



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7)

**Virtual Meeting
17–19 May 2021**

IPPC Secretariat

IPPC Secretariat. 2021. *Report on the virtual meeting of the Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7), 17-19 May 2021*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). 63 pages. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2021



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original English edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

Third-party materials. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting	4
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	4
2.	Meeting arrangements	4
2.1	Election of the Chairperson	4
2.2	Election of the Rapporteur	4
2.3	Adoption of the agenda	4
3.	Administrative matters	4
4.	Draft ISPMs for approval for the second consultation	4
4.1	Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008), Priority 1	4
4.2	Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014), Priority 2	9
4.3	Focused revision of ISPM 12 (<i>Phytosanitary certificates</i>) in relation to re-export (2015-011), Priority 2	11
4.4	Draft 2019 and 2020 amendments to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) (1994-001), Priority 1	14
5.	Review of the standard setting calendar	15
6.	Any other business	15
7.	Date and type of the next SC-7 meeting	15
8.	Evaluation of the meeting process	15
9.	Close of the meeting	15
	Appendix 1: Agenda	16
	Appendix 2: Documents list	18
	Appendix 3: Participants list	20
	Appendix 4: Draft ISPM Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)	22
	Appendix 5: Draft ISPM Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014)	28
	Appendix 6: Draft Focused revision of ISPM 12 (<i>Phytosanitary certificates</i>) in relation to re-export (2015-011)	36
	Appendix 7: Draft 2019 and 2020 amendments to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) (1994-001) as modified in this meeting for submission to the first consultation	59

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The Standard Setting Unit Acting Officer-in-Charge for daily matters, Adriana MOREIRA, opened the Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) meeting and welcomed all participants.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Election of the Chairperson

- [2] The SC-7 elected Marina ZLOTINA (United States of America) as Chairperson.

2.2 Election of the Rapporteur

- [3] The SC-7 elected Sophie PETERSON (Australia) as Rapporteur.

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

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

3. Administrative matters

- [5] The Chairperson referred SC-7 members to the documents list (Appendix 2) and the participants list (Appendix 3).

4. Draft ISPMs for approval for the second consultation

- [6] The SC-7 reviewed the draft ISPMs that had been submitted for first consultation in July–September 2020. The compiled consultation comments for all draft ISPMs are available on the IPP.¹ The draft ISPMs had been modified by the respective Stewards and Assistant Stewards in response to the consultation comments and the modified versions had then been submitted for review by the SC-7 through the Online Comment System (OCS).

4.1 Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008), Priority 1

- [7] One of the Assistant Stewards, Joanne WILSON (New Zealand), introduced the draft standard and supporting documentation,² noting that there were several comments from the country consultation and subsequent OCS review by the SC-7 that needed to be considered by the SC-7.
- [8] The Steward thanked the Assistant Stewards for their work in reviewing the consultation comments and highlighted the difference between this draft ISPM and other ISPMs which are discussed below.
- [9] The SC-7 considered the issues raised as they reviewed the text of the draft ISPM.

Review of the draft ISPM and outstanding issues

- [10] **Title.** A few contracting parties had commented that the naming of commodity standards had the potential to conflict with the issuance of commodity standards by other standards setting organizations. The SC-7 took the view, however, that the Codex Alimentarius and other standards produced by other international standard-setting bodies are independent of the IPPC and it is unlikely that there would be a conflict with the naming of this draft ISPM. The SC-7 therefore agreed to leave the title unchanged.

¹ Compiled comments from first consultation are available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/member-consultation-draft-ispm/>

² 2019-008; 2019-008_OCS; 12_SC7_Tel_2021_May; 13_SC7_Tel_2021_May; 14_SC7_Tel_2021_May; 15_SC7_Tel_2021_May.

- [11] **Background.** The Steward noted that agriculture, forests and the environment had been referred to in the Background section by the focus group, but had been removed in response to consultation comments received, as such reference was not felt to be necessary.
- [12] The SC-7 considered whether to keep the reference to the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 in the Background section, or whether it was no longer needed. They decided to keep it to provide extra context, given the differences between this draft ISPM and other ISPMs. The SC-7 did, however, make a minor text amendment to ensure that the text would still be valid when read in the future.
- [13] **Principles.** Some contracting parties had suggested that the Principles section be renamed or incorporated into the Background or Requirements sections, although no alternative title had been proposed. The Steward explained that the Principles section had been included by the focus group to address some of the general concerns that contracting parties may have about issues such as sovereign rights, given that this draft ISPM was so different to other ISPMs. The SC-7 acknowledged this rationale and agreed to keep the text as a separate section, but renamed it as “Principles in relation to commodity standards” to clarify that the principles specifically relate to commodity standards rather than being general phytosanitary principles.
- [14] The SC-7 considered the overlap between the phrase “of particular importance” in the sentence stem of the list of principles and “in particular” in the first principle in the list, which related to sovereign rights. The SC-7 noted that the latter may serve to provide more weight to the principle regarding sovereign rights, which had been a matter of concern among some contracting parties. However, to avoid duplication, the SC-7 agreed to omit “in particular” in the first principle in the list.
- [15] **Purpose and use of commodity standards.** One SC-7 member voiced concern about the requirement that the pest lists and options in commodity standards *should* be considered when developing phytosanitary import requirements. The Steward explained that the primary purpose of this standard was to help contracting parties, particularly developing countries, by providing a list of options to consider. Another SC-7 member commented that having a requirement to *consider* was not too onerous a requirement to impose on contracting parties, and that even national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) that have adequate capacity could benefit from at least checking the lists of measures and pests. The SC-7 noted that it was important that the text of the draft ISPM did not conflict with the requirements of the World Trade Organization Agreement on the Application and Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (the SPS Agreement) or Article III of the IPPC, under which contracting parties *shall* base their phytosanitary measures on international standards where they exist, but agreed that the current wording of the draft ISPM, “should be considered”, did not present a conflict. The SC-7 therefore agreed to leave the wording for this requirement unchanged in the draft ISPM.
- [16] **The benefits of commodity standards.** A few contracting parties had expressed the view that the benefits of commodity standards listed in the section on Purpose and use of commodity standards were speculative or were misplaced within this section. The SC-7 discussed whether the list of possible uses of commodity standards were requirements, in which case they could stay under the section on Purpose and use of commodity standards, or just background information, in which case they could be moved to the Background section. The Secretariat added a further possibility of moving the text to the end of the first paragraph of the section on Purpose and use of commodity standards, but removing reference to benefits, so that the bulleted list became simply a list of possible uses of commodity standards. Returning to this matter later in the meeting, the SC-7 agreed to move the list of benefits to the Background section.
- [17] **Circumstances when commodity standards are not developed.** One consultation comment had suggested that the text on circumstances when commodity standards are not developed should be moved from the section on Purpose and use of commodity standards to the section on Principles. The SC-7 agreed to keep the text where it was.
- [18] **Scope of commodity standards.** The SC-7 changed this heading from “Scope” to “Scope of commodity standards” to avoid confusion with the Scope section of the concept standard. In terms of the content of this section, the SC-7 noted that the current draft text explained the generic scope of commodity

standards rather than describing the type of information contained within the Scope section of commodity standards. The SC-7 considered various options, including: amending the text in this section to describe the intended content of the Scope section of commodity standards, making sure not to duplicate information in the section on Description of the commodity and its intended use; moving the text from this section to merge with the first paragraph of the section on Content of commodity standards, and then either inserting new text into this section or removing it; or amending the proposed structure of commodity standards to omit the Scope, with the scope of each commodity standard being specified in the section on Description of the commodity instead. The SC-7 noted that phytosanitary treatments do have a Scope section, containing fairly standard text, and considered whether equivalent text could be used in the Scope section of commodity standards, giving the commodity name and intended use. If so, the concept standard could explain what information goes into this section of the commodity section. The SC-7 agreed instead, however, to use standard text in each commodity standard, describing the general scope of commodity standards, and to give this standard text in the body text of the concept standard. The SC-7 considered whether to say explicitly that “This section contains the following standard text:”, but agreed that it was better to omit this preface, even if it did risk a little confusion.

[19] **Format of lists of pests and measures.** Several consultation comments had called for information to be included on the format of lists of pests and measures. The SC-7 agreed that it would be more appropriate for the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) to make decisions regarding format, rather than including guidance in the concept ISPM itself, as the format may need to vary between different individual commodity standards.

[20] **Pests not known to be associated with the traded commodity.** Many consultation comments had questioned the relevance of including pests not associated with the commodity. The Steward recalled that differing views on this matter had been expressed at the focus group meeting, but that the rationale for listing these pests in commodity standards was to help countries that only have pest records but do not have information on which hosts the pests were found on, so that the countries could immediately disregard those pests not associated with the traded commodity. The SC-7 noted that pest risk analyses (PRAs) often list all pests known to be associated with the commodity, on any part of the plant in any region, even though some of these pests may not be relevant to a particular region. Given the concerns raised during the consultation, the SC-7 considered whether to add text to explain that measures would not be required for these pests, but noted that the purpose of an ISPM is to give *requirements* and these pests would have no requirements associated with them. One way round this would be to move the list of these pests from the body of the commodity standard into an appendix, which would not be prescriptive and so would not be a requirement. The SC-7 acknowledged that there might still be a risk that some contracting parties would treat the inclusion of a pest on such a list as justification to regulate it, and considered whether this could be addressed by adding text to say that these pests should not be regulated on the targeted commodity. However, the SC-7 acknowledged that it is not automatic that the pest would not be regulated, so the text could not be categorical about this. One SC-7 member suggested that perhaps it might be the word “information” that was the problem, indicating there was going to be lots of information in the commodity standard about these pests; in which case, it might be better to refer to “information on pests (not measures) known not to be associated with the plant species”. In the end, however, the SC-7 agreed it was better to remove the text about pests not known to be associated with the traded commodity and highlight it for possible inclusion in implementation material.

[21] **Options for phytosanitary measures: guidance on when measures can be applied.** One contracting party had suggested that the section on Options for phytosanitary measures could include a description of the critical control points where measures (phytosanitary and commercial practices) could be applied to mitigate risk. The SC-7 agreed to leave the text as it was because the draft ISPM concerns phytosanitary measures, which should not be confused with other measures used commercially, but noted that if commercial production practices are equivalent to independent measures they could be considered as part of a systems approach.

- [22] **Criteria for inclusion of measures in commodity standards.** The SC-7 noted that having options for measures does not in itself result in harmonization. The Steward explained that the focus group had provided some examples of criteria to provide a starting point for the TPCS. A baseline criterion had been included that each measure should have been set as a phytosanitary import requirement by at least one contracting party, recognizing that at least some assessment on these measures will have been done. The SC-7 noted, however, that there would be differences regarding the applicability of measures in different regions. The SC-7 also noted that most of the example criteria related to historical data, and the Secretariat confirmed that it was the intention of the focus group that historical data be used.
- [23] The Steward commented that the TPCS needs to have the ability to remove a measure from a commodity standard if evidence supports this. The SC-7 considered whether to add text to the draft ISPM to say that the TPCS needs to develop criteria, but noted that this would be difficult as it is not yet clear exactly how the panel will operate. Instead, the SC-7 agreed to allow some flexibility by amending the first line of this section to say that “a measure *can* be considered” rather than “a measure *is* considered”. The SC considered whether to further amend this paragraph to place the emphasis more on the TPCS developing the criteria, but decided against this.
- [24] Some consultation comments had suggested that text on equivalence be included in this section, together with additional wording relating to the practicality, feasibility and cost of implementation. The SC-7 was satisfied with the amendments that had already been made by the stewarding team in response to the latter suggestion, but decided that text did not need to be added on equivalence as there is no requirement to use any specific measure, just a requirement to consider the measures listed.
- [25] **Confidence in measures.** One SC-7 member queried why this section was included, as it was about criteria for selecting measures to include in commodity standards, not about confidence in the measures *per se*. Recalling the large number of consultation comments questioning how confidence in measures could be categorized into high, medium and low, one of the Assistant Stewards suggested that perhaps this whole section could be removed or further guidance on efficacy added. The SC-7 noted that if the criteria were retained, the same comments were likely to be repeated at the second consultation, but on the other hand, if they were deleted altogether this was a substantial change to make and the criteria did need to be available somewhere. Regarding the confidence categories, the SC-7 noted that commodity standards should, in any case, not include any measure for which there is only low confidence.
- [26] The SC-7 therefore agreed to remove the reference to the three categories, and to amend the introductory sentence stem for the bulleted list of examples so that it no longer referred to categories. Instead, the SC-7 added generic text to say that measures are evaluated based on criteria developed and revised, as necessary, by the TPCS and categorized according to confidence in measures. The SC-7 considered that there was not a conflict between this and TP 6 (*Technical Panel on Commodity Standards*), which refers to criteria being *in the concept standard*, as provided the concept standard included some criteria (which it did in section 4), this did not preclude the TPCS from applying additional criteria. The new text also allowed for the evolution of criteria.
- [27] Regarding the bulleted list of factors upon which the confidence in measures may be based, the SC-7 removed reference to “factors” in the sentence stem in order to avoid confusion between “factors” and “criteria”. The SC-7 considered the value of the bulleted list itself, including whether to delete it and concerns that it was not very well developed, but the Steward clarified that the list, which had been drawn up by the focus group with careful thought, was just intended as *general examples* not as criteria. The SC-7 therefore agreed to retain the bulleted list.
- [28] The SC-7 considered changing the heading from “Confidence in measures” to “Evaluation of measures”, “Evaluation and revision of measures” or “Evaluation of confidence in measures”, as the section was about evaluating confidence, but decided that this was not necessary.
- [29] **Use of “measures” vs “phytosanitary measures” vs “options for phytosanitary measures”.** At various points in the discussion, queries were raised about the use of “measure” and related terms in the draft ISPM. The Steward clarified that the focus group had discussed the use of the term “phytosanitary

measure” at length and had concluded that a measure only becomes a “phytosanitary measure” when it is implemented; hence, the draft ISPM referred to “measures”. He also explained that, for the same reason, the draft ISPM referred to “pests” rather than “regulated pests”. The Assistant Steward confirmed that this approach was consistent with the comments from the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG). The SC-7 recognized the validity of this argument, as although measures included in commodity standards would be a phytosanitary measure in at least one country (because one of the criteria for a measure to be included in commodity standards was that it had to have been set as a phytosanitary import requirement by at least one contracting party), the measure may not be a phytosanitary measure in other countries. The SC-7 noted that the draft ISPM also used the term “options for phytosanitary measures” and the Secretariat confirmed that, to avoid confusion, this had been the default term used by the IPPC editor, with “measure” used where the default was not possible and “phytosanitary measure” used to refer to measures set as phytosanitary import requirements.

[30] The SC-7 agreed to use “options for phytosanitary measures” as the default, as “measures” on its own could be confusing and “options for phytosanitary measures” refers to measures that contracting parties might adopt as phytosanitary measures. They agreed, however, that an explanation of this needed to be included early on in the draft ISPM. The SC-7 considered whether to add this explanation as a new footnote in the Scope section (upon first use of “phytosanitary measure”) or to put it in the Background section or the Principles section, and opted to insert it at the end of the Background section. The SC-7 agreed that it was not necessary to explain the term “phytosanitary measure”.

[31] **Processes for selecting topics and for developing, adopting, reviewing and amending annexes to the ISPM.** Several consultation comments had focused on the need for transparency about processes concerning the selection of topics. The SC-7 considered that this was an implementation issue rather than an issue affecting the content of the standard, and so added it to the list of potential implementation issues (see below).

Potential implementation issues

[32] The following implementation issues had been highlighted during the first consultation:

- the lack of capacity and capability of some countries to conduct PRA to sufficiently implement the standard and its annexes;
- the criteria for justifying the use of certain phytosanitary measures for different levels of risk posed by different pests.

[33] Regarding the first of these issues, one SC-7 member commented that that the concept standard itself is supposed to address those situations where there is a lack of capacity to conduct PRA, by providing information that can be used in lieu of PRA, so it is unlikely that PRA would be conducted to implement this standard as such. The SC-7 considered whether, in that case, the implementation issue is the lack of capacity to evaluate the technical information in the standard, rather than the lack of capacity to conduct PRA, but noted that there could be other capacity issues, not just those relating to the evaluation of technical information. The SC-7 therefore simply deleted the reference to PRA. Another SC-7 member commented that if contracting parties were to implement the standard without conducting PRA, any corresponding phytosanitary import requirements may be challenged. The Chairperson suggested that the SC-7 submit the implementation issue as modified, but encouraged the member concerned to submit this comment during the second consultation, so it could then be discussed by the Standards Committee.

[34] The SC-7 added two further items to the list of potential implementation issues, arising from their earlier discussions. The resulting list of issues was as follows:

- the lack of capacity and capability of some countries to sufficiently implement standard and its annexes;
- the criteria for justifying the use of certain phytosanitary measures for different levels of risk posed by different pests;
- the need for transparency about process and how annexes are chosen and criteria developed, etc;

- the need for an understanding of pest association with the commodity being traded rather than with the plant species.

[35] The SC-7:

- (1) *approved* the draft ISPM on *Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008) as modified in this meeting for submission to the second consultation;
- (2) *agreed* to forward the implementation issues on the draft ISPM on *Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008) identified during first consultation and modified in this meeting to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee.

