



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Standards Committee

**Virtual Meeting
15–19 November 2021**

IPPC Secretariat

IPPC Secretariat. 2021. *Report on the virtual meeting of the Standards Committee, 15-19 November 2021*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). 79 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
2.2 Election of the Rapporteur	4
2.3 Adoption of the agenda	4
3. Administrative matters	4
4. Draft ISPMs for recommendation to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures for adoption (from second consultation)	5
4.1 Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008), priority 1	5
4.2 Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014), priority 2	8
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)	14
5. Draft specification from first consultation for revision and approval	15
5.1 Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001)	15
6. Topics	18
6.1 Adjustments to the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i> and the stewards	18
7. Summary of SC e-decisions	19
8. Update from the Standard Setting Unit	19
9. Recommendations to CPM-16 (2022)	21
10. Review of the standard setting calendar	21
11. Any other business	21
12. Date and type of the next SC meeting	21
13. Evaluation of the meeting process	21
14. Close of the meeting	21
Appendix 1: Agenda	22
Appendix 2: Documents list	24
Appendix 3: Participants list	26
Appendix 4: Draft ISPM on Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008), priority 1	30
Appendix 5: Draft ISPM on Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014), priority 2	36
Appendix 6: Focused revision of ISPM 12 (<i>Phytosanitary certificates</i>) in relation to re-export (2015-011), priority 2	44
Appendix 7: Draft Specification on Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001)	67
Appendix 8: Draft 2019 and 2020 amendments to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) (1994-001)	72
Appendix 9: Summary of SC e-decisions	77
Appendix 10: Update from SSU - Standard Setting Unit (SSU) 2022 tentative work plan	78

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The Chairperson of the Standards Committee (SC), Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), opened the SC meeting, the main focus of which was to consider the draft ISPMs from second consultation and one draft specification from first consultation. He welcomed all participants, including the five observers.
- [2] The Acting IPPC Officer-in-Charge for daily matters, Avetik NERSISYAN, extended his welcome to everyone and his wishes for a successful meeting. He confirmed that the Sixteenth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-16) in 2022 would be held in virtual mode, pending the outcome of the ongoing poll of contracting parties. He thanked the SC for their effective work and highlighted the importance of the committee, given that the prime purpose of the IPPC is standard setting. He also drew the attention of the SC to the ongoing work on implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 and emphasized the importance of improving communication. Mr NERSISYAN gave an update on staffing issues within the Secretariat and confirmed that a decision on the final selection of the IPPC Secretary was expected within a few weeks. Finally, he expressed his gratitude to the Standard Setting Unit (SSU) for their dedication and good work, and in particular Adriana MOREIRA, who would continue to act as SSU lead until the new IPPC Secretary was appointed.
- [3] The acting SSU lead recalled the progress made in standard setting during the year, thanked the SC for their work in achieving this, and looked forward to a successful meeting.
- [4] The following SC members were absent: Imad (M.E) Jrouh Al-AWAD (Jordan) and Alphonsine LOUHOARI TOKOZABA (Republic of Congo).

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Election of the Vice-Chairperson

- [5] The SC elected David KAMINGIRA (Malawi) as Vice-Chairperson to the SC.

2.2 Election of the Rapporteur

- [6] The SC elected Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) as Rapporteur.

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

- [7] The SC agreed to add a new agenda item after agenda item 8 to note the SC's recommendations to CPM-16 (2022) and to discuss under "Any other business" the invitation of an invited expert to the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG). The SC adopted the Agenda as modified (Appendix 1).

3. Administrative matters

- [8] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as "the Secretariat") introduced the documents list (Appendix 2) and the participants list (Appendix 3). The Secretariat explained the different versions of the draft ISPMs and draft specification under consideration, pointing out that some updated documents had been uploaded to the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) just before the SC meeting. The Secretariat invited participants to notify the Secretariat of any information that required updating in the participants list or was missing from it.

4. Draft ISPMs for recommendation to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures for adoption (from second consultation)

- [9] The SC reviewed the draft ISPMs that had been submitted for second consultation in July–September 2021. 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, with the exception of the draft amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001) where the stewards made no changes, and the modified versions had then been submitted for review by the SC through the Online Comment System (OCS). At this meeting, the SC considered the draft ISPMs that had resulted from this process.

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

- [10] The Steward, Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom), introduced the draft ISPM and supporting documentation.² He explained that the consultation comments received had mostly been straightforward to address, although there had also been a few substantial, conceptual points, from two contracting parties and he invited the SC to consider these. He also made a general suggestion that, at some point in the future, the SC may wish to review the categories of comments used in consultations, as they were not being applied consistently.

Conceptual issues with the draft ISPM

- [11] **Requirement to consider existing measures when developing import requirements.** The Steward explained that one contracting party had expressed a concern that by requiring existing measures to be considered when developing phytosanitary import requirements, the standard would effectively *prevent* the development of new least-trade-restrictive measures, which would be a retrograde step. The Steward clarified that this was not the aim of commodity standards, but he could not see how the draft text could be reconciled with the consultation comment. The SC Chairperson added that, according to his understanding of the draft text, the aim of the draft ISPM was to have phytosanitary measures that are less trade-restrictive as alternatives to more restrictive measures. He also drew the attention of the SC to section 6 of the draft, which allowed for new measures to be added to the annexes.
- [12] The SC member from the contracting party who had submitted the consultation comment explained that the main concern was that historically used measures are often not supported by a technical justification. The member also referred to the other concerns raised by the contracting party, including the view that the text about the benefits of commodity standards did not belong in an ISPM and the risk that contracting parties might use the pest lists incorrectly and require phytosanitary measures for pests based on their association with the plant rather than the commodity, even if the pest is not associated with the commodity being traded.
- [13] The SC Chairperson commented that the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) may be able to address some of these concerns.
- [14] **Confidence in measures.** The SC decided to address the comments about this conceptual issue as they reviewed the relevant section of the draft ISPM.
- [15] The SC reviewed the draft ISPM.

Review of the draft ISPM

- [16] **Missing consultation comments.** The SC noted that, in a few places, the consultation comments referred to comments from New Zealand that did not exist in the compiled comments. The SC member from New Zealand confirmed that although this was the case, most of the missing comments had been captured in the comments from the corresponding regional plant protection organization (RPPO). The

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

² 2019-008; 2019-008_OCS; 06_SC_Tel_2021_Nov; 07_SC_Tel_2021_Nov.

Secretariat clarified that, in correspondence with the IPPC contact point last year, various options for reducing the duplication of comments had been discussed and so, as a result, duplicated comments from New Zealand might have been subsumed into the RPPO comments.

- [17] **Title of the ISPM.** The Steward explained that he had incorporated the change to the title of the draft ISPM that had been suggested during the consultation and by the TPG. The SC agreed with the new title, “Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures”.
- [18] **Sovereign rights.** The Steward explained that one of the important underlying principles of commodity standards was that there would not be any obligation for contracting parties to approve or use the measures included in them. In response to a consultation comment, he had therefore moved the text about this from a footnote into the main body of the standard.
- [19] **Introduction and spread.** The SC agreed that “introduction” should be listed before “spread” as this was a more logical order, and that both introduction and spread should be mentioned when referring to Article VII.1 of the IPPC, not just “spread”, as the text of this Article mentioned both.
- [20] **Impacts on biodiversity and the environment.** The Steward suggested that, at a future SC meeting, the SC should try to draft some standard text for this section, as it appears in all ISPMs.
- [21] **Principles in relation to commodity standards.** This section of the draft ISPM provided a list of basic principles of particular importance and relevance to commodity standards. One SC member queried the final one of these, which explained that the options for phytosanitary measures presented in commodity standards were not intended to be exhaustive and that other measures may be required by contracting parties, if technically justified, and may be proposed for inclusion in revisions of commodity standards. The SC member pointed out that the principle of minimal impact, which was also referred to in Article VII.2(g) of the IPPC as well as technical justification, was missing from this text and suggested that the text be amended to refer to “other measures that are technically justified *and represent the least restrictive measures available*”. The Steward expressed the view that there was no need to mention this concept in this paragraph as the purpose of the text here was simply to emphasize that the measures included in the annexes were not the only ones that could be used. Another SC member commented that use of the definitive article (“*the* least restrictive measures”) could imply that there should only be one measure per pest – the one that is least restrictive – but the least restrictive measure may differ between countries. A further SC member, however, supported the proposed amendment, noting that the principles being expressed were enshrined in the World Trade Organization’s Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement) and the language was directly from Article VII.2(g) of the IPPC. This member added that measures would only be required for those pests that could establish in the importing country (as determined through a pest risk analysis (PRA)), not all pests. The SC considered whether to simply refer to Article VII.2(g) rather than referring to technical justification or least-restrictive measures, as this would still convey the message that there are other measures that are consistent with Article VII.2(g) that are not included in the standard. In the end, however, the SC agreed to leave the text as it was, without modification.
- [22] **Purpose and use of commodity standards.** One observer suggested that the level of obligation for importing countries should be changed so that they *may* consider the pest lists and options for phytosanitary measures contained within commodity standards, rather than they *should* consider them. The SC recalled that this issue had been raised before, but the Steward and the SC Chairperson emphasized that the requirement is only that the pest lists and measures should be *considered*, not that they should be *used*, so there is no obligation to use them. The SC therefore left the text as it was.
- [23] **Description of the commodity and its intended use.** The SC considered whether to retain the mention of varieties when outlining what is in this section of a commodity standard (“This section clearly describes the commodity, such as the plant species (Latin name) and variety when necessary ...”). The Steward explained that the reference to varieties had been included to tightly define the commodity to which the standard related. The SC recalled that, for PRAs, the taxonomic unit is generally species according to ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) but that ISPM 11 also allows for the use

of a higher or lower taxonomic level, provided it is supported by a scientifically sound rationale. The SC therefore considered whether the phrase “a higher or lower taxonomic level” could be used instead of referring to “variety” in the draft ISPM under consideration.

- [24] Some SC members expressed support for simply deleting the reference to varieties, as the provision for using a higher or lower taxonomic level was already covered in ISPM 11 and referring to different taxonomic levels made the text of this draft ISPM unnecessarily complicated. The SC noted that taxonomic levels lower than species are used for some pests, but that there are only a few commodities for which PRAs are conducted at a variety level (one example being avocado).
- [25] One SC member expressed the view that if the reference to varieties was deleted, an essential element would be lost.
- [26] Another SC member speculated that there might be cases where a higher taxonomic level than species (e.g. genus) would be appropriate, so simply referring to “variety” would not cover these.
- [27] One SC member pointed out that, as the text said “such as”, the plant species and variety were only examples of the information to be given in the commodity standard and also suggested that “cultivar” might be a more appropriate term than “variety”.
- [28] In an attempt to satisfy all these various viewpoints, the SC considered whether to amend the text to read “plant species, to the appropriate taxonomic level when justified by a scientifically sound rationale”, but decided against it as the use of the word “species” would preclude higher taxonomic levels.
- [29] The SC therefore agreed simply to refer to plant species and not to varieties or any other taxonomic level, although changed “Latin name” to “botanical name” for consistency with ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) and ISPM 36 (*Integrated measures for plants for planting*).
- [30] **Confidence in the effectiveness of measures.** The SC considered the concerns expressed by one contracting party during the consultation about this section of the draft ISPM. The SC member from that contracting party explained that if the options for phytosanitary measures are to be categorized, then the TPCS should use transparent criteria to do this and there should be the opportunity for contracting parties to comment on the draft criteria. The SC member suggested that the criteria could either be placed in the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting* or in an annex to this ISPM. If the criteria were to be developed as an annex of this ISPM, then the member suggested that it could be submitted to consultation at the same time as the draft annex on *International movement of mango (*Mangifera indica*) fruit* (2021-011), if this is added to the SC’s work programme by CPM-16 (2022).
- [31] The SC noted that the bullet points in this section, which list the basic criteria that may be used to evaluate the effectiveness of measures, were a matter for the TPCS and so could be deleted from the standard and left for the TPCS to develop. If so, all the standard would need would be a simple sentence to say that options for phytosanitary measures would be categorized by the TPCS.
- [32] The Secretariat recalled that there had been no comments during consultation suggesting that the list of criteria be removed. Furthermore, Specification TP 6 (*Technical Panel on Commodity Standards*) assumed that the standard included criteria. The Secretariat also commented that if the list of criteria were to be omitted from the draft ISPM, then this could make matters worse as there would be no baseline at all for evaluating confidence.
- [33] The SC therefore agreed that the criteria should remain in the standard. They also noted that the text said that evaluation of the effectiveness *may* be based on the listed criteria, so the text already allowed some flexibility in the eventual criteria used by the TPCS.
- [34] The SC considered whether the criteria should be in the core text of the standard or moved to an annex. Options considered for the annex approach were: to include a blank annex at this stage and populate it with content once the TPCS had developed the criteria; to use the current list as an annex for now and

revise it later; or the keep the criteria in the core text for now, and then delete this and add an annex with the full criteria once the TPCS had developed them. Given that moving the text to an annex would be a major change to make to the draft ISPM at this late stage of its development, and no contracting parties had called for this, the SC agreed to keep the text as it was, with just a minor amendment to make it clear that it was the TPCS who would be categorizing the options for phytosanitary measures. The SC member from the contracting party who had raised the concern was satisfied with this outcome.

[35] The SC noted that the list of criteria did include some repetition, but the Steward commented that although repetition should usually be avoided, in this case the repetition was helpful.

[36] In response to a query, the SC Chairperson confirmed that, if the SC were to recommend the draft ISPM to CPM-16 (2022), there would be no need to highlight the concern that had been raised about this section, as the SC would have approved the text.

Potential implementation issues

[37] The SC considered the potential implementation issues raised during the second consultation:

- Some contracting parties may have limited or no resources to develop pest lists for specific commodities. Technical assistance may need to be offered to such countries.
- There may be a lack of political will to provide the required facilities to implement export measures to the national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) of importing countries that are primary importers. This could perhaps be addressed by such importing countries relying more heavily on pre-export certification measures, which may require additional training for technical staff in pre-export certification methodologies and options.
- The cost of measures, particularly where infrastructure may have to be built, will be of particular concern to small island developing states. The availability of chemicals or other control agents and their costs will also have to be looked at.

[38] The SC recognized the potential value in developing guidance and training, but noted that there was little that the Secretariat or IPPC bodies could do about a lack of political will and it was difficult to see how they could help to address the issues of cost. However, the SC recognized that the IC was the appropriate body to consider these matters and so agreed to forward all the issues raised to the IC.

[39] The SC:

- (1) *thanked* the Steward and Assistant Stewards for their efforts in developing this draft standard;
- (2) *recommended* the draft ISPM on *Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008), as modified in this meeting, for submission to CPM-16 (2022) for adoption (Appendix 4);
- (3) *requested* that the Secretariat forward implementation issues identified for this draft standard to the Implementation Facilitation Unit of the Secretariat for consideration by the IC.

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

[40] The Steward, Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile), introduced the draft ISPM and supporting documentation.³ The Steward highlighted the main issues raised during the consultation, in which 319 comments had been received. These included a proposal to include a definition of “audit” in the Glossary, comments about terms such as “phytosanitary context”, “entity” and “facility”, and a suggestion to align terminology on types of nonconformity with ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*). Various potential implementation issues had also been raised during the consultation.

