



## Report of the extraordinary working group of the Standards Committee

12 - 16 July 2004

Rome, Italy

### Report of the extraordinary working group of the Standards Committee 12-16 July 2004

#### ANNEXES:

<i>Annex 1</i>	Agenda
<i>Annex 2</i>	Specification No. 15 (1 <sup>st</sup> revision) - The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management of citrus canker ( <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i> )
<i>Annex 3</i>	Specification No. 17 - Debarking of wood
<i>Annex 4</i>	Specification No. 22 - Research protocols for phytosanitary measures
<i>Annex 5</i>	Specification No. 23 - Guidance for surveillance for specific pests: <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i> (Citrus canker)
<i>Annex 6</i>	Specification No. 24 - Post-entry quarantine facilities
<i>Annex 7</i>	Specification No. 25 - Guidelines for formatting / drafting pest specific ISPMs
<i>Annex 8</i>	Specification No. 26 - Guidelines for formatting / drafting commodity specific ISPMs
<i>Annex 9</i>	Specification for Technical Panel No. 4 - Technical Panel on forest quarantine
<i>Annex 10</i>	Criteria for the formation and subsequent change of supplements, annexes and appendices in ISPMs
<i>Annex 11</i>	Submission form for ICPM work programme topics
<i>Annex 12</i>	Revision of <i>Outline of procedures for elaboration of international standards for phytosanitary measures</i> (IPPC Procedural manual, First edition, 2004, Section 5.1.1)
<i>Annex 13</i>	Guidelines for the role of a steward of an ISPM
<i>Annex 14</i>	Guidelines for the operation of expert working groups
<i>Annex 15</i>	Guidelines on the duties of members of the Standards Committee of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
<i>Annex 16</i>	Contacts for submission of comments on documents and specifications produced at the extraordinary working group of the SC meeting, July 2004.
<i>Annex 17</i>	List of participants

## 1. Opening

Mr Brent Larson of the IPPC Secretariat opened the meeting and welcomed the participants: Mr Ringolds Arnitis (Latvia), Mr John Hedley (New Zealand), Ms Asna Booty Othman (Malaysia) and Mr Odilson Luiz Ribeiro e Silva (Brazil).

## 2. Election of the chair and adoption of the agenda

Mr Larson was nominated to chair the meeting. The extraordinary working group proceeded to review the agenda [Annex 1] and minor changes to the order of topics were agreed upon.

## 3. New or revised specifications for ISPMs

The group examined and modified the specifications presented. The resulting modified specifications are appended to the report and will be presented to the Standards Committee (SC) for approval in November 2004.

The group recommended that the specification format be modified to replace “Title” with “Subject” and that specifications for Expert Working Groups (EWGs) should always include the task to recommend an appropriate title. The group also felt that it might be useful to add a section on “Background” to the specification format. These two points will be forwarded to the SC for consideration.

### **Specification No. 15 (1<sup>st</sup> revision) - The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management of citrus canker (*Xanthomonas axonopodis* pv. *citri*)** [Annex 2]

The revisions to this specification were minimal, only to specify that surveillance for citrus canker is to be covered generally in the draft on integrated measures, as a new specification (Specification No. 23) was created to address surveillance of citrus canker in detail.

The specification was agreed to by the extraordinary working group of the SC and will be presented to the SC in November.

### **Specification No. 17 - Debarking of wood** [Annex 3]

The group stressed in the specification the importance of liaising with the Technical Panel (TP) on forest quarantine and relevant EWGs. There was some discussion as to the division of tasks described in this specification and those in the specification for the TP on forest quarantine, but the group agreed that there seemed to be a balance between the two specifications.

The specification was agreed to by the extraordinary working group of the SC and will be presented to the SC in November.

### **Specification No. 22 - Research protocols for phytosanitary measures** [Annex 4]

The group decided that the EWG for this standard should only deal with research on phytosanitary treatments. The EWG will define the general criteria for research in phytosanitary treatments, discuss and determine what items need to be included in the research protocol for consideration, and liaise with the Technical Panel on phytosanitary treatments.

The specification was agreed to by the extraordinary working group of the SC and will be presented to the SC in November.

### **Specification No. 23 - Guidance for surveillance for specific pests: *Xanthomonas axonopodis* pv. *citri* (Citrus canker)** [Annex 5]

A draft standard on this subject was written in 2002, at a time when specifications were not systematically prepared for standards. ICPM-5 had identified this standard as a priority, but the draft had never been finalized. The completion of the standard was not on the work programme approved at ICPM-6, but the group recommended that the SPTA and the SC consider proposing it for adoption on the work programme of ICPM-7. For this reason it was thought that a specification should be written.

The group agreed that the standard should be technically and statistically based. A range of options should be given so that countries have options for surveillance, especially developing countries.

The specification was agreed to by the extraordinary working group of the SC and will be presented to the SC in November.

**Specification No. 24 - Post-entry quarantine facilities** [Annex 6]

The group agreed that the specification should cover the different levels of security of post-entry quarantine facilities, as well as the different types of organisms that could be contained in such facilities.

The specification was agreed to by the extraordinary working group of the SC and will be presented to the SC in November.

**Specification No. 25 - Guidelines for formatting / drafting pest specific ISPMs** [Annex 7]

The specification was agreed to by the extraordinary working group of the SC and will be presented to the SC in November.

**Specification No. 26 - Guidelines for formatting / drafting commodity specific ISPMs** [Annex 8]

The specification was agreed to by the extraordinary working group of the SC and will be presented to the SC in November.

**Technical Panel Specification No. 4 - Technical Panel on forest quarantine** [Annex 9]

The specification was agreed to by the extraordinary working group of the SC and will be presented to the SC in November.

#### **4. Integration of supplements to ISPMs**

The Secretariat had initially put this item on the agenda thinking that a procedure had been required. Upon further investigation, it appeared that there was no need for a procedure. When discussing the supplement to ISPM No. 11 on living modified organisms, the SC had simply requested that, next time it adopted a supplement to an existing standard, the ICPM should provide guidance on how the supplement should be integrated (see SC-3 report, November 2003).

Mr Ribeiro e Silva felt that if the ICPM was expected to give such guidance to the SC, criteria on producing documents such as supplements, including how these documents should be integrated into standards, should be produced. He pointed out that there were different types of supplements, such as those for ISPM No. 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) and 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*), and a document with criteria for their production and integration would facilitate the work of the EWGs and SC. Mr Hedley was not sure that it was a good idea to create this type of criteria, because it could be limiting. He felt that it was too difficult to think of every type of situation and thought it best left to the EWG to recommend a method for integration, perhaps providing several options.

It was suggested that some text on the subject could be added into the document to be discussed on annexes (see section 5 of this report).

#### **5. Criteria for the formation and subsequent change of supplements, annexes and appendices in ISPMs**

Originally the document only dealt with the formation and content of annexes, but the group decided to extend the scope to also include supplements and appendices, and to identify how these documents can be incorporated into standards and subsequently revised or amended.

The document [Annex 10] was agreed to by the extraordinary working group of the SC and will be presented to the SC in November.

## **6. Submission form for ICPM work programme topics**

Due to the large number of submissions for standards received in 2002 and 2003 and the lack of clarity in some of the submissions, a submission form was prepared by the Secretariat. This form required specific information to be provided for the standards proposed. To align the form with the document *Criteria for the formation and subsequent change of supplements, annexes and appendices* (see section 5), the group added in the choice to add a supporting document to an existing standard and also included the possibility to request a revision or amendment to an existing standard.

The form [Annex 11] was agreed to by the extraordinary working group of the SC and will be presented to the SC in November.

## **7. Additional round of formal consultation**

The ICPM-6 report, Appendix IX-1.1, states that the SC should initiate a further round of consultation on standards that have undergone extensive changes as a result of formal country consultation and report to the ICPM their justification for sending a standard for a second round of consultation. Appendix IX-1.2 requires the SC to draw up criteria or guidance that it proposes to apply in determining the need for a further round of formal consultation on a draft standard.