4.2 Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014), Priority 2

- [36] The Steward, Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile), introduced the draft standard and supporting documentation.³ During the first consultation, over 570 comments had been received. The Steward highlighted the two issues that remained for the SC-7 to consider: concerns about an NPPO conducting audits in the territory of other NPPOs; and use of the term “findings”.
- [37] The Secretariat also explained that comments submitted to the OCS after 22 April 2021 had not been incorporated into the draft ISPM, but now needed to be considered.
- [38] The SC-7 considered the issues raised as they reviewed the text of the draft ISPM.

Review of the draft ISM and outstanding issues

- [39] **The territory in which audits may take place.** Opinions in the first consultation had differed on whether the draft ISPM should be focused on the conduct of audits in the territory of the NPPO itself or also include audits in the territory of the NPPOs of exporting countries. Likewise, some contracting parties had commented that third-party entities authorized to carry out audits on behalf of the NPPO should not carry out audits in the territory of the NPPOs of exporting countries, whereas others had indicated that such audits may take place, especially where expertise lies outside the NPPO. In light of these differing views, the Steward suggested that the draft ISPM should be open to more than one option, thereby allowing NPPOs, according to their own legislation and bilateral agreements with other contracting parties, to decide on the option that is most appropriate to them. The SC-7 made no changes to the draft ISPM in this regard.
- [40] **Singular vs plural for “audit”.** Further to the TPG expressing a preference for “audit” to be in the singular, the SC-7 agreed to present “audit” in the singular wherever possible in the draft ISPM.
- [41] **Findings, observations and nonconformities.** Some consultation comments had raised issues regarding the term “finding” and its relationship with conformities and nonconformities. The Steward had adjusted the text in response to these comments, to improve clarity and avoid confusion. Referring to a flow chart in the Steward’s notes,⁴ the Steward explained that in the draft ISPM, an “audit finding” was the result of the audit (i.e. the result of the evaluation against set audit criteria): if the result was positive, the finding would be a “conformity”; if it was negative, it would be a “nonconformity”.
- [42] The SC-7 discussed the meanings of “finding”, “observation” and “nonconformity”, and whether to reintroduce references to “observation”, which had been removed from the draft. There was not a common understanding of these terms among SC-7 members: one SC-7 member had been advised that nonconformities related to the scope of the audit being conducted, with observations being things that are observed while doing the audit but fall outside the scope of the audit; another understood that nonconformities were part of observations; and another understood that an observation is a type of finding, but not necessarily a nonconformity. The Steward expressed a preference for omitting references to “observations”, as some countries were confused about the term, and clarified that in the

³ 2015-014; 2015-014_OCS; 04_SC7_Tel_2021_May; 05_SC7_Tel_2021_May; 06_SC7_Tel_2021_May.

⁴ Appendix 1, 05_SC7_Tel_2021_May.

draft ISPM, an observation was therefore a nonconformity. He also wondered whether things that are observed but are outside the scope are “additional comments” rather than “observations”. The SC-7 agreed that “observations” are included within “findings” and so “observations” did not need to be inserted in the text.

[43] The SC-7 noted that the terminology could be explained in implementation material.

[44] **Background.** The SC-7 amended the text to refer to a system achieving the expected phytosanitary outcomes rather than conforming to phytosanitary requirements, so that the focus is on the outcomes of the system.

[45] **Purpose of an audit.** The SC-7 deleted the footnote that cited ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) in relation to audits conducted in an exporting country, and inserted a citation to ISPM 20 in the body text of this section instead.

[46] In the bulleted list of situations where an NPPO may conduct an audit in the phytosanitary context, the SC-7 considered whether to refer simply to “entities that have been authorized by the NPPO” rather than “entities that have been authorized by the NPPO to conduct audits on its behalf”, thereby widening the scope of the audits. They decided instead, however, to amend it to “entities that have been authorized by the NPPO, including entities [authorized] to conduct audits on its behalf”. One SC-7 member queried why authorization to conduct audit is a special case and suggested that the text could simply refer to “entities authorized to conduct phytosanitary procedures on its behalf”, but as entities conducting audits on behalf of the NPPO was mentioned in the Scope of the draft ISPM, the SC-7 decided the new text was satisfactory.

[47] **Types of audit: verification audit.** The SC-7 considered whether the distinction between a “verification audit” and a “system audit” had been lost with the amendments made to the text during the OCS review, noting that it was confusing to say that a system audit is a “comprehensive review” and a verification review is a “focused review of an entire phytosanitary system” as these sound fairly similar. Working on the assumption that a system audit looks at a whole system whereas a verification audit is focused on a particular part of the system, the SC-7 therefore deleted the word “entire”. The SC-7 also noted that one of the other differences was the timing of the audits, as the draft ISPM said that a systems audit can be done before authorizing an entity or a new process.

[48] **Responsibilities of an auditor.** The SC-7 recalled that ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*) referred to *management* of conflict of interest rather than auditors being *free of* conflict of interest because in some small countries the population size means that it can be impossible to be “free of” conflicts of interest. The SC-7 therefore initially changed “be free of any conflict of interest” in the list of auditor responsibilities to “manage the conflict of interest” and noted that the auditor would declare any conflict of interest and would then manage any conflict of interest so declared. The SC-7 recognized that this would probably prompt comments during the second consultation as some countries prefer “free of” but noted that guidance on managing conflicting of interest could go in implementation material. In the end, however, the SC-7 decided to revert back to “free of” and wait to see what comments are submitted during the second consultation. The Chairperson encouraged SC-7 members who preferred “manage” to submit comments to this effect during the consultation.

[49] **Conflicts of interest.** The SC-7 noted that this section could now be perceived as being inconsistent with the section on Responsibilities of an auditor, as here it referred to the auditor identifying and managing conflicts of interest, whereas the Responsibilities section now referred to the auditor being free of conflict of interest. The SC-7 considered whether “free of” is included in the concept of “manage”, because if the auditor identifies a conflict the auditor would manage the conflict to become free of it, but they decided it was better to simply remove any reference to managing the conflict of interest.

[50] **Scheduling of audits.** The SC-7 noted that, as a result of an amendment made during the OCS review by the SC-7, this section now referred to the “un-scheduling” of audits, which implied the cancellation

of audits. The SC-7 therefore amended the text to “unscheduled audit”, as the intended meaning was audits that are not scheduled in advance (i.e. unannounced audits).

[51] **Closure and reporting.** The SC-7 noted that the merger of the sections on closure and reporting had resulted in some of the activities listed being in the wrong order. The SC-7 therefore rearranged the order of the activities in the list to reflect the order in which the activities occur during an audit. This included moving the review of the next steps to after the drafting of the report but before the agreement on the deadline for presentation of the final report.

[52] **Follow-up of non-conformance.** The SC changed “non-conformance” to “nonconformity” for consistency with other ISPMs.

Potential implementation issues

[53] The SC-7 identified the following potential implementation issues, the first arising from their review of the draft ISPM and the others from the first consultation:

- the need for guidance on the management of conflict of interest versus being free of conflict of interest;
- the need for auditor training to provide NPPOs with the ability to perform an audit (including training on accessing reliable information where the audits are conducted in an exporting country (reporting protocols available and records or data) and guidance on the management of confidentiality and integrity);
- the need to define how auditors are selected, to ensure transparency and impartiality;
- the development of templates to conduct audits (e.g. a checklist);
- the legal or regulatory framework necessary to support authorization of entities other than the NPPO to perform audits;
- the need for agreement on the language in which an audit is to be conducted (guidance on language would be useful or the provision of translation services should be mutually agreed);
- the need for the key factors of the audit framework to be listed and described in this draft ISPM or as an implementation issue;
- concerns about financial constraints to the conduct of audits, as audits are usually costly and countries with limited resources would be disadvantaged;
- the need for guidelines on conducting audits remotely or virtually.

[54] The SC-7:

- (3) *approved* the draft ISPM on *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014) as modified in this meeting for submission to the second consultation;
- (4) *asked* the Secretariat to forward the implementation issues on the draft ISPM on *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014) identified during first consultation and modified in this meeting to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee.

4.3 Focused revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011), Priority 2

[55] The Steward, Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France), introduced the draft standard and supporting documentation.⁵ A total of 217 comments had been received during the first consultation. The Steward introduced the issues for consideration by the SC-7.

[56] The SC-7 considered these issues and reviewed the draft ISPM.

⁵ 2015-011; 2015-011_OCS; 07_SC7_Tel_2021_May; 08_SC7_Tel_2021_May; 09_SC7_Tel_2021_May.

Review of the draft ISPM and outstanding issues

- [57] **Consignment “subjected to the risk of” vs “exposed to” infestation or contamination.** In response to several consultation comments, the Steward proposed that the wording “the consignment has not been subjected to the risk of infestation or contamination” be replaced with “the consignment has not been infested or contaminated” in the Outline of requirements and the section on Considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export. Similarly, the Steward proposed that the wording “exposed to infestation or contamination” be replaced with “infested or contaminated” in the section on Place of origin and in the last sentence of the first paragraph in the section on Repacking. The SC-7 accepted these changes.
- [58] **Outline of requirements.** The SC-7 considered whether to change “meets” back to the original “complies with” in relation to phytosanitary import requirements, but decided to use “meets” for consistency with the closed parts of the text.
- [59] The SC-7 amended the text to make it clear that throughout the draft ISPM, “certified copy” refers to a certified copy of the phytosanitary certificate.
- [60] **Electronic phytosanitary certificates.** The expert working group (EWG) on the focused revision of this ISPM had noted several technical comments from one contracting party related to perceived difficulties in implementing the current ISPM 12 in an electronic phytosanitary certificate (ePhyto) system. The EWG had decided that this was outside its mandate and, supported by the IPPC Secretariat, had invited the SC to consider encouraging the ePhyto Steering Committee to ensure that appropriate equivalent features are developed so that electronic phytosanitary certificates are the electronic equivalents of phytosanitary certificates in paper form. The EWG had also agreed that a future revision of ISPM 12 may be necessary, in conjunction with the ePhyto project, once the use of ePhyto becomes the norm.
- [61] The EWG had therefore concluded that no changes were needed to the wording of the draft ISPM in response to these comments, and the SC-7 agreed.
- [62] **Place of origin.** In response to consultation comments, the Steward invited the SC-7 to consider whether to add “over a period of time” after “stored” in the second paragraph of this section because the longer the storage period, the higher the risk of infestation and contamination of the commodity by pests; this addition would also be in line with the current version of ISPM 12. The Steward noted that the length of time is at the discretion of the NPPO according to its risk assessment, which will depend not only on the storage time but also, for example, on the quality of packaging and the particular pests concerned. The SC-7 were of the opinion that the “over a period of time” is already implied in the concept of “stored” and so the addition was unnecessary.
- [63] **Considerations for re-export situations: footnote to cover multiple re-exports.** Several consultation comments had expressed the view that the footnote about multiple re-exports was somewhat redundant given the two new sentences added at the very end of the section on Considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export (at the end of the General considerations subsection). This issue is also already covered in ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*). The Steward had therefore proposed during the OCS review that the footnote be deleted and a simplified version of it be inserted at the end of the final paragraph of the Outline of requirements. The SC-7 accepted this change.
- [64] **Considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export.** The SC-7 considered whether a phytosanitary certificate for re-export *may* be issued if all the listed requirements are met (as per the wording in the version submitted for first consultation), or *should* be issued, or *should only* be issued if all the listed requirements are met. The SC-7 agreed that the intended meaning was that the NPPO should have the choice of whether or not to issue the certificate of re-export, but if it chose to issue one, it could only do this if all four requirements listed had been met. The SC-7 noted that “should only” would convey this intended meaning, but there was still a risk that the “should” could be misconstrued as meaning that a certificate of re-export could be demanded. The SC-7 therefore agreed to revert to the text submitted for first consultation: “*may* issue a phytosanitary certificate for re-export *only* if all the following requirements are met”.

- [65] **Commodity not processed to change its nature.** Several contracting parties had sought clarification on the meaning of the phrase “processed to change its nature” in the section on Considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export. One suggestion had been to add a footnote. The Steward noted that the phrase “processed to change its nature” has been used in the two earlier versions of ISPM 12 (2001 and 2011) without further guidance being provided, and that the word “nature” is included in the Glossary definition of “plant products” and also briefly used about commodities in ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*), so the consultation comments did not relate to the *revision* of ISPM 12 but to existing, unchanged text. The Steward had proposed some draft text for a footnote during the OCS review by SC-7 members, and SC-7 members had provided feedback on this. Taking account of this feedback, the Steward now presented two options for the draft footnote to the SC-7. The longer version explained that a commodity may be considered to have been processed to change its nature if the processing has resulted in a change in the type of plant, plant product or other article, but that in case of doubt the decisive criterion for judging whether it has been processed to change its nature is the categorization used in the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination. The shorter version just explained the decisive criterion.
- [66] In considering the two options for the footnote, the SC-7 noted that sometimes more elaborate text can cause more problems than it solves and that this also applies to the provision of examples. The SC-7 therefore agreed to use the shorter version of the footnote, but recognized that this was still likely to give rise to comments during the second consultation, as it was a difficult concept to convey.
- [67] **Repacking, reloading, storing, splitting or combining consignments.** In response to several consultation comments, the Steward had proposed in the OCS review that a test may be an alternative option to an additional inspection to verify that a consignment has not been infested or contaminated. The Steward noted that this alternative option of a test was already mentioned in the preceding subsection (on Examination of the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination) and that reference to a test also ensures better consistency between the two types of phytosanitary certificates, as the model phytosanitary certificate for export refers to the plants, plant products or other regulated articles having been “inspected and/or tested”. The SC-7 accepted the Steward’s insertion of “or a test” after “an additional inspection”.
- [68] **Considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for export in certain re-export cases.** Several consultation comments had queried the wording of this section concerning the attaching of the original phytosanitary certificate or its certified copy to a phytosanitary certificate for export. The Steward had amended the text accordingly. In addition, the Steward noted that in cases of multiple re-export, an additional declaration relating to a phytosanitary certificate for export may originate from a previous country of re-export rather than the country of origin; she therefore suggested that the phrase “from the country of origin” be deleted. The SC-7 agreed to this deletion.

Potential implementation issues

- [69] The SC-7 identified no potential implementation issues, as the revision itself addressed the potential issues. The Steward noted that the EWG had included some implementation issues in their report in relation to the issue of processing commodities to change their nature, but agreed not to forward these at the present time. These issues could then be reviewed along with any potential implementation issues submitted during the second consultation.
- [70] The SC-7:
- (5) *approved* the draft focused revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011) as modified in this meeting for submission to the second consultation;
 - (6) *requested* that the Secretariat archive the potential implementation issues raised by the EWG on the Focused Revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011), for review by the SC after the second consultation.

4.4 Draft 2019 and 2020 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001), Priority 1

- [71] The Steward, Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) introduced the draft amendments to ISPM 5 and supporting documentation.⁶ A total of 110 comments had been submitted during the first consultation and the TPG had prepared responses to them. The Steward highlighted the following comments and responses that may need further discussion by the SC-7.
- [72] **Incidence (deletion).** A few consultation comments had expressed opposition to the deletion of “incidence” and had suggested instead that the definition be revised and the term “prevalence” be defined. Other comments had either supported the deletion of “incidence” or had not opposed it. Recognizing that a global agreement on “incidence” and “prevalence” would be unlikely, the TPG had therefore maintained its recommendation that the term “incidence” be deleted from the Glossary.
- [73] The SC-7 agreed with the TPG proposal for deletion.
- [74] **Emergency action (revision).** To take account of several consultation comments, the TPG had modified the proposed revised definition of “emergency action” to explicitly state that such an action is undertaken “to prevent the introduction or spread of a pest” in a situation “not covered by existing phytosanitary measures”, thereby clearly distinguishing the situation triggering an emergency action from the situation triggering a phytosanitary action. However, in reviewing the draft 2021 amendments to ISPM 5, the SC had revised the proposed definition of “emergency measure” to keep “new or unexpected” before “situation”, to replace “introduction or spread” with “entry, establishment or spread”, and to replace “covered” by “addressed”.⁷ During the OCS review by SC-7 members, it had been suggested that the equivalent changes be made to the revised definition of “emergency action”. The Steward therefore proposed the following draft definition:
- A prompt ~~phytosanitary~~ official action operation undertaken to prevent the entry, establishment or spread of a pest in a new or unexpected ~~phytosanitary~~ situation not addressed by existing phytosanitary measures”.
- [75] The Steward confirmed that although the SC had removed “prompt” from the draft definition of “emergency measure” at their meeting in May 2021, it had been retained in this proposed definition of “emergency action” because an action is an operation so “prompt” is relevant.
- [76] The Steward also clarified that the proposed definition covers both non-regulated pests, by use of the term “pest”, and those pests that are regulated but have been detected in a situation that is new or unexpected and is not covered by existing phytosanitary measures.
- [77] The SC agreed with the definition proposed by the Steward.
- [78] **Clearance (of a consignment) (revision).** Several consultation comments had sought clarification on the use of the terms “clearance (of a consignment)” and “compliance procedure (of a consignment)”. In response, the TPG had agreed to withdraw the proposed revised definition of “clearance (of a consignment)” from the draft 2019 and 2020 amendments to ISPM 5 and instead had proposed the deletion of this term, together with revised definitions of the terms “compliance procedure (of a consignment)” and “release (of a consignment)”, in the draft 2021 amendments to ISPM 5.
- [79] The SC agreed with the TPG’s proposal to withdraw the revision of “clearance (of a consignment)” from the draft 2019 and 2020 amendments to ISPM 5.
- [80] **Detection survey (revision).** In response to consultation comments, the TPG had agreed to add “the” before “presence or absence of pests” for consistency with the definition of “survey”. The TPG had also agreed not to add “place of production or production site” and even to delete “in an area” in the proposed revised definition, because the spatial scope of a detection survey is specified in the definition of

⁶ 1994-001; 1994-001_OCS; 10_SC7_Tel_2021_May; 11_SC7_Tel_2021_May.