[41] The SC Chairperson thanked the Steward and the SC then reviewed the draft ISPM.

³ 2015-014; 2015-014_OCS; 08_SC_Tel_2021_Nov; 09_SC_Tel_2021_Nov_Rev1.

Review of the draft ISPM

- [42] **Definition of audit.** The Steward explained that a suggestion had been made during the second consultation that a definition for “audit” be considered, but the TPG’s view had been that the concept should be described in the standard itself rather than being defined in the Glossary.⁴ One SC member representing the region that submitted this comment confirmed that they had no objection to the concept being described in the text, and so the SC agreed to that approach.
- [43] **Responsibilities of an NPPO auditing in an exporting country.** The SC noted that, before the second consultation, the responsibilities listed for an NPPO auditing in an exporting country were additional to the responsibilities of the NPPO auditing in its own territory. As a result of a consultation comment, these responsibilities had been split into two sections – one for auditing in the NPPO’s own territory and the second for auditing in an exporting country – but this meant that the latter responsibilities were now separate from the former, rather than being in addition to them. The SC therefore considered whether any of the responsibilities pertaining to auditing in the NPPO’s own territory, particularly those relating to contingency planning and taking the necessary actions when a nonconformity is identified, should be repeated in the list of responsibilities for auditing in an exporting country. The Steward commented that the precise responsibilities of the NPPO when auditing in an exporting country would depend on what the NPPO chooses to include in their auditing framework, so the first responsibility in the list (to “establish an audit framework and requirements for the audit process”) should cover this. The SC therefore agreed to leave the text as it was.
- [44] **Responsibilities of the auditor.** The SC discussed at some length whether auditors should be free of any conflict of interest or should identify and manage any such conflicts. They recognized that a requirement for auditors to be free of any conflict of interest may be difficult to implement in some countries, particularly small ones, as it may be difficult to find an auditor who is free of any conflict of interest. They recalled that in ISPM 45, however, the requirement for entities authorized to audit or supervise is stricter than the general guidance regarding authorization of entities, with the general guidance potentially allowing for conflicts of interest to be identified and managed but the requirement for entities authorized to audit or supervise being to be free of any conflict of interest.⁵ The SC acknowledged that, where mistakes occur in ISPMs, these should not be propagated in other ISPMs merely for the sake of consistency, but noted that ISPM 45 had been adopted very recently (earlier in 2021) and so the guidance in it was most unlikely to be a mistake. The SC considered whether simply to refer to ISPM 45 to avoid duplication, or to omit mention of conflicts of interest and just refer to the responsibility to maintain impartiality and independence from the entities being audited. However, they recognized that the latter approach would reduce the scope of the responsibility as maintaining impartiality and independence was not the same as being free of any conflict of interest. In the end, the SC agreed that, for consistency and to avoid confusion, the requirement in the draft ISPM on audit should be aligned with that in ISPM 45, requiring auditors to be free of any conflict of interest and to maintain impartiality and independence from the entities being audited.
- [45] **Conflicts of interest.** The SC considered whether there was any value in expanding the text in the Conflicts of interest section to say that the auditor should be impartial “and free of any conflict of interest”, but agreed that this was already adequately covered by the final sentence.
- [46] **Confidentiality.** The SC considered whether to omit “an appropriate level of” in the phrase “the parties should agree and ensure an appropriate level of confidentiality”, as “appropriate” was rather vague. They noted, however, that if the requirement was to “ensure confidentiality”, this could preclude the publication of audit results, which was not the intention. The SC therefore agreed to keep the text as referring to an appropriate level of confidentiality.

⁴ TPG 2020-12 to 2021-01, agenda item 4.3.

⁵ ISPM 45, section 4.2.1.

[47] **Performing and evaluation.** The SC noted that, in the section on Performing and evaluation, there was inconsistency as to whether “system” or “phytosanitary system” was used, and agreed to use the latter throughout this section for consistency.

[48] **Types of nonconformity (“non-critical nonconformity” vs “other nonconformity”).** The Steward explained that, owing to the disparity between the terminology used in this draft ISPM (“non-critical nonconformity”) and that used in ISPM 45 (“other nonconformity”) for the same concept, he had changed the term used in this draft ISPM to “other nonconformity”. The SC agreed to this change for consistency with ISPM 45.

Potential implementation issues

[49] The SC considered the potential implementation issues that had been raised during the second consultation:

- There may be a need for guidance on the practical (operational) implementation of this ISPM within NPPOs.
- There may be a need for guidance or additional support to aid understanding of the terminology used, as some of the terms will not be those currently used by NPPOs.
- A template document may be needed for use by contracting parties when establishing an audit framework, so that NPPOs know what the framework should comprise.
- There may be a need for guidance on the conduct of remote audit (i.e. audit from a distance).
- Guidance from other accepted normative documents such as ISO 19011:2018 (*Guidelines for auditing management systems*) may be helpful (e.g. when producing checklists; for guidance on determining the authorization for conducting the audit, establishing agreements on observers, interpreters, accompanying officials or support team, or determining the feasibility of the audit; for guidance on the statistical basis of sampling).

[50] **Remote audit.** One SC member queried the feasibility of remote audit, given that audit involves physical, visual examination. Another SC member commented that, based on experience in the member’s region, remote audit may be useful for certain focused audits but for systems audits it is better not to use remote audits unless there is no alternative. The SC Chairperson speculated on the possibility of developing, in the future, an annex to this draft ISPM to provide guidance on remote audit.

[51] **Guidance on audit.** The SC representative on the Task Force on Topics (TFT) highlighted the proposal that had been submitted during the 2021 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation for a *Guide on performing audits in the phytosanitary context* (2021-009). This had received support from the TFT, pending consideration by the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) at its meeting in November. The SC noted that if the guide were to be added to the work programme by CPM-16 (2022), it could address some of the implementation issues raised during the consultation on the draft ISPM.

[52] **Non-IPPC standards.** The SC noted that not all NPPOs have the capacity to follow the standards of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and the Secretariat recalled that the CPM had decided previously, with regard to standards for diagnostic laboratories, that standards adopted under the auspices of the Secretariat should be written in such a way that they can be implemented without the need to also implement ISO standards. The SC Chairperson commented that as ISO standards are outside the remit of IPPC bodies, IPPC documents should not include guidance on implementing ISO standards, but ISO standards could be considered as references when developing ISPMs or other IPPC guidance. The SC acknowledged that the IC was the appropriate body to consider these issues, and could take matters to the CPM if needed. The Secretariat confirmed that they would forward the implementation issues raised in relation to this draft ISPM to the IC (and to the IC representative on the SC and the SC representative on the IC).

[53] The SC agreed to forward all the potential implementation issues raised during the consultation to the IC.

[54] The SC:

- (4) *thanked* the present and previous stewards for their efforts in developing this draft standard;
- (5) *recommended* the draft ISPM on *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014), as modified in this meeting, for submission to CPM-16 (2022) for adoption (Appendix 5);
- (6) *requested* that the Secretariat forward implementation issues identified for this draft standard to the Implementation Facilitation Unit of the Secretariat for consideration by the IC.

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

[55] The Assistant Steward, Masahiro SAI (Japan), introduced the draft ISPM and supporting documentation.⁶ The Assistant Steward highlighted the main issues raised during the consultation, in which 129 comments had been received. Questions and suggestions had been submitted about the phrase “pests regulated by the country of destination”, the circumstances under which a phytosanitary certificate of re-export is issued (whether it is when a consignment has not been infested or contaminated or when it has been subjected to the risk of infestation or contamination), and who validates certified copies of phytosanitary certificates. Comments had also been submitted regarding text changes to the section on specific considerations for the preparation and issuance of phytosanitary certificates, the meaning of “place of origin”, the level of obligation regarding the issuance of phytosanitary certificates (“should” vs “may”), and documentation that may be attached to a phytosanitary certificate for export.

[56] The Steward explained that, in addition, some comments had been made that were beyond the scope of this topic. These included: a call for the full revision of ISPM 12; a suggestion that the principle of equivalence of measures be restored and risk-based measures considered to resolve problems that arise in countries of re-export when all the phytosanitary import requirements are for phytosanitary measures to be performed by the NPPO of the country of origin; and a comment that it needs to be possible to accomplish the requirements for copies of phytosanitary certificates when using electronic phytosanitary certificates (ePhytos).

[57] The SC Chairperson thanked the Assistant Steward and the SC then reviewed the draft ISPM.

Review of the draft ISPM

[58] **Specific considerations for the preparation and issuance of phytosanitary certificates.** The Assistant Steward explained that, during the SC’s review on the OCS, one SC member had suggested a rearrangement of the text concerning what happens in re-export situations when the NPPO of the re-exporting country needs specific information from the country of origin to comply with the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination but this information is not available on a phytosanitary certificate for export. The SC member concerned elaborated on this. The existing text of ISPM 12 gives two situations: one where the NPPO of the re-exporting country requires a phytosanitary certificate for export, and one where it does not require one. In the first situation, the NPPO of the country of origin may, on request from exporters, provide additional phytosanitary information for inclusion in the additional declaration section of the phytosanitary certificate for re-export. In the second situation, the NPPO of the country of origin may, on request from exporters, issue a phytosanitary certificate for export. In the proposed revision to the text, the references to “on request by exporters” had been deleted and moved into an introductory sentence stem, common to both situations. However, this introductory stem also referred to “on request by the NPPO of the re-exporting country”. The SC member pointed out that the latter applied only to the first situation, not the second, and suggested amendments to the text to resolve this, including presenting the two situations as two separate paragraphs rather than two bullet points. The Assistant Steward acknowledged the problem with the sentence stem, but suggested that the two situations should form part of the same paragraph (as bullet points) as they are both cases of a re-export process that the NPPO of the country of origin can support: the first depending on a request by the NPPO of the re-exporting country or by exporters, and

⁶ 2015-011; 2015-011_OCS; 10_SC_Tel_2021_Nov_Rev1; 13_SC_Tel_2021_Nov_Rev1.

the second depending on a request by exporters. He proposed some amended text to make this clear, keeping two bullet points, and the SC agreed to it.

- [59] **Examination of the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination.** The SC considered the part of this section that explained the circumstances under which a phytosanitary certificate of re-export may still be issued when the re-exporting country is not able to meet some of the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination. One SC member sought clarification on the precise meaning of the text about alternative phytosanitary actions and asked whether alternative phytosanitary actions would always be a requirement or whether it would depend on whether the pest risk had changed while the consignment was in the re-exporting country. The SC Chairperson and Steward explained that the intended meaning of this text was that if some, but not all, the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination cannot be met, the re-exporting country may either attach the phytosanitary certificate from the country of origin if the necessary actions have been taken there or alternative phytosanitary actions that are considered equivalent (such as an additional inspection, a test or a treatment) may be accepted instead.
- [60] One SC member expressed caution about the possibility that additional phytosanitary actions may, at some point, change the nature of a commodity, in which case a phytosanitary certificate for re-export would not be appropriate, but recognized that this was a conceptual point beyond the scope of the current discussion. Another SC member, however, was of the view that the additional phytosanitary actions would be providing additional information rather than changing the nature of the commodity. The SC noted that the model phytosanitary certificate for re-export (in the Annex to the IPPC) foresees the possibility of an additional inspection, but also noted that such additional actions were optional not mandatory.
- [61] At this point, the SC welcomed Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark), who had been a member of the Expert Working Group (EWG) and had served as the EWG Chairperson. He recalled that the EWG had not attempted to make any changes to the intended meaning of this section but just to make the intended meaning clearer. However, he did suggest a minor editorial amendment (changing “In such cases” to “However”) to improve the text further. He also highlighted the footnote that the EWG had added to the previous section to address the question of how to judge whether a commodity has changed its nature.
- [62] One SC member suggested that, if the intention was to not change the meaning of the guidance in ISPM 12, it would be better to retain the wording of the current ISPM 12 as this was clearer than the text being considered in the draft revision of the ISPM. The SC decided, however, to use the latter, but with “In such cases” replaced by “However” as suggested earlier.
- [63] **Considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for export in certain re-export cases.** The SC had an extensive discussion about the final paragraph of this section, which concerned the documentation that may be attached to a phytosanitary certificate for export issued by a re-exporting country.
- [64] The SC agreed that such documentation would include the original phytosanitary certificate (the phytosanitary certificate of export from the country of origin), or a certified copy thereof, if they contained information that was used to complete the phytosanitary certificate for export. Some SC members, however, expressed concern about also including “or other official communication”, which had been added in response to a consultation comment, as its meaning was open to interpretation by different countries. The SC discussed what sort of official documentation an NPPO may need to attach. Suggestions included: diagnostic results from an NPPO laboratory; proof of pest free area status; and in situations where there is no phytosanitary certificate for export from the country of origin and the NPPO of the re-exporting country feels uncomfortable issuing a phytosanitary certificate for export without official phytosanitary information from the NPPO of the country of origin. The SC noted, however, that phytosanitary certificates already have the necessary boxes to complete for the relevant information and, when signed and stamped by an authorized officer, each certificate act as a guarantee to the importing country that the information on the certificate can be trusted, so it should not be necessary to attach other official documentation to confirm the information on the certificate. Also, laboratory reports would not

be needed to complete the phytosanitary certificate, so should not form part of the certificate by being attached to it. One SC member commented that some importing countries require laboratory results as part of their phytosanitary import requirements, but given the ambiguity of the phrase “other official documentation” the SC decided to omit it.

[65] The SC also discussed the level of obligation for attaching documentation. Some SC member expressed concern that the use of “may” (“Documents issued by NPPOs ... may be attached to the phytosanitary certificate for export”) could result in importing countries routinely asking for original phytosanitary certificates in their phytosanitary import requirements, whereas the intended meaning was that it would be at the discretion of the NPPO of the re-exporting country whether or not to attach any documentation. The SC noted that not all countries keep all the phytosanitary certificates they issue, so it might not even be possible for those countries to provide them. One SC member commented that an NPPO could negotiate further if they disagreed with another NPPO requiring the original phytosanitary certificate to be attached, and the SC recognized that “may” meant that it would not be compulsory to attach the original phytosanitary certificate. One SC member suggested that the level of obligation be changed to “should”, because if a document contains information used in completing the phytosanitary certificate, then it should be attached to allow the accuracy of the information on the new phytosanitary certificate to be confirmed, given that mistakes in transferring information from one document to another can occur. However, the SC agreed to use “may” and also decided to rearrange the text to the active rather than the passive voice (“The NPPO of the re-exporting country may attach documents ...”), so that there no was obligation on the NPPO of the re-exporting country to attach documents. The SC also decided not to say “*documents such as* an original phytosanitary certificate ...” but just to refer to the original phytosanitary certificate and the certified copy of it. The SC considering whether to qualify the requirement about attached documentation by saying “*In exceptional cases*, the NPPO of the re-exporting country may attach ...”, but decided against this as this section was already about special circumstances.

