide on Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions might provide guidance authorizing entities to carry out fumigation, so there may not be a need to develop a new guide.

[58] The TFT agreed on the following:

- (1) TFT did not recommend considering this topic submission.
- (2) The TFT recommends that the IC ensures whether the issue outlined in the proposal is addressed by the guide on Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2018-040), noting that the draft Specification for this guide is scheduled for consultation in 2022.

## 7. Diagnostic protocols

[59] Some TFT members suggested facilitating discussions on the proposed DPs as they are all critical, well-developed, contain a lot of reliable information, and therefore could be considered. Furthermore, they agreed that different pests are recognized globally, and their value will differ from country to country, so regulating them is crucial.

[60] One TFT member raised concern about developing so many DPs. He noted that an IRSS study on the utility of DPs (Priority 1) would evaluate the benefits of the DPs, but it has not been initiated. He questioned whether the proposed DPs should be added to the waiting list before the evaluation is initiated. Another TFT member noted that the IRSS study would examine whether the DPs and their translations were used.

[61] One TFT member suggested that the DPs proposals should be recommended even though the IRSS study has not been initiated since some pests are spreading quickly around the world and pose a threat to many countries, so the development of the DPs will be precisely the right thing to do right now.

[62] The TFT Chairperson noted the general support on all proposed DPs and that there is sufficient value and rationale that has been provided as part of the proposals with regards to the impact that these pests have in different parts of the world. He concluded that there are specific paths for which there is science lacking, and the harmonized DPs would help these countries in their surveillance activities.

[63] TFT members also acknowledged that both New Zealand's and Kenya's proposed DPs for fall armyworm complement each other, and the SC could consider combining them into a single DP.

[64] The TFT members agreed on the development of all the proposed DPs and recommended that the SC consider the outcomes of the IRSS study on DPs.

[65] The TFT agreed on the following general recommendations:

- (1) TFT recommended the development of all proposed diagnostic protocols.
- (2) TFT also recommended that the IRSS study on the utility of IPPC DPs, once completed, should be considered by the SC to ensure the value in keeping these DPs on the work programme.

[66] The TFT also agreed on the scores and recommended priorities for the proposed DPs, considering the pest impact and potential threats.

### 7.1 2021-005\_EG\_Diagnostic Protocol for *Bactrocera zonata* (Saunders, 1842) (2021-013)

[67] The Secretariat introduced a summary<sup>14</sup> of 5 TFT members' information submitted via the preliminary assessment online forms. The proposed DP for *Bactrocera zonata* (Saunders, 1842) was submitted by Egypt (2021-013).

[68] The TFT agreed on the following:

- (1) TFT score – 3,2.
- (2) TFT recommended priority – 2.

### 7.2 2021-006\_NZ\_Diagnostic protocol for *Dickeya* spp. on potato (2021-014)

[69] The Secretariat introduced a summary<sup>15</sup> of 4 TFT members' information submitted via the preliminary assessment online forms. The proposed DP for *Dickeya* spp. on potato was submitted by New Zealand (2021-014).

[70] The TFT agreed on the following:

- (1) TFT score – 3.
- (2) TFT recommended priority – 2.

### 7.3 2021-007\_NZ\_Diagnostic protocol for *Heterobasidion annosum* (2021-015)

[71] The Secretariat introduced a summary<sup>16</sup> of 4 TFT members' information submitted via the preliminary assessment online forms. The proposed DP for *Heterobasidion annosum* was submitted by New Zealand (2021-015).

[72] The TFT agreed on the following:

- (1) TFT score – 3.
- (2) TFT recommended priority – 3.

### 7.4 2021-008\_NZ\_Diagnostic protocol for *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Fall Armyworm) (2021-016)

[73] The Secretariat introduced a summary<sup>17</sup> of 4 TFT members' information submitted via the preliminary assessment online forms. The proposed DP for *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Fall Armyworm) was submitted by New Zealand (2021-016).

[74] The TFT agreed on the following:

- (1) TFT score – 4,25.
- (2) TFT recommended priority – 1.

### 7.5 2021-009\_NZ\_Diagnostic Protocol for *Drosophila suzukii* (2021-017)

[75] The Secretariat introduced a summary<sup>18</sup> of 4 TFT members' information submitted via the preliminary assessment online forms. The proposed DP for *Drosophila suzukii* (Diptera: Drosophilidae) was submitted by New Zealand (2021-017).