The group felt that when technical issues arise about a draft standard, it should be sent back to the EWG concerned. However, if the SC, by incorporating country comments, had made substantial changes and made the draft standard unrecognizable compared to the version sent for country consultation, then the draft could be sent for another round of formal consultation. These substantial changes would cover both the content and/or the structure. In addition, another round of formal consultation might be recommended if the draft standard contained too much or too little information on certain points, or included controversial changes.

A revision to the IPPC Procedural manual (First edition, 2004) Section 5.1.1 *Outline of procedures for elaboration of international standards for phytosanitary measures* to include text on an additional round of formal consultation [Annex 12] was agreed to by the extraordinary working group of the SC and will be presented to the SC in November.

## **8. Guidelines for the role of a steward of an ISPM**

ICPM-6 agreed that the SC should develop guidelines on the role and responsibilities of a steward (Appendix IX-5.1 of ICPM-6 report). A draft was presented by Mr Hedley and several issues were discussed. The idea of having stewards review country comments on their standard to aid the work of the SC was considered. It was decided that this would be very helpful in aiding the work of the SC, but that it would only extend to substantial comments; the Secretariat would continue to look at editorial comments. Mr Ribeiro e Silva asked that stewards have guidelines on how to deal with country comments in order to ensure a harmonized screening of comments between stewards, and the Secretariat agreed to provide this.

The respective roles of the steward and of the IPPC Secretariat were discussed. With the increasing volume of standards and comments received, the Secretariat now had difficulties in providing discussion papers for EWG meetings and preparing responses to country comments at the SC. It was felt that, in some cases, the steward or a SC member might be able to take on some of this work for EWG and SC meetings, allowing the workload to be shared between the steward, SC members and IPPC Secretariat.

Mr Arnitis voiced concerns over the workload that seemed to be implied by the document. However, it was thought that if the steward did not help with some of the work in advance of EWG and SC meetings, then these groups would not be able to complete their agendas. Additionally, the group felt that these tasks were not compulsory for stewards but would be helpful in distributing the workload to meet the growing demand for standards.

The group decided that this document also applied to stewards of technical panels, although they might oversee a suite of standards instead of just one.

The document [Annex 13] was agreed to by the extraordinary working group of the SC and will be presented to the SC in November.

## **9. Guidelines for the operation of expert working groups**

Appendix IX-9.1 of ICPM-6 report states that brief guidelines for the operation of EWGs should be produced by the Secretariat in consultation with SC, to be approved at ICPM. It would then be provided to all EWG/TP participants.

A draft was presented. The group discussed the addition to the document of specifying the language in which EWG meetings should take place. Some members felt that EWGs should always take place in English, while others felt that if another language was more comfortable for all EWG members then they could use that language. The suggested text on the subject was:

“The business of EWGs should be conducted in the language which is most convenient to all participants, but the final draft ISPM and meeting report should be in English.”

The group could not reach consensus on the above text and asked that this point be put on the agenda of the SC meeting in November.

The document [Annex 14] was agreed to by the extraordinary working group of the SC and will be presented to the SC in November.

## **10. Guidelines on the duties of members of the Standards Committee of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures**

Appendix IX-11.1 of ICPM-6 report stated that a brief guideline on the role and responsibilities of SC members should be produced by the Secretariat in consultation with SC for approval by ICPM. This should be provided to all SC members. Through the course of discussion and analysis of the document, it became apparent that there were some items in this document that could also be included in the Terms of Reference (TOR) of the SC. These were:

- review the work programme to be submitted to the ICPM
- oversee the standard development process
- upon request, respond to enquiries from countries on the actions taken with their comments (Report ICPM-6, Appendix IX-6.1b)
- participate, as appropriate, in regional workshops on draft ISPMs.

Regarding the last point, the group discussed whether this applied specifically to SC-7 members or also to other SC members. The group recommended that the SC consider adding these points to their TOR. The idea of submitting these points to the SPTA so that they can be integrated to the version presented to ICPM-7 was discussed but the group could not come to a consensus on this point. In addition, Mr Arnitis did not agree with section 4.5 of the document and suggested that this point be put on the agenda of the SC-5 meeting in November.

This document [Annex 15] was agreed to by the extraordinary working group of the SC and will be presented to the SC in November.

## **11. Update on electronic certification**

Mr Larson introduced the topic by noting that at ICPM-6 a note from the floor had informed the Commission that a United Nations (UN) group was currently working on electronic certification. The IPPC Secretariat had been asked to investigate the activities undertaken by this group before initiating work on a standard.

Mr Larson informed the group that the United Nations Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business (UN/CEFACT) is a UN body looking at trade issues, under which a team focusing specifically on electronic certification, composed of individuals from Asia, Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States, had been formed. Sub-committees of this team had also been formed, each one dealing with either OIE, Codex or IPPC issues.

The group is setting up the technology behind SPS electronic data exchanges. The group will create the interface in which electronic data, such as that of a phytosanitary certificate, will be communicated between countries. Each country will be responsible for setting up its own system for electronic certification and information between national systems will be exchanged according to the standard that this UN group is developing.

Due to the information received from the group, it had been decided not to go ahead at this time with a standard on electronic certification. The Secretariat had asked Mr Patrice Sinave (Canada), who is a member of the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) Support Group, to sit on the committee and act as a liaison with the IPPC Secretariat. Mr Mike Robson, database manager of the International Portal on Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health (IPFSAPH), who is also involved in the IPP, had also been asked to liaise with this UN group, especially on data exchange, to ensure that the IPP developed correspondingly. Both Mr Sinave and Mr Robson had been asked to keep both the Secretariat and the SC informed of developments in this area.

## **12. Other business**

### **12.1 Replacement of steward for EWG on potato export certification**

Mr Wolff had informed the Secretariat that it would be financially difficult for Canada to send both an expert and himself as the steward to the EWG meeting on *Export certification for potato mini tubers and micropropagative material* in South Africa, and had requested to be replaced as steward.

The group recommended that the Secretariat investigate the following three possibilities:

1. Hold the meeting in Canada in order to reduce Canada's burden of funding the travel for two participants and keep Mr Wolff as the steward.
2. If funds are available within the IPPC Secretariat, offer to assist Mr Wolff with travel costs.
3. Ask the Canadian expert to take on the role of steward and liaise with Mr Wolff so that he may report to the SC.

The Secretariat also informed the group that the meeting had to be postponed since several other experts on this EWG were unable to attend at the planned dates.

### **12.2 Comments on documents and specifications produced at the extraordinary working group of the SC meeting**

Documents or specifications produced at this meeting were allocated to specific members of the group (see Annex 16) who would take responsibility for receiving comments from other SC members. This was to ensure that only critical comments submitted in a written form to the responsible person would be considered by the SC. Contact information of the extraordinary working group members can be found in Annex 17. Comments should be received by the respective extraordinary working group member no later than 20 October 2004.

### **12.3 SC-4 Report**

Mr Arnitis voiced concerns that the SC-4 report had not yet been distributed.

## **13. Close**

The Chairperson thanked the participants for their active participation in the meeting and ensuring that all specifications and documents had been agreed to.