[66] **Original phytosanitary certificate.** In response to a query from the Secretariat, the SC confirmed that in the paragraph on attaching documentation (above), the term “original phytosanitary certificate” referred to the phytosanitary certificate for export issued by the country of origin. The SC acknowledged that this term could equally be interpreted as meaning the certificate from which a copy is made. However, as this term appeared in several places throughout ISPM 12, including text that was not open for revision, the SC agreed that a review of each instance to ensure clarity was outside the scope of the present topic but could perhaps be undertaken by the TPG when ISPM 12 is next opened for revision. The SC therefore agreed to leave all instances of this term unchanged.

Other issues

[67] **Full revision of ISPM 12.** The Steward explained that one RPPO had suggested during the second consultation that ISPM 12 be fully revised in the near future to better consolidate sections (including text on re-export, which is currently scattered throughout the ISPM), provide more clarity, and include specific scenarios and solutions. The RPPO had also suggested the inclusion of non-phytosanitary matters (e.g. regarding animal or human health, pesticide residues, radioactivity, commercial information, or quality) on the phytosanitary certificate where there is agreement between the importing and exporting country. The SC agreed, however, that this matter was outside the scope of the current topic and noted that contracting parties or RPPOs could submit a proposal along these lines in the next call for topics.

Potential implementation issues

[68] The SC considered the potential implementation issues that had been raised during the second consultation:

- In implementation material, it would be useful to provide concrete examples of different re-export cases, for clarification.
- Guidance may be needed to contribute to a better understanding, by the country of final destination, of the pest status of the country of export.

- The list of contact points on the IPPC website needs to be kept up-to-date.
- It would be useful to have guidance on how NPPOs decide on the validity period of the phytosanitary certificate (the length of time that a phytosanitary certificate is valid).

[69] The SC noted that an IPPC guide to *Export certification* was published in 2015,⁷ so it may be worthwhile checking whether any of the suggested implementation issues are covered by this guide.

[70] One SC member expressed support for the first of these issues. The SC agreed, however, to forward all the implementation issues identified during the consultation to the IC for consideration.

[71] The SC:

- (7) *thanked* the Steward and Assistant Steward for their efforts in revising this draft standard;
- (8) *recommended* the draft focused revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011), as modified in this meeting, for submission to CPM-16 (2022) for adoption (Appendix 6);
- (9) *requested* that the Secretariat forward implementation issues identified for this draft standard to the Implementation Facilitation Unit of the Secretariat for consideration by the IC.

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

[72] The Assistant Steward for the TPG, Ebbe NORDBO (Denmark), introduced the draft 2019 and 2020 amendments to ISPM 5, the compiled comments from the second consultation and the notes prepared by the Steward and Assistant Steward.⁸ During the second consultation, 37 comments had been received, most of which agreed with the proposed amendments to ISPM 5. The Steward outlined the remaining comments.

[73] **Revision of “emergency action” (2018-044).** One consultation comment had suggested that “the entry, establishment or spread of a pest” be changed to “the establishment and spread of a pest”. The Steward explained that entry, establishment and spread need to be distinguished as three distinct phases in the definition, as actions can be directed at any one these phases and it was extremely important that action could be taken at the border to prevent entry of a pest. He also confirmed that, as per general usage in ISPMs, the meaning of “or” in this definition included the meaning of “and”.

[74] **Deletion of “incidence” (2018-010).** In relation to this proposed amendment, one comment had expressed concern that the lack of a Glossary definition for the related term “pest prevalence” may affect the Glossary definition of “area of low pest prevalence”. The Assistant Steward explained that the term “pest prevalence” had never been defined in the Glossary, only “incidence”, and that the definition of “area of low pest prevalence” would not be affected by the deletion of the term “incidence”.

[75] **“Emergency action” and emergency measure.** One consultation comment had requested an explanation of the difference between these two terms. The Assistant Steward confirmed that an explanation is given in the *Explanatory document on ISPM 5*,⁹ which would be revised by the TPG once the 2019 and 2020 amendments to the ISPM 5 had been adopted.

[76] In the light of these comments, the Assistant Steward proposed to the SC that the draft 2019 and 2020 amendments be submitted to CPM-16 (2022) without modification and the SC agreed.

[77] The SC:

⁷ IPPC Secretariat. 2015. *Export certification: A guide to export certification for national plant protection organizations*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO. 38 pp. [Cited 16 November 2021]. <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/86042/>

⁸ 1994-001; 11_SC_Tel_2021_Nov; 12_SC_Tel_2021_Nov.

⁹ *Explanatory document on ISPM 5*: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87049/>

- (10) *thanked* the Steward and Assistant Steward for their efforts in developing these draft amendments to ISPM 5;
- (11) *recommended* the draft 2019 and 2020 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001) for submission to CPM-16 (2022) for adoption (Appendix 7).

5. Draft specification from first consultation for revision and approval

5.1 Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001)

- [78] The Steward, Masahiro SAI (Japan), introduced the draft specification and supporting documentation.¹⁰ The draft specification had been submitted for second consultation in July–August 2021 and 111 comments had been received.¹¹ The draft specification had been modified by the Steward in response to the consultation comments and the modified version had then been submitted for review by the SC through the OCS.
- [79] The Steward highlighted the outstanding issues that needed consideration by the SC:
- whether to expand the scope of the reorganization and revision of PRA standards to include substantial revisions if identified by the EWG;
 - whether to add a subtask for the EWG to consult members of the EWG on Guidance on Pest Risk Management (2014-001);
 - whether to add a task for the EWG to consider the elements contained in ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*);
 - the composition of the EWG and how it may organize its work;
 - whether the SPS Agreement should be specifically referred to under the section on Expertise.
- [80] The SC Chairperson thanked the Steward and invited comments from the SC. There were no general comments, so the SC reviewed the draft specification and addressed the outstanding issues as they did so.
- [81] **Systems approaches.** The Steward explained that one consultation comment had suggested that the EWG should consider the elements contained in ISPM 14, and this had been endorsed by one SC member during the SC OCS review. He expressed his view that the guidance for Annex 3 of the revised standard (the annex on pest risk management) should follow Specification 63 (*Guidance on pest risk management*) – the specification for the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) – and so it was not necessary to include it in this specification. Although Specification 63 did not explicitly mention systems approaches, Task 1 covered it in a broader sense.
- [82] The SC member from the contracting party that had submitted this comment explained that the reason for submitting it was because systems approaches are used more widely today than when the original PRA standards were developed. The SC noted, however, that a systems approach is only one of the possible options for phytosanitary measures that may be an outcome of a PRA, and there was not a clear reason why this one option would be mentioned in the specification but not others. The SC therefore agreed not to refer to systems approaches in the draft specification.
- [83] **Consulting the pest risk management EWG.** The Steward explained that one consultation comment had suggested that the EWG should consult the members of the EWG on Guidance on Pest Risk Management (2014-001) to ensure alignment of the pest risk management section with the previous EWG’s thinking. However, in the SC review of the specification on OCS, some SC members had commented that this was not necessary as the specification already specified that one member of the EWG on Guidance on Pest Risk Management (2014-001) should be invited.

¹⁰ 2020-001; 2020-001_OCS; 2020-001_OCS_Rev1; 04_SC_Tel_2021_Nov; 05_SC_Tel_2021_Nov_Rev1.

¹¹ Compiled comments from first consultation: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/member-consultation-draft-specifications-ispms/>

- [84] The SC member from the contracting party that had submitted this comment added that in the SC OCS review, another comment had been that consulting other groups should not be the responsibility of the EWG but, more appropriately, the Steward (or stewards), the SC, or the Secretariat. In the light of these comments from the SC, the member confirmed that, provided both versions of the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) are made available to the EWG (the version drafted by the EWG and that revised by the SC) and there are two rounds of consultation, then the suggested bullet point about consultation could be removed. The SC therefore agreed not to include this task for the EWG.
- [85] **Substantial revisions.** The Steward explained that one consultation comment had suggested that the scope of the reorganization and revision of PRA standards should be expanded to include substantial improvements of the text (from ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*) and ISPM 11), if the need for such improvements was identified by the EWG. In the SC OCS review, however, one SC member had argued against this, and the Steward recalled that at its focused meeting in April 2021, the SC had agreed that the EWG would not consider substantial revision of text relating to Stage 1 and Stage 2 of PRA arising from development of text relating to Stage 3.¹²
- [86] One SC member expressed the view that, owing to the amount of work that would be involved in substantial revisions and the possibility that different experts may be needed, substantial revision would probably require another specification and another EWG. Another SC member expressed a preference for the substantial revisions to be identified but not revised, and this was supported by other SC members, who endorsed the view that substantial revisions would be too much for one EWG to deal with and it was too early to do it.
- [87] The SC therefore agreed that the scope of the EWG's work would not include substantial revisions. They reverted to the original text of the draft specification, with minor amendments.
- [88] **Inclusion of experts on the SPS Agreement.** The Steward explained that one suggestion made during the consultation was that experts on the SPS Agreement were not required on the EWG, because experts in PRA that were also on the EWG would have sufficient knowledge of it. During the SC OCS review, however, one SC member had favoured retaining this item in the list of expertise because SPS experts would have a greater understanding of the SPS Agreement.
- [89] One SC member expressed the view that there was no need for experts with specific expertise in the SPS Agreement, as the work of this EWG was only to reorganize text relating to Stage 1 and Stage 2 of PRA, and to refine text that had already been drafted by another group. The SC agreed and deleted the corresponding bullet point from the list of expertise.
- [90] **Composition of the EWG.** The Steward explained that one consultation comment had suggested that the EWG should consist of two groups of five experts. The Steward agreed with this idea, suggesting that each subgroup could be assigned certain tasks, but added that, in his view, it would also be necessary to consider the number of experts with each expertise to ensure a balance within the EWG. He recalled the discussion at the SC meeting in April 2021, where the SC had acknowledged that the EWG should have the freedom to choose how best to organize its work, including – if it saw fit – assigning small groups of EWG members to work on specific parts of the standard.¹³ The Steward had therefore made some suggested amendments to the draft specification in line with the SC's discussion (at the end of the Tasks section), but also regarding the importance of ensuring a balance of expertise (in the Participants section).
- [91] The SC discussed the second of these amendments, regarding the balance of expertise. One SC member commented that there is no need to refer to expertise in the Participants section, as the areas of expertise are already listed in the Expertise section. Another SC member acknowledged this point, but also recognized the importance of achieving a balance of expertise, and expressed the view that there was no

¹² SC 2021-04, agenda item 4.1.

¹³ SC 2021-04, agenda item 4.1.

harm in mentioning about a balance of expertise. The SC noted, however, that there might be confusion over the precise meaning of “balance” in this context, and there was also the question of what would happen if a balance could not be achieved. The SC therefore deleted the Steward’s suggested sentence about balance of expertise.

[92] The Secretariat clarified that the invited experts to the EWG would be in addition to the eight to ten EWG members specified at the start of the Participants section. The SC therefore adjusted the text of the draft specification to make this clear.

[93] As the draft specification said that at least one member of the EWG on Guidance on Pest Risk Management (2014-001) would be invited as an invited expert, the SC considered whether they needed to decide how to make this selection. They noted that as the text said “at least one former member”, it could be more than one person, and also that the people concerned might in any case be nominated as experts during the call for experts, so there was perhaps no need to be specific about the selection process for invited experts at this stage. Another suggestion made was that the EWG on Guidance on Pest Risk Management (2014-001) could be invited to select someone from among their number, in the same way as the SC invites the IC to select an IC representative. The SC made no changes to the draft specification on this point.

[94] **Title of the specification.** One consultation comment had suggested that the title be changed to “Reorganization *and revision* of pest risk analysis standards”, because the draft specification implied not only the reorganization of ISPM 2 and ISPM 11, but also the revision of ISPM 11. The SC noted that, even though the scope of the EWG’s work would not include substantial revisions, there would still be some revisions and the tasks were quite clear about what revisions would be considered. The SC therefore agreed the new title as amended and the corresponding changes in the text of the specification.

[95] **References.** The SC deleted the reference to ISPM 14 as the citation to this had been deleted from the Tasks section.

[96] **Discussion papers.** The Steward explained that he had added Specification 63 to this section of the draft specification, to inform the EWG’s work on Annex 3 of the revised standard, but he asked the SC to confirm whether it was necessary to include it as a discussion paper. The SC Chairperson responded that the most important resources for the EWG would be the two versions of the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001), rather than Specification 63, so it was not essential to refer to Specification 63 in the section on Discussion papers. The Steward suggested that the reference be moved to the References section instead and the SC agreed.

[97] The SC noted that the two versions of the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001), both of which were referred to in the section on Discussion papers, were not in the public domain. As such, they would be provided to EWG participants after appointment, with appropriate advice on their restricted circulation.

[98] The SC considered whether to add a sentence to the end of the section on Discussion papers to say that the EWG was invited to consider the report of the EWG on Guidance on Pest Risk Management (2014-001) and the relevant SC report including the relevant discussion. However, they decided that this was not necessary, so omitted it.

[99] **Call for experts.** After approving the specification (see decision point below), the Secretariat informed the SC that the call for experts would be issued next year.

[100] The SC:

- (12) *thanked* the Steward and Assistant Stewards for their efforts in developing this draft specification;
- (13) *approved* Specification 72 (*Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) as modified in this meeting (Appendix 8).

6. Topics

6.1 Adjustments to the *List of topics for IPPC standards and the stewards*

[101] The Secretariat presented the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (LOT), which had been updated to take account of the recommendations made by the SC at their focused meeting on 14–15 September 2021.¹⁴ The Secretariat explained that these recommendations would be presented to CPM-16 (2022) with the rationale, but the SC also needed to consider the assignment of stewards for some topics. The updated LOT also included the new diagnostic protocol subjects that the SC had added to the LOT at their focused meeting on 3–4 November 2021, arising from the call for topics.¹⁵

[102] The SC reviewed and assigned stewards for some topics on the LOT.

[103] **Technical Panel for the Glossary (2006-013).** The SC reviewed the continued need for a new Steward for the TPG, further to their decision at the SC focused meeting in September to assign Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) as Steward for the TPG on a temporary basis.¹⁶ The Secretariat confirmed that Ms BOUHOT-DELDUC was willing to continue as Steward given the strong support from the Assistant Steward. The SC welcomed this generous offer but noted that, where possible, the steward of a technical panel (TP) should be an SC member.¹⁷ However, as there were still no proposals for an SC member to take on this role, the SC agreed to accept the offer from Ms BOUHOT-DELDUC, recognizing her long experience as a former Steward of the TPG, with the intention that a new Steward be assigned at the SC meeting in May 2022. Harry ARIJS (Belgium), one of the SC members representing Europe, offered to act as the connection between the SC and Ms BOUHOT-DELDUC and the SC welcomed this kind offer.

[104] The Secretariat encouraged the SC to also consider assigning assistant stewards for the other TPs.

[105] **Focused revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011).** The SC considered that there was no need to assign a steward for this topic, as it would be presented to CPM-16 (2022) for adoption and hence, if adopted, there would be no further work for a steward on this topic.

[106] The Secretariat thanked the Assistant Steward for dealing with the second consultation comments on this topic after the Steward had completed her term on the SC.

[107] **Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (Annex to ISPM 39: International movement of wood) (2015-004).** Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) was assigned Steward and Sophie PETERSON (Australia) as Assistant Steward.