[76] The TFT agreed on the following:

---

<sup>14</sup> 12\_TFT\_Tel\_2021\_Oct.

<sup>15</sup> 13\_TFT\_Tel\_2021\_Oct.

<sup>16</sup> 14\_TFT\_Tel\_2021\_Oct.

<sup>17</sup> 15\_TFT\_Tel\_2021\_Oct.

<sup>18</sup> 16\_TFT\_Tel\_2021\_Oct.

- (1) TFT score – 3,5.
- (2) TFT recommended priority – 1.

#### **7.6 2021-014\_KE\_Spodoptera frugiperda (2021-022)**

[77] The Secretariat introduced a summary<sup>19</sup> of 5 TFT members' information submitted via the preliminary assessment online forms. The proposed DP for *Spodoptera frugiperda* was submitted by Kenya (2021-022).

[78] The TFT agreed on the following:

- (1) TFT score – 4,2.
- (2) TFT recommended priority – 1.

#### **7.7 2021-017\_CN\_Tomato brown rugose fruit virus (2021-025)**

[79] The Secretariat introduced a summary<sup>20</sup> of 5 TFT members' information submitted via the preliminary assessment online forms. The proposed DP for Tomato brown rugose fruit virus was submitted by China (2021-025).

[80] The TFT agreed on the following:

- (1) TFT score – 3,8.
- (2) TFT recommended priority – 1.

### **8. Follow up on the incomplete submissions**

#### **8.1 2021-011\_LK\_Field Certification for export oriented fruits (2021-019)**

[81] The Secretariat introduced a complete topic proposal (2021-019) with a draft specification for the proposed standard submitted after the Secretariat's additional follow-up requested by the TFT at the meeting. The proposed standard "Field Certification for export oriented fruits and vegetables" was submitted by Sri Lanka.

[82] The TFT members noted that the reason for the standard in the submitted draft specification provides almost the same information submitted through the submission form for topics for Standards and Implementation, which was not clear. They also added that the proposal's idea could be linked to the proposed standard "New Annex 1 "Field inspection (including growing season inspection)" to ISPM 23 "Guidelines for inspection" submitted by Japan (2021-010). In addition, they noted that since the field inspection is a phytosanitary measure in some countries, this and other concerns, such as export certification, could be covered and developed in Japan's proposal.

[83] The TFT re-reviewed the proposed draft specification of Japan's proposal and agreed that it could cover the key aspects of Sri Lanka's submission.

[84] The TFT agreed on the following:

- (1) TFT didn't recommend considering this topic submission.
- (2) TFT felt that the proposed standard "New Annex 1 "Field inspection (including growing season inspection)" to ISPM 23 "Guidelines for inspection" submitted by Japan (2021-010) would adequately address this proposal.

#### **8.2 2021-015\_KE\_ISPM 31 - Methodologies for sampling of consignments (2021-023)**

[85] The Secretariat introduced a complete topic proposal (2021-023) with a draft specification for the proposed standard submitted after the Secretariat's additional follow-up requested by the TFT at the

---

<sup>19</sup> 17\_TFT\_Tel\_2021\_Oct.

<sup>20</sup> 18\_TFT\_Tel\_2021\_Oct.

meeting. The proposed standard “ISPM 31 - Methodologies for sampling of consignments” was submitted by Kenya.

[86] One TFT member noted that the tasks in the proposed draft specification provide almost the same information submitted through the submission form for topics for Standards and Implementation, which were broad and hard to understand.

[87] Another TFT member added that although the proposal is interesting, in the reason for the revision, all the text is related to the guidance on application, but it may not be necessary to modify the ISPM 31 (Methodologies for sampling of consignments), the proposal could be developed as an implementation resource. He also noted that the provided information was already contained in ISPM 31 appendices, so it was unclear what additional information was provided to revise ISPM 31.

[88] One more TFT member recalled that the North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) had developed Risk-Based Sampling manuals<sup>21</sup>. He noted that Kenya’s proposal is related to them, making it not feasible to revise ISPM 31.

[89] Another TFT member also recalled that the IC is working on the guide on Risk based inspection of imported consignments (2018-017) that could address the concerns raised in the proposal, which is very implementation-oriented.