⁷ SC 2021-05, agenda item 4.4.

“survey” (i.e. “in an area, place of production or production site”) and therefore does not need to be repeated.

[81] The SC agreed with the TPG proposal for revision and did not make any changes.

[82] The SC-7:

- (7) *approved* the draft 2019 and 2020 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001) as modified at this meeting for submission to the second consultation.

5. Review of the standard setting calendar

[83] The Secretariat referred to the standard setting calendar presented on the IPP.⁸

6. Any other business

[84] There was no other business.

7. Date and type of the next SC-7 meeting

[85] The next SC-7 meeting is scheduled to take place after the SC May 2022 meeting.

8. Evaluation of the meeting process

[86] The Secretariat invited participants to complete the evaluation of the meeting via the link provided in the Agenda (<https://forms.office.com/r/6pixCHtUti>).

9. Close of the meeting

[87] Although originally scheduled to finish on 21 May 2021, the SC-7 completed the agenda early, allowing the meeting to be closed at the end of the session on 19 May.

[88] The Chairperson and Secretariat thanked all participants for their contributions.

[89] The Chairperson closed the meeting.

⁸ IPP calendar: <https://www.ippc.int/en/year/calendar/>

Appendix 1: Agenda

N	Agenda item	Document number / link	Presenter / IPPC Secretariat support
1.	Opening of the Meeting		
1.1.	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat		NERSISYAN (OiC for IPPC daily matters) MOREIRA (OiC for SSU daily matters)
2.	Meeting Arrangements		
2.1.	Election of the Chairperson	–	IPPC Secretariat
2.2.	Election of the Rapporteur	–	Chairperson
2.3.	Adoption of the Agenda	01_SC7_Tel_2021_May	Chairperson
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1.	Documents list	02_SC7_Tel_2021_May	Chairperson
3.2.	Participants list	03_SC7_Tel_2021_May SC membership list	Chairperson
4.	Draft ISPMs for approval for the second consultation		
4.1.	Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008), Priority 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steward: Mr Samuel BISHOP Assistant stewards: Ms Joanne WILSON, Mr Ezequiel FERRO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steward's responses to Comments from 2020 Consultation and to TPG review (2019-008) Steward's additional notes and potential implementation issues (2019-008) TPG recommendations on terms and consistency (2019-008) 	2019-008 2019-008_OCS	BISHOP / WILSON / MOREIRA
		13_SC7_Tel_2021_May	
		14_SC7_Tel_2021_May_Rev1	
		12_SC7_Tel_2021_May	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addendum 2: responses comments from IPPC-APPPC - Regional Workshop for Asia 	15_SC7_Tel_2021_May	
4.2.	Audit in the Phytosanitary context (2015-014), Priority 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steward: Mr Alvaro SEPULVEDA LUQUE Assistant steward: Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steward's responses to Comments from 2020 Consultation and to TPG review (2015-014) Steward's additional notes and potential implementation issues (2015-014) TPG recommendations on terms and consistency (2015-014) 	2015-014 2015-014_OCS	SEPULVEDA / KISS
		04_SC7_Tel_2021_May	
		05_SC7_Tel_2021_May	
		06_SC7_Tel_2021_May	
4.3.	Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export, Priority 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steward: Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC Assistant steward: Mr Masahiro SAI <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steward's responses to Comments from 2020 Consultation and to TPG review (2015-011) 	2015-011 2015-011_OCS	BOUHOT-DELDUC / SHAMILOV
		07_SC7_Tel_2021_May	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steward's additional notes and potential implementation issues (2015-011) ○ TPG recommendations on terms and consistency (2015-011) 	08_SC7_Tel_2021_May_Rev1 09_SC7_Tel_2021_May	
4.4.	Draft 2019 and 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms (1994-001), Priority 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steward: Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC - Assistant steward: Mr Ebbe NORDBO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TPG responses to comments from 2020 Consultation (1994-001) ○ Steward's additional notes and potential implementation issues (1994-001) 	1994-001 1994-001_OCS 10_SC7_Tel_2021_May 11_SC7_Tel_2021_May_Rev1	BOUHOT-DELDUC / SHAMILOV
5.	Review of the standard setting calendar	Link to the IPP calendar	MUSHEGYAN
6.	Any other business		Chairperson
7.	Date and type of the next SC-7 Meeting		Chairperson
8.	Evaluation of the meeting process	Link to survey	Chairperson
9.	Close of the meeting		Chairperson

Appendix 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
Draft ISPMs for approval for the second consultation (“_OCS” – out of OCS)			
2015-014 2015-014_OCS	4.2	Audit in the Phytosanitary context (2015-014), Priority 2	2021-03-01 2021-04-26
2015-011 2015-011_OCS	4.3	Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export, Priority 2	2021-03-01 2021-04-26
1994-001 1994-001_OCS	4.4	Draft 2019 and 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms (1994-001), Priority 1	2021-03-01 2021-04-26
2019-008 2019-008_OCS	4.1	Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008), Priority 1	2021-03-25 2021-04-26
Meeting documents			
01_SC7_Tel_2021_May	2.3	Agenda	2021-04-01
02_SC7_Tel_2021_May	3.1	Documents List	2021-04-01
04_SC7_Tel_2021_May	4.2	Steward's responses to Comments from 2020 Consultation and to TPG review (2015-014)	2021-04-01
05_SC7_Tel_2021_May	4.2	Steward's additional notes and potential implementation issues (2015-014)	2021-04-01
06_SC7_Tel_2021_May	4.2	TPG recommendations on terms and consistency (2015-014)	2021-04-01
07_SC7_Tel_2021_May	4.3	Steward's responses to Comments from 2020 Consultation and to TPG review (2015-011)	2021-04-01
08_SC7_Tel_2021_May 08_SC7_Tel_2021_May_Rev 1	4.3	Steward's additional notes and potential implementation issues (2015-011)	2021-04-01 2021-05-04
09_SC7_Tel_2021_May	4.3	TPG recommendations on terms and consistency (2015-011)	2021-04-01
10_SC7_Tel_2021_May	4.4	TPG responses to comments from 2020 Consultation (1994-001)	2021-04-01
11_SC7_Tel_2021_May 11_SC7_Tel_2021_May_Rev 1	4.4	Steward's additional notes and potential implementation issues (1994-001)	2021-04-01 2021-05-04
12_SC7_Tel_2021_May	4.1	TPG recommendations on terms and consistency (2019-008)	2021-04-01

13_SC7_Tel_2021_May	4.1	Steward's responses to Comments from 2020 Consultation and to TPG review (2019-008)	2021-04-01
14_SC7_Tel_2021_May 14_SC7_Tel_2021_May_Rev 1	4.1	Steward's additional notes and potential implementation issues (2019-008)	2021-04-01 2021-05-04
15_SC7_Tel_2021_May	4.1	Addendum 2: responses comments from IPPC-APPPC - Regional Workshop for Asia	2021-04-01
03_SC7_Tel_2021_May	3.2	Participants list	2021-04-14

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

Links	Agenda item	Document link
SC membership list	3.2	SC membership list
Review of the standard setting calendar	5	Link to the IPP calendar
Evaluation of the meeting process	8	Link to survey

Appendix 3: Participants list

Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Africa Member SC-7	Mr David KAMANGIRA Senior Deputy Director and IPPC Focal Point Department of Agricultural Research Services Headquarters, P.O. Box 30779, Lilongwe 3 MALAWI Tel: +265 888 342 712 Tel: +265 999 122 199	davidkamangira1@gmail.com	CPM-11 (2016) CPM-14 (2019) 2 nd term / 3 years	2022
Asia Member SC-7	Mr Masahiro SAI Senior Researcher (Head of Section) Planning and Coordination Section, Research Division Yokohama Plant Protection Station Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) JAPAN Tel: +81-45-211-7165	masahiro_sai670@maff.go.jp	CPM-13 (2018) 1 st term / 3 years	2021
Europe Member SC-7	Mr Samuel BISHOP Plant Health Policy team Room 11G35 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs National Agri-Food Innovation Campus Sand Hutton York North Yorkshire UNITED KINGDOM YO41 4LZ Tel: +44 (0) 2080262506 Mob.: +44 (0) 7827976902	sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk	CPM-13 (2018)	2021
Latin America and Caribbean Member SC-7	Mr Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ Pest Risk Analyst Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado 300 Sur de Teletica, Sabana Sur, San José, COSTA RICA Tel: +(506) 8660-8383	hmorera@sfe.go.cr	CPM-13 (2018) 1 st term / 3 years	2021
Near East Member SC-7	Mr Nader ELBADRY Phytosanitary Specialist, Central Administration of Plant Quarantine, 6 Michel Bakhoun St., Dokki, Giza, EGYPT Tel: +201096799493	nader.badry@gmail.com	Replacement member for Mr Abdulqader Khudhair ABBAS CPM-13 (2018) 1 st term / 3 years	2021

North America Member SC-7	Ms Marina ZLOTINA IPPC Technical Director USDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) 4700 River Rd, 5c-03.37 Riverdale, MD 20737 USA Tel: 1-301-851-2200 Cell: 1 -301-832-0611	Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) 2 nd term / 3 years	2021
Southwest Pacific Member SC-7	Ms Sophie Alexia PETERSON Assistant Director Plant Health Policy Biosecurity Plant Division Department of Agriculture and Water Resources GPO Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Tel: (+61) 2 6272 3769 Mobile: +61 402 313 170	sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au	Replacement member for Mr Bruce HANCOCKS CPM-12 (2017) 1 st term / 3 years	2020

IPPC Secretariat	
Ms Adriana MOREIRA Standard Setting Officer, OiC for SSU	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org
Mr Artur SHAMILOV Standard Setting Officer	Artur.Shamilov@fao.org
Ms Erika MANGILI ANDRÉ Standard Setting Specialist	Erika.MangiliAndre@fao.org
Ms Janka KISS Standard Setting Associate	Janka.Kiss@fao.org
Mr Edgar MUSHEGYAN Standard Setting Associate	Edgar.Mushegyan@fao.org
Ms Karen ROUEN Report writer	karen@karenrouen.com

Appendix 4: Draft ISPM Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)

DRAFT ISPM: Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)

Status box

This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
Date of this document	2021-06-09
Document category	Draft ISPM
Current document stage	To second consultation
Major stages	2018-10 Focus group on commodity and pathway standards recommended adding to the work programme. 2018-12 CPM Bureau recommended adding to the work programme. 2019-04 CPM-14 agreed to a second meeting of focus group, to draft overarching concept standard. 2019-06 Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards drafted ISPM. 2019-10 Strategic Planning Group reviewed and provided comments. 2019-11 Standards Committee reviewed and proposed changes. 2019-12 CPM Bureau approved the draft for consultation. 2020-06 CPM Bureau added topic <i>Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures to work programme</i> to work programme, on behalf of CPM, with priority 1 (subsequently confirmed by CPM-15 (2021)). 2020-07 First consultation. 2021-05 SC-7 revised and approved for second consultation.
Steward history	2019-07 Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards]2020-09 SC Samuel BISHOP (GB, Lead Steward) 2020-09 SC Joanne WILSON (NZ, Assistant Steward) 2020-09 SC Ezequiel FERRO (AR, Assistant Steward)
Notes	This is a draft document 2019-06 Focus group recommended that “pathways” be excluded 2019-09 Edited 2019-12 Edited 2021-05 Edited

Adoption

[1] [To be inserted following adoption].

INTRODUCTION

Scope

[2] This standard provides guidance on the purpose, use, content, publication and review of commodity-based standards (hereafter referred to as “commodity standards”) for phytosanitary measures. Such standards, presented as annexes to this overarching concept standard, apply to commodities being moved in international trade and identify pests associated with these commodities and options for relevant phytosanitary measures to be considered by contracting parties. The pests and measures identified are not intended to be exhaustive.

[3] The scope of this standard and its annexes does not include contamination or diversion from intended use of commodities.

References

[4] The present standard refers to ISPMs. ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms>.

IPPC Secretariat. 1997. *International Plant Protection Convention*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

IPPC Secretariat. 2021. *Strategic framework for the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) 2020–2030*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

Definitions

- [5] Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

Outline of requirements

- [6] Contracting parties should consider available commodity standards when developing phytosanitary import requirements. Each commodity standard is specific to a particular commodity and intended use, and contains a list of pests and corresponding options for phytosanitary measures to manage them. The list of pests includes pests that may infest the commodity being traded and that may pose a risk to the importing country when the commodity is used for the intended use specified in the commodity standard. The options for phytosanitary measures listed are those that satisfy minimum criteria for inclusion in the standard,⁹ and are categorized according to confidence in the measures. The lists of pests and options for phytosanitary measures are not intended to be exhaustive and are subject to review and amendment.
- [7] Commodity standards are presented as annexes to this standard.

BACKGROUND

- [8] The IPPC aims at protecting plants and plant products against pests without causing unjustified impediments to trade. Trade supports economic growth and development, helping to reduce poverty around the world. Significant advances in the facilitation of safe trade can be made through the development and adoption of international commodity standards for phytosanitary measures.
- [9] The IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 (IPPC Secretariat, 2021) includes the development of ISPMs for specific commodities, with, as required, accompanying diagnostic protocols, phytosanitary treatments and guidance to support implementation, simplify trade and expedite market-access negotiations.
- [10] The purpose of this standard is to provide guidance on the development and use of such commodity standards. Such standards, included as annexes to this standard, are designed to support the development of phytosanitary import requirements where measures are technically justified to facilitate safe trade.
- [11] The intended benefits of using commodity standards may include the following:
- They may support the development of phytosanitary import requirements.
 - They may facilitate market-access discussions.
 - They may facilitate safe trade.
 - They may help **national plant protection organizations (NPPOs)** optimize the use of their resources.
 - They identify, and may therefore increase awareness of, the measures available to manage the pest risk associated with the movement of commodities in international trade.
 - They **identify, and may therefore increase awareness of, the pests of the commodities commonly managed by NPPOs.**
- [12] Each annex lists measures for consideration as phytosanitary measures. These measures are referred to as “options for phytosanitary measures”.

⁹ The inclusion of a measure in the annexes to this ISPM does not create any obligation for a contracting party to approve it, register it or adopt it for use in its territory.

IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

- [13] Commodity standards provide guidance on options for phytosanitary measures. Such measures may help preserve biodiversity by managing the pest risk posed by commodities that are moved internationally, including the pest risk posed by invasive alien species.

PRINCIPLES IN RELATION TO COMMODITY STANDARDS

- [14] In the context of IPPC rights and obligations, the basic principles of particular importance and relevance to commodity standards are as follows:
- The sovereign rights of contracting parties, to prescribe and adopt phytosanitary measures to protect plant health within their territories and determine the appropriate level of protection for plant health, are not affected by commodity standards.
 - Existing international obligations of contracting parties under the IPPC and the World Trade Organization Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures remain unaffected by commodity standards.
 - Additional obligations are not imposed on importing countries by commodity standards, over and above the obligations already identified in the IPPC.
 - The regulation of any pests listed in commodity standards remains subject to technical justification using a pest risk analysis (PRA) or, where applicable, another comparable examination and evaluation of available scientific information (Articles II and VI of the IPPC).
 - Options for phytosanitary measures presented in commodity standards are not intended to be exhaustive; alternative measures may be implemented by contracting parties, if technically justified (Article VII.2(h) of the IPPC), and may be proposed for inclusion in revisions of commodity standards.

REQUIREMENTS

1. Purpose and use of commodity standards

- [15] The purpose of commodity standards is to support the development of phytosanitary import requirements that are technically justified and facilitate safe trade by reducing the pest risk to the importing country to an acceptable level.
- [16] Phytosanitary import requirements established by importing countries should be technically justified according to international obligations. Pest lists and options for phytosanitary measures contained within commodity standards should be considered when developing phytosanitary import requirements. The relevance of the pest lists and options for phytosanitary measures should be evaluated for each country of origin and imported commodity (where a commodity standard is available for that commodity and intended use). Commodity standards may serve to facilitate the evaluation of such measures in PRA (or other comparable examination and evaluation).
- [17] Commodity standards are not developed in the following circumstances:
- when no effective phytosanitary measures are available;
 - when an existing ISPM already provides sufficient guidance;
 - when a commodity should not be considered a regulated article (e.g. when a commodity is processed to the point where it is no longer capable of being infested with pests).