[108] The SC:

- (14) *noted* the revised *List of topics for IPPC standards* that will be presented to CPM-16 (2022);
- (15) *confirmed* that Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France) would continue as Steward of the TPG on a temporary basis and *asked* the Secretariat to include the appointment of a new Steward on the agenda for the May 2022 meeting of the SC;
- (16) *agreed* to assign Steve CÔTÉ (Canada) as Steward and Sophie PETERSON (Australia) as Assistant Steward for the topic *Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (Annex to ISPM 39: International movement of wood) (2015-004)*;
- (17) *asked* the Secretariat to update the *List of topics for IPPC standards* based on decisions taken at the SC November 2021 (regular) meeting.

¹⁴ SC 2021-09, agenda item 4.1.

¹⁵ SC FM 2021-11, agenda item 4.

¹⁶ SC 2021-09, agenda item 6.

¹⁷ Rules of Procedure for Technical Panels, Rule 5 (see *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*).

7. Summary of SC e-decisions

[109] The Secretariat presented a paper listing the outcomes of the e-decision fora and polls conducted from May to November 2021, noting that there had been only one conducted during this period.¹⁸ The level of response to this e-forum had been very good, but the Secretariat emphasized how important it was that SC members participated in such fora and polls as they were official decisions of the SC. The Secretariat encouraged SC members to contact the Secretariat if they have difficulties accessing an e-forum or poll.

[110] The Secretariat updated the SC on the e-decision fora and polls that are foreseen for the coming months:

- five PTs to be presented for approval for adoption;
- draft DP for '*Candidatus Liberibacter*' spp. on *Citrus* spp. (2004-010) to be presented for approval for the Notification Period;
- a joint SC–IC e-decision to approve the CPM paper on *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid* (2021-012);
- (in early 2022) selection of new members for the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments and the TPCS, from nominations received in response to the call for members for these panels.

[111] The SC:

- (18) *agreed* that the “Summary of Standard Committee e-decisions 2021 May–November” accurately reflected the outcome of the SC e-decisions (Appendix 9).

8. Update from the Standard Setting Unit

[112] The SSU lead presented a tentative work plan and associated calendar for the SSU for 2022.¹⁹ As it was envisaged that meetings would continue to operate in virtual mode, the work plan included tentative dates for three focused SC meetings in addition to the regular meetings of the SC and Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7), and the first of these would focus on assigning stewards and reviewing the draft specifications for the topics added by CPM-16 (2022). The work plan also listed the other meetings organized by the SSU or with SSU involvement. The work plan listed the draft standards and CPM recommendations that it was foreseen would be presented for adoption at CPM-16 (2022), notification (in the case of diagnostics protocols) or consultation, and other activities such as work on communications and advocacy material and improving the SC training material. Noting that there would be some overlap between the SC meeting scheduled for 9–13 May and the planned International Day of Plant Health on 12 May, the SSU lead commented that the timing of the SC sessions may be adjusted to allow SC members and the Secretariat to participate in the International Day of Plant Health. The SSU lead finished by thanking the SSU staff.

[113] The SC Chairperson thanked the SSU lead for presenting the work plan and invited the SC to comment.

[114] **Timing and virtual mode of SC meetings.** The SC discussed whether it would be possible to rearrange the dates of the May SC meeting to avoid a clash with the International Day of Plant Health and indeed the International Plant Health Conference also planned for that week. The Secretariat explained that the timing of the SC meeting was limited by the availability of interpreters and the tight standard setting schedule to get drafts ready for consultation. Although there is no longer a direct connection between the work of the SC-7 meeting and that of the SC meeting immediately preceding it, swapping the two meetings around would present the same problems, as it would depend on interpreters being available for 16–20 May and the deadlines for consultation would still be tight. For next year, the Secretariat commented that it might be possible to have a slightly shorter SC session on 12 May, as the agenda for the meeting would not be over full. The Secretariat suggested that, for future years, the SC and

¹⁸ 15_SC_Tel_2021_Nov.

¹⁹ 16_SC_Tel_2021_Nov.

Secretariat could consider moving the May SC meeting closer to the CPM session to avoid 12 May, but that the timing of the SC-7 meeting would also need to be considered.

[115] The SC recognized the challenges presented by holding meetings in a virtual mode, particularly for those SC members for whom the time of day is either very early in the morning or late at night. Given that it was likely to be some time before face-to-face meetings were fully restored, some SC members asked whether the time of day of virtual meetings could be varied and sessions of regular meetings spread over two weeks rather than one, as happens with the IC meetings, and also whether hybrid meetings could be held. The Secretariat confirmed that they needed to follow the rules set by FAO rules regarding face-to-face meetings and currently hybrid meetings were only possible with a maximum of four people present in person. The time of day of virtual meetings was limited by the availability of interpreters, this being a difference between SC and IC meetings, as interpretation was not provided for IC meetings. One SC member suggested that the Secretariat actively promote hybrid meetings with FAO, given that other international organizations such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and the World Trade Organization were now holding such meetings.

[116] Regarding the International Plant Health Conference, the Secretariat clarified that the arrangements for the conference were still being developed, so the dates and mode (face-to-face, virtual or hybrid) had not yet been finalized.

[117] Noting the very real difficulties experienced by SC members with virtual meetings and that the burden of early or late hours always fell on the same members, the SC Chairperson suggested that the SC note these issues for now and continue to explore how to address them at a future meeting.

[118] **Expert working groups.** The SC reviewed the experience to date of holding EWGs in virtual mode. Three EWGs had been held in virtual mode: the EWG for the Revision of ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) (2009-002), the EWG for the Use of Specific Import Authorizations (2008-006) and the EWG for the Annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*). The Secretariat and the Steward of the first and last of these EWGs outlined the following lessons learned:

- one week is not sufficient and two weeks should be scheduled;
- the maximum length of time per day should be three hours;
- the EWG members should be prepared to work on drafting in-between sessions (as “homework”);
- the roles and responsibilities of the EWG members, the EWG Chairperson and invited experts need to be more clearly explained before the meeting and at the start of it;
- further consideration needs to be given to how invited experts contribute to the proceedings;
- sufficient advance notice should be given of the dates of the meeting, to allow ample time for discussion papers to be prepared.

[119] The Secretariat informed the SC that the next EWG was already scheduled for January and would be in virtual mode, but the two other EWGs planned for 2022 have been tentatively scheduled for the second half of the year, in the hope that they may be hybrid meetings. The Secretariat would be working on better defining the roles of EWG participants and how best to handle comments from industry during consultation periods, given that this is potentially an issue for the commodity standards that are expected to be developed over the coming years. The Secretariat suggested that the SC review their rules of procedure next year to accommodate the virtual environment and also discuss the participation of industry.

[120] The SC:

- (19) *noted* the tentative list of activities for 2022 (Appendix 10);
- (20) *noted* the tentative dates for the SC meetings in 2022;
- (21) *noted* the comments made about the timing of SC meetings and the challenges of virtual meetings, and *agreed* to explore these further at a future SC meeting.

9. Recommendations to CPM-16 (2022)

[121] The SC noted that the following will be recommended to CPM-16 (2022):

- draft ISPMs for adoption: *Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019/008), *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014), focused revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011), draft 2019 and 2020 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001);
- adopted diagnostic protocol for noting: DP 30 (*Striga* spp.) (2008-009);
- *List of topics for IPPC standards* (to agree changes in the status of topics) (see agenda item 6 of this report and agenda item 4.1 of SC September 2021);
- paper on the topic *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid* (2021-012), including proposal for a CPM focus group (see agenda item 4, SC November focused meeting).

[122] The SC noted that there may also be some phytosanitary treatments (PTs) to recommend for adoption, pending the outcome of the forthcoming e-decision on five draft PTs.

[123] The Secretariat informed the SC that the draft paper on the topic *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid* (2021-012) would soon be made available to the SC for comment.

10. Review of the standard setting calendar

[124] The SC Chairperson and Secretariat drew the attention of SC members to the standard setting calendar on the IPP, and highlighted the forthcoming meetings of the TPG and the TFT.²⁰

11. Any other business

Invited expert to Technical Panel for the Glossary

[125] The Secretariat explained that a request had been received from the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization for the former TPG expert on the Russian language, Andrei ORLINSKI, to be invited to the next TPG meeting as an invited expert. The reason for the request was to facilitate the handover from Mr ORLINSKI to the new expert on the Russian language.

[126] The SC:

- (22) *agreed* that Andrei ORLINSKI be invited to the December 2021 meeting of the TPG as an invited expert.

12. Date and type of the next SC meeting

[127] The next SC meeting is scheduled for 27–28 April 2022, to be held in virtual mode. This will be a focused meeting, reviewing the draft specifications for the topics added to the work programme by CPM-16 (2022).

13. Evaluation of the meeting process

[128] The SC Chairperson encouraged all SC members and observers to complete the evaluation of the meeting, via the link provided on the agenda for this meeting, by 3 December 2021.

14. Close of the meeting

[129] The SC Chairperson thanked all participants for their contributions and closed the meeting.

[130] As all the business was completed, the SC Chairperson closed the meeting one day earlier than scheduled, on 18 November.

²⁰ Standard Setting 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 Vice Chairperson	–	FERRO (Chairperson)
2.2	Election of the Rapporteur	–	Chairperson
2.3	Adoption of the Agenda	01_SC_Tel_2021_May	Chairperson
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1	Documents list	02_SC_Tel_2021_May	MANGILI
3.2	Participants list	03_SC_Tel_2021_May SC membership list	MANGILI
3.3	Standard Setting Unit staff	Link to standard setting staff	MANGILI
4.	Draft ISPMs for recommendation for the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) for adoption (from the second consultation)		
4.1	Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008), Priority 1 - Steward: Samuel BISHOP - Assistant Stewards: Joanne WILSON and Ezequiel FERRO	2019-008 ¹ 2019-008_OCS ²	BISHOP / MOREIRA
	o Compiled comments (including Steward's responses to comments from 2021 Consultation)	06_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	
	o Steward's notes	07_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	
	o SC-7 2021 meeting report	Link SC-7 2021 meeting report	
	o SC OCS review Compiled Comments report	Link SC OCS compiled comments	
4.2	Audit in the Phytosanitary context (2015-014), Priority 2 - Steward: Alvaro SEPULVEDA LUQUE - Assistant Steward: Steve CÔTÉ	2015-014 ¹ 2015-014_OCS ²	SEPULVEDA LUQUE / KISS
	o Compiled comments (including Steward's responses to comments from 2021 Consultation)	08_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	
	o Steward's notes	09_SC_Tel_2021_Nov_Rev1 ³	
	o SC-7 2021 meeting report	Link SC-7 2021 meeting report	
	o SC OCS review Compiled Comments report	Link SC OCS compiled comments	
4.3	Focused Revision of ISPM 12 ("re-export") (2015-011), Priority 2 - Steward: Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC - Assistant Steward: Masahiro SAI	2015-011 ¹ 2015-011_OCS ² 2015-011_OCS_Rev1 ⁴	SAI / SHAMILOV
	o Compiled comments (including Steward's responses to comments from 2021 Consultation)	10_SC_Tel_2021_Nov_Rev1 ³	
	o Steward's notes	13_SC_Tel_2021_Nov_Rev1 ³	
	o SC-7 2021 meeting report	Link SC-7 2021 meeting report	
	o SC OCS review Compiled Comments report	Link SC OCS compiled comments	
	Draft 2019 and 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001)	1994-001 ¹ 1994-001_OCS ²	

4.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steward: Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC Assistant Steward: Ebbe NORDBO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Compiled comments (including Steward's responses to comments from 2021 Consultation) o Steward's notes o SC-7 2021 meeting report 	11_SC_Tel_2021_Nov 12_SC_Tel_2021_Nov Link SC-7 2021 meeting report	NORDBO / SHAMILOV
5.	Draft Specification from first consultation for revision and approval		
5.1	Reorganization of Pest Risk Analysis standards (2020-001) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steward: Masahiro SAI Assistant Stewards: Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ and Joanne WILSON o Compiled comments (including Steward's responses to comments from 2021 Consultation) o Steward's notes o SC OCS review Compiled Comments report 	2020-001 ¹ 2020-001_OCS ² 2020-001_OCS_Rev1 ³ 04_SC_Tel_2021_Nov 05_SC_Tel_2021_Nov_Rev1 ³ Link SC OCS compiled comments	SAI/KISS
6.	Topics		
6.1	Adjustments to the List of topics and the stewards	Link to List of Topics for IPPC standards 14_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	CASSIN
7.	Summary of SC e-decisions	15_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	KISS
8.	Update from SSU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard Setting Unit (SSU) 2022 tentative work plan 	16_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	MOREIRA
9.	SC recommendations to CPM-16	-	IPPC Secretariat / Chairperson
10.	Review of the standard setting calendar	Link to the IPP calendar	MUSHEGYAN
11.	Any other business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TPG invited expert 	-	Chairperson
12.	Date and type of the next SC Meeting		Chairperson
13.	Evaluation of the meeting process	Link to survey	Chairperson
14.	Close of the meeting		Chairperson

Appendix 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
Draft ISPMs for approval for recommendation to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) for adoption (from second consultation)			
2019-008 ¹ 2019-008_OCS ²	4.1	Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008), Priority 1	2021-10-18 2021-11-05
2015-014 ¹ 2015-014_OCS ²	4.2	Audit in the Phytosanitary context (2015-014), Priority 2	2021-10-18 2021-11-05 2021-11-15
2015-011 ¹ 2015-011_OCS ² 2015-011_OCS_Rev1 ³	4.3	Focused Revision of ISPM 12 ("re-export") (2015-011), Priority 2	2021-03-11 2021-11-05 2021-11-15
1994-001 ¹	4.4	Draft 2019 and 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001)	2021-10-19
Draft Specification from first consultation for revision and approval			
2020-001 ¹ 2020-001_OCS ² 2020-001_OCS_Rev1 ³	5.1	Reorganization of Pest Risk Analysis standards (2020-001)	2021-10-11 2021-11-05 2021-11-09
Meeting documents			
01_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	2.3	Agenda	2021-10-18 2021-10-27 2021-11-05 2021-11-09
02_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	3.1	Documents list	2021-11-05 2021-11-09
03_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	3.2	Participants list	2021-11-05
04_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	5.1	2020-001: Compiled comments (including Steward's responses to comments from 2021 Consultation)	2021-10-11
05_SC_Tel_2021_Nov 05_SC_Tel_2021_Nov_Rev1 ³	5.1	2020-001: Steward's notes	2021-10-11 2021-11-09
06_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	4.1	2019-008: Compiled comments (including Steward's responses to comments from 2021 Consultation)	2021-10-18
07_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	4.1	2019-008: Steward's notes	2021-10-18
08_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	4.2	2015-014: Compiled comments (including Steward's responses to comments from 2021 Consultation)	2021-10-18
09_SC_Tel_2021_Nov 09_SC_Tel_2021_Nov_Rev1 ³	4.2	2015-014: Steward's notes	2021-10-18 2021-11-04
10_SC_Tel_2021_Nov 10_SC_Tel_2021_Nov_Rev1 ³	4.3	2015-011: Compiled comments (including Steward's responses to comments from 2021 Consultation)	2021-10-18 2021-11-15
11_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	4.4	1994-001: Compiled comments (including Steward's responses to comments from 2021 Consultation)	2021-10-19
12_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	4.4	1994-001: Steward's notes	2021-10-19
13_SC_Tel_2021_Nov 13_SC_Tel_2021_Nov_Rev1 ³	4.3	2015-011: Steward's notes	2021-10-18 2021-11-15
14_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	6.1	Adjustments to the List of topics and the stewards	2021-11-04
15_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	7	Summary of SC e-decisions	2021-11-05
16_SC_Tel_2021_Nov	8	Standard Setting Unit (SSU) 2022 tentative work plan	2021-11-08