[90] The TFT members reviewed the proposed draft specification and agreed that the guide could cover the raised concerns in Kenya’s proposal, both for export and import activities.

[91] The TFT agreed on the following:

- (1) TFT didn't recommend considering this topic submission.
- (2) TFT felt that the guide on Risk based inspection of imported consignments (2018-017) would address the majority of concerns described in the topic submission.

### **8.3 2021-013\_KE\_Methodology for Field Sampling (2021-021)**

[92] The Secretariat introduced an incomplete topic proposal (2021-021). After Secretariat’s additional follow-up, requested by the TFT at the meeting, no response was received. The proposed standard “Methodology for Field Sampling” was submitted by Kenya.

[93] Since the draft specification for the proposed standard had not been submitted, the TFT members agreed that they were not in a position to formulate the recommendation given the incomplete submission.

[94] The TFT agreed on the following:

- (1) TFT wasn't in a position to formulate the recommendation given the incomplete submission.

## **9. Recommendations to the SC and IC**

[95] The TFT recommendations finalized at the meeting are provided in the tables (Appendix 4).

## **10. Any other business**

### **10.1 Streamlining the TFT preliminary assessment online form**

[96] The TFT members acknowledged the preliminary assessment forms that the Secretariat made available to them online.

[97] One TFT member, Dominique PELLETIER, proposed the following improvements in the TFT preliminary assessment online form:

- (1) Combine questions “Is the problem and proposed option relevant from an IPPC perspective?” and “Is it within the IPPC mandate?”.

---

<sup>21</sup> Resources and Learning Tools for Risk-Based Sampling: <https://www.nappo.org/english/learning-tools/Resources-and-Learning-Tools-for-Risk-Based-Sampling>

- (2) Combine questions “Is the topic relevant from a global perspective?”, “How widespread or common is the problem?” and “Does the topic reflect a global challenge?”.
- (3) Order the question “Does the topic align with the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030?” after the question “Does this submission contribute to filling gaps in the Framework for Standards and Implementation?”.
- (4) Combine questions “Is the proposed material adequate?” and “Is the proposed material appropriate?” or change the second question to “Is the proposed supporting material appropriate?”.
- (5) Maybe specify the question “In your opinion, is it feasible to develop the proposed material in a reasonable time frame?”

[98] Some TFT members supported the proposed improvements.

[99] The TFT Chairperson proposed to streamline or eliminate the question “Is there support from contracting parties?” considering that the contracting parties or RPPOs provide this information in the submission form and avoiding duplication. However, another TFT member suggested keeping the question since it facilitates the TFT discussions. The TFT Chairperson agreed and proposed to change the question to “Is there support from contracting parties and RPPOs?”.

[100] The TFT Chairperson also suggested adding hyperlinks in subtitles for the relevant documents (for example, the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 and the Framework for Standards and Implementation) for ease of reference. In addition, he proposed to take a second look at the preliminary assessment online form right before the next Call for Topics in 2023 and adjust it to meet new needs and challenges, if needed.

[101] The TFT agreed on proposed suggestions and asked the Secretariat to incorporate these changes into the preliminary assessment online form. The Secretariat will apply these changes and distribute them among TFT members for final confirmation.

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

[102] The TFT members thanked the Secretariat for streamlining the 2021 Call for Topics and the TFT meetings by implementing new tools and technologies that improved the topic submission process and facilitated the work of the TFT.

[103] The TFT Chairperson thanked all participants for their active contributions and closed the meeting.