2. Scope and content of commodity standards

- [18] The commodity standards that form the annexes to this overarching concept standard are arranged according to the following sections:
- Scope of commodity standards

- Description of the commodity and its intended use
- [List of pests](#) associated with the commodity
- Options for phytosanitary measures
- References.

[19] The content of these sections is described below, together with the basis on which pests (section 2.3) and measures (sections 2.4 and 3) are included in the standards.

2.1 Scope of commodity standards

[20] This commodity standard clearly describes the commodity (including plant scientific name and its intended uses) and covers a list of pests associated with this commodity and related options for phytosanitary measures.

2.2 Description of the commodity and its intended use

[21] This section clearly describes the commodity, such as the plant part that is specifically being traded. The description is intended to provide sufficient information to allow the identification of a focused list of pests and associated options for phytosanitary measures. The intended use of the commodity is given because of the influence it has on the pest risk posed by the commodity, as described in ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*).

2.3 List of pests associated with the commodity

[22] This section includes a list of pests or groups of pests that are known to be associated with the commodity described. A criterion for inclusion of a pest is that it is regulated by at least one contracting party based on the availability of evidence, such as reliable scientific data, a PRA, or other technical justification.

[23] Inclusion of a pest in a commodity standard does not constitute technical justification for its regulation. The determination of whether to regulate these pests is at the discretion of the importing country, based on technical justification using either a PRA or, where applicable, another comparable examination and evaluation of available scientific information.

[24] The list of pests is not intended to be exhaustive.

2.4 Options for phytosanitary measures

[25] This section presents options for phytosanitary measures, including measures adopted in ISPMs or currently used in trade, and conditions under which a measure may be applied. Individual or combinations of measures may be provided for each pest and may relate to any point of production and handling of the commodity before import.

[26] Although commodity standards only present options for measures that may be applied up to the point of entry, post-entry measures may also be considered by contracting parties, as described in ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*).

[27] The list of measures is not intended to be exhaustive but rather to give countries options for consideration.

[28] The measures are presented in the list of pests known to be associated with the commodity, with each measure being listed against the corresponding pest or pests that it manages. A description of each measure, sufficient to indicate its use and practical application, is provided. When necessary, additional information on the measures may be included in an appendix.

2.5 The References section of commodity standards

[29] All information presented on pests and measures in the standard is referenced in the References section.

3. Criteria for inclusion of measures in commodity standards

[30] A measure can be considered for inclusion in a commodity standard by the Technical Panel for Commodity Standards when it is, or has been, set as a phytosanitary import requirement by at least one contracting party and hence in operation between at least two contracting parties. Inclusion in the standard is further supported if one or more of the following criteria are met:

- Experience from use in international trade indicates that the measure is effective. For example:
 - the measure is, or has been, used extensively;
 - the measure has been successfully used to manage non-compliant consignments;
 - information from plant certification and accreditation schemes indicates that the measure is effective.
- Experience from domestic use indicates that the measure is effective. For example:
 - the measure has been used extensively in relation to domestic movement of commodities;
 - the measure has been used successfully in outbreak management and eradication programmes;
 - information from plant certification and accreditation schemes indicates that the measure is effective;
 - best management practices for the measure are available.
- Experimental evidence indicates that the measure is effective.
- Information from PRAs (pest risk management options) or, where applicable, from another comparable examination and evaluation of available scientific information, indicates that the measure is effective.
- Adopted ISPMs exist that are relevant to the pests or commodities.
- Regional standards exist that are relevant to the pests or commodities.

[31] The practicality and feasibility of the measure is also taken into account when a measure is being considered for inclusion in a commodity standard. These factors and cost should also be considered by contracting parties when evaluating an option as a phytosanitary measure.

[32] The practicality, feasibility and cost of potential measures should also be considered by contracting parties when implementing a commodity standard and evaluating the suitability of the measures contained within it.

4. Confidence in measures

[33] Options for phytosanitary measures are categorized according to confidence in the measures. Confidence in the measures is evaluated based on criteria developed and revised as necessary by the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards. Evaluation of confidence may be based on:

- the presence of the measure in an adopted ISPM;
- the presence of the measure in a regional standard;
- the history of the use of the measure by contracting parties;
- the history of the use of the measure by the private sector or an authorized entity;
- the inclusion of the measure in a PRA;
- the number of PRAs that include the measure;
- the number of years that the measure has been in use;
- reports of success or failure of the measure, including interception data;
- the volume or frequency of traded commodities subjected to the measure;
- the availability of quantitative or qualitative analyses pertinent to the measure;
- the number and diversity of countries applying the measures.

- [34] Confidence depends on the rigour of any supporting analyses and may be increased if there are cumulative sources of evidence, such as information on usage or acceptance.

5. Publication of commodity standards

- [35] After adoption by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), commodity standards are posted separately on the IPP as annexes to this standard. Where appropriate, commodity standards may instead be presented as annexes of other ISPMs.

6. Review and re-evaluations

- [36] Contracting parties should submit to the IPPC Secretariat any new information related to technical or implementation issues that could have an impact on commodity standards currently adopted by the CPM. Appropriate information should be provided to support any claims. The Technical Panel on Commodity Standards will review the data and revise the pest lists and options for phytosanitary measures if necessary, following the Standard Setting Procedure.

Appendix 5: Draft ISPM Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014)

DRAFT ISPM: Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014)

Status box

This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
Date of this document	2020-06-03
Document category	Draft ISPM
Current document stage	To second consultation
Major stages	2015-11 Standards Committee (SC) recommended the topic be added to the work programme. 2016-04 CPM-11 added the topic <i>Audit in the phytosanitary context</i> (2015-003, subsequently changed to 2015-014) to the work programme with priority 2. 2017-11 SC approved Specification 66 and recommended priority 1. 2018-04 CPM-13 approved the priority change. 2019-06 Expert working group (EWG) met and drafted the standard. 2020-04 SC revised the draft via Online Comment System (to replace the cancelled 2020-05 SC meeting) and approved it for first consultation via e-decision (2020_eSC_May_19). 2020-07 First consultation. 2021-05 SC-7 revised and approved for second consultation.
Steward history	2016-05 SC Mr Álvaro SEPULVEDA LUQUE (CL, Lead Steward) 2020-11 SC Mr Steve CÔTÉ (CA, Assistant Steward) 2016-05 SC Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (CA, Assistant Steward)
Notes	2017-03 Topic number changed from 2015-003 to 2015-014 2019-10 Edited 2020-05 Edited 2021-06 Edited

Adoption

- [1] [Text to this paragraph will be added following adoption.]

INTRODUCTION

Scope

- [2] This standard covers audits in the phytosanitary context conducted by a national plant protection organization (NPPO) in its own territory, or with and in the territory of another NPPO, and audits conducted by entities that have been authorized by the NPPO to conduct audits on its behalf. This standard focuses only on the phytosanitary aspects of audits. For general aspects of audits, other sources of information are available.

References

- [3] The present standard refers to ISPMs. ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms>.

IPPC Secretariat. 1997. *International Plant Protection Convention*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

Definitions

- [4] Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

Outline of requirements

- [5] This standard describes the purpose and procedures for audit activities in the phytosanitary context. This includes the circumstances that may initiate an audit, the criteria and the procedures for planning,

preparing for, undertaking and reporting the outcome of an audit. The audit elements to be considered depend on the type of audit and its purpose, scope and objectives.

- [6] This standard also provides guidance on selecting auditors, establishing the audit frequency, settling disputes over audit findings, and agreeing financial arrangements between the parties involved. The roles and responsibilities of the parties involved in an audit are also described.

BACKGROUND

- [7] National plant protection organizations have a number of responsibilities under the IPPC, for activities such as surveillance, inspections, the establishment of phytosanitary import requirements, phytosanitary certification, the conduct or supervision of treatments, the conduct of pest risk analyses, and the training of staff. To help them fulfil these responsibilities effectively, NPPOs are increasingly using audits to provide confidence that phytosanitary systems and procedures achieve their objectives.
- [8] Audits are referenced in many adopted ISPMs. This standard aims to provide guidance to NPPOs on a common approach to audits in the phytosanitary context.
- [9] An audit is a documented verification process. An audit in the phytosanitary context (hereafter referred to as an “audit”) is a documented, systematic review of a phytosanitary system or procedure to evaluate the level of control, assure the quality of the processes set by the auditing NPPO (the NPPO responsible for the audit), and evaluate whether the system or procedure is achieving the expected phytosanitary outcomes.
- [10] Unlike supervision, an audit does not involve continuous observation and direction of activities but instead provides an evaluation of a specific phytosanitary system, procedure, or particular elements of a system or procedure, at a given time.
- [11] Objective evidence is collected on whether the outcomes of the phytosanitary system or procedure conform with the relevant requirements of the auditing NPPO and whether these requirements are implemented effectively to achieve the phytosanitary objectives.

IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

- [12] Conducting audits helps to ensure the effectiveness of phytosanitary systems and procedures, thereby reducing the pest risk. This protects plant health, which in turn reduces negative environmental impacts and benefits biodiversity.

REQUIREMENTS

1. Purpose of an audit

- [13] An audit should objectively evaluate whether a specific phytosanitary system or procedure conforms with the requirements set by the auditing NPPO. An audit should provide an opportunity to identify findings, including nonconformities, regarding the effectiveness of the phytosanitary system or procedure being audited.
- [14] An NPPO may conduct audits to:
- verify the conformity of the NPPO’s own systems and procedures;
 - verify the systems and procedures of entities that have been authorized by the NPPO, including entities authorized to conduct audits on behalf of the NPPO;
 - verify the systems and procedures of the NPPO of an exporting country in accordance with the requirements of ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*).

- [15] An entity authorized by an NPPO to conduct audits on its behalf may conduct audits to verify the systems and procedures of entities authorized by that NPPO to perform phytosanitary actions.

2. Types of audit

- [16] The main types of audit are system audits and verification audits.
- [17] A **system audit** is a comprehensive review of a phytosanitary system or procedure to evaluate its effectiveness and conformity with the requirements of the auditing NPPO. It is conducted to determine whether the system or procedure is designed to achieve its objectives and whether the auditee has sufficient capability to implement the system or procedure. In general, a system audit may be conducted before authorizing an entity or a new process, or at other times as and when necessary. The scope of a system audit may include an entire system from production to export or a system of a particular entity.
- [18] A **verification audit** is a focused review of a phytosanitary system or procedure, in which particular elements of the system or procedure are reviewed to evaluate their effectiveness of the system or procedure and its conformity with the requirements of the auditing NPPO. It is conducted to determine whether the system or procedure is being properly implemented and maintained. A verification audit may be conducted periodically, at regular or random intervals, or as a result of certain circumstances.

3. Circumstances that may initiate audit

- [19] The following are examples of circumstances that may initiate an audit in:
- scheduling of a routine audit to verify ongoing conformity with the requirements of the auditing NPPO;
 - changes to conditions (e.g. production practices, pest status, management systems or operations of a facility);
 - changes to phytosanitary import requirements, management systems or operation of a facility;
 - a new import pathway;
 - a new export programme;
 - a notification of non-compliance from the NPPO of an importing country (e.g. detection of a regulated pest in an imported consignment);
 - a detected nonconformity that may compromise the phytosanitary system;
 - the implementation of corrective actions to address nonconformity;
 - new requests for participation in the phytosanitary system.

4. Roles and responsibilities

4.1 Roles

- [20] The audit involves two parties: an auditor and an auditee. The auditor may be either an NPPO or its authorized entity. The sections below describe the responsibilities of each party. In the context of this standard, both the terms “auditor” and “auditee” may refer to an individual person, a group of people representing an organization or an entity.

4.2 Responsibilities of the NPPO

- [21] For audits in its own territory, the NPPO should:
- establish an audit framework and requirements for the audit process;
 - ensure that an appropriate legal and technical framework is in place if deciding to authorize entities to conduct audits on its behalf and for subsequently maintaining oversight of their action;
 - develop contingency plans for continuity of action in the event that an authorized entity is no longer able to conduct audit activities;
 - identify costs and ensure that appropriate financial arrangements are in place to meet these costs;

- if nonconformities are identified, ensure that the auditee identifies and implements corrective actions to address these nonconformities in the time frame agreed;
- take necessary actions, which may include revocation of authorization of an entity or suspension of participation in the phytosanitary system, when a critical nonconformity has been identified or when identified nonconformities have not been addressed satisfactorily.

[22] In addition, an NPPO of an importing country conducting audits in the territory of an exporting country should:

- establish an audit framework and requirements for the audit process;
- reach an agreement with the NPPO of the exporting country to conduct the audit, including arrangements for aspects such as the financial cost of the audit and which entities are authorized to conduct the audit;
- if nonconformities are identified, agree with the NPPO of the exporting country what corrective actions are required and within what time frame.

4.3 Responsibilities of the auditor

[23] The following are general responsibilities of an auditor that should apply, regardless of whether the auditor is an NPPO or an authorized entity. The auditor should:

- develop, implement and maintain an audit programme within the audit framework established by the auditing NPPO;
- identify the purpose, scope and objectives of each audit;
- identify the audit criteria to be used;
- prepare for and undertake audits using the agreed criteria;
- prepare and finalize audit reports and provide these in a timely manner to the auditee, or to both the auditor and NPPO if the auditor is an authorized entity;
- provide sufficient human resources, with the required training and competence to conduct the audits;
- be free of any conflict of interest, maintaining impartiality and independence from the entities being audited;
- provide an opportunity for the auditee to respond to the findings of the report (e.g. to support the findings or disagree with them) before it is finalized and published;
- maintain confidentiality of information gained through the audit (see section 8).

4.3.1 Specific responsibilities of entities authorized to conduct an audit

[24] Authorized entities conducting an audit on behalf of an NPPO should meet the following requirements in addition to those set out in section 4.3 and ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*):

- conduct audits as agreed with the NPPO;
- immediately notify the authorizing NPPO of any nonconformities as defined in section 12.

4.4 Responsibilities of the auditee

[25] The auditee may be an NPPO auditing itself, the NPPO of an exporting country audited by the NPPO of an importing country, an entity authorized by an NPPO to perform phytosanitary actions, or any other participant in the phytosanitary system that is being audited. The auditee should be required to:

- cooperate with the auditor and conform with audit requirements;
- provide access to information, facilities, records and personnel as required for the audit being conducted;
- facilitate, within the country of the auditee and as appropriate, the logistics associated with visits by the auditor to the auditee;

- draw up and deliver an action plan according to the audit findings;
- if nonconformities are identified, identify and implement corrective actions to address these nonconformities within the agreed time frame.

5. Selection of auditors

- [26] Auditors should be selected based on a combination of knowledge, training and experience relevant to the scope of the audit, including the audit methodology and the gathering of objective evidence.
- [27] Where additional technical expertise is required, a relevant technical expert may be part of the audit team or may assist the auditor.
- [28] To meet the requirement for impartiality (see section 7), any conflict of interest between the auditor and auditee should also be considered during the selection process.

6. Frequency of audits

- [29] When setting up an audit programme, the auditing NPPO should determine the frequency of audits of the phytosanitary system or procedure being audited and review this frequency as appropriate. The audit frequency may be influenced by:
- circumstances triggering an audit to be initiated, as identified in section 3;
 - seasonality in relation to phytosanitary activities, if appropriate;
 - the pest risk associated with relevant pests or pathways;
 - the history of conformity and compliance;
 - whether an established, documented procedure is in place that has been shown to reduce the pest risk.

7. Conflicts of interest

- [30] The auditing NPPO should develop guidance on impartiality and possible conflicts of interest related to audits. In order to maintain the integrity of the audit system, the auditor should be impartial. For each audit, the auditor should identify the potential, perceived or actual conflicts of interest relating to the audit. Both the auditor and the auditee should declare that there are no conflicts of interest relating to the audit.

8. Confidentiality

- [31] The parties should consider and manage confidentiality, including that of private and commercially sensitive information, in order to maintain the integrity of the audit. The auditing NPPO should develop guidance on this matter as appropriate.
- [32] Before the commencement of the audit, parties should be made aware of the intended and possible disclosure of information gathered during the audit, including the report.

9. Financial arrangements

- [33] Financial arrangements should be discussed and agreed upon by the parties before commencement of the audit.

10. Settlement of Disputes

- [34] The process for settlement of disputes may be established in advance of audits, as part of the audit framework.
- [35] If parties do not agree that the intended methodology was followed, or with findings or conclusions of the audit, they should consult among themselves during the audit.

- [36] If the dispute is still not resolved after this consultation, disputing parties should refer to the agreed dispute settlement process.

11. Steps in the audit process

- [37] The audit methodology may differ depending on the purpose, scope and objectives of the audit. It may entail review of documents, interviews, meetings, site visits or a combination of these. The following subsections describe the steps in the audit process.

11.1 Planning an audit

- [38] The planning of an audit should include the following elements:
- defining and agreeing the purpose, scope (entire system or particular elements of the system) and objectives of the audit;
 - identifying the audit criteria for assessment of conformity;
 - identifying the auditor and the auditee;
 - considering existing equivalent audit systems, or other systems developed by NPPOs or industry, where appropriate.