## Extraordinary Working Group of the Standards Committee

### Proposed Agenda

Monday 12 July 9:00 to Thursday 15 July 18:00  
Nigeria Room, C215, FAO, Rome, Italy

- 1.0 Approval of agenda
- 2.0 Review specifications for expert working groups on:
  - 2.1 Redraft Specification No. 15, The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management of citrus fruit for citrus canker (*Xanthomonas axonopodis* pv. *citri*) to include a brief description of citrus canker surveillance.
  - 2.2 Citrus canker surveillance.
  - 2.3 Post-entry quarantine facilities.
  - 2.4 Research protocols for phytosanitary measures.
  - 2.5 Guidelines for the formatting/drafting of commodity or pest specific ISPMs.
  - 2.6 Debarking of wood
- 3.0 Review specifications for technical panels:
  - 3.1 Technical panel on forest quarantine issues.
- 4.0 Update on status of Electronic certification.
- 5.0 Formulate guidance on integrating supplements.
- 6.0 Develop criteria/guidance to apply in determining the need for a further round of formal consultation on a draft standard.
- 7.0 Guidelines for the roles and responsibilities of stewards.
- 8.0 Criteria for the formation and content of annexes.
- 9.0 Guidelines for the operation of expert working groups (in consultation with the IPPC Secretariat).
- 10.0 Guidelines on the roles and responsibilities of SC members and SC procedures (in consultation with the IPPC Secretariat).
- 11.0 Other Items:
  - Replacement of Greg Wolff as steward (Potatoes)
  - Submission form for topics and priorities for standards

**DRAFT SPECIFICATION NO. 15 (1<sup>ST</sup> REVISION)**

**Title:** The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management of citrus fruit for citrus canker (*Xanthomonas axonopodis* pv. *citri*)

**Reason for the standard:**

ISPM No. 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*) provides general guidelines related to pest risk management by the application of integrated measures in a systems approach, as an alternative to the application of a single phytosanitary measure or restrictive phytosanitary measures, with the objective of satisfying phytosanitary requirements.

The Fourth Session of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures recommended that a specific standard on risk management of citrus canker (*Xanthomonas axonopodis* pv. *citri*) for citrus fruit be developed.

Based on the biological characteristics of the pest, it is possible to offer different phytosanitary measures, integrated in a systems approach for the risk management of pest entry and establishment, that could be employed by importing countries with the aim to facilitate citrus fruit trade.

**Scope and purpose:** This standard provides specific guidelines on options for risk management of citrus canker by applying integrated phytosanitary measures in a systems approach to facilitate the movement of citrus fruit.

**Tasks:**

The Expert Working Group should:

- consider existing standards, such as ISPMs No. 4, 6, 8, 9 and 10
- consider citrus canker dissemination in relation to citrus fruit
- incorporate relevant concepts of systems approach (ISPM No. 14), including consideration of items such as:
  - inspections (field and packaging)
  - laboratory diagnostics
  - treatments
  - relationship between infested areas and pest free areas
  - general aspects of surveillance (keeping in mind that the technical aspects of surveillance are to be contained in a future standard on surveillance for citrus canker).

**Provision of resources:** Funding for meetings will be provided by the COSAVE region.

**Proposed work programme:** 13-17 September, 2004.

**Steward:** Odilson Ribeiro e Silva.

**Collaborators:** NPPOs from COSAVE region - Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay.

**Expertise:** A working group of 6-8 phytosanitary experts having familiarity with phytosanitary systems, ISPMs, systems approaches and citrus canker expertise.

**Participants:** Pablo Cortese (Argentina), Françoise Poliakoff (France), José Adalberto Zuniga Reyes (Honduras), Olivier Pruvost (Réunion), Lawrence Brown (U.S.), Maria Inés Ares (Uruguay), Ana Peralta (COSAVE).

**Approval:** Specification modified by the SC-7 in May 2003, and then following SC-20 comments obtained by e-mail. First revision recommended for approval by the SC at the extraordinary working group of the Standards Committee meeting, July 2004.

**References:**

IPPC 1997; WTO-SPS Agreement, ISPM No. 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*); ISPM No. 6 (*Guidelines for surveillance*); ISPM No. 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*); ISPM No. 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*); ISPM No. 10 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*); ISPM No. 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*); draft standard on citrus canker.



**DRAFT SPECIFICATION NO. 17**

Title: Debarking of wood

Reason for the standard:

Different interpretations by plant health authorities on what constitutes debarked wood –as opposed to complete freedom/absence of bark– often have an impact on the international trade of wood and wood products. Therefore, a standard is required to elaborate on what constitutes debarked wood.

Scope and purpose:

The purpose of this standard is to provide an IPPC description of what constitutes debarked wood. This standard will, therefore, propose tolerances for bark on debarked wood and an approach to estimate surface coverage of bark on debarked wood.

Tasks:

The Expert Working Group should:

- choose an appropriate title for the draft standard
- develop criteria to determine whether wood is or is not debarked
- liaise with the Technical Panel on forest quarantine and other relevant Expert Working Groups (EWGs) regarding pest risks and results of research relating to debarking
- estimate pest risks associated with remaining bark after debarking (for example, thickness, size of individual patches etc.)
- provide on site, visual inspection methodology for assessing bark amounts on wood including estimating surface area and thickness of bark present (which may be similar to keys for assessing area of leaf infection)
- propose tolerances for the presence of bark (area and thickness) on wood in cases where debarking is required
- discuss whether this draft standard should be a stand-alone standard or a component of an existing standard (e.g. a supplement to the glossary).

Provision of resources: Funding for meetings is provided from the regular programme of the IPPC Secretariat (FAO) except where expert participation is funded voluntarily by the expert's government.

Proposed work programme: June 2005.

Steward: Ringolds Arnitis.

Collaborators: EPPO.

Expertise: Research, phytosanitary and inspection experience.

Participants: It is recommended that the EWG for this standard draw some experts from the Technical Panel on forest quarantine.

Approval: Introduced into the work programme by the ICPM at its sixth session, April 2004. Specification recommended for approval by the SC at the extraordinary working group of the Standards Committee meeting, July 2004.

References: Relevant ISPMs and specifications and *Plant Pathology* or similar journals that have included visual keys for assessing surface area of leaf infection.

## **DRAFT SPECIFICATION NO. 22**

Title: Research protocols for phytosanitary measures

Reason for the standard: There is a need for guidelines for the submission of scientific research data on phytosanitary measures to be reviewed.

Scope and purpose: This standard provides criteria for submitting and evaluating scientific research data for phytosanitary measures for specific standards.

Tasks:

The first Expert Working Group (EWG) meeting will deal with phytosanitary treatments only.

The EWG should:

- define the general criteria for research in phytosanitary treatments (for example how to measure the efficiency of the treatment)
- discuss and determine what items need to be in the research protocol for consideration
- in cooperation with the Technical Panel on phytosanitary treatments ensure all items needed for the evaluation of scientific research data is contained in the protocol.

Provision of resources: Funding for meetings is provided from the regular programme of the IPPC Secretariat (FAO) except where expert participation is funded voluntarily by the expert's government.

Proposed work programme: To be determined.

Steward: John Hedley.

Collaborator: To be determined.

Expertise: Experience in research in phytosanitary treatments and general phytosanitary experience.

Participants: 5-7, including a representative(s) from the Technical Panel on phytosanitary treatments.

Approval: Introduced into the work programme by the ICPM at its sixth session, April 2004. Specification recommended for approval by the SC at the extraordinary working group of the Standards Committee meeting, July 2004.

References: Relevant ISPMs and specifications.

**DRAFT SPECIFICATION NO. 23**

**Title:** Guidelines for surveillance for specific pests: *Xanthomonas axonopodis* pv. *citri* (citrus canker).

**Reason for the standard:** Phytosanitary measures related to citrus canker often use area freedom or low pest prevalence. Claims about area freedom or low pest prevalence need to be based on surveillance and detection methodologies that have a sound technical and statistical base.

**Scope and purpose:** This standard provides specific guidelines on options for the surveillance and detection of citrus canker with a view to improve risk management decisions and facilitate the movement of citrus fruit.

The standard will provide a range of surveillance options relevant to area freedom and low pest prevalence. A range of detection methodologies will be provided including methodologies suitable for application by developing countries. Efficacy levels and confidence limits of the different options will be provided.

**Tasks:**

The Expert Working Group should:

- consider existing ISPMs, regional standards and other relevant documents produced by international organizations (see under References). Relevant import requirements or export certification schemes of individual countries may also be considered.
- consider and recommend relevant detection methodologies
- draft a standard that incorporates sound statistical principles for surveillance and appropriate detection technology for *Xanthomonas axonopodis* pv. *citri*.

