Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics

Core criteria

1. Contribution to the purpose of the IPPC as described in article I.1.
2. Feasibility of implementation at the global level (includes ease of implementation, technical complexity, capacity of NPPOs to implement, relevance for more than one region).
3. Clear identification of the problems that need to be resolved through the development of the standard.
4. Availability of, or possibility to collect, information in support of the proposed standard (e.g. scientific, historical, technical information, experience).

Supporting criteria

Practical

1. Feasibility of adopting the proposed standard within a reasonable time frame.
2. Stage of development of the proposed standard (is a standard on the same topic already widely used by NPPOs, RPPOs or a relevant international organization).
3. Availability of expertise needed to develop the proposed standard.

Economic

4. Estimated value of the plants protected.
5. Estimated value of trade affected by the proposed standard (e.g. volume of trade, value of trade, the percentage of Gross Domestic Product of this trade) if appropriate.
6. Estimated value of new trade opportunities provided by the approval of the proposed standard.
7. Potential benefits in terms of pest control or quarantine activities.

Environmental

8. Utility to reduce the potential negative environmental consequences of certain phytosanitary measures, for example reduction in global emissions for the protection of the ozone layer.
9. Utility in the management of non indigenous species which are pests of plants (such as some invasive alien species).
10. Contribution to the protection of the environment, through the protection of wild flora, and their habitats and ecosystems, and of agricultural biodiversity.

Strategic

11. Extent of support for the proposed standard (e.g. one or more NPPOs or RPPOs have requested it, or one or more RPPOs have adopted a standard on the same topic).
12. Frequency with which the issue addressed by the proposed standard emerges as a source of trade disruption (e.g. disputes or need for repeated bilateral discussions, number of times per year trade is disrupted).
13. Relevance and utility to developing countries.
14. Coverage (application to a wide range of countries/pests/commodities).
15. Complements other standards (e.g. potential for the standard to be used as part of a systems approach for one pest, complement treatments for other pests).
16. Foundation standards to address fundamental concepts (e.g. treatment efficacy, inspection methodology).
17. Expected standard longevity (e.g. future trade needs, suggested use of easily outdated technology or products).
18. Urgent need for the standard.