11.1.1 Scheduling of audits

- [39] Audits should be scheduled by the auditing NPPO or the authorized entity conducting the audit in advance (i.e. the date and time of the performing and evaluation stage of the audit (section 11.3.2)). Non-periodic audits may be scheduled by an NPPO or an authorized entity as a result of certain circumstances (see section 3). In some situations (e.g. nonconformities), an audit may be unscheduled.

11.2 Preparing for an audit

- [40] To prepare for an audit, the auditor should:
- gather and review relevant information, such as manuals, procedures, work plans, notifications of non-compliance, records, a pre-audit questionnaire, relevant standards, agreements, previous audit reports and reports on corrective actions implemented to address nonconformities;
 - prepare audit tools, such as checklists, reference materials, equipment and a list of possible questions;
 - communicate with participants (which may include notifying auditees) and confirm their availability, finalize logistics arrangements and agree to the language in which the audit will be conducted;
 - ask the auditee to ensure that personnel and relevant documentation be available during the audit;
 - confirm the roles and responsibilities of the participants during the audit, such as the principal contact persons for each party, the lead auditor, audit team members, technical experts and observers.

11.3 Undertaking an audit

- [41] There are three stages involved in undertaking an audit. The activities that take place during each stage may differ depending on the type of audit and what is being audited. The three stages are set out below, along with examples of activities that may be included.

11.3.1 Initiation

- [42] The activities of the auditor may include:
- confirming the purpose, scope and objectives of the audit and confirming the audit criteria;
 - introducing the audit participants and confirming the availability of required personnel;
 - discussing previous audit reports, including corrective actions implemented (if applicable);

- reviewing the methodology to be used in the performing and evaluation stage of the audit;
- confirming if submitted documentation is current;
- confirming the audit process and time frame;
- informing participants about legal requirements for confidentiality and data protection.

11.3.2 Performing and evaluation

[43] The activities of the auditor may include:

- interviewing relevant personnel if required and seeking clarification as necessary;
- assessing documented processes;
- assessing records from procedures (e.g. technical and administrative records, inspection records, treatment records, testing results, corrective actions log);
- verifying whether facilities, instruments, machinery and equipment comply with the relevant specifications and with the phytosanitary requirements set by the auditing NPPO;
- observing processes to assess conformity with agreed procedures and to note aspects that may compromise the phytosanitary system or procedure being audited;
- investigating whether the system or procedure being audited is achieving the expected phytosanitary outcomes;
- discussing audit findings within the audit team to reach consensus;
- identifying and informing the auditee of any findings during the audit and informing the auditing NPPO, within the time frame agreed, of any nonconformities.

11.3.3 Closure and reporting

[44] The activities of the auditor and auditee may include:

- discussing findings, identified nonconformities and preliminary conclusions;
- requesting or providing additional clarification and feedback;
- the auditor drafting an audit report and the auditee commenting on the draft audit report, with both parties discussing the timelines for implementation of corrective actions when nonconformities have been identified, and, in situations where dispute occurs, attempting to resolve the dispute (see section 10);
- reviewing the next steps and agreeing on the deadline for the presentation of the final report of the audit.

[45] The audit report should be always be produced and should include the purpose, scope, objectives and findings (conformities and nonconformities) of the audit. The report should also draw conclusions based on analysis of the findings. If nonconformities are identified, these conclusions should include the need for corrective actions and the assessment by the auditor of the action plan proposed by the auditee (including the proposed timelines for implementation of these corrective actions). In addition, the audit report may provide suggestions for improving the effectiveness of the phytosanitary system or procedure, highlight good practices, and provide useful feedback on phytosanitary regulations or requirements.

[46] Before finalizing the audit report and providing it to the auditee, additional information (e.g. comments, implemented corrective actions) received from auditees should be considered. Details of any disputes should be clearly described in the report.

12. Types of nonconformity

[47] Nonconformities should be recorded, along with supporting evidence. Nonconformities may be considered as critical nonconformities or non-critical nonconformities.

- [48] A “critical nonconformity” is a nonconformity that immediately compromises the integrity of the auditing NPPO’s phytosanitary system or its elements and that requires a rapid corrective action to be identified and implemented.
- [49] A “non-critical nonconformity” is a nonconformity that does not directly or immediately compromise the integrity of the auditing NPPO’s phytosanitary system or its elements and that is therefore not considered a critical nonconformity by the NPPO. A non-critical nonconformity requires corrective actions to be taken within a specified time frame.

13. Follow-up of nonconformity

- [50] Follow-up should take place if the audit report identifies that corrective actions are needed. These corrective actions should be implemented within the timelines identified in the report and their effectiveness verified.

Appendix 6: Draft Focused revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011)

DRAFT ISPM: Focused revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011)

Status box

This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
Date of this document	2021-06-07
Document category	Draft ISPM
Current document stage	To second consultation
Major stages	<p>2015-11 Standards Committee (SC) recommended that the topic be added to the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i>.</p> <p>2016-04 CPM 11 (2016) added the topic <i>Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export (2015-011)</i> with priority 2.</p> <p>2018-02 SC approved Specification 67 (<i>Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export</i>).</p> <p>2019-12 Expert working group met and drafted the standard.</p> <p>2020-04 SC revised the draft via Online Comment System (to replace the cancelled 2020-05 SC meeting) and approved it for first consultation via e-decision (2020_eSC_May_18), also agreeing to include some ink amendments beyond the scope of the focused revision of ISPM 12 in relation to re-export, to correct the terminology and improve consistency within the standard.</p> <p>2020-07 First consultation.</p> <p>2021-05 SC-7 revised and approved for second consultation.</p>
Steward history	<p>2016-05 SC Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (FR, Lead Steward)</p> <p>2019-05 SC Masahiro SAI (JP, Assistant Steward)</p>
Notes	<p><i>Grey text is not open for comments. Additions are indicated by <u>bolded and underlined text</u> and deletions by crossed through text</i></p> <p>2020-05 Edited</p> <p>2021-06 Edited</p>

Adoption

This standard was first adopted by the Third Session of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in April 2001 as *Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates*. The first revision of the standard was adopted by the Sixth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in March 2011 as the present standard. The revised Appendix 1 was adopted by the Ninth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in April 2014.

[Text to this paragraph will be added following adoption].

INTRODUCTION

Scope

This standard provides the requirements and guidelines for the preparation and issuance of phytosanitary certificates¹⁰ (phytosanitary certificates for export and phytosanitary certificates for re-export).

¹⁰ The IPPC refers to a “phytosanitary certificate” for export purposes and a “phytosanitary certificate for re-export” for re-export purposes. In order to keep the use of these terms simple and clear in this standard

Specific guidance on requirements and components of a phytosanitary certification system to be established by national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) is provided in ISPM 7 (*Phytosanitary certification system*).

References

The present standard refers to International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms>.

IPPC. International Plant Protection Convention. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

Definitions

Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

Outline of requirements

Phytosanitary certification is used to attest that consignments meet phytosanitary import requirements and is undertaken by an NPPO. A phytosanitary certificate for export or for re-export can be issued only by a public officer who is technically qualified and duly authorized by an NPPO.

A phytosanitary certificate for export is usually issued by the NPPO of the country where the plants, plant products or regulated articles were grown or processed. A phytosanitary certificate for re-export is issued by the NPPO of the country of re-export (a country where the commodity has not been grown or processed **to change its nature**) when the consignment has not been ~~subjected to the risk of infestation~~ **infested or contaminated by regulated pests and** ~~complies with~~ **meets** the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country, and the original phytosanitary certificate or a certified copy **of the phytosanitary certificate (hereafter referred to as a “certified copy”)** is available.

NPPOs shall use the model phytosanitary certificates of the IPPC.

Where the required phytosanitary information exceeds the space available on the phytosanitary certificates, an attachment may be added with this information.

Phytosanitary certificates should accompany the consignment or may be transmitted by mail or other means, or where agreed between countries, NPPOs may use electronic phytosanitary certificates, using standardized language, structure of the message and exchange protocols.

Phytosanitary certificates may have a limited duration of validity. The NPPO of the exporting country or the importing country may make relevant stipulations.

Specific procedures should be followed in the case of replacement phytosanitary certificates, certified copies of phytosanitary certificates, and alterations to phytosanitary certificates. Invalid or fraudulent phytosanitary certificates should not be accepted.

~~Special~~ **Specific** consideration is given to situations of re-export, particularly when **the country of re-export does not require** ~~the issuance of a phytosanitary certificate for importing the commodity~~ **export is not required by the country of re-export and when** **but the country of destination requires that** specific phytosanitary measures **have been applied** ~~need to be conducted~~ in the country of origin¹¹.

“phytosanitary certificate for export” and “phytosanitary certificate for re-export” are used. The term “phytosanitary certificates” (plural) is used to cover both types of certificate.

¹¹ **In this standard, except where stated otherwise, the requirements set out for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export consider only a country of origin (issuing a phytosanitary certificate for export), a country of re-export (issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export) and a country of destination.**

BACKGROUND

Phytosanitary certification is used to attest that consignments meet phytosanitary import requirements and is applied to most plants, plant products and other regulated articles that are traded internationally. Phytosanitary certification contributes to the protection of plants, including cultivated and uncultivated/unmanaged plants and wild flora (including aquatic plants), habitats and ecosystems in the importing countries. Phytosanitary certification also facilitates international trade in plants, plant products and other regulated articles by providing an internationally agreed document and related procedures.

Article V.2(a) of the IPPC stipulates how phytosanitary certificates should be issued:

Inspection and other related activities leading to issuance of phytosanitary certificates shall be carried out only by or under the authority of the official national plant protection organization. The issuance of phytosanitary certificates shall be carried out by public officers who are technically qualified and duly authorized by the official national plant protection organization to act on its behalf and under its control with such knowledge and information available to those officers that the authorities of importing contracting parties may accept the phytosanitary certificates with confidence as dependable documents.

[See also ISPM 7]

This was clarified at the FAO Conference in 1997 during adoption of the 1997 revision of the IPPC: “It is understood that ... ‘public officers who are technically qualified and duly authorized by the national plant protection organization’ include officers from the national plant protection organization”. “Public” in this context means employed by a level of government, not by a private company. “Include officers from the national plant protection organization” means that the officer may be directly employed by the NPPO, but does not have to be directly employed by the NPPO.

The IPPC also states requirements for the use of model phytosanitary certificates (in Article V.3):

Each contracting party undertakes not to require consignments of plants or plant products or other regulated articles imported into its territories to be accompanied by phytosanitary certificates inconsistent with the models set out in the Annex to this Convention. Any requirements for additional declarations shall be limited to those technically justified.

REQUIREMENTS FOR PHYTOSANITARY CERTIFICATION

1. Phytosanitary Certificates

1.1 Purpose of phytosanitary certificates

Phytosanitary certificates are issued to attest that plants, plant products or other regulated articles meet the phytosanitary import requirements of importing countries and are in conformity with the certifying statement. Phytosanitary certificates may also be issued to support re-export certification to other countries. Phytosanitary certificates should be issued only for these purposes.

1.2 Types and forms of phytosanitary certificates

In the Annex to the IPPC, there are two types of certificates: a “phytosanitary certificate” (see Annex 1 of this standard) for export purposes and a “phytosanitary certificate for re-export” (see Annex 2 of this standard) for re-export purposes¹².

A phytosanitary certificate for export is usually issued by the NPPO of the country of origin. A phytosanitary certificate for export describes the consignment and, through a certifying statement, additional declarations and treatment records, declares that the consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements. A phytosanitary certificate for export may also be issued in certain re-export situations for plants, plant products and other regulated articles originating in countries other than the country of

¹² See Scope, footnote 1, concerning terminology.

re-export if compliance with the phytosanitary import requirements can be attested by the country of re-export (e.g. by inspection).

A phytosanitary certificate for re-export may be issued by the NPPO of the re-exporting country in the case where the commodity in the consignment was not grown or processed to change its nature in that country and only where an original phytosanitary certificate for export or a certified copy is available. The phytosanitary certificate for re-export provides the link to ~~a~~ the phytosanitary certificate issued in ~~a~~ the country of export and takes into account any changes in the pest risk associated with the consignment ~~phytosanitary status~~ that may have occurred in the country of re-export.

Procedures for managing the issuance of the two types of phytosanitary certificates and the systems that ensure their legitimacy are the same.

According to Article V.2(b) of the IPPC, the IPPC model phytosanitary certificates provide standardized wording that shall be followed for the preparation of phytosanitary certificates. The standardization of the phytosanitary certificates is necessary to ensure consistency, that they are easily recognized, and that essential information is reported. NPPOs are encouraged to use a single format for their phytosanitary certificates for export and a single format for phytosanitary certificates for re-export and to place a sample of the phytosanitary certificates' format on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) (<https://www.ippc.int>) in a manner that prevents falsification.

Phytosanitary certificates can be in paper form or, where it is accepted by the NPPO of the importing country, in electronic form.

Electronic phytosanitary certificates are the electronic equivalent of the wording and data of phytosanitary certificates in paper form, including the certifying statement, transmitted by authenticated and secure electronic means from the NPPO of the exporting country to the NPPO of the importing country. Electronic phytosanitary certification does not constitute text processing or other electronic generation of paper forms, which are then distributed non-electronically. Nor is it the transfer of an electronic version of the paper certificate (e.g. through e-mail).

NPPOs should apply safeguards against falsification of paper phytosanitary certificates, for example special papers, watermarks or special printing. When electronic certification is used, appropriate safeguards should also be applied.

Phytosanitary certificates are not valid until all requirements have been met and they are dated, signed and stamped, sealed, marked or completed electronically by the NPPO of the exporting or re-exporting country.

1.3 Attachments to phytosanitary certificates

If the information required to complete phytosanitary certificates exceeds the available space on the form, an attachment may be added. The information in the attachment should only include what is required on the phytosanitary certificates. All pages of attachments should bear the number of the phytosanitary certificates and should be dated, signed and stamped in the same manner as required for the phytosanitary certificates. Phytosanitary certificates should refer to any attachments in the appropriate section. If an attachment has more than one page, the pages should be numbered and the number of pages indicated on the phytosanitary certificates. Other documents such as the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) certificates may accompany the consignment along with the phytosanitary certificate, but such documents should not be considered attachments to the phytosanitary certificates nor should they be referenced on the phytosanitary certificate.

1.4 Electronic phytosanitary certificates

Electronic phytosanitary certificates may be issued where accepted by the NPPO of the importing country.

When using electronic phytosanitary certificates NPPOs should develop systems that generate certificates using standardized language, message structure and exchange protocols. Appendix 1 provides guidance on standardized language, message structure and exchange protocols.

Electronic phytosanitary certificates may be used subject to the following provisions:

- The mode of issue, transmission and level of security is acceptable to the NPPO of the importing country and if relevant to NPPOs of other countries involved.
- The information provided is consistent with the IPPC model phytosanitary certificates.
- The purpose of phytosanitary certification under the IPPC is realized.
- The identity of the issuing NPPO can be adequately established and authenticated.

1.5 Mode of transmission

Phytosanitary certificates should accompany the consignments for which they have been issued. Phytosanitary certificates may also be transmitted separately by mail or other means if accepted by the NPPO of the importing country. In the case of electronic phytosanitary certificates, they should be directly available to the relevant NPPO officials. In all cases, phytosanitary certificates should be available to the NPPO of the importing country upon the consignment's arrival.

1.6 Duration of validity

The phytosanitary security of consignments may be lost after issuance of phytosanitary certificates and therefore the NPPO of the exporting or re-exporting country may decide to restrict the duration of the validity of phytosanitary certificates after issuance and prior to export.

The NPPO of the exporting or re-exporting country may assess the situation and define an appropriate period of validity before export occurs, taking into account the likelihood of the consignment becoming infested or contaminated prior to export or re-export. Such likelihood may be affected by packaging (sealed carton or loose packing) and storage environment (open air or enclosed), type of commodity and conveyance, time of year and type of pests. A phytosanitary certificate for export **for which the duration of validity has expired** may still be used ~~after this period~~ for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export, provided that **the consignment meets all the requirements set out in section 6.1**, ~~the consignment has not been subjected to the risk of infestation and that the commodity still achieves the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country.~~

NPPOs of importing countries may also stipulate as part of the phytosanitary import requirements the duration for which phytosanitary certificates remain valid.

2. Actions Taken with Issued Phytosanitary Certificates

2.1 Certified copies of phytosanitary certificates

A certified copy is a copy of the original of the phytosanitary certificate **for export or re-export** that is validated (stamped, dated and countersigned) by the NPPO **of the exporting or re-exporting country**, indicating it is a true representative copy of the original phytosanitary certificate. It may be issued upon request by the exporter. It does not replace the original. Such copies are used primarily for re-export purposes.

2.2 Replacement of phytosanitary certificates

Phytosanitary certificates may be replaced at the request of an exporter for a consignment for which a phytosanitary certificate has already been issued. This should be done only in exceptional circumstances (e.g. damage to the phytosanitary certificates issued; change of addresses, country of destination or points of entry; missing or incorrect information) and should be carried out by the NPPO of the country that issued the phytosanitary certificates being replaced.

In all cases, the issuing NPPO should request exporters to return the original phytosanitary certificates and any certified copies that have already been issued for the consignments.