**Provision of resources:** Funding is provided from the regular programme of the IPPC Secretariat (FAO) except where expert participation is voluntarily funded by the expert's government.

**Proposed work programme:** Put on the work programme at ICPM-5. Work programme to be determined.

**Steward:** Lawrence G. Brown.

**Collaborators:** To be determined.

**Expertise:** 5-7 participants comprised primarily of surveillance and citrus canker detection experts and to include practical expertise in phytosanitary measures and the statistical basis of surveillance.

**Participants:** To be determined.

**Approval:** Introduced into the work programme by the ICPM at its Sixth Session in 2004. Specification recommended for approval by the SC at the extraordinary working group of the Standards Committee meeting, July 2004.

**References:**

IPPC 1997; WTO-SPS Agreement; ISPM No. 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*); ISPM No. 6 (*Guidelines for surveillance*); ISPM No. 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*); ISPM No. 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*); ISPM No. 10 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*); draft standard on the Use of integrated measures in a systems approach for *Xanthomonas axonopodis* pv. *citri* (hasse) Vauterin et al, 1995 risk management in citrus fruit; previous versions of draft standards on this subject.

**DRAFT SPECIFICATION NO. 24**

Title: Post-entry quarantine facilities

Reason for the standard:

There is often a need for countries to import organisms for research or to supply new genetic plant material. However, such material has the potential to harbor plant pests and intentional importation can present a risk to plant health. Containment facilities are required during testing for potential pests in order to prevent the escape of such pests while plants are grown or organisms are multiplied.

Scope and purpose:

This standard provides information on the design and operation of containment facilities at different security levels where organisms, including plants and biocontrol agents, can be grown in an environment where there is minimal potential for the escape of pests.

Tasks:

The Expert Working Group should:

- discuss the overall systems (administrative and technical aspects) which would provide different levels of security required to manage post-entry quarantine and identify possible topics for future ISPMs
- discuss and determine what post-entry quarantine facilities are (i.e. contained field (fenced), laboratory, greenhouse). Develop guidelines for the safe handling of organisms, including plants and biocontrol agents, for research and possible release.
- develop comprehensive lists of conditions for laboratories, glasshouses etc. for different levels of security. For instance, growing plants with air-borne fungi may require strict containment requirements such as negative pressure and sealed doors and windows (high containment facility), while a facility importing exotic nematodes for research may only require minimal security and only deal with control of water and waste material (low containment facility).
- develop different requirements for different needs of infrastructure and expertise
- develop specifications of different requirements, where appropriate. For instance, seals, doors, window screens, windows, furnishings, heating/cooling systems, disposal/sanitation etc.
- elaborate on security measures such as signage, controlling access and plans for dealing with breaches that could result in unintentional releases.

Provision of resources: Funding for meetings is provided from the regular programme of the IPPC Secretariat (FAO) except where expert participation is voluntarily funded by the expert's government.

Proposed work programme: Put on the work programme at ICPM 6.

Steward: David Porritt (Australia).

Collaborators: To be determined.

Expertise: 5-7 international phytosanitary experts that have interest and expertise in phytosanitary systems for import of organisms, including plants and bio-control agents, and knowledge of relevant aspects of other standards. The experts should have practical expertise in post-entry quarantine facilities.

Participants: To be determined.

Approval: Introduced into the work programme by the ICPM at its sixth session, April 2004. Specification recommended for approval by the SC at the extraordinary working group of the Standards Committee meeting, July 2004.

References: National manuals and legislation, relevant ISPMs, regional standards and texts.

## **DRAFT SPECIFICATION NO. 25**

Title: Guidelines for formatting / drafting pest specific ISPMs

Reason for the standard: Pest specific standards are needed to deal with specific aspects of a particular pest as identified by the ICPM to help members with the application of phytosanitary measures and the specification of import requirements.

Scope and purpose: To describe in appropriate detail an aspect of a pest and/or a phytosanitary measure related to this specific pest.

### Tasks:

The Expert Working Group should:

- identify the aspects of pests and phytosanitary measures that may be considered for specific standards (for example identification, detection, relation between host and pest, biology, surveillance, pest free areas, control etc.)
- identify subject headings for pest specific ISPMs for each of the aspects identified
- consider means of obtaining published information for use in pest specific standards
- consider if standards can be developed for groups of pests, not just specific pests
- consider how to publish and disseminate this type of standard
- consider how pest specific standards (e.g. treatments, diagnostics, surveillance etc.) on the same pest could be integrated.

Provision of resources: Funding for meetings is provided from the regular programme of the IPPC Secretariat (FAO) except where expert participation is voluntarily funded by the expert's government.

Proposed work programme: February 2005.

Steward: John Hedley

Collaborator: To be determined.

Expertise: Experience in drafting pest specific standards and experience in collaborating with publishing organizations.

Participants: 5-7 participants including members of related EWGs and TPs.

Approval: Introduced into the work programme by the ICPM at its sixth session, April 2004. Specification recommended for approval by the SC at the extraordinary working group of the Standards Committee meeting, July 2004.

References: Relevant ISPMs, specifications, regional and/or national standards.

## **DRAFT SPECIFICATION NO. 26**

Title: Guidelines for formatting / drafting commodity specific ISPMs.

Reason for the standard: Commodity specific standards are needed to deal with specific aspects of a particular traded commodity.

Scope and purpose: To describe in appropriate detail pests associated with the commodity and phytosanitary measures related to the commodity.

### Tasks:

The Expert Working Group should:

- develop a format for listing pests associated with the commodity
- develop a format for describing phytosanitary measures used in the management of the associated pests
- consider other aspects that may be included in commodity specific ISPMs
- identify the subject headings for commodity specific ISPMs
- consider if standards can be developed for groups of commodities associated with a specific pest or group of pests and phytosanitary measures
- consider means of obtaining published information for use in commodity specific standards
- consider how to publish and disseminate this type of standard.

Provision of resources: Funding for meetings is provided from the regular programme of the IPPC Secretariat (FAO) except where expert participation is voluntarily funded by the expert's government.

Proposed work programme: February 2005.

Steward: John Hedley

Collaborator: To be determined.

Expertise: Experience in drafting commodity specific standards and experience in collaborating with publishing organizations.

Participants: 5-7 participants including members of related EWGs and TPs.

Approval: Introduced into the work programme by the ICPM at its sixth session, April 2004. Specification recommended for approval by the SC at the extraordinary working group of the Standards Committee meeting, July 2004.

References: Relevant ISPMs, specifications, regional and/or national standards.

**DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR TECHNICAL PANELS NO. 4**

Title: Technical Panel on forest quarantine.

Reason for the Technical Panel: ICPM-6 identified the need for the formation of a Technical Panel on forest quarantine issues.

Scope and purpose: The Technical Panel on forest quarantine will deal with technical matters regarding forest quarantine issues. It will review relevant technical and scientific information to provide guidance to the SC as requested on development, amendment and revision of standards.

Tasks:

The Technical Panel should:

- identify needed standards and recommend priorities for standards to the SC
- identify standards that need further research and report this to the SC
- in collaboration with the Expert Working Group (EWG) on research protocols for phytosanitary measures, develop a process and set up a protocol for the submission of forest quarantine research information (e.g. data on alternative treatments for wood packaging). They should also identify and define criteria and then develop an evaluation method for such research protocols.
- identify the extent to which the work of this panel overlaps with the work of other groups, such as the EWG on debarking of wood, the EWG on research protocols for phytosanitary measures and the International Forest Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG), and ensure coordination with these groups to prevent duplication of work
- as necessary, propose revisions for the existing treatment parameters provided in Annex I of ISPM No. 15
- provide recommendations on alternative treatments for inclusion in Annex I of ISPM No. 15
- analyse existing research data and identify knowledge gaps relating to the pest risks of bark remaining on wood and wood packaging material and make proposals to the SC.