**Appendix 1: Agenda**

<b>N</b>	<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Document number / link</b>	<b>Presenter / IPPC Secretariat support</b>
	<b>Opening of the meeting</b>		
1.	By the IPPC Secretariat	–	MOREIRA (OiC for SSU daily matters) LARSON (IFU Lead)
	By the Task Force on Topics Chairperson	–	<b>CÔTE (Chairperson)</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>		
2.1.	Election of the Rapporteur	–	<b>Chairperson</b>
2.2.	Adoption of the Agenda	01_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	<b>Chairperson</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Administrative Matters</b>		
3.1.	Documents list	02_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	MUSHEGYAN
3.2.	Participants list	03_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct <a href="#">TFT membership</a>	MUSHEGYAN
<b>4.</b>	<b>2021 Call for Topics: a review of submissions for new topics</b>		
4.1.	List of submitted topic proposals	04_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct <a href="#">2021 Call for Topics submissions</a>	MUSHEGYAN
	- Review of the incomplete submissions		<b>TFT / Secretariat</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Standards</b>		
5.1.	2021-002_NZ_Revision of ISPM 26 Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies	05_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	<b>TFT / Secretariat</b>
5.2.	2021-003_APPPC_ISPM XX_International Movement of Mango Fruit	06_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	<b>TFT / Secretariat</b>
5.3.	2021-004_JP_Requirements for the use of diagnostic testing laboratories	07_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	<b>TFT / Secretariat</b>
5.4.	2021-010_JP_New Annex 1 "Field inspection" to ISPM 23	08_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	<b>TFT / Secretariat</b>
5.5.	2021-012_PPPO_Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid	09_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	<b>TFT / Secretariat</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Implementation resources</b>		
6.1.	2021-001_CA_Guide on Performing Audits in the Phytosanitary Context	10_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	<b>TFT / Secretariat</b>
6.2.	2021-016_UA_Development of authorization programme for use of fumigation	11_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	<b>TFT / Secretariat</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Diagnostic protocols</b>		
7.1.	2021-005_EG_Diagnostic Protocol for <i>Bactrocera zonata</i> (Saunders, 1842)	12_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	<b>TFT / Secretariat</b>
7.2.	2021-006_NZ_Diagnostic protocol for <i>Dickeya</i> spp. on potato	13_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	<b>TFT / Secretariat</b>

7.3.	2021-007_NZ_Diagnostic protocol for <i>Heterobasidion annosum</i>	14_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	TFT / Secretariat
7.4.	2021-008_NZ_Diagnostic protocol for <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> (Fall Armyworm)	15_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	TFT / Secretariat
7.5.	2021-009_NZ_Diagnostic Protocol for <i>Drosophila suzukii</i>	16_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	TFT / Secretariat
7.6.	2021-014_KE_ <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i>	17_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	TFT / Secretariat
7.7.	2021-017_CN_Tomato brown rugose fruit virus	18_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	TFT / Secretariat
<b>8.</b>	<b>Follow up on the incomplete submissions</b>		
8.1.	2021-011_LK_Field Certification for export oriented fruits	–	TFT / Secretariat
8.2.	2021-015_KE_ISPM 31 - Methodologies for sampling of consignments	–	TFT / Secretariat
8.3.	2021-013_KE_Methodology for Field Sampling	–	TFT / Secretariat
<b>9.</b>	<b>Recommendations to the SC and IC</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>
<b>10.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>
10.1	Improvement suggestions in the TFT preliminary assessment online form	–	<b>PELLETIER</b>
<b>11.</b>	<b>Close of the meeting</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>

**Appendix 2: Documents list**

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
<b>Meeting documents</b>			
–	–	2021 submissions and support letters	2021-09-27
01_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	2.2	Agenda	2021-09-27
02_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	3.1	Documents list	2021-09-28
03_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	3.2	Participants list	2021-09-28
04_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	4.1	List of submitted topic proposals	2021-09-30
05_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	5.1	2021-002_NZ_Revision of ISPM 26 Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies	2021-09-30
06_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	5.2	2021-003_APPPC_ISPM XX_International Movement of Mango Fruit	2021-09-30
07_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	5.3	2021-004_JP_Requirements for the use of diagnostic testing laboratories	2021-09-30
08_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	5.4	2021-010_JP_New Annex 1 “Field inspection” to ISPM 23	2021-09-30
09_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	5.5	2021-012_PPPO_Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid	2021-09-30
10_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	6.1	2021-001_CA_Guide on Performing Audits in the Phytosanitary Context	2021-09-30
11_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	6.2	2021-016_UA_Development of authorization programme for use of fumigation	2021-09-30
12_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	7.1	2021-005_EG_Diagnostic Protocol for <i>Bactrocera zonata</i> (Saunders, 1842)	2021-09-30
13_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	7.2	2021-006_NZ_Diagnostic protocol for <i>Dickeya</i> spp. on potato	2021-09-30
14_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	7.3	2021-007_NZ_Diagnostic protocol for <i>Heterobasidion annosum</i>	2021-09-30
15_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	7.4	2021-008_NZ_Diagnostic protocol for <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> (Fall Armyworm)	2021-09-30
16_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	7.5	2021-009_NZ_Diagnostic Protocol for <i>Drosophila suzukii</i>	2021-09-30
17_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	7.6	2021-014_KE_ <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i>	2021-09-30
18_TFT_Tel_2021_Oct	7.7	2021-017_CN_Tomato brown rugose fruit virus	2021-09-30
		2021-011_LK_Field Certification for export oriented fruits	2021-10-05
		2021-015_KE_ISPM 31 - Methodologies for sampling of consignments	2021-10-05