Other requirements concerning replacement of phytosanitary certificates include:

- Phytosanitary certificates returned for replacement should be retained by the NPPO of the issuing country and be cancelled. The new phytosanitary certificates should not have the same number as the certificate being replaced. The number of the original certificate should not be re-used.
- When previously issued phytosanitary certificates cannot be returned and have left the care and control of the NPPO (for example because they are lost or in another country), the NPPO may decide that it is appropriate to issue a replacement certificate. The new phytosanitary certificate should not have the same number as the phytosanitary certificate being replaced but should refer to it by including an additional declaration stating that “This certificate replaces and cancels phytosanitary certificate no. [insert number] issued on [insert date]”.

2.3 Alterations to phytosanitary certificates

Alterations should be avoided as they may create uncertainty about the validity of phytosanitary certificates. However, if alterations are necessary, they should be made only on the original phytosanitary certificates by the issuing NPPO. Alterations should be minimal and should be stamped, dated and countersigned by the issuing NPPO.

3. Considerations for Importing Countries and NPPOs Issuing Phytosanitary Certificates

NPPOs of importing countries may require phytosanitary certificates for regulated articles only. These are usually plants and plant products but may include articles such as empty containers, vehicles and organisms other than plants where phytosanitary measures are technically justified.

NPPOs of the importing countries should not require phytosanitary certificates for plant products that have been processed to the point where they have no potential for introducing regulated pests, or for other articles that do not require phytosanitary measures (see IPPC Article VI.2 and ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*)).

NPPOs should consult bilaterally when there are differences between their views regarding the technical justification for requiring phytosanitary certificates. Requirements for phytosanitary certificates should respect the principles of transparency, non-discrimination, necessity and technical justification (see ISPM 1 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*)).

3.1 Unacceptable phytosanitary certificates

NPPOs of importing countries should not accept phytosanitary certificates that they determine to be invalid or fraudulent. The NPPO of the declared country of issuance should be notified as soon as possible regarding unacceptable or suspect phytosanitary certificates as described in ISPM 13 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*). Where the NPPO of the importing country suspects that phytosanitary certificates may be unacceptable, it may require the prompt cooperation of the NPPO of the exporting or re-exporting country in determining the validity or non-validity of the phytosanitary certificates. The NPPO of the exporting or re-exporting country should take corrective action where necessary and review systems for the issuance of phytosanitary certificates so as to ensure that a high level of confidence is associated with its phytosanitary certificates.

3.1.1 Invalid phytosanitary certificates

Phytosanitary certificates are invalid if, for example, they have or they are:

- incomplete or incorrect information
- false or misleading information
- conflicting or inconsistent information
- wording or information that is inconsistent with the model phytosanitary certificates
- information added by unauthorized persons

- unauthorized (not stamped, dated or countersigned) alterations or deletions
- an expired period of validity unless used as a certified copy for re-export
- illegible (e.g. badly written, damaged)
- non-certified copies
- transmitted through a mode of transfer unauthorized by the NPPO (for electronic phytosanitary certificates)
- phytosanitary certification of plants, plant products and other regulated articles prohibited for import.

These are also reasons for rejecting phytosanitary certificates or for requesting additional information.

3.1.2 Fraudulent phytosanitary certificates

Fraudulent phytosanitary certificates typically include those:

- issued on non-authorized forms
- not dated, stamped, marked or sealed, and signed by the issuing NPPO
- issued by persons who are not authorized public officers.

Fraudulent phytosanitary certificates are invalid. The NPPO issuing phytosanitary certificates should have safeguards against their falsification. In the case of electronic phytosanitary certification, safeguards against falsification are an element of the electronic certification mechanism. The NPPO of the exporting country should take corrective action when notified of a non-compliance.

3.2 Phytosanitary ~~import~~ requirements for the preparation and issuance of phytosanitary certificates

Importing countries frequently specify phytosanitary import requirements that should be observed with respect to the preparation and issuance of phytosanitary certificates. Examples of what an importing country may require include:

- that phytosanitary certificates be completed in a specific language or one of its listed languages (however, countries are encouraged to accept one of the official languages of FAO, preferably English)
- the period of time allowed for issuance after inspection or treatment and the period of time between the issuance of phytosanitary certificates and the dispatch of the consignment from the exporting country
- that phytosanitary certificates be completed by typing or if handwritten, be in legible capital letters (where the language allows it)
- the units of measurement to be used in the description of the consignment and for other declared quantities.

4. Specific Considerations for the Preparation and Issuance of Phytosanitary Certificates

Phytosanitary certificates shall only be issued by public officers who are technically qualified and duly authorized by the NPPO.

Phytosanitary certificates should only be issued if the NPPO is confident ~~it is confirmed~~ that the phytosanitary import requirements are met.

Phytosanitary certificates should contain the necessary information to clearly identify the consignment to which each relates.

Phytosanitary certificates should only contain information related to phytosanitary matters. They should not include statements related to non-phytosanitary requirements such as animal or human health matters, pesticide residues, radioactivity, commercial information (e.g. letters of credit), or quality.

To facilitate cross-referencing between phytosanitary certificates and documents not related to phytosanitary certification (e.g. letters of credit, bills of lading, CITES certificates), notes may accompany phytosanitary certificates that associate them with the identification code, symbol or numbers of the relevant documents that require cross-referencing. Such notes should be used only when necessary and should not be considered part of phytosanitary certificates.

All sections of the phytosanitary certificates should be completed. Where no entry is made, the term “None” should be entered or the line should be blocked out or a line drawn through the section to prevent unauthorized additions.

For re-export of consignments, **the NPPO of the country of re-export may need** specific information from the country of origin ~~may be necessary~~; however, this may not be available on a phytosanitary certificate for export (e.g. lack of the specific information for the additional declaration of a phytosanitary certificate for export, or a phytosanitary certificate for export itself is not required by the country of re-export). In such cases, if the specific phytosanitary import requirements **of the country of destination** cannot be met within the country of re-export, ~~no~~ **a phytosanitary certificate for re-export may should not** be issued. However, **the NPPO of the country of origin may, upon request by the NPPO of the re-exporting country or by exporters, support any subsequent re-export process as follows:** the following may apply:

- Where ~~a~~ **a** the phytosanitary certificate for export is required by the country of re-export, ~~on request by exporters~~, the NPPO of the country of origin may provide additional phytosanitary information (e.g. the results of a growing season inspection) to that required by the country of re-export. Such information may be necessary for the issuance of phytosanitary certificates for re-export. This information should be placed in the additional declaration section, under the subheading “Additional official phytosanitary information” (see section 5).
- Where a phytosanitary certificate for export is not required by the country of re-export, ~~on request from an exporter~~, the NPPO of the country of origin may nevertheless issue a phytosanitary certificate for export. This would be for consignments intended for re-export to other countries in order to provide additional phytosanitary information necessary for the issuance of phytosanitary certificates for re-export.

In both cases above, the country of re-export should **appropriately address the considerations for re-export situations set out in section 6.** ~~ensure that the identity of the consignment is maintained and that it has not been subjected to the risk of infestation.~~

Phytosanitary certificates should be issued before dispatch; however, they may also be issued after dispatch of a consignment provided that:

- the phytosanitary security of the consignment has been assured, and
- the NPPO of the exporting country has undertaken sampling, inspection and treatments necessary to satisfy phytosanitary import requirements before dispatch of the consignment.

If these criteria are not met, phytosanitary certificates should not be issued.

In the case where phytosanitary certificates are issued after dispatch, the inspection date should be indicated in the additional declaration section if required by the importing country.

5. Guidelines and Requirements for Completing Sections of a Phytosanitary Certificate for Export

Information on completing the sections of the phytosanitary certificate for export is provided as follows:

[Headings in bold refer to the sections of the model certificate, see model in Annex 1]

No. _____

Each phytosanitary certificate for export should have a unique identification number, which allows for trace-back of consignments, facilitates audits and serves for record-keeping.

Plant Protection Organization of _____

The name of the country issuing the phytosanitary certificate for export should be listed here along with the name of the NPPO.

TO: Plant Protection Organization(s) of _____

The name of the importing country should be listed here. Where a transit country and the importing country have specific phytosanitary requirements that include the need for a phytosanitary certificate for export, the names of both countries should be listed and the transit country should be indicated. Care should be taken to ensure that the phytosanitary import or transit requirements of each country are met and appropriately indicated. In those cases where the consignment is imported and then re-exported to another country, the names of both countries (i.e. the country of re-export and the country of destination) may be inserted by the NPPO of the exporting country, provided that the phytosanitary import requirements of both countries have been met.

I. Description of Consignment

Name and address of exporter: _____

This information identifies the source of the consignment to facilitate its trace-back and audit by the NPPO of the exporting country. The address of the exporter should be located in the exporting country. The name and address of an exporter's local agent or shipper should be used where an international company with a foreign address is the exporter.

Declared name and address of consignee: _____

The name and address inserted here should be in sufficient detail to enable the NPPO of the importing country to confirm the identity of the consignee and, where necessary, to be able to conduct trace-back of non-compliant imports. Where the consignee is not known, "To order" may be used if the NPPO of the importing country permits the use of the term and accepts any associated risks. The importing country may require that the address of a consignee be a location in the importing country.

Number and description of packages: _____

The number of packages and their description should be included. Sufficient detail should be included in this section to enable the NPPO of the importing country to link the phytosanitary certificate for export with the corresponding consignment. In some cases (e.g. grain and bulk timber), shipping containers and/or railcars are considered the package and the number may be included (e.g. 10 containers). In cases of bulk shipments, the term "in bulk" may be used.

Distinguishing marks: _____

Distinguishing marks on packages (e.g. lot numbers, serial numbers or brand names) and conveyance identification numbers or names (e.g. container and railcar identification numbers or vessel name in the case of bulk shipments) should be included if necessary for the identification of the consignment.

Place of origin: _____

The place of origin refers to places where the commodity was grown or produced, and where it may therefore have been infested or contaminated ~~was possibly exposed to infestation or contamination~~ by regulated pests. In all cases, the name of the country or countries of origin should be stated. ~~Normally a consignment gains its phytosanitary status from the place of origin.~~ Countries may also require that the name or code of the pest free area, pest free place of production or pest free production site be identified. Further details on the pest free area, pest free place of production or pest free production site may be provided in the additional declaration section.

If a the commodity is repacked, stored or moved, its phytosanitary status may change over a period of time as a result of its new location through the possible was moved from the place of origin to a new place where it was repacked or stored, and where it may therefore have been infested or contaminated ~~infestation or contamination~~ by regulated pests, this new place should also be declared under the section "place of origin". ~~Phytosanitary status may also be changed by~~ Similarly, if the

commodity was moved from the place of origin to a new place where it was ~~processed, disinfected or treated, thereby a commodity that results in removing possible infestation or contamination, this new place should also be declared under the section “place of origin”~~. ~~Thus a commodity may gain its phytosanitary status from more than one place.~~ In such cases, each country and place, where necessary, should be declared with the initial place of origin in brackets, **for example e.g.** declared as “**name of** country X of export (**name of** country Y of origin)”.

If plants were imported **into** or moved within a country and have **subsequently** been grown for a specific period of time (depending on the commodity concerned, but usually one growing season or more), these plants may be considered to have changed their country or place of origin, provided that the ~~phytosanitary status~~ **pest risk associated with them** is **affected** ~~determined~~ only by that country or place of further growth.

If different lots within a consignment originate in different places or countries, all countries and, **where necessary, all** ~~where necessary~~ places should be indicated. To assist with trace-back in such cases, the most relevant place for undertaking trace-back may be identified, for example the exporting company where records are stored.

Declared means of conveyance: _____

This section refers to how the ~~commodity~~ **consignment** is transported when leaving the certifying country. Terms such as “ocean vessel”, “boat”, “aircraft”, “road”, “truck”, “rail”, “mail” and “carried by hand” may be used. The ship’s name and voyage number or the aircraft’s flight number may be included if known. The means of conveyance is generally as declared by the exporter. Often this will be only the first means of conveyance used directly after issuance of the phytosanitary certificate for export. Consignments frequently move in such a way that the means of conveyance can change, for example a container that is transferred from a ship to a truck. If the distinguishing marks identify the consignment, it is sufficient to declare only the first means of conveyance. This is then not necessarily the means of conveyance used when arriving in the country of import.

Declared point of entry: _____

This should be the first point of arrival in the country of destination, or if not known, the country name. Where the consignment transits through another country this may need to be recorded if the country of transit has phytosanitary requirements for transiting consignments. The entry point of the country of transit, or if not known the country name, should be noted in brackets.

The point of entry is declared by the exporter at the time of issuance of the phytosanitary certificate for export. This point of entry may change for various reasons, and entry into the country at a place other than the declared point of entry should not normally be considered as non-compliance. However, when the NPPO of the importing country prescribes specified points of entry in its phytosanitary import requirements, then one of the specific points of entry should be declared and the consignment should enter through that point.

Name of produce and quantity declared: _____

This section should be sufficiently descriptive of the commodity and should include the name of the plant, plant product or other regulated article, unit and the quantity as accurately as possible to enable the NPPO of the importing country to verify the contents of the consignment. International codes may be added to facilitate identification (e.g. Customs codes) and internationally recognized units and terms should be used (e.g. metric system). Because different phytosanitary import requirements may apply to the different intended uses (e.g. consumption as compared with propagation) or degree of processing (e.g. fresh as compared with dried), the intended use or degree of processing should be specified. Entries should not refer to trade names, sizes or other commercial terms.

Botanical name of plants: _____

The information inserted here should identify plants and plant products using accepted scientific names, at least to genus level but preferably to species level.

It may not be feasible to provide botanical names for certain regulated articles and products of complex composition such as stock feeds. In these cases, the NPPOs of the importing and exporting countries may agree on a suitable common name descriptor, or the words “Not applicable” or “N/A” should be entered.

Certifying statement

This is to certify that the plants, plant products or other regulated articles described herein have been inspected and/or tested according to appropriate official procedures and are considered to be free from the quarantine pests specified by the importing contracting party and to conform with the current phytosanitary requirements of the importing contracting party, including those for regulated non-quarantine pests.

They are deemed to be practically free from other pests.* [*Optional clause]

In most instances specific phytosanitary import requirements exist or regulated pests are specified and the certifying statement on the phytosanitary certificate for export is used to certify conformity with these phytosanitary import requirements.

In instances where phytosanitary import requirements are not specific, the NPPO of the exporting country may certify the general status of the consignment for any pests believed by it to be of phytosanitary concern.

NPPOs of exporting countries may include the optional clause on their phytosanitary certificate for export. NPPOs of importing countries cannot request that the optional clause be added.

“Appropriate official procedures” refers to procedures carried out by the NPPO or persons authorized by the NPPO for purposes of phytosanitary certification. Such procedures should be in conformity with ISPMs where appropriate. The procedures may be specified by the NPPO of the importing country taking into account any relevant ISPMs.

“Considered to be free from quarantine pests” refers to freedom from pests in numbers or quantities that can be detected by the application of phytosanitary procedures. It should not be interpreted to mean absolute freedom in all cases but rather that quarantine pests are believed not to be present based on the procedures used for their detection or elimination. It should be recognized that phytosanitary procedures have inherent uncertainty and variability, and involve some probability that pests will not be detected or eliminated. This uncertainty and probability should be taken into account in the specification of appropriate procedures.

In some cases where irradiation treatments have been applied, live stages of target pests may be present in the consignment. Providing the treatment has been applied in accordance with ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) and the appropriate treatment has been applied to achieve the required response, the validity of this part of the certifying statement is not compromised because the detection of live stages of the target pest is not considered as non-compliance.

“Phytosanitary requirements”, as provided by the importing country, are officially prescribed conditions to be met in order to prevent the introduction and/or spread of pests. Phytosanitary import requirements should be specified in advance by the NPPO of the importing country in legislation, regulations or elsewhere (e.g. import permits and bilateral and other arrangements).

“Importing contracting party” refers to governments that have adhered to the IPPC.

II. Additional Declaration

Additional declarations provide specific additional information on a consignment in relation to regulated pests **and regulated articles**. Additional declarations should be kept to a minimum and be concise. NPPOs of the importing countries should keep under review the need for additional declarations and they should not require additional declarations with the required wording similar to that already included in the certifying statement on the phytosanitary certificate for export. The text of additional declarations

may be specified in phytosanitary regulations, import permits or bilateral agreements. Treatments should not be indicated in this section but in section III of the phytosanitary certificate for export.

Additional declarations should be only those containing specific phytosanitary information required by the NPPO of the importing country or requested by the exporter for future phytosanitary certification purposes and they should not repeat information that is otherwise noted in the certifying statement or in the treatment section. In cases where phytosanitary import requirements allow for several alternative measures, the NPPO of the exporting country should specify in its additional declaration which option has been applied.

Appendix 2 provides examples of text for different types of additional declarations that are often required by NPPOs of importing countries. When NPPOs consider it necessary to require or provide an additional declaration they are encouraged to use the standard wording as provided in Appendix 2.

In the case where an import permit is required by the importing country, the import permit number may be referred to here to assist cross-referencing.

Where a phytosanitary certificate for export is issued after the consignment's dispatch, and if required by the importing country, the date of inspection should be added to this section of the phytosanitary certificate for export (see also applicable conditions in section 4).