Provision of resources: Funding for meetings is provided from the regular programme of the IPPC Secretariat (FAO) except where expert participation is funded voluntarily by the expert's government.

Proposed work programme: 2005.

Steward: Gregory W. Wolff.

Collaborator: FAO.

Expertise: Expertise in forest quarantine issues from both the research and phytosanitary fields including practical experience.

Participants: It is recommended that 4-7 participants from several regions be selected.

Approval: Introduced into the work programme by the ICPM at its sixth session, April 2004. Specification recommended for approval by the SC at the extraordinary working group of the Standards Committee meeting, July 2004.

References: Appropriate ISPMs, specifications and ICPM reports.

## **CRITERIA FOR THE FORMATION, CONTENT AND SUBSEQUENT CHANGE OF SUPPLEMENTS, ANNEXES AND APPENDICES IN ISPMs**

(Revised at the extraordinary working group of the Standards Committee meeting, July 2004)

There are several ways to add or change information in an ISPM and its component documents (supplements, annexes and appendices).

ISPMs may be:

- amended
- revised or
- have supplements, annexes and appendices added to them.

Supplements, annexes and appendices may be:

- amended or
- revised.

In general, a revision affects the entire document whereas an amendment affects a specific part or parts of the document.

### **1. Criteria for the formation, content and subsequent change of supplements**

- Supplements are the mechanism that the ICPM uses in certain situations to add conceptual information that is supplemental to a standard and that provides additional text without changing existing text. This is different from amendments or revisions to a standard.
- Supplements are numbered sequentially with Arabic numerals.
- Supplements are the first component document to follow the body of the standard.
- Glossary (ISPM No. 5) supplements are used to clarify and explain complex phytosanitary terms and definitions which cannot be understood from a normal concise definition.
- Text from supplements may be integrated into the standard according to the decision of the ICPM. In this case, the integrated text should be clearly indicated by a symbol or other means, and the standard should carry the date of adoption of the supplement by the ICPM.
- Glossary supplements are attached to the end of the section containing terms and definitions, and are numbered sequentially in the order of adoption of the supplement by the ICPM.
- The date of adoption by the ICPM should be indicated in the amended or revised supplement.

### **2. Criteria for the formation, content and subsequent change of annexes**

- An annex is an official part of a standard (prescriptive) and this should be stated in the header. An annex adds technical information to the standard. It is referred to in the main text of the standard.
- Annexes are numbered sequentially with Arabic numerals.
- Annexes follow the body of the standard and follow supplements, if present.
- Information in annexes does not affect the principles incorporated in the primary standard. They do not normally include conceptual information of relevance to the standard.
- Annexes may provide technical guidelines for phytosanitary treatments or procedures, including treatments, treatment schedules and diagnostic protocols. They may include tables and figures.
- Annexes may contain information that may need to be amended or revised to ensure that the specific information provided is consistent with and reflects current scientific knowledge and other relevant information. The circumstances under which amendments and revisions become necessary may include:
  - the approval of new guidelines, treatments or procedures
  - a change in existing methods
  - as a result of experiences with implementation of a particular standard.



- New annexes or amendments and revisions to existing annexes may be proposed following section 5.1.3 of the IPPC Procedural Manual, First edition, 2004 *Procedures for identifying topics and priorities for standards*.
- Amendment or revision of annexes may be made without modifying the standard.
- The date of adoption by the ICPM should be indicated in the amended or revised annex.

### **3. Criteria for the formation, content and subsequent change of appendices**

- Appendices are not official parts of standards (for information only, not prescriptive) and this should be stated in the header.
- Appendices are numbered sequentially with Arabic numerals.
- Appendices should be the last component document in a standard.
- Appendices provide references or further information relevant to the standard.
- The date of adoption by the ICPM should be indicated in the amended or revised appendix.

## Submission form for ICPM work programme topics

(Revised at the extraordinary working group of the Standards Committee meeting, July 2004)

Complete the following as thoroughly as possible and submit to the IPPC Secretariat no later than October 1, 2004. Please use one form per topic. An electronic version is available at [www.ippc.int](http://www.ippc.int).

(Text in brackets given for explanatory purposes)

<b>Proposed by:</b> (Name of country or organization)			
<b>Contact:</b> (Contact information of an individual able to clarify issues relating to this submission)			
Name: .....			
Position and organization: .....			
Mailing address: .....			
.....			
Phone: .....			
Fax: .....			
Email: .....			
<b>Type of topic:</b> (Choose only one option from column A, B, C or D)			
A. New ISPM:	B. New component	C. Revision of:	D. Amendment to:
<input type="checkbox"/> Concept	to an existing ISPM:	<input type="checkbox"/> ISPM	<input type="checkbox"/> ISPM
<input type="checkbox"/> Pest specific	<input type="checkbox"/> Supplement	<input type="checkbox"/> Supplement	<input type="checkbox"/> Supplement
<input type="checkbox"/> Commodity specific	<input type="checkbox"/> Annex	<input type="checkbox"/> Annex	<input type="checkbox"/> Annex
<input type="checkbox"/> Reference	<input type="checkbox"/> Appendix	<input type="checkbox"/> Appendix	<input type="checkbox"/> Appendix
Suggested title of new ISPM or component:		Title of document to be revised or amended:	
.....		.....	
<b>Subject:</b> (Provide information on the topic of the document)			
<b>Purpose:</b> (Background information on why the document is needed and the intended outcome)			
<b>Key areas to be addressed:</b> (Specific subject matter to be contained in the document)			

Send submissions to:

**E-mail:** [ippc@fao.org](mailto:ippc@fao.org)

**Fax:** (+39) 06 5705 6347

**Mail:** IPPC Secretariat (AGPP)  
Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00100 Rome, Italy

## OUTLINE OF PROCEDURES FOR ELABORATION OF INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

### IPPC Procedural manual (First edition, 2004) Section 5.1.1

(Recommended for revision by the extraordinary working group of the SC, July 2004)

#### Step 1

Proposals for a new International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) or for the review or revision of an existing ISPM are submitted to the IPPC Secretariat in the form of a discussion paper accompanied by a topic or draft standard.

#### Step 2

A summary of proposals is submitted by the Secretariat to the ICPM. The ICPM identifies the topics and priorities for standard setting from among the proposals submitted to the Secretariat and the others that may be raised by the ICPM.

#### Step 3

Specifications for the standards identified as priorities by the ICPM are drafted by the Secretariat. The draft specifications are submitted to the Standards Committee for approval/amendment and subsequently made available to Members and RPPOs for comment (60 days). Comment is by written submission to the Secretariat. Specifications are finalized by the Standards Committee taking into account the comments.

#### Step 4

The standard is drafted or revised by a Working Group designated by the Standards Committee and in accordance with the specification. The resulting draft standard is submitted to the Standards Committee for review.

#### Step 5

Draft standards approved by the Standards Committee are distributed to Members and RPPOs for consultation (100 days). Comment is by written submission to the Secretariat. Where appropriate, the Standards Committee may establish Open-ended Discussion Groups, as fora for further comment. Comments are summarized by the Secretariat and submitted to the Standards Committee.

#### Step 6

The draft standard is revised by the Secretariat in cooperation with the Standards Committee taking comments into account. Based on comments the draft standard may be substantially changed (structurally and/or technically). In these cases the Standards Committee may decide to submit the draft for another round of consultation. In addition, when comments indicate a substantial disagreement over a part of the draft standard, the Standards Committee must decide whether to submit the draft to another round of consultation or to return it to the Expert Working Group for redrafting.

When the SC agrees on a final version of the draft standard it is submitted to the ICPM for adoption.

#### Step 7

The ISPM is established through formal adoption by the ICPM according to Rule X of the Rules of Procedure of the ICPM.