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

Links	Agenda item	Document link
Participants list	3.2	<a href="#">TFT membership</a>
2021 Call for Topics submissions	4.1	<a href="#">2021 Call for Topics submissions</a>

**Appendix 3: Participants list**

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Latin America and Caribbean SC Chairperson	<b>Mr Ezequiel FERRO</b> Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA Av. Paeso Colón 315 C.A. de Buenos Aires <b>ARGENTINA</b> Tel/Fax: (+5411) 4121-5091	<a href="mailto:eferro@senasa.gov.ar">eferro@senasa.gov.ar</a>	CPM-8 (2013) CPM-11 (2016) CPM-14 (2019) 3 <sup>rd</sup> term / 3 years	2022
Latin America and Caribbean SC member	<b>Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE</b> Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal Av. Presidente Bulnes 140, 4 <sup>th</sup> floor, Santiago, <b>CHILE</b> Tel: + 56-2 234 5120	<a href="mailto:alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl">alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl</a>	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 3 <sup>rd</sup> term / 3 years	2024
North America SC member	<b>Mr Steve CÔTE</b> National Manager, International Phytosanitary Standards Plant Import/Export Division 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 <b>CANADA</b> Tel: (+1) 613-773-7368 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7576	<a href="mailto:Steve.Cote@inspection.gc.ca">Steve.Cote@inspection.gc.ca</a>	CPM-15 (2021) 1 <sup>st</sup> term / 3 years	2024
North America IC Chairperson	<b>Mr Dominique PELLETIER</b> International Plant Health Standards Officer Canadian Food Inspection Agency 1400, Merivale Rd, Tower 1, Room 307 Ottawa, ON, K1A 0Y9 <b>CANADA</b> Tel: 613-773-6492	<a href="mailto:dominique.pelletier2@canada.ca">dominique.pelletier2@canada.ca</a>	2 <sup>nd</sup> term (2020-2023)	2023
Africa IC member	<b>Ms Faith NDUNGE</b> Chief Inspector - Trade and Standards Office. KEPHIS P.O. Box 49592, 00100 Nairobi <b>KENYA</b> Tel: 254 722697674	<a href="mailto:ndungeq@yahoo.com">ndungeq@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:fndunge@kephis.org">fndunge@kephis.org</a>	2 <sup>nd</sup> term (2020-2023)	2023
Southwest Pacific IC member	<b>Mr Lalith Bandula KUMARASINGHE</b> Plant Health and Environment Laboratory Diagnostic and Surveillance Services Ministry for Primary Industries 231 Morrin Road, St. Johns. Auckland <b>NEW ZEALAND</b> Tel: (64) 9 9095713 Mobile: (64) 29 9095713	<a href="mailto:Lalith.kumarasinghe@mpi.govt.nz">Lalith.kumarasinghe@mpi.govt.nz</a>	1 <sup>st</sup> term (2020-2023)	2023

IPPC Secretariat	
<b>Ms Adriana MOREIRA</b> Standard Setting Officer, OIC for SSU	<a href="mailto:Adriana.Moreira@fao.org">Adriana.Moreira@fao.org</a>
<b>Mr Artur SHAMILOV</b> Standard Setting Officer	<a href="mailto:Artur.Shamilov@fao.org">Artur.Shamilov@fao.org</a>
<b>Mr Edgar MUSHEGYAN</b> Standard Setting Associate	<a href="mailto:Edgar.Mushegyan@fao.org">Edgar.Mushegyan@fao.org</a>
<b>Mr Brent LARSON</b> Implementation and Facilitation Unit Lead	<a href="mailto:Brent.Larson@fao.org">Brent.Larson@fao.org</a>
<b>Ms Barbara PETERSON</b> Implementation Facilitation Officer	<a href="mailto:Barbara.Peterson@fao.org">Barbara.Peterson@fao.org</a>

