



Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) Working Procedures

(Status: approved by the TPDP October 2006 (annex 3), noted by the SC May 2007, revised by the TPDP June 2008; revised by the TPDP July 2010, noted by the SC May 2011; revised by the TPDP November 2012, noted by the SC May 2013)

Annual work programme

- The TPDP annually identifies priority subjects for diagnostic protocols (DP) taking into account guidance from the Standards Committee (SC), and any requests for reviews and amendments to a DP that have been received by TPDP members and the criteria for prioritization of DPs. The TPDP submits recommendations on subjects to the SC. National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) and regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) may also submit subjects for a DP in response to the IPPC Secretariat's biennial call made for topics to be considered for the IPPC List of topics for IPPC standards
- The TPDP reports annually through the Steward to the SC. This report includes the achievements during the year, proposals for subjects, a proposed work programme, report on tasks allocated by the SC, such as revision of working procedures as necessary, and other items needing SC decision.

Nominations of experts

- Once subjects for DPs are put on the work programme, the IPPC Secretariat issues a call requesting nominations of experts for DPs identified as priorities and posts the call on the IPP. For seed-related DPs the Secretariat also informs the International Seed Testing Association and the International Seed Federation of the call.
- The TPDP discipline leads are encouraged to notify relevant experts of the call.
- Experts are encouraged to be nominated by NPPOs or RPPOs, but all nominations will be considered
- The CVs of nominated experts are reviewed by the discipline lead taking into account the expertise required for authors for DPs (as detailed below).
- In parallel to the call, the discipline lead may identify one expert that would be essential for the development of the DP, and contact that expert to ensure his/her commitment.
- Considering nominations from the call and possibly the experts identified in parallel, the TPDP discipline lead recommends a DP drafting group, with an expert to lead the development of a DP (lead author) and a small group of experts to assist him/her with the development (co-authors).
- This information, along with a summary of the expertise of each expert, is submitted to the TPDP, who agrees or amends the recommendations as appropriate. The list of DP drafting groups (with lead authors and co-authors) and referees is included in the TPDP report, which is presented to the SC.

Expertise required for experts to draft DPs

- The DP drafting group should have appropriate global coverage.
- Authors of existing DPs, such as regional DPs, should be included in the DP drafting group, where appropriate.

Core expertise required:

- diagnostic expertise with the pest.

Additional expertise that would be helpful:

- taxonomy and molecular diagnostics

- practical experience related to the pest (detection, identification, isolation etc.)
- drafting of DPs (such as regional DPs)
- development of novel diagnostic methods
- experience using DPs for diagnosis of regulated pests, including in the context of international trade
- experts associated with international seed testing organizations may be included, where considered appropriate by the TPDP.

The development of a draft DP

- The lead author uses ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic Protocols for Regulated Pests*) and the *Instructions to authors of diagnostic protocols for regulated pests* to produce a first draft. Additional guidance is provided by the TPDP discipline lead if needed. The discipline lead and the lead author should, within the first 3 months, agree on a timeframe for the development of a draft (including appropriate consultation of co-authors), leading to the preparation of a first draft within the first year (max. 6-12 months).
- The lead author is assisted in the preparation of the DP by the co-authors.
- Where the subject of the DP is above species level, or the scope is unclear, the discipline lead and lead author, in consultation with the co-authors, should propose amendments to the scope of the DP. The TPDP may modify the amended scope and should inform the DP drafting group. The TPDP should report on its discussions to the SC, in the report of a meeting or by email through the Secretariat.
- Where disagreement arises within a DP drafting group during preparation of a protocol, the lead author should discuss the issues with the discipline lead. The discipline lead may discuss the issues, if necessary, with the full DP drafting group in order to resolve them. The discipline lead should decide how to proceed based on scientific evidence and present a proposal to the TPDP. Once the proposal is final, it should be reported to the DP drafting group.