#### Step 8

The ISPM is reviewed by the specified date or such other date as may be agreed upon by the ICPM.

Circumstances may arise where it would be appropriate to vary this procedure. These circumstances should be brought to the attention of the ICPM as soon as they arise, enabling the ICPM to assess them and to take action accordingly.

## **GUIDELINES ON THE ROLE OF A STEWARD OF AN ISPM**

(Revised at the extraordinary working group of the Standards Committee meeting, July 2004)

### **Scope**

This document describes the role of a steward for an ISPM.

### **1. Introduction**

The management of the technical development of standards through the standard setting procedure has been found to exceed the capacity of the IPPC Secretariat. It was also recognized that there was a need to establish strong links between Expert Working Groups (EWGs) and the SC. To deal with the workload, it has been suggested that some of the duties concerned with the preparation of standards and the associated procedures be taken on by stewards.

### **2. Selection of stewards**

Stewards are senior plant health officers or scientists who are familiar with the standard setting process. Proposed stewards should recognize that considerable time may be required (see section 4). Stewards should be drawn from the SC or membership of the EWG.

### **3. Role of the steward**

In general terms, the role of the steward is to assist with the development of a particular standard from the time of the drafting of the specification to the adoption the standard by the ICPM and to provide a linkage between the EWG and the SC. The functions of a steward will vary according to the nature and complexity of the standard and the requirements stated in the specification. The steward should ensure that the EWG follows the IPPC standard setting procedures. The steward could be involved in the following sequence of normal standard development.

#### **3.1 Prior to the EWG meeting**

If requested the steward may be able to provide guidance to the IPPC Secretariat and the SC in relation to the selection of experts for the EWG. The steward should liaise with the Secretariat to ensure that discussion papers are produced for the EWG meeting.

#### **3.2 At the EWG meeting**

The steward would be expected to:

- explain the requirements of the specification to the EWG at the time of its first meeting. Hence, the steward should have a good understanding of the specification for the standard. If some issues are unclear, the steward should discuss the matters with the Secretariat or members of the SC.
- assist with the running of the meeting. In some instances, the steward may take the role of the chair of the group or of the discussion facilitator
- assist the Secretariat to complete the draft standard
- assist the Secretariat in the preparation of the meeting report.

#### **3.3 At the SC meeting that approves drafts for country consultation**

The steward may attend the relevant SC meeting to assist the work of the SC on the standard that he or she is responsible for. If the steward cannot attend the SC meeting, he or she should provide documentation about the standard, brief a SC member or hold a conference call with the SC.

#### **3.4 Prior to the SC meeting that approves standards for adoption at ICPM**

In preparation for the SC meeting, the steward should review country comments to facilitate the review of the comments by the SC, identifying the important or contentious issues within the comments and recommending amendments to the draft. Guidance for the steward's review will be provided by the IPPC Secretariat.

### **3.5 At the SC meeting that approves standards for adoption at ICPM**

The steward, if not a member of the SC, may attend the relevant SC meeting to assist with discussions on the country comments. If the steward cannot attend the SC meeting, he or she should provide documentation about the standard, brief a SC member or hold a conference call with the SC.

### **4. Conclusion**

The level of involvement of the steward in the preparation of a standard will vary with the complexity of the standard. There is also likely to be limits on the time that some stewards can spend on this work and the travel expenditures regarding SC attendance. The estimated time requirements for the involvement of a steward in a single standard is approximately six weeks, including activities such as reading documents, developing discussion papers, attending the EWG meeting, reporting, reviewing country comments, attending SC meetings or briefing SC member and preparation of a presentation for regional workshops on draft ISPMs. Contracting parties, and the Regional Plant Protection Organizations of which they are members, are encouraged to support the production of standards by supporting the work of stewards where this is possible.

**GUIDELINES FOR THE OPERATION OF EXPERT WORKING GROUPS**  
(Revised at the extraordinary working group of the Standards Committee meeting, July 2004)

**1. Introduction**

These guidelines have been prepared to aid those assisting, involved in organizing or attending an Expert Working Group (EWG) meeting. The guidelines cover most of the requirements and procedures for the successful operation of an EWG. They are general guidelines so not all parts apply to every EWG meeting and some very specific requirements of some groups may not be included.

**2. Funding**

The main funding for EWG meetings comes from the FAO IPPC budget. This is normally supplemented by member countries or organizations covering participants' expenses [travel and daily subsistence allowance (DSA)]. In some instances, member countries or organizations have funded, or partially funded, an EWG on a specific subject. A member country, organization or agency offering such funding or providing any level of assistance in operating an EWG is referred to as a collaborator in this document.

Participation of the IPPC Secretariat is funded by FAO.

**3. Organization**

EWG meetings can only be organized for those topics which have been adopted under the topics and priorities for standards at the ICPM. The organization of EWG meetings is normally done by the IPPC Secretariat with varying levels of assistance from a collaborator.

**3.1 Composition of the EWG**

See the IPPC Procedural manual, first edition, 2004, section 4.3.

**3.2 Meetings held at FAO Rome or other FAO Offices**

The IPPC Secretariat in general uses FAO offices to make logistical arrangements, including travel and DSA.

For a meeting at FAO in Rome, the IPPC Secretariat does not make hotel bookings, but names and addresses of accommodation are provided on the IPP ([www.ippc.int](http://www.ippc.int)).

**3.3 Meetings held outside of FAO offices**

The collaborator may take various levels of involvement. A commonly operated system is where FAO enters into a letter of agreement with the collaborator (after agreeing on a budget) and transfers the funds needed for the meeting. The letter of agreement generally covers participants' expenses (travel and DSA) and may cover other items as appropriate. The collaborator is expected to make arrangements for participants' expenses, meeting rooms, photocopying, field trip etc.

In other cases the collaborator may fund the entire meeting (including participants' expenses, meeting room, photocopying, field trip etc.) or part of the meeting.

**4. Roles of meeting organizers and participants**

**4.1 IPPC Secretariat**

The Secretariat is expected to:

- plan a meeting date and seek a collaborator
- provide resources for the meeting, if held on FAO premises
- approve budget being paid by the IPPC and, if necessary, prepare a letter of agreement
- send a letter of invitation to participants (especially for the purpose of obtaining visas) and interact with the FAO visa office if needed
- liaise with collaborator, steward and EWG participants as appropriate

- arrange with the steward for the production of discussion papers
- attempt to find a replacement if an EWG participant approved by the SC is not able to attend the meeting (and inform the SC of such changes)
- coordinate the organization of the meeting and be responsible for the production of the draft ISPM and meeting report.

#### **4.2 Collaborator**

The collaborator is expected to:

- select location, make local arrangements, make hotel bookings, book meeting rooms and arrange for coffee breaks, official dinner (if appropriate) and field trip (if appropriate)
- interact with embassies as needed for the purpose of obtaining visas
- provide meeting resources (see item 5)
- provide, where possible, a rapporteur (who could be regarded as a resource outside of the EWG)
- arrange for local transportation as appropriate, including airport transfer and transfer from the hotel to the meeting room (or provides suitable information)
- provide, as necessary, information on local conditions, address of the hotel and meeting venue, map, medical information etc.
- have facilities to provide copies of working papers and of documents drafted during the meeting, as appropriate.

#### **4.3 Steward**

The steward is expected to:

- explain the requirements of the specification to the EWG at the time of its first meeting. Hence, the steward should have a good understanding of the specification for the standard. If some issues are unclear, the steward should discuss the matters with the Secretariat or members of the SC.
- liaise with the Secretariat to ensure that discussion papers are produced for the EWG meeting
- assist with the running of the meeting. In some instances, the steward may take the role of the chair of the group or of the discussion facilitator
- assist the Secretariat to complete the draft standard
- assist the Secretariat in the preparation of the meeting report.

These duties are discussed in more detail in the *Guidelines for the role of a steward of an ISPM*.