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

Links	Agenda item	Document link
SC membership list	3.2	SC membership list
Standard Setting Unit staff	3.3	Link to standard setting staff
SC-7 2021 meeting report	4.1	Link SC-7 2021 meeting report
	4.2	
	4.3	
	4.4	
SC OCS review compiled comments report for Draft ISPM Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)	4.1	Link SC OCS compiled comments
SC OCS review compiled comments report for Draft ISPM Audit in the Phytosanitary context (2015-014)	4.2	Link SC OCS compiled comments
SC OCS review compiled comments report for Draft ISPM Focused revision of ISPM 12 ("re-export") (2015-011)	4.3	Link SC OCS compiled comments
SC OCS Review compiled comments report for Draft Specification Reorganization of Pest Risk Analysis standards (2020-001)	5.1	Link SC OCS compiled comments
Review of current List of Topics for IPPC Standards	6.1	Link to List of Topics for IPPC standards
Review of the standard setting calendar	10	Link to the IPP calendar
Evaluation of the meeting process	13	Link to survey

Appendix 3: Participants list

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address	Members hip Confirmed	Term expires
	Africa Member	Ms Alphonsine LOUHOARI TOKOZABA Ministère de l'Agriculture et del'Elevage, 24, rue KiéléTenard, Mfilou, Brazzaville, REPUBLIC OF CONGO Tel: +242 01 046 53 61 Tel: +242 04 005 57 05	louhouari@yahoo.fr A.louhouaritoko@gmail.com	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 2 nd term / 3 years	2024
✓	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
✓	Africa Member	Mr Theophilus Mwendwa MUTUI Acting Director, Technical Services Division. National Biosafety Authority, Pest Control Products Board (PCPB) Building, Loresho, off Waiyaki way P.O. Box 28251-00100 Nairobi KENYA Tel: +254 20 267 8667 Mob: +254 725 294445	mutuitm@yahoo.com	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Africa Member	Mr Prudence Tonator ATTIPOE Deputy Director, Head Plant Quarantine Division. Ministry of Food and Agriculture P.O. Box AM 94 Amasaman-Accra GHANA Tel: 0209793292, 0262235397	tonattipoe@yahoo.co.uk	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Asia Member	Ms Chonticha RAKKRAI Director, Plant Quarantine Research Group, Plant Protection Research and Development Office, Department of Agriculture, 50 Phaholyothin Rd., Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok, 10900 THAILAND Tel: (+66) 2561 2537 Fax: (+66) 2561 2146 Mob: (+66) 8 9128 6488	rakkrai@yahoo.com chonticha.r@doa.in.th	CPM-14 (2019) 1 st term / 3 years	2022
✓	Asia Member	Mr. Gerald Glenn F. PANGANIBAN Assistant Director for Operations and Administration, Bureau of Plant Industry, 692 San Andres Street, Malate, Manila, PHILIPPINES Tel: +639153141568	gfpanganiban@gmail.com gerald_glenn97@hotmail.com	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Asia Member SC-7	Mr Masahiro SAI Senior Researcher (Head of Section) Planning and Coordination Section, Research Division Yokohama Plant Protection Station	masahiro_sai670@maff.go.jp	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021)	2024

		Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) JAPAN Tel: +81-45-211-7165		2 nd term / 3 years	
✓	Asia Member	Mr Xiaodong FENG Deputy Director of the Division of Plant Quarantine, NATESC Ministry of Agriculture No. 20, Maizidian Street, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100125 CHINA Tel: (8610)59194524	fengxdong@agri.gov.cn	CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 2 nd term / 3 years	2024
✓	Europe Member	Mr Harry ARIJS European Commission, DG Sante G-1, Plant Health Rue Froissart 101, 6/60 1040 Brussels BELGIUM Tel: +3222987645	Harry.ARIJS@ec.europa.eu	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Europe Member	Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI Servizio Fitosanitario DG Agricoltura Regione Lombardia Piazza Città di Lombardia 1 20124 Milano ITALY Tel: (+39) 3666603272	mariangela_ciampitti@regione.lombardia.it	CPM-14 (2019) 1 st term / 3 years	2022
✓	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) CPM-15 (2021) 2 nd term / 3 years	2024
✓	Europe Member	Mr David OPATOWSKI Head, Plant Biosecurity, Plant Protection and Inspection Services (PPIS), P.O. Box 78, Bet Dagan, 50250 ISRAEL Tel: 972-(0)3-9681518 Mob: 972-(0)506-241885 Fax: 972-(0)3-9681571	dopatowski@yahoo.com davido@moag.gov.il	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) CPM-12 (2017) CPM-15 (2021) 4 th term / 3 years	2024
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	Mr André Felipe C. P. da SILVA Federal Inspector Quarantine Division Ministry of Agriculture, Live Stock and Food Supply BRAZIL Tel: (61) 3218-2925	andre.peralta@agricultura.gov.br	CPM-14 (2019) 1 st term / 3 years	2022
✓	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) CPM-15 (2021) 2 nd term / 3 years	2024

✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member SC Chairperson	Mr Ezequiel FERRO Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA Av. Paeso Colón 315 C.A. de Buenos Aires ARGENTINA Tel/Fax: (+5411) 4121-5091	eferro@senasa.gov.ar	CPM-14 (2019) 3 rd term / 3 years	2022
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	Mr Alvaro SEPULVEDA LUQUE Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal Av. Presidente Bulnes 140, 4 th floor, Santiago, CHILE Tel: + 56-2 234 5120	alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl	CPM-10 (2015) CPM-13 (2018) CPM-15 (2021) 3 rd term / 3 years	2024
✓	Near East Member	Ms Maryam Jalili MOGHADAM Head of Phytosanitary and Plant Quarantine Bureau, Plant Protection Organization, Agriculture Ministry. No.24, the Eastern first floor, Eastern Shahrokh Alley, Mordad Street, Golha (flowers) Square, Fatemi Square, Tehran. Postal code: 1413973143 IRAN Cel: 00989126049255	marypaya@yahoo.com jalili@ppo.ir	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Near East Member SC-7	Mr Nader ELBADRY Phytosanitary Specialist, Central Administration of Plant Quarantine, 6 Michel Bakhoum St., Dokki, Giza, EGYPT Tel: +201096799493	nader.badry@gmail.com	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
	Near East Member	Mr Imad (M.E) Jrouh Al-Awad Director Assistant of plant protection & Phytosanitary Department / Ministry of Agriculture. JORDAN Tel: 0096265686151 Ext. 309 Mob: 00962795363297	alawademad@yahoo.com	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Near East Member	Mr Mohamed Lahbib BEN JAMAA Direction of Plant Health and Control of Agricultural Inputs, 30, Rue Alain Savary, 1002- Tunis. TUNISIA Mob: +216.98.265.525	benjamaaml@gmail.com	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	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) CPM-15 (2021) 3 rd term / 3 years	2024
✓	North America Member	Mr Steve CÔTÉ National Manager, International Phytosanitary Standards Plant Import/Export Division 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 CANADA Tel: (+1) 613-773-7368 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7576	Steve.Cote@canada.ca	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024

✓	Southwest Pacific Member	Ms Joanne WILSON Principal Adviser, Risk Management Plant Imports Group Ministry for Primary Industries. NEW ZEALAND Tel: +64 489 40528 Mob: +64 2989 40528	joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz	CPM-14 (2019) 1 st term / 3 years	2022
✓	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 Mob: +61 402 313 170	sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024
✓	Southwest Pacific Member	Mr David Boas TENAKANAI General Manager- Technical & Advisory Division, National Agriculture Quarantine & Inspection Authority (NAQIA) P. O. Box 741, Port Moresby, NCD, PNG PAPUA NEW GUINEA Tel: (675) 3136900 Mob: (675) 74482319	DTenakanai@naqia.gov.pg dtenakanai@gmail.com	CPM-15 (2021) 1 st term / 3 years	2024

Role	Name	Email address
TPG English & Assistant Steward	Mr Ebbe NORDBO	ebbenordbo@outlook.com
Observer	Mr Fuyou DENG NPPO of Canada	fuyou.deng@inspection.gc.ca
Observer	Ms Stephanie DUBON NPPO of the United States of America	stephanie.m.dubon@usda.gov
Observer	Mr Ian BOOTH NPPO of the United States of America	ian.g.booth@usda.gov
Observer	Ms Melisa NEDILSKYJ NPPO of Argentina	mnedilsk@senasa.gob.ar
Observer	Mr Prateep ARAYAKITTIPONG NPPO Thailand	prateep_ming@hotmail.com
Observer	Mr Ahmed M. Abdellah ABDELMOTTALEB IC Representative	bidoeng@yahoo.com
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Avetk NERSISYAN Standard Setting Unit Lead, OiC IPPC Secretary for daily matters	Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Adriana MOREIRA Standard Setting Officer, OiC for SSU	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Artur SHAMILOV Standard Setting Officer	Artur.ShamiloV@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Erika MANGILI ANDRÉ Standard Setting Specialist	Erika.MangiliAndre@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Alejandra JIMENEZ TABARES Standard Setting Assistant	Alejandra.JimenezTabares@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Aoife CASSIN Standard Setting Associate	Aoife.Cassin@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Janka KISS Standard Setting Associate	Janka.Kiss@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Edgar MUSHEGIAN Standard Setting Associate	Edgar.Mushegian@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Karen ROUEN Report writer	karen@karenrouen.com

Appendix 4: Draft ISPM on Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008), priority 1

[1] DRAFT ISPM: Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)

[2] Status box

[3] This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
[4] Date of this document	[5] 2021-11-30
[6] Document category	[7] Draft ISPM
[8] Current document stage	[9] To CPM-16 (2022) for adoption
[10] Major stages	<p>[11] 2018-10 Focus group on commodity and pathway standards recommended adding to the work programme.</p> <p>[12] 2018-12 CPM Bureau recommended adding to the work programme.</p> <p>[13] 2019-04 CPM-14 agreed to a second meeting of focus group, to draft overarching concept standard.</p> <p>[14] 2019-06 Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards drafted ISPM.</p> <p>[15] 2019-10 Strategic Planning Group reviewed and provided comments.</p> <p>[16] 2019-11 Standards Committee (SC) reviewed and proposed changes.</p> <p>[17] 2019-12 CPM Bureau approved the draft for consultation.</p> <p>[18] 2020-06 CPM Bureau added topic <i>Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures</i> to work programme, on behalf of CPM, with priority 1 (subsequently confirmed by CPM-15 (2021)).</p> <p>[19] 2020-07 First consultation.</p> <p>[20] 2021-05 SC-7 revised and approved for second consultation.</p> <p>2021-07 Second consultation.</p> <p>2021-10 SC revised the draft via OCS.</p> <p>2021-11 SC revised and recommended the draft for adoption by CPM.</p>
[21] Steward history	<p>[22] 2020-09 SC Samuel BISHOP (GB, Lead Steward)</p> <p>[23] 2020-09 SC Joanne WILSON (NZ, Assistant Steward)</p> <p>[24] 2020-09 SC Ezequiel FERRO (AR, Assistant Steward)</p> <p>2019-07 Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards</p>
[25] Notes	<p>[26] This is a draft document</p> <p>[27] 2019-06 Focus group recommended that “pathways” be excluded</p> <p>[28] 2019-09 Edited</p> <p>[29] 2019-12 Edited</p> <p>[30] 2021-05 Edited</p> <p>2021-11 SC changed title to <i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i></p> <p>2021-11 Edited</p>

CONTENTS [to be inserted]

[31] Adoption

[32] [To be inserted following adoption].

[33] INTRODUCTION

[34] Scope

[35] This standard provides guidance on the purpose, use, content, publication and review of commodity-specific 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 lists of pests and options for phytosanitary measures identified are not intended to be exhaustive and are subject to review and revision.

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

[37]References

[38]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>.

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

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

[41]Definitions

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

[43]Outline of requirements

[44]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 their pest risk. 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, and they 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 revision.

[46]Commodity standards are presented as annexes to this standard.

[45]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.

[47]BACKGROUND

[48]The IPPC aims to protect the world's plant resources from the introduction and spread of pests and to facilitate safe trade. Significant advances in the facilitation of safe trade can be made through the development and adoption of international commodity standards for phytosanitary measures. Safe trade supports economic growth and development, helping to reduce poverty around the world.

[49]The IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 includes the development of ISPMs for specific commodities, with accompanying diagnostic protocols, phytosanitary treatments and guidance to support implementation, simplify trade and expedite market-access negotiations, when appropriate.

[50]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.

[51]The intended benefits of using commodity standards may include the following:

- [52]They may form a common basis for the development of phytosanitary import requirements;
- [53]They may facilitate market-access discussions;
- [54]They may facilitate safe trade;
- [55]They may help national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) optimize the use of their resources;

- [56] They identify and increase awareness of the measures available to manage the pest risk associated with the movement of commodities in international trade;
- [57] They identify and increase awareness of the commodity-associated pests that are commonly managed by NPPOs.

[58] Each annex lists measures for consideration as phytosanitary measures. These measures are referred to as “options for phytosanitary measures”.

[59] IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

[60] Commodity standards provide guidance on options for phytosanitary measures. Such measures may help protect the environment and preserve biodiversity by managing the pest risk posed by commodities that are moved internationally.

[61] PRINCIPLES IN RELATION TO COMMODITY STANDARDS

[62] In the context of IPPC rights and obligations, the basic principles of particular importance and relevance to commodity standards are as follows:

- [63] The sovereign authority of contracting parties, as set out in Article VII.1 of the IPPC text, to prescribe and adopt phytosanitary measures to prevent the introduction and spread of pests into their territories and therefore to determine their phytosanitary import requirements is not affected by commodity standards.
- [64] 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.
- [65] Additional obligations are not imposed on importing countries by commodity standards, over and above the obligations already identified in the IPPC.
- [66] 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, VI and VII.2(g) of the IPPC).
- [67] The lists of options for phytosanitary measures presented in commodity standards are not intended to be exhaustive; other measures may be required by contracting parties, if technically justified (Article VII.2(g) of the IPPC), and may be proposed for inclusion in revisions of commodity standards.

[68] REQUIREMENTS

[69] 1. Purpose and use of commodity standards

[70] The purpose of commodity standards is to support the development of phytosanitary import requirements that are technically justified and facilitate safe trade.

[71] 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 by importing countries 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, where applicable, another comparable examination and evaluation of available scientific information.

[72]Commodity standards are not developed when:

- [73]no effective phytosanitary measures are available;
- [74]an existing ISPM already provides sufficient guidance;
- [75]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 as described in ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*)).

[76]2. Scope and content of commodity standards

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

- [78]Scope
- [79]Description of the commodity and its intended use
- [80]List of pests associated with the commodity
- [81]Options for phytosanitary measures
- [82]References.

[83]The content of these sections is described in Table 1, together with the basis on which pests and options for phytosanitary measures are included in the standards.