Where additional official phytosanitary information is included for future phytosanitary certification purposes, such as re-export (see section 4), such information should be presented **in this section here**. This information should be clearly separated from the additional declaration required by the importing country and should follow the added subheading "Additional official phytosanitary information".

III. Disinfestation and/or Disinfection Treatment

Entries should be as follows:

Date

The date that the treatment was applied to the consignment. Months should be written in full so that the month, day and year are not confused.

Treatment

The type of treatment applied to the consignment (e.g. heat treatment, irradiation).

Chemical (active ingredient)

The active ingredient of the chemical applied in the treatment.

Duration and temperature

The duration of the treatment and temperature in the treatment.

Concentration

The concentration and dosage of the treatment applied.

Additional information

Any relevant additional information.

Treatments indicated should only be those that are acceptable to the importing country and are performed or initiated (in the case of transit) in the exporting country under supervision or authority of the NPPO of the exporting country to meet the phytosanitary import requirements.

For irradiation treatments, the provisions of ISPM 18 should be considered.

Stamp of organization

The official seal, stamp or mark identifying the issuing NPPO should be included on the phytosanitary certificate for export. The NPPO of the exporting country should normally use a uniform stamp, seal or mark within a country. It should be added by the **authorized** public officer upon completion of the form or may be printed on the phytosanitary certificate for export. Care should be taken to ensure that the stamp, seal or mark does not obscure essential information.

Name of authorized officer, date and signature

The name of the **authorized** public officer ~~is~~ **should be** printed, typed, stamped or handwritten in legible upper case (capital) letters (where the language allows it). The date ~~is~~ **should** also ~~to~~ be printed, typed, stamped or handwritten in legible upper case (capital) letters (where the language allows it). The names of months should be written in full so that the month, day and year are not confused.

Although sections of the phytosanitary certificate for export may be completed in advance, the date stated should be the date of issuance. Upon request of the NPPO of the importing country, the NPPO of the exporting country should be able to verify the authenticity of signatures of authorized public officers. The phytosanitary certificate for export shall be signed only after it is duly completed.

When electronic phytosanitary certificates are issued, the certification data should be authenticated by the issuing NPPO. This authentication process is equivalent to the signature of the authorized public officer and stamp, seal or mark. Authenticated electronic certification data is equivalent to the completed paper document of the phytosanitary certificate for export.

Financial liability statement

The inclusion of a statement of the financial liability of the NPPO on the phytosanitary certificate for export is optional and at the discretion of the NPPO of the exporting country.

6. Considerations for Re-Export Situations and Transit

6.1 Considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export

The phytosanitary certificate for re-export (see model in Annex 2) is the same as the phytosanitary certificate for export (see model in Annex 1) except for the text covering the certifying statement. In the certifying statement on the phytosanitary certificate for re-export, the NPPO of the country of re-export indicates, by inserting ticks in the appropriate boxes, whether ~~the phytosanitary certificate for re-export is accompanied by the original phytosanitary certificate or a certified copy~~ **is attached to the phytosanitary certificate for re-export**, whether the consignment has been repacked or not, whether the containers are original or new, and whether an additional inspection has been done.

~~6.1~~ Considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export

When a consignment is imported into a country, **and** then **re-exported** to another, the NPPO of the country of re-export, **upon** request by exporters, may issue a phytosanitary certificate for re-export³ (~~see model in Annex 2~~) **only if all of the following requirements are met:**

- **All the plants, plant products or other regulated articles of the consignment for re-export have been imported.**
- **All the plants, plant products or other regulated articles of the consignment for re-export are covered and accompanied by an original phytosanitary certificate (or phytosanitary certificates) for export or a certified copy (or certified copies).**
- **The plants, plant products or other regulated articles of the consignment for re-export have not been grown, or processed to change their nature¹³, in the country of re-export.**

¹³ **The decisive criterion for judging whether a plant, plant product or other article has been processed to change its nature is the categorization used in the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination. If the phytosanitary import requirements for the unprocessed commodity and the processed commodity are the same, then a phytosanitary certificate for re-export may be issued.**

- **The consignment has not been infested or contaminated by regulated pests.**

The **In addition to the above requirements, the** NPPO should issue a phytosanitary certificate for re-export only if it is confident that the phytosanitary import requirements **of the country of destination** are met.

6.1.1 Examination of the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination

Before issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export, the NPPO should first examine the **phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination and determine if they are met.** ~~original phytosanitary certificate or certified copy that accompanied the consignment upon import and determine whether the requirements of the subsequent country of destination are more stringent, the same or less stringent than those certified by the phytosanitary certificate or its certified copies.~~

~~If the consignment is repacked or reloaded with its identity being affected or if a risk of infestation or contamination is identified, additional inspection should be carried out. If the consignment is not repacked and the phytosanitary security of the consignment has been maintained, the NPPO of the re-exporting country has two options regarding inspection of the consignment for re-export:~~

- ~~—— If the phytosanitary import requirements are the same or less stringent, the NPPO of the re-exporting country may not need to undertake an additional inspection.~~
- ~~—— If the phytosanitary import requirements are different or more stringent, the NPPO of the re-exporting country may undertake an additional inspection to ensure that the consignment conforms to the phytosanitary requirements of the importing country where this requirement can be met through inspection.~~

The country of destination may have phytosanitary import requirements (e.g. growing season inspection, soil testing) that cannot be **met** fulfilled by the country of re-export. In such cases, the country of re-export may still be able to issue a phytosanitary certificate ~~for export or phytosanitary certificate for re-export~~ if:

- ~~either particular~~ information on compliance **with such requirements** has been ~~included or~~ declared on the phytosanitary certificate for export by the country of origin; **or**
- ~~or an alternative phytosanitary measure~~ **action** can be **performed by the country of re-export** applied (such as **an additional inspection**, ~~laboratory~~ **a** tests ~~on samples~~ or **a** treatments) that is considered equivalent and in accordance with the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination.

6.1.2 Repacking, reloading, storing, splitting or combining consignments

~~A Re-export phytosanitary certificate for re-export ion~~ may still be **issued** ~~performed~~ if the consignment has been **repacked, reloaded,** stored, split up; **or** combined with other **imported** consignments ~~or repackaged,~~ provided that it has not been ~~exposed to infestation or contamination~~ **infested or contaminated** by **regulated** pests. **If a possible risk of infestation or contamination is identified, an additional inspection or a test should be carried out to verify that the consignment has not been infested or contaminated by regulated pests.**

If the consignment is split up and the resulting consignments are re-exported separately **to one or multiple countries**, then phytosanitary certificates for re-export and certified copies of the **original** phytosanitary certificate ~~from the country of~~ **for** export ~~will be required to~~ **should** accompany all such consignments.

Where **imported** consignments are combined, **the original phytosanitary certificates for export or certified copies of these must be available for all the regulated articles forming part of** ~~all the relevant parts added to these~~ **the** consignments **for re-export, and all those articles** must be available and meet the same phytosanitary import requirements **of the country of destination**.

6.1.3 General considerations

~~When~~ **By issuing** a phytosanitary certificate for re-export ~~is issued~~, the NPPO of the re-exporting country ~~is providing~~ assurance **to the country of destination** related to the handling (e.g. splitting, combining, packing, storage) of the consignment in the country of re-export.

Additional declarations on phytosanitary certificates for re-export, where required, should be based on the activities of the NPPO of the country of re-export. Additional declarations from the original phytosanitary certificate or certified copies should not be transferred to phytosanitary certificates for re-export.

The phytosanitary certificate for re-export shall be signed only after it is duly completed.

The original phytosanitary certificate **for export** or ~~its~~ certified copy should accompany the consignment together with the phytosanitary certificate for re-export.

In the case of consignments re-exported multiple times, all the original phytosanitary certificates for re-export or certified copies of these should also accompany the consignment. The phytosanitary certificate number indicated in the certifying statement of the phytosanitary certificate for re-export should be the number of the phytosanitary certificate issued by the NPPO of the most recent country of re-export.

6.2 Considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for export in certain re-export cases

In those cases where one or more of the requirements set out in section 6.1 for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export cannot be met, a phytosanitary certificate for re-export should not be issued. ~~If the identity of plants, plant products or other regulated articles in the consignment has not been maintained or the consignment has been subjected to the risk of infestation, or the commodity has been processed to change its nature, no phytosanitary certificate for re-export should be issued.~~

Instead, ~~the~~ NPPO of the country of re-export, **upon** request by exporters, may carry out **inspection, testing, treatment or another** appropriate phytosanitary **action**, ~~procedures~~ and if the NPPO is confident that the phytosanitary import requirements **of the country of destination** are met, it should issue a phytosanitary certificate for export. The **country** ~~place~~ of origin should still be indicated in brackets **in the place of origin section of** ~~on~~ the phytosanitary certificate for export.

~~If the NPPO of the country of re-export does not require a phytosanitary certificate for the import of a commodity but the NPPO of the country of destination does, and the phytosanitary import requirements can be fulfilled by visual inspections or laboratory testing of samples, the country of re-export may issue a phytosanitary certificate for export with the country of origin indicated in brackets in the place of origin section of the phytosanitary certificate for export.~~

Documents such as the original phytosanitary certificate or a certified copy may be attached to the phytosanitary certificate for export if they contain information that was used to complete the phytosanitary certificate for export. In this case, the relevant additional declarations on the original phytosanitary certificate or the certified copy, and the number of that certificate, may be referred to in the additional declaration section of the phytosanitary certificate for export to attest compliance with the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination (e.g. growing season inspection, soil testing) that cannot be met by the country of re-export.

6.3 Other considerations for re-export situations

When re-exports routinely occur, or are started, suitable procedures for satisfying ~~these~~ **the phytosanitary import** requirements **of both the re-exporting country and the country of destination** may be agreed between the NPPOs of the countries of origin and re-export. This may include an exchange of written correspondence between the respective NPPOs on phytosanitary **actions**

performed measures applied at in the country of origin (e.g. growing season inspection, soil testing) **that which** provides the assurance required for the country of re-export to certify the consignments as required by **in accordance with the phytosanitary import requirements of** the country of destination.

6.2 7. Considerations for Transit

If a consignment is in transit through a country, the NPPO of the country of transit is not involved unless risks for the country of transit have been identified (ISPM 25 (*Consignments in transit*)).

If the phytosanitary security of the consignment has been compromised during transit, and the NPPO of the country of transit receives a request to become involved, the NPPO may perform phytosanitary certification for export in accordance with the provisions described in this standard.

A change of means of conveyance during transit or the transport of two or more consignments in one conveyance should not be considered a reason to issue phytosanitary certificates unless the phytosanitary security of the consignment is compromised.

Importing countries may have specific phytosanitary import requirements (e.g. require seals, specific packaging) addressed to the country of export for the import of consignments to be moved in transit through other countries if specific risks have been identified.

This annex is a prescriptive part of the standard.

ANNEX 1: Model phytosanitary certificate for export

[Original annexed to the IPPC]

No. _____

Plant Protection Organization of _____

TO: Plant Protection Organization(s) of _____

I. Description of Consignment

Name and address of exporter: _____

Declared name and address of consignee: _____

Number and description of packages: _____

Distinguishing marks: _____

Place of origin: _____

Declared means of conveyance: _____

Declared point of entry: _____

Name of produce and quantity declared: _____

Botanical name of plants: _____

This is to certify that the plants, plant products or other regulated articles described herein have been inspected and/or tested according to appropriate official procedures and are considered to be free from the quarantine pests specified by the importing contracting party and to conform with the current phytosanitary requirements of the importing contracting party, including those for regulated non-quarantine pests.

They are deemed to be practically free from other pests.*

II. Additional Declaration

[Enter text here]

III. Disinfestation and/or Disinfection Treatment

Date _____ Treatment _____ Chemical (active ingredient) _____

Duration and temperature _____

Concentration _____

Additional information _____

(Stamp of Organization) _____ Place of issue _____
Name of authorized officer _____

Date _____

(Signature)

No financial liability with respect to this certificate shall attach to _____ (name of Plant Protection Organization) or to any of its officers or representatives.*

*Optional clause

This annex is a prescriptive part of the standard.

ANNEX 2: Model phytosanitary certificate for re-export

[Original annexed to the IPPC]

No. _____

Plant Protection Organization of _____ (contracting party of re-export)
TO: Plant Protection Organization(s) of _____ (contracting party(ies) of import)

I. Description of Consignment

Name and address of exporter: _____
Declared name and address of consignee: _____
Number and description of packages: _____
Distinguishing marks: _____
Place of origin: _____
Declared means of conveyance: _____
Declared point of entry: _____
Name of produce and quantity declared: _____
Botanical name of plants: _____

This is to certify that the plants, plant products or other regulated articles described above _____ were imported into (contracting party of re-export) _____ from _____ (contracting party of origin) covered by Phytosanitary certificate No. _____, *original ☐ certified true copy ☐ of which is attached to this certificate; that they are packed ☐ repacked ☐ in original ☐ *new ☐ containers, that based on the original phytosanitary certificate ☐ and additional inspection ☐, they are considered to conform with the current phytosanitary requirements of the importing contracting party, and that during storage in _____ (contracting party of re-export), the consignment has not been subjected to the risk of infestation or infection.

*Insert tick in appropriate ☐ boxes

II. Additional Declaration

[Enter text here]

III. Disinfestation and/or Disinfection Treatment

Date _____ Treatment _____ Chemical (active ingredient) _____
Duration and temperature _____
Concentration _____
Additional information _____

Place of issue _____

(Stamp of Organization) Name of authorized officer _____
Date _____

(Signature)

No financial liability with respect to this certificate shall attach to _____ (name of Plant Protection Organization) or to any of its officers or representatives.**

**Optional _____ clause

This appendix was adopted by the Ninth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in April 2014.
This appendix is for reference purposes only and is not a prescriptive part of the standard.

APPENDIX 1: Electronic phytosanitary certificates, information on standard XML schemas and exchange mechanisms (2014)

Introduction

Electronic phytosanitary certificates are the electronic equivalents of phytosanitary certificates in paper form and may be used if they are accepted by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of the importing country. When electronic phytosanitary certificates are issued by the NPPO of the exporting or re-exporting country, they should be made directly available to the NPPO of the importing country.

All the requirements and procedures in this standard apply to electronic phytosanitary certificates.

When using electronic phytosanitary certificates, NPPOs should develop a system for the issuance, transmission and receipt of electronic phytosanitary certificates that uses Extensible Markup Language (XML), standardized message structure and contents, and standardized exchange protocols.

This appendix provides guidance on these elements and refers to a page on the IPPC website¹⁴ that provides links to further details – both IPPC and external websites and documents – on the information contained in this appendix. These links are referred to in the text as “*Link 1*”, “*Link 2*” and so forth.

The system should include the following harmonized components to generate electronic phytosanitary certificates.

1. XML Message Structure

NPPOs should use the World Wide Web Consortium’s (WC3) XML (*Link 1*) for exchange of electronic phytosanitary certification data.

The phytosanitary XML message structure is based on the United Nations Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business (UN/CEFACT) Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) XML schema (*Link 2*) and on XML data mapping, which indicates where the phytosanitary certification data should be placed in the XML schema.

The phytosanitary XML data mapping enables the generation of an electronic phytosanitary certificate for export (*Link 3*) and an electronic phytosanitary certificate for re-export (*Link 4*).

2. XML Schema Contents

To facilitate automatic electronic communication and processing of phytosanitary certification data, NPPOs are encouraged to use standardized (harmonized) terms, codes and text for the data elements associated with the XML message for electronic phytosanitary certificates.

The use of free (i.e. non-standardized) text should be limited when appropriate codes are available.

For dates and country names, harmonized text is available and no free text is anticipated to be required.

For scientific names of plants and pests, consignment description, treatments, additional declarations and points of entry, extensive lists of harmonized terms, codes and text are being developed and will be available. Free text may be inserted if the appropriate term, text or value does not appear in the lists.

The process for maintaining and updating the lists of harmonized terms is being developed and will be described on the IPPC website¹⁴ NPPOs will be requested to submit proposals for new harmonized terms using this process.

¹⁴ <http://www.ippc.int/en/ephyto/ephyto-technical-information/>

For data elements other than those above, no harmonization of terms and text is needed and therefore free text may be entered.

Further details on the information to be entered for the data elements in the XML message are provided in the following subsections.

2.1 Country names

For the names of countries (i.e. the country of origin, export, re-export, transit and destination) it is encouraged that the two-letter country codes of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) (*Link 6*) be used.

2.2 Scientific names of plants and pests

For the scientific names of the plants in the consignment, the plants from which plant products were derived, and the regulated pests, the use of the database of scientific names (*Link 7*) is encouraged.

2.3 Description of consignment

The type of commodity and the type of packaging should be included in the description of the consignment. It is encouraged that the commodity be described using IPPC commodity terminology (*Link 8*). It is also encouraged that the type of packaging be described using the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) Recommendation 21 (*Link 9*).

Other elements of the description of the consignment may include, where possible:

- weight, volume and height (which is encouraged to be described using UNECE Recommendation 20 (*Link 10*))
- declared means of conveyance (which is encouraged to be described using UNECE Recommendation 19 (*Link 15*))
- declared point of entry and country name (which is encouraged to be described using the United Nations Code for Trade and Transportation Locations (UN/LOCODE) (*Link 14*)).

