Potential revision of ISPM 14

BACKGROUND

The IPPC Secretariat introduced this standard during ICPM 04 in 2002 as the first standard in which a risk management process was described, setting a precedent for such standards.

Much of the discussion focused on the importing country´s responsibilities regarding the application of phytosanitary measures within the context of systems approaches, the relationship to the appropriate level of phytosanitary protection and the link to relevant pest risk analysis standards. Finally the ICPM adopted ISPM 14: "The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management"

The TPG proposed a revision of the term "systems approach" in October 2012, which was reviewed by the SC in May 2013 and adopted by the CPM (2015). The current definition of the term is as follows:

> *A pest risk management option that integrates different measures, at least two of which act independently, with cumulative effect [ISPM 14, 2002; revised ICPM, 2005; CPM, 2015]*

TIME TO REVIEW ISPM 14

According to the preliminary results of the IPPC Global Workshop on systems approaches, held in Santiago, Chile from December 1-5, 2025, participants identified several areas of ISPM 14 that may require review, clarification, or strengthening to improve its usefulness and consistency with the systems approach.

This document presents the main points identified by COSAVE and its member countries that should be reviewed or improved if the CPM approves the revision of ISPM 14.

GENERAL REVIEW

ISPM 14 was adopted in 2002; and since then, ISPMs applying systems approaches have been adopted (e.g., ISPM 35, and Annex 1 to ISPM 39 adopted in 2025). Therefore, a general review of the standard is advisable to update the use of terms, ensure consistency with ISPM 5, other related ISPMs adopted or revised after the adoption of ISPM 14, and with current systems approach practices.

SPECIFIC REVISION

Scope: ISPM 14 *"provides guidelines for the development and evaluation of integrated measures in a systems approach as an option for pest risk management"*.

A SA is an option for pest risk management that integrates different measures. Scope should be clarified to avoid confusion with integrated measures. The main difference between the two is that integrated measures may be dependent on each other, i.e. they may not have the necessary independence to be considered as systems approaches.

Outline of requirements:

A SA integrates measures for pest risk management in a defined manner, and could provide an alternative to single measures to meet the appropriate level of protection of an importing country.

A systems approach may be established by an importing country or proposed by the exporting country. Only in the first case would it aim at meeting phytosanitary import requirements; in the second, it would be proposed as equivalent to those requirements.

Purpose of systems approaches

This section should also be improved to avoid duplication with section 2 "Characteristics of systems approaches" and to clarify that SA add possibilities for trade to single point phytosanitary measures providing an equivalent option for pest risk management. This option allows for

the inclusion of practices not traditionally prescribed as measures, and SA encourages collaboration between NPPOs and industry.

Characteristics of systems approaches

This section should also be improved to clarify that measures in a SA should be clearly defined, and that the NPPO can monitor or supervise them, thus complementing section 6 “types of systems approaches”.

Relationship with PRA and Available Pest Risk Management Options

This section should be revised to describe this relationship more clearly; as the process leading to a systems approach begins with the conclusions from pest risk assessment (stage 2 of PRA). These conclusions are used in stage 3 to identify options for responding to the assessed pest risk.

The options described should be reviewed to ensure consistency with ISPM 4 and 10 regarding PFAs, pest-free places of production (“PFPPs”) and pest-free production sites (“PFPSs”). When a PFA has been established and maintained in accordance with ISPM 4 requirements, no additional phytosanitary measures should be imposed. Therefore, a PFA should be considered a phytosanitary measure that, used alone, is sufficient to manage pest risk.

The same reasoning should be applied to pest-free places of production and pest-free production sites, although ISPM 10 (Requirements for the establishment of pest-free places and pest-free production sites) does not explicitly state that pest-free places of production and pest-free production sites should be used as independent measures. However, ISPM 10 provides that the choice of a pest free place of production or a pest free area as a management option will depend on the actual distribution of the pest concerned in the exporting country, the characteristics of the pest and on administrative considerations. Both systems can offer the required assurance of pest freedom: the pest free area mainly assures this by the common application of measures to an area covering many places

of production; the pest free place of production mainly assures this by the fact that management procedures, surveys and inspections are applied specifically and intensively to it.

Independent and dependent measures

The current wording of this section has led to heterogeneous interpretations, as evidenced during the Global Systems Approach Workshop. It is proposed that it be revised to clarify that a systems approach can be composed of independent and dependent measures, and that it must include at least two independent measures. Operationally, dependent measures are those whose efficacy is coupled: all are necessary for the composite measure to be effective, and their probability of failure is cumulative. In contrast, when two measures are independent, both would have to fail for the system to fail; therefore, their contribution is understood as an additional risk reduction, consistent with the cumulative effect of the systems approach. In practice, dependent measures usually act at the same point or stage of the chain, with similar objectives and mechanisms, and can fail for the same reason. In contrast, independent measures tend to be located at different times or places in the chain, may involve different responsible parties, and use different mechanisms, so that one can compensate for the residual limitations of the other, reducing the likelihood that control gaps (biological variability, climate, human error, or other operational factors) will align and the risk will reach the importing country.

Circumstances for Use: The section could be improved to better describe the advantages of using systems approaches; that is, when one of the measures fails, the system includes additional measures that still mitigate the pest risk, and that they can provide a mechanism for addressing uncertainty by varying the types and strengths of measures.

Types of systems approaches:

This section should be revised to clarify that the complexity of a systems approach is related to the commodity in question and the pest risk associated with the commodity.

It would be useful to describe the purpose of the measures required in a systems approach, describing those measures intended to reduce pest risk, safeguard measures or verification measures.

Efficacy of measures

More guidance is needed to assess the efficacy of SAs. Since SAs can integrate a number of different types of measures, each with different effects, the efficacy of the SA can be difficult to describe. Furthermore, some components of systems approaches are not even mitigation measures (trapping surveys for example serves to monitor and verify pest prevalence but have no mitigation effect).