Changes to the DP drafting group

- When an expert who has been chosen as lead author is unable to continue in this role, the TPDP discipline lead will ask a member of the DP drafting group to become the lead author. The TPDP is informed of the change of leadership.
- Where additional experts are required for the DP drafting group, the TPDP discipline lead, in consultation with the lead author, chooses from the experts nominated in the original call for authors. If no suitable experts are available, the IPPC Secretariat is requested to seek new nominations for the DP by announcing the vacancy on the IPP, with a 30 day deadline for receipt of CVs. The TPDP discipline lead or DP drafting group may also notify relevant experts of the call. The TPDP discipline lead reviews the CVs and submits a recommendation of an expert, along with a summary of their expertise to the TPDP, who reviews and approves the addition, which is included in the TPDP's annual report to the SC. In special circumstances (e.g. when the expertise was so small for the pest that the discipline lead was aware of all experts working on it), discipline leads might "hand-pick" an expert, and submit a recommendation to the TPDP.
- In its review of the status of protocol the TPDP also reviews the list of lead authors, co-authors and referees to identify those teams where additional authors or replacements are needed.
- When the lead author or a co-author is not answering, the discipline lead should request the Secretariat to contact the NPPO (date of the last attempt to contact the expert should be provided).

If, after all due contacts, the status of the lead author or co-author cannot be clarified and verified within 1 year of the first Secretariat's attempt, the author is withdrawn from the DP drafting group, and the Secretariat informs the discipline lead, the withdrawn author and his/her NPPO contact point.

Assessment of draft DPs by the TPDP

- The lead author and co-authors discuss the draft DP (possibly involving other experts)
- Once the lead author and co-authors are satisfied with the draft DP, the lead author submits it to the TPDP discipline lead.
- The TPDP discipline lead reviews the draft DP and ensures it meets all the requirements set out by ISPM No. 27 (*Diagnostic Protocols for Regulated Pests*) instructions previously agreed to by the TPDP including the checklist for DPs.
- The discipline lead consults the lead author and co-authors to modify the draft.
- The draft DP should then be reviewed by a wider group of experts from the particular discipline related to the DP in order to ensure broad global relevance.
- The expert consultation system on the IPP is used for this purpose. The discipline lead should inform the lead author of the system, and request the Secretariat that the draft is put on the IPP publicly available for comments by experts. The process for the expert consultation on the IPP is described separately (see Expert consultation process paper). This public consultation should be advertised as provided in the process description, and the discipline lead and TPDP members have a key role in that (e.g. through scientific societies and networks, conferences) . Prior to contacting individual experts to invite them to comment, the discipline lead may request to the IPPC Secretariat a letter inviting experts to review a draft DP.
- The draft is revised by the lead author based on expert comments, possibly based on a first compilation and analysis of the comments by the discipline lead. The lead author lists experts involved and records substantial comments that were not included in the draft.
- Once the discipline lead and lead author consider that the expert consultation has been completed the draft is submitted to the member of the TPDP identified as referee together with a list regarding consultation on the technical level (written by; reviewed by; for at which the draft was discussed) and a list of main issues discussed during the development of the draft.
- The referee reviews the draft, assembles comments using the “checklist for DP review” and proposes changes of the draft to the discipline lead.
- The discipline lead consults the lead author and co-authors to modify the draft.
- Once satisfied with the draft DP, the discipline lead sends the draft DP and updated “checklist for DP review” to the entire TPDP, through the Secretariat, for assessment. The checklist should show that the draft fulfils the requirements. If relevant, the discipline lead should highlight in the DP which sections were modified based on comments received. Note: DPs that do not meet the requirements in the checklist may be presented to the TPDP only to solve specific issues of content or scope. In this case, it is preferable to present only questions, except if the text of the diagnostic protocol is necessary to the discussion.
- The TPDP discusses the draft DP during a meeting, and either finds it suitable for member consultation and recommends it to the SC, or returns it, through the discipline lead, with specific comments or proposals to the lead author and co-authors for further work, or agrees on some other action such as to consult with other relevant experts.