#### **4.4 Chair**

The EWG chairperson is selected at the meeting. The function is that of a normal chair - to keep the meeting running smoothly and ensure participation by all experts - with some additional duties. The chairperson is expected to:

- describe and explain the mode of operation of the EWG and the roles and responsibilities of participants (ICPM-6 Report, Appendix VIII *Improvement in the current standard setting process*)
- act as facilitator of the group in its production of draft text
- assist the Secretariat, steward and rapporteur to prepare the EWG report
- be involved, where appropriate, with the steward in incorporating EWG comments into the draft standard.

#### **4.5 Experts**

The experts in an EWG should:

- take responsibility for their travel and accommodation arrangements and visa requirements as requested by the meeting organizer. Experts are expected to be in attendance for the entirety of the EWG meeting and should plan to arrive before the meeting starts and depart after the meeting concludes. They should undertake whatever

needs to be done in a timely manner so there are no urgent arrangements to be made by the organizers.

- prepare discussion papers, possibly consulting with national or regional experts, as requested
- actively participate in e-mail discussion prior to and after the meeting, if appropriate
- study discussion papers prior to the meeting and develop specific comments and text as appropriate
- in reflecting their regional viewpoints, aim to produce a globally acceptable standard
- assist stewards as needed, particularly when reviewing country comments.

#### **4.6 Rapporteur**

Each EWG requires a rapporteur to take down the text for the draft standard and, where possible, to take notes on the meeting discussions. The rapporteur should have facility with the English language and be able to use a computer for note taking. This is an extremely important supporting function of the EWG. Where possible the rapporteur should not be a member of the EWG but be part of the supporting team. If a member of the EWG does have to act as rapporteur, that expert's contribution to the meeting discussions tends to be severely restricted. The rapporteur should, where possible, assist the Secretariat with the meeting report.

#### **5. Meeting resources**

The usual meeting resources are required for an EWG meeting. These include:

- a quiet room large enough to accommodate up to 10 people
- white boards, flip charts and marker pens
- computer
- coffee/tea making facilities for work breaks
- copies of ISPMs, ICPM reports, dictionary.

#### **6. Time schedule for meeting**

The meeting is scheduled by the Secretariat in coordination with interested parties and participants after the ICPM has agreed to the work programme. Meeting dates are posted on the IPP. Experts are nominated by member countries and RPPOs and the specific experts for any particular EWG are selected by the SC. Following this, the nominated Secretariat person and the steward arrange:

- **3 months prior to the meeting**

The Secretariat:

- makes a call for discussion papers.

- **2 months prior to the meeting**

The Secretariat:

- sends the discussion papers to the EWG members
- announces the meeting to participants by e-mail, and sends out early personal invitations by e-mail and surface mail (in some cases via courier) to those members known to have less rapid national administrative procedures.

- **1 month prior to the meeting**

The Secretariat:

- asks experts to exchange comments on discussion papers
- sends a personal invitation letter by e-mail to each expert announcing the meeting (if not already done). When the meeting is in Rome, and for experts from countries not requiring a visa, paper copies of the letter of invitation may be sent only on request.
- asks experts if they have any specific needs.

The collaborator:

- sends a personal invitation letter.



EWG members:

- undertake to obtain authorization from their authorities, if appropriate
  - reply to the IPPC Secretariat and request financial assistance for their expenses, if needed, immediately after they receive a copy of their e-mail invitation
  - reply to the organizers as stated in the letter of invitation to acknowledge receipt of the invitation and inform the organizer of their attendance (this requirement facilitates the obtaining of building passes etc.)
  - ensure their visa and travel arrangements are completed in time.
- **2 weeks prior to the meeting**
- The Secretariat forwards to the EWG members:
- an agenda for the meeting
  - dates, time and venue of the meeting
  - planned meeting hours
  - information provided by the collaborator (see section 4.2).

### **7. Output of the meeting**

The EWG should finish the meeting with a draft standard. Occasionally, this is not the case and further discussions via e-mail are required. However, these should be limited to one month after the EWG meeting and the draft should then be released to the Secretariat.

Where substantial work still needs to be done on the draft standard the Secretariat, in consultation with the steward and SC, arranges for a further meeting.

Each EWG meeting should produce a draft standard and a report of the meeting (noting major discussion points or contentious issues). The steward should be familiar enough with the issues of the draft standard to be able to attend a SC meeting (often the steward is a SC member) and discuss the draft with the SC.

**GUIDELINES ON THE DUTIES OF MEMBERS OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE**  
(Revised at the extraordinary working group of the Standards Committee meeting, July 2004)

## **1. Introduction**

ICPM-6 adopted the recommendations of the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) on improvements in the current standard setting process. These included the production of brief guidelines on the roles and responsibilities of Standards Committee (SC) members by the IPPC Secretariat in consultation with the SC for approval by the ICPM. These guidelines should be provided to all SC members.

These recommendations arise from the difficulties that SC members may face in understanding their roles and responsibilities and aim at improving transparency in the standard setting process.

These difficulties may increase as the number of standards being developed increases (two per year to eleven in 2004), the turnover of members of the SC intensifies (three in 2003, eight in 2004 etc.) and the SC increases in size (1994 CEPM - 14 members, 2001 ISC - 16 members, 2005 SC - 25 members).

It was suggested that a more detailed practical guide would assist SC members in understanding their duties better and improve the efficiency of the standard setting process. This is in addition to the following documents (published in the IPPC Procedural Manual, first edition, 2004):

- Terms of Reference (TOR) for the SC
- Rules of Procedure (ROP) for the SC
- Outline of Procedures for the Elaboration of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures.

## **2. Purpose of the Standards Committee**

The Standards Committee is an integral component of the standard setting process with the purpose of assisting the production of draft standards that are of sufficient quality to be adopted by the ICPM as International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). The SC does not write standards but prepares draft ISPMs according to the standard-setting procedures, monitors each standard's development and ensures they have a consistent quality. The SC may also be assigned additional tasks by the ICPM.

The SC ensures that the standards:

- fulfil the specification for the standard
- fall within the scope of the IPPC
- are technically based
- have scientific integrity
- follow the principles and policies of the ICPM
- are presented in the required format for standards
- are written in a simple, clear and focused language.

The ICPM has decided that the SC should be made up of experts from different regions. The ICPM intends that the committee include a diversity of global views on any subject it deals with. These views are used in the production of internationally harmonised standards. They encompass, for example, the views of different geographic regions of the world, developing and developed countries, tropical and temperate regions, continental and island nations, highly and sparsely populated countries, countries with intensive agricultural or forestry interests etc. The choice of experts on a regional basis is a pragmatic choice to obtain a range of views that can produce internationally acceptable standards.

The primary purpose of the SC is to ensure that ISPMs help to protect plant health on a global scale. The officials or scientists that are selected are expected to act as individual experts, not as country representatives. However, the views of the expert are usually those characteristic of the region the expert comes from.

In addition to assisting with the development of standards, the SC serves as a forum for other functions as directed by the ICPM. These types of functions could include the review of procedural and administrative documents to ensure they are consistent with the standard setting process and are feasible.

### **3. Structure of the SC**

The formation of the SC is outlined in the TORs for the SC. The whole body is referred to the SC and this body selects its own chair and vice chair. In addition, the SC members from each FAO region select a member to form the SC 7 who, in turn, select their own chair. The SC oversees the work of Expert Working Groups (EWGs) and Technical Panels (TPs) through the use of specifications. The SC may break into smaller working groups as necessary in order to deal with a heavy workload. Holding extraordinary meetings of the SC should be done in consultation with the Bureau.

### **4. Duties and associated tasks of SC members**

During the standard setting process, SC members have a number of duties directly concerned with draft standards by virtue of their membership of the SC. These duties are listed in section 4.2 below. Normally, however, SC members also undertake any one or several of a number of other roles within the standard drafting procedure. The duties of these roles are described in sections 4.5 and 4.6. The other duties of SC members are listed in the following sections.