Table 1. Content of commodity standards

[84]**Scope** [85]This commodity standard clearly describes the commodity (including, when relevant, the botanical name and part of the plant as well as its intended use) for which a list of associated pests and related options for phytosanitary measures are identified.

[86]**Description of the commodity and its intended use** [87]This section clearly describes the commodity, such as the plant species (botanical name), the part that is specifically being traded and its intended use. 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.

[88]**List of pests associated with the commodity** [89]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 technical justification.

[90]Inclusion of a pest in a commodity standard does not constitute technical justification for its regulation. When determining whether to regulate a pest listed in a commodity standard, an importing country should base its decision on technical justification using either a PRA or, where applicable, another comparable examination and evaluation of available scientific information.

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

[92]**Options for phytosanitary measures** [93]This section presents options for phytosanitary measures, including measures adopted in ISPMs or technically justified measures currently used in trade, and the conditions under which a measure may be applied. Individual measures or combinations of measures may be provided for each pest and may relate to any point of production or handling of the commodity before import.

[94]Although commodity standards only present options for phytosanitary 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*).

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

[96]The measures are presented together with the list of pests known to be associated with the commodity, with each measure being listed against the corresponding pest or pests whose pest risk 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.

[97]**References** [98]All sources of information on pests and options for phytosanitary measures included in the commodity standard are listed in the References section.

[99]3. Criteria for inclusion of measures in commodity standards

[100]A measure may be considered by the Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS) for inclusion in a commodity standard 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:

[101]- Experimental evidence indicates that the measure is effective.

- [102]Experience from use in international trade indicates that the measure is effective. For example:
 - [103]the measure is, or has been, used extensively;
 - [104]the measure has been successfully used to manage non-compliant consignments.
- [105]Experience from domestic use indicates that the measure is effective. For example:
 - [106]the measure has been used extensively in relation to domestic movement of commodities;
 - [107]the measure has been used successfully in outbreak management and eradication programmes;
 - [108]information from domestic plant certification schemes indicates that the measure is effective;
 - [109]best management practices for the measure are available.
- [110]The measure has been identified as a pest risk management option based on a PRA (where applicable) or on another comparable technical examination and evaluation of available scientific information, indicating that the measure is effective in mitigating pest risk.
- [111] The measure is included in an adopted ISPM which is relevant to the pest or commodity that falls within the scope of the commodity standard.
- [112]Regional standards exist that include the measure and are relevant to the pests or commodity that fall within the scope of the commodity standard.

[113]The practicality and feasibility of the measure is also taken into account by the TPCS when considering it for inclusion in a commodity standard.

[115]4. Confidence in the effectiveness of measures

[116]Options for phytosanitary measures are categorized by the TPCS according to confidence in the effectiveness of measures. Effectiveness of the measures is evaluated based on criteria developed and revised as necessary by the TPCS. Evaluation of the effectiveness may be based on:

- [117]the presence of the measure in an adopted ISPM;
- [118]the presence of the measure in a regional standard;
- [119]the history of the use of the measure by contracting parties;
- [120]the history of the use of the measure by the private sector or authorized entities;
- [121]the inclusion of the measure in a PRA;
- [122]the number of PRAs that include the measure;
- [123]the number of years that the measure has been in use;
- [124]reports of success or failure of the measure, including interception and non-compliance data;
- [125]the volume or frequency of traded commodities subjected to the measure;
- [126]the availability of quantitative or qualitative analyses pertinent to the measure;
- [127]the number and diversity of countries applying the measures.

[128]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.

[129]5. Publication of commodity standards

[130]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.

[131]6. Review and re-evaluations

[132]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. The TPCS 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 on Audit in the phytosanitary context (2015-014), priority 2

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

[2]Status box

[3]This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
[4]Date of this document	[5]2021-11-30
[6]Document category	[7]Draft ISPM
[8]Current document stage	[9]To CPM-16 (2022) for adoption
[10]Major stages	<p>[11]2015-11 Standards Committee (SC) recommended the topic be added to the work programme.</p> <p>[12]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.</p> <p>[13]2017-11 SC approved Specification 66 and recommended priority 1.</p> <p>[14]2018-04 CPM-13 approved the priority change.</p> <p>[15]2019-06 Expert working group (EWG) met and drafted the standard.</p> <p>[16]2020-04 SC revised the draft via the Online Comment System (OCS) (to replace the cancelled 2020-05 SC meeting) and approved it for first consultation via e-decision (2020_eSC_May_19).</p> <p>[17]2020-07 First consultation.</p> <p>[18]2021-05 SC-7 revised and approved for second consultation.</p> <p>[19]2021-07 Second consultation.</p> <p>2021-10 SC revised the draft via OCS.</p> <p>2021-11 SC revised and recommended the draft for adoption by CPM.</p>
[20]Steward history	<p>[21]2016-05 SC Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (CL, Lead Steward)</p> <p>[22]2020-11 SC Mr Steve CÔTÉ (CA, Assistant Steward)</p> <p>[23]2016-05 SC Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (CA, Assistant Steward)</p>
[24]Notes	<p>[25]2017-03 Topic number changed from 2015-003 to 2015-014</p> <p>[26]2019-10 Edited</p> <p>[27]2020-05 Edited</p> <p>[28]2021-06 Edited</p> <p>[29]2021-11 Edited</p>

CONTENTS [to be inserted]

[30]Adoption

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

[32]INTRODUCTION

[33]Scope

[34]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. It also covers 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.

[35]References

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

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

[38]Definitions

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

[40]Outline of requirements

[41]This standard describes the purpose and procedures for audit activities in the phytosanitary context. This includes the circumstances that may trigger an audit, the roles and responsibilities of the auditor and auditee 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.

[42]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.

[43]BACKGROUND

[44]National plant protection organizations have a number of responsibilities under the IPPC for activities in their territory such as surveillance, inspection, the conduct of pest risk analyses, the establishment of phytosanitary import requirements, phytosanitary certification, the conduct or supervision of treatments as phytosanitary measures, 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.

[45]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.

[46]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, ensure that it conforms with the requirements set by the auditing NPPO (the NPPO responsible for the audit), and evaluate whether the system or procedure is achieving the expected phytosanitary objectives.

[47]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.

[48]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.

[49]IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

[50]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.

[51]REQUIREMENTS

[52]1. Purpose of an audit

[53]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 and observations, regarding the effectiveness of the phytosanitary system or procedure being audited.

[54]An NPPO may conduct audits to verify the conformity of:

- [55]the NPPO's own systems and procedures;
- [56]the systems and procedures of entities that have been authorized by the NPPO, including entities authorized to conduct audits on behalf of the NPPO;
- [57]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*).

[58]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.

[59]2. Types of audit

[60]The main types of audit are system audits and focused audits.

[61]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 achieving 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 when necessary. The scope of a system audit may include an entire system from production to export or a system of a particular entity.

[62]A focused audit is a review of particular elements of a phytosanitary system or procedure to evaluate their effectiveness and 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 focused audit may be conducted periodically, at regular or random intervals, or as a result of certain circumstances.

[63]3. Circumstances that may trigger an audit

[64]The following are examples of circumstances that may trigger an audit:

- [65]
- [66]changes to conditions (e.g. production practices, pest status, phytosanitary import requirements, management systems or operations of a facility);
- [67]
- [68]a new import pathway;
- [69]a new export programme;
- [70]a notification of non-compliance from the NPPO of an importing country (e.g. detection of a regulated pest in an imported consignment);
- [71]a detected nonconformity that may compromise the phytosanitary system;
- [72]the implementation of corrective actions to address nonconformity;
- [73]new requests for participation in the phytosanitary system.
- [74]scheduling of a routine audit to verify conformity with the requirements of the auditing NPPO.

[75]4. Roles and responsibilities

[76]4.1 Roles

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

[78]4.2Responsibilities of an NPPO auditing in its own territory

[79]For audits in its own territory, the auditing NPPO should:

- [80]establish an audit framework and requirements for the audit process;
- [81]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;
- [82]develop contingency plans for continuity of audits in the event that an authorized entity is no longer able to conduct audit activities;
- [83]identify costs and ensure that appropriate financial arrangements are in place to meet these costs;
- [84]if nonconformities are identified, ensure that the auditee identifies and implements corrective actions to address these nonconformities within the agreed time frame; and
- [85]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.

[86]4.3 Responsibilities of an NPPO auditing in an exporting country

[87]The NPPO of an importing country conducting audits in the territory of an exporting country should:

- [88]establish an audit framework and requirements for the audit process;
- [89]reach an agreement with the NPPO of the exporting country on how the audit will be conducted, including arrangements for aspects such as the financial cost of the audit and which entities are authorized to conduct the audit; and
- [90]if nonconformities are identified, agree with the NPPO of the exporting country what corrective actions are required and within what time frame they should be completed.

[91]4.4Responsibilities of the auditor

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

- [93]develop, implement and maintain an audit programme within the audit framework established by the auditing NPPO;
- [94]identify the purpose, scope and objectives of each audit;
- [95]identify the audit criteria to be used;
- [96]prepare for and undertake audits using the agreed criteria;
- [97]prepare and finalize audit reports and provide these in a timely manner to the auditee, or to both the auditee and the auditing NPPO if the auditor is an authorized entity;
- [98]provide sufficient human resources with the required training and competence to conduct the audits;
- [99]be free of any conflict of interest and maintain impartiality and independence from the entities being audited;
- [100]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; and
- [101]maintain the confidentiality of information gained through the audit (see section 8).

[102]4.4.1 Specific responsibilities of entities authorized to conduct an audit

[103]In addition to the general responsibilities of an auditor set out at the start of section 4.4 and the responsibilities set out in ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*), authorized entities conducting an audit on behalf of an NPPO should:

- [104]conduct audits as agreed with the authorizing NPPO; and

- [105]notify the authorizing NPPO of any nonconformities as defined in section 12.

[106]4.5 Responsibilities of the auditee

[107]The auditee should be required to:

- [108]cooperate with the auditor and meet the audit requirements;
- [109]provide access to information, facilities, records and personnel necessary for the audit being conducted;
- [110]facilitate, within the auditee's country and as appropriate, the logistics associated with visits by the auditor;
- [111]develop and deliver an action plan according to the audit findings; and
- [112]develop and implement corrective actions to address nonconformities within the agreed time frame if nonconformities are identified.

[113]5. Selection of auditors

[114]Auditors should be selected based on a combination of their knowledge, training and experience pertaining to the phytosanitary system or procedure they are auditing, the audit methodology and the gathering of objective evidence.

[115]Where additional technical expertise is required, a relevant technical expert may be part of the audit team or may assist the auditor.

[116]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.

[117]6. Frequency of audits

[118]When setting up an audit programme, the auditing NPPO should determine the frequency of audits and review this frequency as appropriate. The audit frequency may be influenced by:

- [119]circumstances that may trigger an audit (see section 3);
- [120]seasonality in relation to phytosanitary activities;
- [121]the pest risk associated with relevant pests or pathways;
- [122]the history of conformity and compliance by the auditee;
- [123]whether an established, documented procedure is in place that has been shown to reduce the pest risk.

[124]7. Conflicts of interest

[125]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, 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 auditee should declare and agree that there are no conflicts of interest relating to the audit.

[126]8. Confidentiality

[127]The parties should agree and ensure an appropriate level of 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.

[128]Before the commencement of the audit, parties should discuss the intended and possible disclosure of information gathered during the audit, including the report.

[129]9. Financial arrangements

[130]Financial arrangements should be discussed and agreed upon by the parties before commencement of the audit (see also sections 4.2 and 4.3).

[131]10. Settlement of disputes

[132]The process for settlement of disputes should be established and agreed in advance of audits, as part of the audit framework.

[133]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.

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

[135]11. Steps in the audit process

[136]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.

[137]11.1 Planning an audit

[138]The planning of an audit should include the following elements:

- [139]defining and agreeing on the purpose, scope (entire system or particular elements of the system), process and objectives of the audit;
- [140]identifying the audit criteria that will be used;
- [141]identifying the auditor and the auditee; and
- [142]considering existing equivalent audit systems, or other systems developed by NPPOs or industry, as an alternative to on-site audits, where appropriate.

[143]11.1.1 Scheduling of audits

[144]Audits should be scheduled (i.e. the auditee should be notified of the date and time of the performing and evaluation stage of the audit (section 11.3.2)) by the auditing NPPO, or the authorized entity conducting the audit, in advance. 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. critical nonconformities), audits may be unscheduled.

[145]11.2 Preparing for an audit

[146]To prepare for an audit, the auditor should:

- [147]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, if available, reports on corrective actions implemented to address nonconformities;
- [148]prepare audit tools, such as checklists, reference materials, equipment and a list of possible questions;
- [149]communicate with participants (which may include notifying auditees) and confirm their availability, finalize logistics arrangements and, if relevant, agree to the language in which the audit will be conducted;
- [150]ask the auditee to ensure that personnel and relevant documentation be available during the audit; and

- [151]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 and, if relevant, the technical experts.

[152]11.3 Undertaking an audit

[153]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 its scope. The three stages are set out below, along with examples of activities that may be included.

[154]11.3.1 Initiation

[155]The activities of the auditor may include:

- [156]confirming the purpose, scope and objectives of the audit and confirming the audit criteria;
- [157]introducing the audit participants and confirming the availability of required personnel;
- [158]discussing previous audit reports, including corrective actions implemented (if applicable);
- [159]reviewing the methodology to be used in the performing and evaluation stage of the audit;
- [160]confirming if submitted documentation is current;
- [161]confirming the audit process and time frame;
- [162]informing participants about legal requirements for confidentiality and data protection.

[163]11.3.2 Performing and evaluation

[164]The activities of the auditor may include:

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

[173]11.3.3 Closure and reporting

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

- [175]discussing findings, identified nonconformities and preliminary conclusions;
- [176]requesting or providing additional clarification and feedback;
- [177]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);
- [178]reviewing the next steps and agreeing on the deadline for the presentation of the final report of the audit.

[179]An audit report should always be produced and should include the purpose, scope, objectives and findings (conformities, nonconformities and, if noted, observations) 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 audited phytosanitary system or procedure, highlight good practices, and provide useful feedback on phytosanitary regulations or requirements.

[180] 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 related to the audit and its findings should be clearly described in the report.

[181] 12. Types of nonconformity

[182] Nonconformities should be recorded, along with supporting evidence. Nonconformities may be considered as critical nonconformities or other nonconformities.

[183] “Critical nonconformity” is a nonconformity that immediately compromises the integrity of the NPPO phytosanitary system that has been audited, or its elements, and that requires a rapid corrective action to be identified and implemented.

[184] “Other nonconformity” is a nonconformity that does not directly or immediately compromise the integrity of the NPPO phytosanitary system that has been audited, or its elements, and that is therefore not considered a critical nonconformity by the auditing NPPO. Other nonconformity requires corrective action to be taken within a specified time frame.