Review of member comments on a draft DP

- Member comments are compiled by the Secretariat
- Compiled member comments are forwarded to the TPDP discipline lead for action, and the TPDP and SC are informed that the comments are posted on the IPP.
- Member comments are reviewed by the discipline lead, whom produces an amended draft (with track changes) and includes responses to member comments within the compiled member comments. The TPDP discipline lead should consult with and may be assisted by the lead author and co-authors in this process, and should be assisted by the steward on specific matters. The amended draft and responses to comments are circulated to all TPDP members, with a recommendation from the discipline lead and TPDP steward on how to proceed.

- Substantial comments that have broad implications should be discussed by the TPDP, even if the discipline lead might have made a proposal for the specific DP under consideration. This process is coordinated by the discipline lead or TPDP steward. Proposed changes may be incorporated or not, or the TPDP may recommend further study, with the reasons documented.
- Whether the draft is changed or not as a result of member comments, the compiled comments and responses to comments are submitted to the SC.
- If the draft standard is changed as a result of comments, the draft should be accompanied by recommendations on how to proceed.
- The CPM has delegated its authority to the SC to adopt DPs on its behalf. Once the SC approves the DP, the Secretariat makes it available and contracting parties are notified. The notification period for approved DPs is twice a year on defined dates. Contracting parties have 45 days to review the approved DP and submit a formal objection, if any. If no formal objection is received, the SC, on behalf of the CPM, adopts the DP. DPs adopted through this process are noted by the CPM at its following meeting and attached to the report of the CPM meeting. (CPM-7, 2012). If formal objections are received, the TPDP is consulted and the SC decides whether they are technically justified, and decides on further steps.

Review of published DPs

- On a regular basis, the TPDP members review existing DPs in their disciplines. This review should first take place 5 years following adoption and further reviews are conducted maximum 5 years afterwards. In particular, the TPDP members for the discipline should make a literature review, and bring to the attention of the TPDP any new literature that may have an impact on the DP.
- If revision is necessary, and in consultation with the lead author and co-authors, the discipline lead recommends updates to take into account newly published and/or validated methods, and modifications to methods in existing DPs. Proposals for update are presented to the TPDP. If a change is required, the TPDP makes a proposal and sends it to the SC with recommendations.
- When a technical revision is required for an adopted DP, the SC can adopt the updates to adopted DPs via electronic means. The revised DPs shall be made publicly available as soon as the SC adopts them. DPs revised through this process are noted by the CPM and attached to the report of the CPM meeting. (CPM-7, 2012). Criteria of the type of revisions that could be submitted to this process were suggested by the TPDP in November 2012, to be discussed by the SC.

ROLE OF TPDP MEMBERS

TPDP members:

- Track and manage preparation of DPs under their lead, including editing and ensuring compliance with ISPM 27.
- Consult and use the latest versions of TPDP procedures available on the TPDP work area.
- Ensure proper communication with lead authors and co-authors, including: contact lead authors and co-authors once selected; inform lead authors and co-authors of changes in procedures or instructions relevant to development of DPs; ensure that lead authors engage their co-authors in the drafting process; maintain appropriate contact with lead authors and co-authors. In case of communication problems with an expert (wrong address, no response, etc.), contact the Secretariat with details on last attempt(s).
- Identify protocols for which new lead authors or additional/replacement co-authors are needed, and follow the process for replacing them.
- Regularly update the document on the status of DPs for each DP under their lead on request of the Secretariat and provide updates at the TPDP meeting, including issues raised during the development of the DP.
- Act as referees for draft DPs and assemble comments using the “checklist for DP review”.

- Use the “checklist for DP review” for each DP under their lead, when receiving the first draft and before presenting a draft DP to the TPDP.
- Manage the consideration of the comments received during the expert consultation on the IPP (and possibly provide compiled comments and proposals to the lead author).
- Manage the response to comments received during member consultation
- Review published DPs in their discipline, and recommend revision as appropriate.
- On demand from the Secretariat, arrange for the preparation of a PowerPoint presentation on a draft DP for member consultation, in preparation for regional workshops for the review of draft ISPMs.
- When they leave the TPDP, transmit appropriate information to the new member for the discipline.