#### **4.1 Procedural division of duties amongst SC members**

SC members examine:

- draft standards before submitting them to the consultation process
- comments from the consultation process.

There are provisions for a smaller SC group, such as the SC 7 made up of one expert from each region, to take the place of the full committee as an economy measure. These provisions may not be used every year. Other members of the SC not included in the small group may contact members of the small group with appropriate advice.

Also, during meetings of the full SC, members may be grouped in smaller sub-groups so as to consider more material in the time available.

#### **4.2 Basic duties directly related to the evaluation of draft standards**

The basic duties of the SC member include:

- examination of draft standards from EWGs or TPs. Prior to the meeting, the SC member reads the drafts, considers the reports of the EWG or TP and prepares comments. The SC member presents any comments or changes to the draft to the SC meeting, usually held in May.
- examination of comments on draft standards after country consultation. The SC member reviews the country comments (except those relating to editing and translation), discusses them with the SC and proposes appropriate changes to the draft. This meeting is usually held in November.

- the making of consequential proposals to:
  - send draft standards for country consultation
  - approve the standard and send it to the ICPM for adoption
  - initiate a further round of consultation or
  - send the draft back to the EWG.

#### **4.3 Time requirements**

The participation as a SC member may involve a considerable time input. The estimate of this time input would be:

- 3 - 4 weeks for meetings (depending on involvement in the SC7 and travel distance)
- 2 weeks to review draft standards
- 2 weeks to review country comments.

This may be increased if the SC member participates in regional workshops on draft standards and/or is a steward of an ISPM(s).

#### **4.4 Regional communication**

SC members are requested, where possible, to assist with the communication of information regarding the draft standards to countries within their region. This could be done by discussing the issues with other regional experts, attending regional workshops on draft standards, or contributing to supplementary written information on the draft standards.

#### **4.5 Duties of SC members in an EWG when they are not a steward**

The ICPM recommends that each EWG has one SC member within the group. The SC member can be a basic member of the group (see *Guidelines for the operation of EWGs*) or be a steward (see *Guidelines for the role of a steward of an ISPM* and section 4.6). The SC member may assist with the EWG more than an ordinary member because of their experience. The duties of an SC member of the EWG who is not a steward may include:

- prior to the meeting of the EWG:
  - assist with the arrangements for the meeting
  - offer their advice to others organizing the meeting.
- during the EWG meeting:
  - explain the standard setting process, if necessary
  - act as the chair or rapporteur if required
  - participate as an expert
  - assist the steward as required.
- at the SC meeting:
  - act as a backup to the steward to explain the draft standard and the main discussion points during the EWG meeting.

Frequently the SC member is the steward for the standard (see section 4.6).

#### **4.6 Duties of SC members in an EWG when they are a steward**

It is intended that most EWGs will have a steward that is an SC member. The functions of a steward are described in detail in the *Guidelines for the role of a steward of an ISPM*. A brief summary of these duties are:

- participate in the selection of experts
- explain the standard setting process and the specifications to the EWG
- assist in the development of discussion papers
- assist the Secretariat in the organization and running of the meeting
- explain the main points of the draft standard to the SC and answer questions
- assist the SC in analyzing country comments.

#### **4.7 Examination of specifications for standards**

The SC member carefully reviews the specifications for standards that are prepared by, or under the auspices of, the Secretariat.

The SC member reviews the specifications drafted by the Secretariat by:

- discussing to ensure the specifications will produce a globally acceptable standard
- ensuring the specifications accurately describe the title and the scope and purpose of the intended standard
- ensuring the tasks and other elements of the specifications are correctly identified
- proposing modifications if necessary.

#### **4.8 The examination of procedural and administrative documents**

The ICPM adopts procedural and administrative documents (e.g. TOR and ROP of various groups). These are reviewed by the SC to ensure they are consistent with the standard setting process and feasible. They are then amended if necessary and forwarded to the ICPM.

#### **4.9 Other administrative duties**

These include:

- designation and approval of the membership of EWGs and TPs
- designation and approval of stewards for EWGs
- approval of subjects for specific standards as proposed by the TPs
- establishment of open-ended discussion groups
- review of priorities for ISPMs proposed by the SPTA with the opportunity to add other priorities
- undertaking of other duties as requested by the ICPM.

**Contacts for submission of comments on documents and specifications produced at the extraordinary working group of the SC meeting, July 2004**

<b>Contact</b>	<b>Specification or document name</b>
Mr John HEDLEY	Specification No. 22 - Research protocols for phytosanitary measures
	Specification No. 25 - Guidelines for formatting / drafting pest specific ISPMs
	Specification No. 26 - Guidelines for formatting / drafting commodity specific ISPMs
	Guidelines on the duties of members of the Standards Committee of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
Mr Odilson Luiz RIBEIRO E SILVA	Specification No. 15 (1 <sup>st</sup> revision) - The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management of citrus canker ( <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i> )
	Specification No. 23 - Guidance for surveillance for specific pests: <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i> (Citrus canker)
	Guidelines for the operation of expert working groups
Mr Ringolds ARNITIS	Specification No. 17 - Debarking of wood
	Technical Panel Specification No. 4 - Technical Panel on forest quarantine
	Guidelines for the role of a steward of an ISPM
Ms Asna BOOTY OTHMAN	Specification No. 24 - Post-entry quarantine facilities
	Criteria for the formation and subsequent change of supplements, annexes and appendices in ISPMs
	Submission form for ICPM work programme topics
	IPPC Procedural manual (First edition, 2004 ) Section 5.1.1 <i>Outline of procedures for elaboration of international standards for phytosanitary measures</i>

**List of participants  
Extraordinary working group of the SC, July 2004**

<p>Mr Ringolds ARNITIS Director State Plant Protection Service Ministry of Agriculture Republikas lauk 2 Riga, LV-1981 Latvia Tel: +371 7027098 Fax: +371 7027302 E-mail: <a href="mailto:ringolds.arnitis@vaad.gov.lv">ringolds.arnitis@vaad.gov.lv</a></p>	<p>Ms Asna BOOTY OTHMAN Director Crop Protection &amp; Plant Quarantine Services Department of Agriculture Jln Gallagher 50632 Kuala Lumpur Malaysia Tel: +60 3 26977120 / +60 3 269273077 Fax: +60 3 26977205 E-mail: <a href="mailto:asna@pqdoa.moa.my">asna@pqdoa.moa.my</a> / <a href="mailto:asnadoa@hotmail.com">asnadoa@hotmail.com</a></p>
<p>Mr John HEDLEY Principal Adviser Biosecurity Coordination – International Biosecurity Authority Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry P.O. Box 2526 Wellington New Zealand Tel: +64 4 474 4170 Fax: +64 4 470 2730 E-mail: <a href="mailto:John.Hedley@maf.govt.nz">John.Hedley@maf.govt.nz</a></p>	<p>Mr Odilson Luiz RIBEIRO E SILVA Chief Sanitary &amp; Phytosanitary Agreements Division Ministry of Agriculture, Cattle &amp; Supply Esplanada dos Ministerios, Bloco D Anexo B, Sala 422 Brasilia DF Brazil Tel: +55 61 2182308 Fax: +55 61 2183995 E-mail: <a href="mailto:odilson@agricultura.gov.br">odilson@agricultura.gov.br</a></p>

**IPPC Secretariat**

<p>Mr Brent Larson Standards Officer International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Rome Italy Tel: +39 06 570 54915 Fax: +39 06 570 56347 E-mail: <a href="mailto:Brent.Larson@fao.org">Brent.Larson@fao.org</a></p>	<p>Ms Stacie Johnston Consultant International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Rome Italy Tel: +39 06 570 55927 Fax: +39 06 570 56347 E-mail: <a href="mailto:Stacie.Johnston@fao.org">Stacie.Johnston@fao.org</a></p>
---	---