[185] 13. Following up nonconformity

[186] 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: Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export (2015-011), priority 2

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

[2] Status box

[3] This is not an official part of the standard and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption.	
[4] Date of this document	[5] 2021-12-13
[6] Document category	[7] Draft ISPM
[8] Current document stage	[9] To CPM-16 (2022) for adoption
[10] Major stages	<p>[11] 2015-11 Standards Committee (SC) recommended that the topic be added to the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i>.</p> <p>[12] 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>[13] 2018-02 SC approved Specification 67 (<i>Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export</i>).</p> <p>[14] 2019-12 Expert working group met and drafted the standard.</p> <p>[15] 2020-04 SC revised the draft via the Online Comment System (OCS) (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>[16] 2020-07 First consultation.</p> <p>[17] 2021-05 SC-7 revised and approved for second consultation.</p> <p>2021-10 SC revised the draft via OCS.</p> <p>2021-11 SC revised and recommended the draft for adoption by CPM.</p>
[18] Steward history	<p>[19] 2016-05 SC Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (FR, Lead Steward)</p> <p>[20] 2019-05 SC Masahiro SAI (JP, Assistant Steward)</p>
[21] Notes	<p>[22] Grey text is not open for comments. Additions are indicated by <u>bolded and underlined text</u> (bolded in table of contents) and deletions by crossed through text. Changes to the order in which sentences or paragraphs appear are not shown (this only affecting section 6).</p> <p>[23] 2020-05 Edited</p> <p>[24] 2021-06 Edited</p> <p>2021-12 Edited</p>

CONTENTS [to be inserted]

[25] Adoption

[26] 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.

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

[28]INTRODUCTION

[29]Scope

[30]This standard provides the requirements and guidelines for the preparation and issuance of phytosanitary certificates¹ (phytosanitary certificates for export and phytosanitary certificates for re-export).²¹

[32]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*).

[33]References

[34]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/ispm>s.

[35]IPPC. International Plant Protection Convention. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

[36]Definitions

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

[38]Outline of requirements

[39]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.

[40]A phytosanitary certificate for export is usually issued by the NPPO of the country where the plants, plant products or **other** 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 **or contamination by pests regulated by the country of destination** and ~~complies with~~ **meets** the phytosanitary import requirements of ~~the importing~~ **that** country, and the original phytosanitary certificate or a certified copy **of the phytosanitary certificate (hereafter referred to as a “certified copy”)** is available.

[41]NPPOs shall use the model phytosanitary certificates of the IPPC.

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

[43]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.

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

[31]²¹ 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 “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.

[45] 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.

[46] ~~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 origin.²²

[48] BACKGROUND

[49] 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.

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

[51] 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.

[52] [See also ISPM 7]

[53] 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.

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

[55] 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.

[56] REQUIREMENTS FOR PHYTOSANITARY CERTIFICATION

[57] 1. Phytosanitary ~~c~~Certificates

[58] 1.1 Purpose of phytosanitary certificates

[59] 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.

[47]²² 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.

[60] 1.2 Types and forms of phytosanitary certificates

[61] 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 purposes^{2, 23}

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

[64] 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.**

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

[66] 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.

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

[68] 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).

[69] 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.

[70] 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.

[71] 1.3 Attachments to phytosanitary certificates

[72] 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

[62]²³ See Scope, footnote 1, concerning terminology.

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.

[73]1.4Electronic phytosanitary certificates

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

[75]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.

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

- [77]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.
- [78]The information provided is consistent with the IPPC model phytosanitary certificates.
- [79]The purpose of phytosanitary certification under the IPPC is realized.
- [80]The identity of the issuing NPPO can be adequately established and authenticated.

[81]1.5Mode of transmission

[82]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.

[83]1.6Duration of validity

[84]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.

[85]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 period 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.~~

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

[87]2. Actions ~~t~~Taken with ~~i~~Issued ~~p~~Phytosanitary ~~c~~Certificates

[88]2.1Certified copies of phytosanitary certificates

[89]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, 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.

[90]2.2 Replacement of phytosanitary certificates

[91]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.

[92]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.

[93]Other requirements concerning replacement of phytosanitary certificates include:

- [94]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.
- [95]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]”.

[96]2.3 Alterations to phytosanitary certificates

[97]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.

[98]3. Considerations for importing countries and NPPOs issuing phytosanitary certificates

[99]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.

[100]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*)).

[101]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*)).

[102]3.1 Unacceptable phytosanitary certificates

[103]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.

[104]3.1.1 Invalid phytosanitary certificates

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

- [106]incomplete or incorrect information
- [107>false or misleading information
- [108]conflicting or inconsistent information
- [109]wording or information that is inconsistent with the model phytosanitary certificates
- [110]information added by unauthorized persons
- [111]unauthorized (not stamped, dated or countersigned) alterations or deletions
- [112]an expired period of validity unless used as a certified copy for re-export
- [113]illegible (e.g. badly written, damaged)
- [114]non-certified copies
- [115]transmitted through a mode of transfer unauthorized by the NPPO (for electronic phytosanitary certificates)
- [116]phytosanitary certification of plants, plant products and other regulated articles prohibited for import.

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

[118]3.1.2 Fraudulent phytosanitary certificates

[119]Fraudulent phytosanitary certificates typically include those:

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

[123]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.

[124]3.2 **Phytosanitary import requirements for the preparation and issuance of phytosanitary certificates**

[125]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:

- [126]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)
- [127]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
- [128]that phytosanitary certificates be completed by typing or if handwritten, be in legible capital letters (where the language allows it)
- [129]the units of measurement to be used in the description of the consignment and for other declared quantities.

[130]4. Specific Considerations for the Preparation and Issuance of Phytosanitary Certificates

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

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

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

[134]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.

[135]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.

[136]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.

[137]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 in order to ensure compliance with the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination.~~ ~~h~~However, this may not be available on ~~a~~ **the** phytosanitary certificate for export (e.g. ~~lack of the~~ specific information for ~~the~~ **an** additional declaration ~~of a~~ **is missing on the** phytosanitary certificate for export, or a phytosanitary certificate for export itself is **was** not required **at import** 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 support any subsequent re-export process as follows: the following may apply:**

- [138]Where ~~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, **upon request by the NPPO of the re-exporting country or by exporters,** 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).
- [139]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 **upon request by exporters.** 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.

[140]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.~~

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

- [142]the phytosanitary security of the consignment has been assured, and

- [143]the NPPO of the exporting country has undertaken sampling, inspection and treatments necessary to satisfy phytosanitary import requirements before dispatch of the consignment.

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

[145]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.

[146]**5. Guidelines and Requirements for Completing Sections of a Phytosanitary Certificate for Export**

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

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

[149]**No.** _____

[150]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.

[151]**Plant Protection Organization of** _____

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

[153]**TO: Plant Protection Organization(s) of** _____

[154]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.

[155]-----

[156]**I. Description of Consignment**

[157]**Name and address of exporter:** _____

[158]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.

[159]**Declared name and address of consignee:** _____

[160]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.

[161]**Number and description of packages:** _____

[162]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.

[163]Distinguishing marks: _____

[164]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.

[165]Place of origin: _____

[166]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 **pests** regulated ~~pests~~ **by the country of destination**. 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.

[167]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 **pests** regulated ~~pests~~ **by the country of destination, this new place should also be declared under the place of origin section.** ~~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 or treated, thereby a commodity that results in removing possible infestation or contamination, this new place should also be declared under the place of origin section.** ~~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)”.

[168]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.

[169]If different lots within a consignment originate in different places or countries, all countries and, **where necessary, all** places ~~where necessary~~ 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.

[170]Declared means of conveyance: _____

[171]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.

[172]Declared point of entry: _____

[173]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.

[174]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.

[175]**Name of produce and quantity declared:** _____

[176]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.

[177]**Botanical name of plants:** _____

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

[179]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.

[180]**Certifying statement**

[181]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.

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

[183]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.

[184]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.

[185]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.

[186]“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.

[187]“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.

[188] 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.

[189] “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).

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

[191] -----

[192] II. Additional Declaration

[193] 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.

[194] 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.

[195] 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.

[196] 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.

[197] Where a phytosanitary certificate for export is issued after **dispatch of** 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).

[198] 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”.

[199] -----

[200] III. Disinfestation and/or Disinfection Treatment

[201] Entries should be as follows:

[202] Date

[203] 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.

[204]Treatment

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

[206]Chemical (active ingredient)

[207]The active ingredient of the chemical applied in the treatment.

[208]Duration and temperature

[209]The duration of the treatment and temperature in the treatment.

[210]Concentration

[211]The concentration and dosage of the treatment applied.

[212]Additional information

[213]Any relevant additional information.

[214]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.

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

[216]-----

[217]Stamp of organization

[218]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.

[219]Name of authorized officer, date and signature

[220]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.

[221]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.

[222]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.

[223]Financial liability statement

[224]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.

[225]6. Considerations for re-export situations and Transit**[226]6.1 Considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export**

[227]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.

[228] 6.1 Considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export

[229] 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-export ~~(see model in Annex 2)~~. **only if all of the following requirements are met:**

- [230] **All the plants, plant products or other regulated articles of the consignment for re-export have been imported.**
- [231] **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).**
- [232] **The plants, plant products or other regulated articles of the consignment for re-export have not been grown, or processed to change their nature,²⁴ in the country of re-export.**
- [234] **The consignment has not been infested or contaminated by pests regulated by the country of destination.**

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

[236] 6.1.1 Examination of the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination

[237] 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 can be 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.

[238] 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:

- [239] ~~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.~~
- [240] ~~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.~~

[241] The country of destination **re-export** may have **not be able to meet some of the** phytosanitary import requirements (e.g. growing season inspection, soil testing) ~~that cannot be fulfilled by~~ **of** the country of re-export **destination. However** ~~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:~~

- [242] ~~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~~

[233]²⁴ **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.**

- ~~[243]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.

[244]6.1.2 Repacking, reloading, storing, splitting or combining consignments

~~[245]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 by pests **regulated by the country of destination. If a 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 pests regulated by the country of destination.**

~~[246]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.

~~[247]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.**

[248]6.1.3 General considerations

~~[249]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, **repacking, reloading, storing**age) of the consignment in the country of re-export.

~~[250]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.~~

~~[251]The phytosanitary certificate for re-export shall be signed only after it is duly completed.~~

~~[252]The original phytosanitary certificate~~ **for export** ~~or its~~ certified copy should accompany the consignment together with the phytosanitary certificate for re-export.

~~[253]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.~~

[254]6.2 Considerations for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for export in certain re-export cases

~~[255]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.~~

~~[256]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~~ **may** 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.

~~[257]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.~~

[258]The NPPO of the re-exporting country may attach the original phytosanitary certificate, or a certified copy thereof, if it contains information that was used to complete the phytosanitary certificate for export. In this case, the number of the 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.

[259]6.3 Other considerations for re-export situations

~~[260]When re-exports routinely occur, or are started, suitable procedures for satisfying these~~ **the phytosanitary import requirements of both the country of re-export 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.

[261]6.27. Considerations for t-Transit

~~[262]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*)).~~

~~[263]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.~~

~~[264]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.~~

~~[265]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.~~

~~[266]~~

~~[267]~~

[268] This annex is a prescriptive part of the standard.

[269] **ANNEX 1: Model phytosanitary certificate for export**

[270] *[Original annexed to the IPPC]*

[271] No. _____

[272] Plant Protection Organization of _____

[273] TO: Plant Protection Organization(s) of _____

[274] **I. Description of Consignment**

[275] Name and address of exporter: _____

[276] Declared name and address of consignee: _____

[277] Number and description of packages: _____

[278] Distinguishing marks: _____

[279] Place of origin: _____

[280] Declared means of conveyance: _____

[281] Declared point of entry: _____

[282] Name of produce and quantity declared: _____

[283] Botanical name of plants: _____

[284] 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.

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

[286] **II. Additional Declaration**

[287] [Enter text here]

[288] **III. Disinfestation and/or Disinfection Treatment**

[289] Date _____ Treatment _____ Chemical (active ingredient) _____

[290] Duration and temperature _____

[291] Concentration _____

[292] Additional information _____

[293] _____

[294] Place of issue _____

[295] (Stamp of Organization) Name of authorized officer _____

[296] Date _____

[297] (Signature)

[298] _____

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

[300] *Optional clause

[301] This annex is a prescriptive part of the standard.

[302] **ANNEX 2: Model phytosanitary certificate for re-export**

[303] *[Original annexed to the IPPC]*

[304] No. _____

[305] Plant Protection Organization of _____ (contracting party of re-export)

[306] TO: Plant Protection Organization(s) of _____ (contracting party(ies) of import)

[307] **I. Description of Consignment**

[308] Name and address of exporter: _____

[309] Declared name and address of consignee: _____

[310] Number and description of packages: _____

[311] Distinguishing marks: _____

[312] Place of origin: _____

[313] Declared means of conveyance: _____

[314] Declared point of entry: _____

[315] Name of produce and quantity declared: _____

[316] Botanical name of plants: _____

[317] 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.

[318] *Insert tick in appropriate ☐ boxes

[319] **II. Additional Declaration**

[320] [Enter text here]

[321] **III. Disinfestation and/or Disinfection Treatment**

[322] Date _____ Treatment _____ Chemical (active ingredient) _____

[323] Duration and temperature _____

[324] Concentration _____

[325] Additional information _____

[326] _____

[327] Place of issue _____

[328] (Stamp of Organization) Name of authorized officer _____

[329] Date _____

[330] (Signature)

[331] _____

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

[333] **Optional _____ clause

[334] 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.

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

[336] **Introduction**

[337] 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.

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

[339] 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.

[340] This appendix provides guidance on these elements and refers to a page on the IPPC website²⁵ 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.

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

[343] **1. XML message structure**

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

[345] 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.

[346] 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*).

[347] **2. XML schema contents**

[348] 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.

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

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

[351] 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.

[341]²⁵ <http://www.ippc.int/en/ephyto/ephyto-technical-information/>

[352]The process for maintaining and updating the lists of harmonized terms is being developed and will be described on the IPPC website²⁵ NPPOs will be requested to submit proposals for new harmonized terms using this process.

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

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

[355]2.1 Country names

[356]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.

[357]2.2 Scientific names of plants and pests

[358]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.

[359]2.3 Description of consignment

[360]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*).

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

- [362]weight, volume and height (which is encouraged to be described using UNECE Recommendation 20 (*Link 10*))
- [363]declared means of conveyance (which is encouraged to be described using UNECE Recommendation 19 (*Link 15*))
- [364]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*)).

[365]2.4 Treatments

[366]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*).

[367]2.5 Additional declarations

[368]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.

[369]2.6 Name of authorized officer

[370]The name of the authorized officer issuing the electronic phytosanitary certificates should be included in each type of electronic phytosanitary certificate.

[371]3. Secure ~~d~~Data ~~e~~Exchange ~~m~~Mechanisms

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

[373] 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.

[374] 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.

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

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

[377] 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.

[378] **4. Electronic phytosanitary certificate for re-export**

[379] 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.

[380] **4.1 Electronic phytosanitary certificate for re-export with original phytosanitary certificate for export in electronic form**

[381] 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.

[382] **4.2 Electronic phytosanitary certificate for re-export with original phytosanitary certificate in paper form**

[383] 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.

[384] **4.3 Paper phytosanitary certificate for re-export with original phytosanitary certificate in electronic form**

[385] 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.

[386] **5. Management of electronic phytosanitary certificates issued by NPPOs**

[387] **5.1 Retrieval issues**

[388] 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.

[389]5.2 Alteration and replacement

[390]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.