2.4 Treatments

It is encouraged that treatment types be specified using the IPPC's harmonized terms for treatment types (*Link 11*). Active ingredients are encouraged to be specified using the pesticide index of the Codex Alimentarius (*Link 12*). Other parameters (e.g. concentration, dosage, temperature, and duration of exposure) are encouraged to be described using UNECE Recommendation 20 (*Link 10*).

2.5 Additional declarations

Recommended standardized wording for additional declarations is provided in Appendix 2 and it is encouraged to be described using IPPC codes for additional declarations (*Link 13*). Free text may be used to supplement the additional declarations indicated on the IPPC website or to describe additional declarations that have not been standardized.

2.6 Name of authorized officer

The name of the authorized officer issuing the electronic phytosanitary certificates should be included in each types of electronic phytosanitary certificate.

3. Secure Data Exchange Mechanisms

NPPOs are responsible for the security of their national information technology (IT) system used for generating electronic phytosanitary certificates.

During transmission, the data should be encrypted to ensure that the electronic exchange of the electronic phytosanitary certification data between NPPOs is secure and authenticated. NPPOs should use a secure

protocol with a minimum 128-bit encryption. Before transmission, the electronic phytosanitary certification data may be subjected to additional encryption that remains intact after transmission.

Transmission of data over the Internet from the NPPO of the exporting country to the NPPO of the importing country should be performed using secure IT mechanisms (e.g. Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP), Secure/Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (S/MIME), File Transfer Protocol (FTP), Representative State Transfer (REST)) using systems that are mutually compatible.

The NPPO of the exporting country should make available to the exporter the actual electronic phytosanitary certificate number for the consignment.

Communication on the status of the message exchange between NPPOs should follow UN/CEFACT recommended standard messages.

NPPOs are responsible for developing and maintaining their systems for exchanging electronic phytosanitary certification data. In cases where an exchange mechanism is suspended due to maintenance or unexpected system failure, the NPPO should notify other NPPOs as soon as possible.

4. Electronic Phytosanitary Certificate for Re-export

In paper-only systems, the original phytosanitary certificate for export or its certified copy should be available as an attachment to the phytosanitary certificate for re-export. In the situation where paper and electronic phytosanitary certificates are both in use, the following requirements should be met.

4.1 Electronic phytosanitary certificate for re-export with original phytosanitary certificate for export in electronic form

When both the phytosanitary certificate for export and the phytosanitary certificate for re-export are in electronic form, the electronic phytosanitary certificate for export should be attached electronically to the electronic phytosanitary certificate for re-export.

4.2 Electronic phytosanitary certificate for re-export with original phytosanitary certificate in paper form

When the original phytosanitary certificate for export is in paper form and the phytosanitary certificate for re-export is in electronic form, a scan of the original phytosanitary certificate for export (in PDF or other non-editable format) should be attached to the electronic phytosanitary certificate for re-export.

4.3 Paper phytosanitary certificate for re-export with original phytosanitary certificate in electronic form

When the original phytosanitary certificate for export is in electronic form and the phytosanitary certificate for re-export is in paper form, the electronic phytosanitary certificate for export should be printed and validated by the NPPO of the country of re-export by stamping, dating and countersigning. The printed version of the electronic phytosanitary certificate for export becomes a certified copy and should then, in paper form, be attached to the phytosanitary certificate for re-export.

5. Management of Electronic Phytosanitary Certificates Issued by NPPOs

5.1 Retrieval issues

If the NPPO of the importing country is unable to retrieve the electronic phytosanitary certificates, the NPPO of the exporting country should resubmit the original electronic phytosanitary certificates at the request of the NPPO of the importing country.

5.2 Alteration and replacement

If any of the information in electronic phytosanitary certificates needs to be altered after their issuance, the original electronic phytosanitary certificates should be revoked and replacement electronic phytosanitary certificates (*Link 5*) with alterations should be issued as described in this standard.

5.3 Cancelled dispatch

If the NPPO of the exporting country becomes aware of a consignment that is not dispatched after the issuance of electronic phytosanitary certificates, the NPPO of the exporting country should revoke the associated electronic phytosanitary certificates.

5.4 Certified copy

Certified copies of electronic phytosanitary certificates are printouts of the electronic phytosanitary certification data that are validated (stamped, dated and countersigned) by an NPPO attesting the authenticity of the data.

The printouts should be in the format that follows the standardized wording provided by the IPPC model phytosanitary certificates and recognized as phytosanitary certificates. However, the printouts may be XML data in XML format if accepted by the NPPO of the importing country.

6. Declared Name and Address of Consignee

In the case of paper phytosanitary certificates, for “Declared name and address of consignee” the term “To order” may be used in instances where the consignee is not known and the NPPO of the importing country permits use of the term.

With electronic phytosanitary certificates, the consignment information may arrive in the importing country well before the consignment arrives, which will allow pre-entry verification of the electronic phytosanitary certification data.

Instead of using the “To order” option, NPPOs are encouraged to require the electronic phytosanitary certificates to include the name and address of a contact person in the importing country responsible for the consignment.

This appendix is for reference purposes only and is not a prescriptive part of the standard.

APPENDIX 2: Recommended wording for additional declarations

Phytosanitary import requirements for additional declarations should preferably use the following wording. However, these are examples and are not the only statements that may be used.

1. The consignment* was inspected and found free from _____ (name of pest(s) or soil [*to be specified*]).
2. The consignment* was tested (method may be specified) and found free from _____ (name of pest(s)).
3. The growing media in which the plants were grown was tested prior to planting and found free from _____ (name of pest(s)).
4. _____ (Name of pest(s)) is absent/not known to occur in _____ (name of country/area).
5. The consignment* was produced in a
 - pest free area for _____ (name of pest(s))**
 - area of low pest prevalence for _____ (name of pest(s))
 - pest free place of production for _____ (name of pest(s))**
 - pest free production site for _____ (name of pest(s))**.
6. The place of production**/production site/field** was inspected during the growing season(s)*** and found free from _____ (name of pest(s)).
7. The plants/mother plants were inspected during the last growing season(s) *** and found free from _____ (name of pest(s)).
8. The plants were produced *in vitro* (specify the *in vitro* technique) and found free from _____ (name of pest(s)).
9. The plants were derived from mother plants that were tested (method may be specified) and found free from _____ (name of pest(s)).
10. This consignment* was produced and prepared for export in accordance with _____ (name of programme/reference to specific phytosanitary import requirement or a bilateral arrangement).
11. This consignment was produced from plant varieties resistant to _____ (name of pest).
12. Plants for planting are in compliance with _____ (specify the tolerance level(s)) established by phytosanitary import requirements for _____ (specify the regulated non-quarantine pest(s)).

* May be specified if this applies only to parts thereof.

** If applicable add: “including a surrounding buffer zone”.

*** Number of times/growing seasons or specific period may be added as appropriate.

Appendix 7: Draft 2019 and 2020 amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001) as modified in this meeting for submission to the first consultation

DRAFT 2019 AND 2021 AMENDMENTS TO ISPM 5: GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS (1994-001)

Publication history

(This is not an official part of the standard)

Date of this document	2021-06-15
Document category	Draft 2019 and 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) (1994-001)
Current document stage	To second consultation
Major stages	<p>CEPM (1994) added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms</p> <p>2006-05 Standards Committee (SC) approved specification TP5</p> <p>2012-10 Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) revised specification</p> <p>2012-11 SC revised and approved revised specification, revoking Specification 1</p> <p>2018-12 TPG drafted text on “detection survey” as 2019 amendments</p> <p>2019-05 SC approved 2019 amendments to first consultation and they are included below</p> <p>2019-11 TPG proposed 2020 amendments below</p> <p>2020-04 SC revised the 2020 amendments via the Online Comment System (to replace the cancelled 2020-05 SC meeting) and approved the 2020 amendments for first consultation via e-decision (2020_eSC_May_17).</p> <p>2020-12-16 TPG reviewed countries’ comments and proposed the amendments as included below for SC-7 consideration. <i>Note:</i> Further TPG elaboration on the term and definition of <i>Clearance (of a consignment)</i> has been postponed.</p> <p>2021-05 SC-7 reviewed the 2019 and 2020 amendments via the Online Comment System and approved at its virtual meeting for the second consultation.</p>
Notes	Note to Secretariat formatting this paper: formatting in definitions and explanations (strikethrough, bold, italics) needs to remain.

1. DELETIONS

1.1 “incidence” (2018-010)

- [1] A topic was submitted during the 2018 Call for topics for standards and implementation to revise the definition of the term “incidence” and define the term “prevalence”, as their meaning can be confused in human and animal epidemiological context versus phytosanitary context.
- [2] The Standards Committee (SC) at its November 2018 meeting discussed the recommendation of the Task Force on Topics (TFT) and noted that the terms “incidence” and “prevalence” had been discussed in depth previously. Only “incidence” is defined in the Glossary and instead of revising that definition and defining “prevalence”, the SC proposed to delete “incidence” from the Glossary and to use the terms “incidence” and “prevalence” in their common dictionary sense in ISPMs. The SC therefore added the term “incidence” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and requested the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) consider deleting it from the Glossary.

- [3] At its November 2019 meeting, the TPG analyzed previous work carried out by the TPG and decisions of SC and CPM since 1995, with regard to the term “incidence” and the linked Glossary terms “area of low pest prevalence” and “tolerance level”. The TPG recalled that the initial intention had been to define the term “prevalence” but, following a lengthy process of consideration and consultation on the terms “prevalence”, “incidence” and “tolerance”, the term and definition of “incidence” (as well as of “tolerance level”) had finally been adopted in 2009 and included in the Glossary rather than “prevalence”. The TPG discussed all relative merits of retaining “incidence” in the Glossary, replacing it by “prevalence”, or having both terms in the Glossary.
- [4] Considering the extensive past discussions on the possible definitions of the terms “prevalence” and “incidence” and the divergent points of view expressed, the TPG confirmed that it is unlikely that an agreement could be reached on a revised Glossary definition of “incidence” and a new Glossary definition of “prevalence”. Recognizing the pragmatic direction set out by the SC, the TPG therefore agreed to propose that the term “incidence” be deleted from the Glossary, with no ink amendments to the definition of “tolerance level” (which refers to “incidence”), and that the words “incidence” and “prevalence” be used in ISPMs with their general, dictionary meaning.
- [5] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the deletion of the term “incidence (of a pest)”:
- The current Glossary definition of “incidence”, although fitting well with the use of the term in plant protection, corresponds to the epidemiological definition of “prevalence” as used in human and animal health. For example, *TERMIUM Plus* defines the two terms as following for the subject field “Statistics; Epidemiology; General Medicine, Hygiene and Health”:
 - incidence: The number of new cases of a disease or condition in a population at risk over a given period, usually one year;
 - prevalence: The number of people in a population with a specific disease or condition at a given time, usually expressed as a proportion of the number of affected people to the total population;
 - The general meaning of “incidence” in conventional dictionaries is consistent with its Glossary definition that simply makes the term more specific to plant protection;
 - It is therefore proposed that the term “incidence” be removed from the Glossary, and the terms “prevalence” and “incidence” used in their common dictionary sense.

Proposed deletion

incidence (of a pest)	Proportion or number of units in which a pest is present in a sample, consignment, field or other defined population [CPM, 2009]
------------------------------	--

2. REVISIONS

2.1 “emergency action” (2018-044)

- [6] At its December 2018 meeting, the TPG, while considering the comments received from first consultation on the proposed revised definition of the term “treatment” (2017-008), discussed how the term “emergency action” would apply for a new, non-yet regulated, pest discovered for instance in an imported consignment.
- [7] The TPG had considered it appropriate that such situations could be managed by the national plant protection organisations (NPPO) taking “emergency action” but had noted that, since the definition of

“emergency action” refers back to “phytosanitary action” and therefore to the implementation of a “phytosanitary measure”, it currently applies only to regulated pests.

[8] Recalling that Article VII.6 of the IPPC states that “nothing in this Article shall prevent any contracting party from taking appropriate emergency action on the detection of a pest posing a potential threat to its territories or the report of such a detection”, the TPG had considered that the text of the Convention justifies NPPOs taking action on any pest posing “a potential threat”, including non-regulated pests. The TPG had therefore concluded that the definition of “emergency action” probably needed to be revised to cover non-regulated pests and in May 2019 the SC had agreed to add this term to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

[9] At its November 2019 meeting, the TPG analysed the use of the terms “emergency action” and “phytosanitary action” in adopted ISPMs, and proposed a revised definition of “emergency action” that went for the first consultation July through September 2020. In reviewing comments received from that consultation, the TPG at its December 2020 meeting produced a revised proposal which was amended by the SC-7 in May 2021 and is presented below.

[10] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the revision of the definition of “emergency action”:

- There is a need for replacing “phytosanitary” with “official” in the current wording “phytosanitary action”, to clarify that an emergency action can target both regulated and non-regulated pests, and at the same time retain the notion that any emergency action should be taken under the authority of the NPPO;
- In the definition, replacing “action” with “operation” is proposed for consistency with the definition of “phytosanitary action”, being “an official operation, such as inspection, testing, surveillance or treatment, undertaken to implement phytosanitary measures”;
- With the word “phytosanitary” being replaced by “official”, wording is being added to explicitly state the purpose of an emergency action, namely “to prevent the entry, establishment or spread of a pest”; it is noted that a pest in question may be a regulated or a non-regulated pest, in consistency also with the change from “phytosanitary” to “official” (about the operation);
- To distinctly characterize the situation in which an emergency action may be undertaken,
 - the word “phytosanitary” (about the situation) has been removed to avoid any confusion with situations where a “phytosanitary action” may be undertaken, and
 - the phrase “not addressed by existing phytosanitary measures” has been added, thereby clearly distinguishing the situation triggering an “emergency action” from the situation triggering a “phytosanitary action”, where, according to its definition, operations are undertaken to implement (existing) phytosanitary measures.
- Thus with the revision the distinction is clarified as to how the terms “phytosanitary action” and “emergency action” should be used appropriately, namely:
 - the term “phytosanitary action” for operations undertaken to implement phytosanitary measures (e.g. in case of non-compliance of a consignment with phytosanitary import requirements);
 - the term “emergency action” for operations undertaken in new or unexpected situations not addressed by existing phytosanitary measures, such as the detection in an imported consignment of a pest not previously assessed, or not regulated for that particular host or pathway, or the detection in an area of a pest that needs to be prevented from establishing

or spreading following its recent entry. Thus, the two concepts are disjunctive, the one not being a subset of the other.

- The proposed revision of the definition adequately reflects the disjunctive use of the terms “emergency action” and “phytosanitary action” in adopted ISPMs.

Current definition

emergency action	A prompt phytosanitary action undertaken in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation [ICPM, 2001]
-------------------------	---

Proposed revision

emergency action	A prompt phytosanitary official action <u>operation</u> undertaken <u>to prevent the entry, establishment or spread of a pest</u> in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation <u>not addressed by existing phytosanitary measures</u>
-------------------------	---

2.2 “detection survey” (consequential to 2015-013 “survey”)

- [11] The Glossary term “survey” was added to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards by the SC in May 2013, for the TPG to consider whether the concept of “absence” should be included in its definition. TPG proposed to the draft 2017 Amendments a revision to the definition of “survey”, in accordance with the draft revision of ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*), the use of the term in other ISPMs and the three types of surveys defined in the Glossary. During their review of first consultation comments, SC-7 in May 2018 noted that “absence” of a pest is not included in the definition of “detection survey”, and asked the TPG to consider whether that definition should be amended to include “or absence”. Notably, the revised definition of “survey” to include “absence” was adopted by the CPM in 2019.
- [12] The TPG discussed the term “detection survey” in their December 2018 meeting and proposed a revised definition that went for the first consultation July through September 2020. In reviewing comments received from that consultation, the TPG at its December 2020 meeting produced the revised proposal as presented below.
- [13] The following explanatory points may be considered when reviewing the proposal for the revision of the definition:
- “Detection survey” is used in several instances throughout ISPMs when referring to determining or verifying absence of a pest.
 - The objective of a detection survey is to determine whether a pest is present, meaning that presence and absence are equally possible outcomes of a detection survey and it can thus be used to determine that a pest is absent.
 - “If” in the definition already expresses the concept of absence, but without being as explicit as in the definitions of “survey”, “delimiting survey” and “surveillance”. As the wording “the presence or absence” should be used consistently, it is suggested to replace the conditional “if” by the addition of “or absence” and insert “the” before “presence or absence”.
 - The recently revised definition of “survey” includes the wording “in an area, place of production or production site”. As “detection survey” is explicitly defined as a subset of “survey”, mentioning the spatial scope of a detection survey would be redundant, and the wording “in an area” is therefore deleted by this revision. This is in analogy to the fact that the temporal scope specified in the “survey” definition (i.e.: “over a defined period”) is not being repeated in the definition of “detection survey”.

- The proposed revised definition of “detection survey” adequately reflects the use of the term in adopted ISPMs.

- *Current definition*

Detection survey	Survey conducted in an area to determine if pests are present [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]
-------------------------	---

- *Proposed revision*

Detection survey	Survey conducted in an area to determine if pests are present <u>the presence or absence of pests</u> [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]
-------------------------	---