#### Appendix 4: Tables of the TFT recommendations

Topic number	Title	CP / RPPO	Support	TFT summary	Proposed standards			Request for SC/IC
					TFT score (0-5)	TFT recommended priority (1-4)	TFT recommended material	
2021-011	ISPM XX Commodity-Based Standards for Phytosanitary Measures, Annex X International Movement of Mango ( <i>Mangifera indica</i> ) Fruit	APPPC	PPPO	TFT recommended considering these topic submissions.	4,60	1	Standards	To the SC
2021-018	New Annex 1 "Field inspection (including growing season inspection)" to ISPM 23 "Guidelines for inspection"	Japan	-		3,80	2		
2021-010	Revision of ISPM 26 Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)	New Zealand	Australia		3,50	3		
2021-020	Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid	PPPO	APPPC, Republic of Korea	TFT did not recommend considering these topic submissions.		-	Recognizing the broad support by CPs to develop this topic, the TFT felt that it might be challenging to address this issue by developing the standard. The TFT recommends that the SC and IC representatives discuss this issue together to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) consider reducing the scope of the proposed topic to facilitate the development of a standard; or</li> <li>2) consider changing the submission from a proposal to develop a standard to a proposal to develop an implementation resource; or</li> <li>3) consider changing the topic submission to amend the existing CPM Recommendation no. 9 "Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation," rather than developing a standard.</li> </ol>	
2021-012	Requirements for the use of testing laboratories	Japan	-			-	Further analysis by the SC is required, considering the existence of the IPPC Guide to Delivering Phytosanitary Diagnostic Services (2016) and the development agenda item of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 "Diagnostic laboratory networking."	
2021-019	Field Certification for export oriented fruits and vegetables	Sri Lanka	-			-	TFT felt that the proposed standard "New Annex 1 "Field inspection (including growing season inspection)" to ISPM 23 "Guidelines for inspection" submitted by Japan (2021-010) would adequately address this proposal.	
2021-023	ISPM 31 - Methodologies for sampling of consignments	Kenya	-			-	TFT felt that the guide on Risk based inspection of imported consignments (2018-017) would address the majority of concerns described in the topic submission.	

Proposed implementation resources								
Topic number	Title	CP / RPPO	Support	TFT summary	TFT score (0-5)	TFT recommended priority (1-4)	TFT recommended material	Request for SC/IC
2021-009	Guide on Performing Audits in the Phytosanitary Context	Canada	NAPPO	TFT recommended considering the topic submission.	4,67	1	Implementation resource	IC should consider linkages with the guide on Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2018-040), considering cross-referencing to avoid duplication.
2021-024	Development of authorization programme for use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure under ISPM 45	Ukraine	-	TFT did not recommend considering this topic submission.		-		IC should ensure that the issue outlined in the proposal is addressed by the guide on Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2018-040), noting that the draft Specification for this guide is scheduled for consultation in 2022.
2021-021	Methodology for Field Sampling	Kenya		TFT wasn't in a position to formulate the recommendation given the incomplete submission.				

Proposed and later recommended by the TFT diagnostic protocols							
Topic number	Title	CP / RPPO	TFT score (0-5)	TFT recommended priority (1-4)	TFT summary	Request for SC/IC	Support
2021-016	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> (Fall Armyworm)	New Zealand	4,25	1	TFT recommended the development of the DPs.	TFT also recommended that the IRSS study on the utility of IPPC DPs, once completed, should be considered by the SC to ensure the value in keeping these DPs on the work programme.	-
2021-017	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Drosophila suzukii</i> (Diptera: Drosophilidae)	New Zealand	3,50	1			
2021-022	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i>	Kenya	4,20	1			
2021-025	Diagnostic protocol for Tomato brown rugose fruit virus	China	3,80	1			
2021-013	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Bactrocera zonata</i> (Saunders, 1842)	Egypt	3,20	2			
2021-014	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Dickeya</i> spp. on potato	New Zealand	3,00	2			
2021-015	Diagnostic protocol for <i>Heterobasidion annosum</i>	New Zealand	3,00	3			