[391]5.3 Cancelled dispatch

[392]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.

[393]5.4 Certified copy

[394]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.

[395]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.

[396]6. Declared ~~n~~Name and ~~a~~Address of ~~c~~Consignee

[397]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.

[398]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.

[399]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.

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

[401] APPENDIX 2: Recommended wording for additional declarations

[402] 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.

[403] 1. The consignment* was inspected and found free from _____ (name of pest(s) or soil [*to be specified*]).

[404] 2. The consignment* was tested (method may be specified) and found free from _____ (name of pest(s)).

[405] 3. The growing media in which the plants were grown was tested prior to planting and found free from _____ (name of pest(s)).

[406] 4. _____ (Name of pest(s)) is absent/not known to occur in _____ (name of country/area).

[407] 5. The consignment* was produced in a

[408] _____ pest free area for _____ (name of pest(s))**

[409] _____ area of low pest prevalence for _____ (name of pest(s))

[410] _____ pest free place of production for _____ (name of pest(s))**

[411] _____ pest free production site for _____ (name of pest(s))**.

[412] 6. The place of production**/production site/field** was inspected during the growing season(s)*** and found free from _____ (name of pest(s)).

[413] 7. The plants/mother plants were inspected during the last growing season(s) *** and found free from _____ (name of pest(s)).

[414] 8. The plants were produced *in vitro* (specify the *in vitro* technique) and found free from _____ (name of pest(s)).

[415] 9. The plants were derived from mother plants that were tested (method may be specified) and found free from _____ (name of pest(s)).

[416] 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).

[417] 11. This consignment was produced from plant varieties resistant to _____ (name of pest).

[418] 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)).

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

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

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

Appendix 7: Draft Specification on Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001)**SPECIFICATION 72****Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards***(Approved 2021, published 2021)***Title**

Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001).

Reason for the reorganization and revision of the standards

Pest risk analysis (PRA) is a core process within the scope of the IPPC and an important science-based evaluation tool for national plant protection organizations (NPPOs). It is used to identify pests of concern, determine whether pests qualify as regulated pests, and identify the options for phytosanitary measures that are appropriate to manage the risk of introduction and spread of pests in a specified PRA area. Guidance for NPPOs on the evaluation of technical, scientific and economic evidence to justify their decisions is currently provided in ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*, adopted in 1995, revised in 2007) and ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*, adopted in 2001, revised in 2003, 2004 and 2013).

ISPM 2 describes the overall process of PRA, with a particular focus on the initiation stage (Stage 1 of the PRA process). ISPM 11 describes the factors to consider when conducting a PRA to determine if a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest. The emphasis in ISPM 11 is on the integrated process to be used for pest risk assessment as well as on the selection of pest risk management options (Stages 2 and 3, respectively, of the PRA process). In addition, ISPM 11 includes guidance on the analysis of risks posed by pests to the environment and biological diversity, the evaluation of potential risks to plants and plant products posed by living modified organisms, and the conduct of PRA for plants as quarantine pests.

The reorganization and revision of the standards related to PRA was proposed following discussions on the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) (in development). The following aspects were identified:

- the need to strengthen the draft ISPM with appropriate guidance on pest risk management;
- the need to integrate PRA standards for quarantine pests (ISPM 2, ISPM 11 and the draft ISPM on pest risk management) into one standard to avoid redundancy and ensure consistency.

The Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) Bureau discussed the reorganization of PRA standards for quarantine pests and recommended that they should be combined into one overarching

standard on the PRA process, with an annex for each stage of PRA.²⁶ This approach is considered the best because it will ensure that PRA is viewed as an integrated process composed of three different stages (each supported by a more comprehensive annex) and it will facilitate the conduct of PRA, thereby making the PRA process more effective.

Scope

This standard should establish a conceptual framework for PRA for quarantine pests within the scope of the IPPC and provide guidance on the PRA process.

General guidance on the PRA process and aspects common to all PRA stages (e.g. information gathering, documentation, pest risk communication) should be provided in the core text of the standard and detailed guidance on each stage of PRA (Stage 1, initiation; Stage 2, pest risk assessment; Stage 3, pest risk management) should be consolidated in the annexes to the standard: one annex for each stage. Pest risk analysis is not necessarily a linear process because, in conducting the entire analysis, it may be necessary to go back and forth between the different stages. Dividing the PRA process into annexes will not change this concept.

The standard should include general guidance on pest risk management, such as criteria related to the relationship between the pest risk and the strength of phytosanitary measures, applying phytosanitary measures that have the minimum negative impact, harmonization, and equivalence of phytosanitary measures (as in ISPM 1 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*) and ISPM 24 (*Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures*)).

Guidance on the analysis of risks posed by pests to the environment and biological diversity, the evaluation of potential risks to plants and plant products posed by living modified organisms, and the conduct of PRA for plants as quarantine pests should also be included in the standard.

The standard should not include guidance on regulated non-quarantine pests, which is provided in ISPM 21 (*Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*).

Purpose

The purpose of the reorganization and revision is to streamline and align the concepts of ISPM 2 and ISPM 11. This will bring greater consistency to the different stages of the PRA process – initiation, pest risk assessment and pest risk management– and support the relationship between the pest risk identified through pest risk assessment and the strength of the corresponding options for phytosanitary measures identified through pest risk management.

The reorganization and revision will be achieved by combining, and revising where relevant, ISPM 2, ISPM 11 and the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) (in development) into one standard. Redundant and repetitive text may be removed but the substantive guidance should remain.

The reorganized and revised guidance on the PRA process will help NPPOs to conduct PRA more effectively.

Tasks

The expert working group (EWG) should undertake the following tasks:

- (23) Integrate the sections of ISPM 2 and ISPM 11 that are relevant to the three stages of PRA, together with the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001), into one overarching standard outlining the main concepts of the IPPC framework on PRA, with more comprehensive guidance provided in annexes to the standard (one annex for each stage of the

²⁶ CPM Bureau 2020-07 (virtual meeting), agenda item 9.2 (<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/88659/>). The CPM Bureau, noting advice from the FAO Legal Counsel, acted on behalf of the CPM in 2020 as the CPM meeting had to be postponed because of the global COVID-19 pandemic.

PRA process). Refer to the following outline as a proposed starting point for EWG discussion and drafting:

- Core text of the standard. The overarching framework for PRA should:
 - include the current Background section and section 3 (Aspects common to all PRA stages) of ISPM 2 and other pertinent sections of ISPM 2,
 - include the current Annex 1 (Comments on the scope of the IPPC in regard to environmental risks), Annex 2 (Comments on the scope of the IPPC in regard to pest risk analysis for living modified organisms), Annex 3 (Determining the potential for a living modified organism to be a pest) and the Introduction and Plants as pests sections of the current Annex 4 (Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests) to ISPM 11,
 - maintain the original intent of the text, but with streamlined descriptions (the original text being modified where needed in line with the structure of this reorganized standard, but without substantially revising the original requirements and guidance);
 - (New) Annex 1 – Stage 1 of PRA (initiation) should:
 - combine section 1 of ISPM 2 and section 1 of ISPM 11,
 - include Stage 1 of the current Annex 4 to ISPM 11,
 - involve no substantial revision of the original requirements and guidance relating to Stage 1 (as the revision is focusing on modification of the text for proper alignment with the structure of the new annex);
 - (New) Annex 2 – Stage 2 of PRA (pest risk assessment) should:
 - combine section 2.2 of ISPM 2 and section 2 of ISPM 11,
 - include Stage 2 of the current Annex 4 to ISPM 11,
 - maintain the original intent of ISPM 2 and ISPM 11 but with streamlined descriptions (as the revision is focusing on modification of the text for proper alignment with the structure of the new annex, with no substantial revision of the original requirements and guidance relating to Stage 2 expected);(New) Annex 3 – Stage 3 of PRA (pest risk management) should:
 - align elements of section 2.3 of ISPM 2, section 3 of ISPM 11 and the draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) (Specification 63 (*Guidance on pest risk management*)), considering the discussion points of the Standards Committee (SC) regarding the latter draft,
- (24) Include Stage 3 of the current Annex 4 to ISPM 11.If any parts of the original requirements and guidance relating to Stages 1 (initiation) and 2 (pest risk assessment) in ISPM 2 and ISPM 11 require revision that is beyond the scope of this specification, identify the parts that need more clarity or improvement and propose a short outline of the review required that may serve as a reference for addressing these parts in future outside the EWG.
- (25) Consider implementation of the revised standard by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the SC.
- (26) Consider whether the revised standard could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft standard.
- (27) Review all references to ISPM 2 and ISPM 11 in other ISPMs to ensure that they are still relevant and propose consequential changes if necessary. Review all references to other ISPMs in the revised standard and amend as necessary.

The EWG may choose how best to organize its tasks, including – if it sees fit – assigning small groups of EWG members to work on specific parts of the standard.

Provision of resources

Funding for the meeting may be provided from sources other than the regular programme of the IPPC (FAO). As recommended by ICPM-2 (1999), whenever possible, those participating in standard setting activities voluntarily fund their travel and subsistence to attend meetings. Participants may request financial assistance, with the understanding that resources are limited and the priority for financial assistance is given to developing country participants. Please refer to the *Criteria used for prioritizing participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat* posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) (see <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/>).

Collaborator

To be determined.

Steward

Please refer to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* posted on the IPP (see <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards>).

Expertise

Experts who, collectively, have knowledge in:

- pest risk assessment, preferably with experience in using or conducting PRA according to ISPM 2 and ISPM 11;
- pest risk management, including experience in evaluating and selecting pest risk management options according to the pest risk identified through the pest risk assessment;
- pest risk communication.

Participants

Eight to ten experts. In addition, at least one former member of the EWG on Guidance on Pest Risk Management (2014-001) and a member of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee should be invited as invited experts. The Assistant Stewards may also be invited to participate.

References

The IPPC, relevant ISPMs and other national, regional and international standards and agreements as may be applicable to the tasks, and discussion papers submitted in relation to this work.

ISPM 1. 2016. *Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

ISPM 2. 2019. *Framework for pest risk analysis*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

ISPM 5. *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

ISPM 11. 2019. *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

ISPM 24. 2017. *Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

Specification 63. 2015. *Guidance on pest risk management*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

Discussion papers

Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) for consideration by the EWG.

The draft ISPM on *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) (both the version drafted by the EWG and the one revised by the SC) and the “Detailed breakdown of sections of PRA related ISPMs”²⁷ should also be considered.

²⁷ SC 2021-04 (agenda item 4.1), paper 2020-001, Appendix 1.

Publication history

This is not an official part of the specification

2020-07 CPM Bureau added topic *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (subsequently confirmed by CPM-15 (2021)).

2020-07 Standards Committee (SC) decided to open an e-forum to discuss and draft the specification for the topic (2020_eSC_Nov_09).

2020-10 SC commented on the draft specification via e-decision (2020_eSC_Nov_09).

2020-11 SC reviewed the draft specification.

2021-02 SC revised the draft specification via the Online Comment System (OCS).

2021-04 SC revised the draft and approved for consultation.

2021-07 Consultation.

2021-10 Steward revised the draft based on consultation comments and SC commented on the revised draft via the OCS.

2021-11 SC revised and approved the specification.

Specification 72. 2021. *Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards*. Rome, IPPC Secretariat, FAO.

Publication history last updated: 2021-11

Appendix 8: Draft 2019 and 2020 amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)

DRAFT 2019 AND 2020 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)

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.

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.

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.

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.

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)

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.

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.

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*.

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.

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 operation 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”)

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.

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.

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]
-------------------------	---

Appendix 9: Summary of SC e-decisions

E-decision number	SC decision	SC members commenting in the forum	Polls (yes/no)
2021_eSC_Nov_01	Selection of experts for the EWG on the Annex Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (<i>International movement of seeds</i>)	19	

2021_eSC_May_01: Selection of experts for the EWG on the Annex Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*)

Summary of SC e-forum discussion

- [131] During the SC e-decision (2021_eSC_Nov_01) the SC was invited to consider the nominations and *select* five to seven member(s) and one invited expert for the EWG on the Annex to ISPM 38: Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009).
- [132] The SC e-forum was open from 27 August to 10 September 2021. 19 SC members provided comments and indicated which experts they thought were most suitable to perform the tasks of the EWG.

SC e-decision

- [133] Based on the forum discussion the SC selected the following 7 members and 1 invited expert for the EWG:
- (1) Ms Melisa NEDILSKYJ
 - (2) Ms Valerie GRIMAUULT
 - (3) Mr John RANDALL
 - (4) Ms Nancy OSTERBAUER
 - (5) Mr Hiroshi UEMATSU
 - (6) Mr Phumudzo TSHIKHUDO
 - (7) Mr Martijn SCHENK
 - (8) Ms Merel LANGENS

Appendix 10: Update from SSU - Standard Setting Unit (SSU) 2022 tentative work plan

Quarter	Date	Activity	Venue	Category
1 st	05 Dec 2021 – 15 Jan 2022	Tentative: Expert consultation on draft diagnostic protocols	-	Expert input: Drafting standards
	05 January – 20 Feb 2022	DP notification period	-	Adoption of ISPMs
	15 Jan – 15 Feb	Tentative: Expert consultation on draft diagnostic protocols	-	Expert input: Drafting standards
	17 – 28 January	EWG on the Annex to ISPM 37	Virtual meeting	Expert input: Drafting standards
	1 February	Call for experts for the PRA reorganization	-	Call
	16 February	Tentative webinar: IPPC commodity standards	Virtual	Other
	February	Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP)	Virtual meeting	Expert input: Drafting standards
	February	Technical Panel on Phytosanitary treatments (TPPT) – to address comments on ISPM 18 and PTs from first consultation	Virtual meeting	Expert input: Drafting standards
	01 March	Posting draft ISPMs to SC May (available to Contracting Parties and SC)	-	Governance
	15 March 2022	Objection period for adoption of ISPMs closure (“3 weeks prior”)	-	Governance
	16 March	Tentative webinar: IPPC Standard Setting process - An overview	Virtual	Other
	March	Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP)	Virtual meeting	Expert input: Drafting standards
	March	Technical Panel on Phytosanitary treatments (TPPT) – approval of PTs for first consultation	Virtual meeting	Expert input: Drafting standards
	30 March	CPM Bureau	Virtual	Governance
	05 and 07 April	CPM-16	Virtual	Governance
	21 April	CPM-16 (Final session and adoption of the report)	Virtual	Governance
	27-28 April	Tentative - SC Focused Meeting (to discuss draft Specifications)	Virtual	Governance
2 nd	09-13 May	Standards Committee (SC)	Virtual meeting	Governance
	09-13 May	Tentative - International Plant Health Conference	TBD	Other
	16-20 May	Standards Committee working group (SC-7)	Virtual meeting	Governance
	01 June	Tentative webinar: The importance of correct pest diagnosis and the role of diagnostic protocols	Virtual	Other
	June	Tentative – EWG on PRA reorganization	TBD	Expert input: Drafting standards
	29 June	Tentative webinar on Food and Other aid and the IPPC community: why and how to get involved	Virtual	Other
3 rd	01 July – 30 September	Consultation period on draft ISPMs and CPM Recommendations	-	Consultation period
	13-14 July	Tentative – SC focused meeting	Virtual meeting	Governance

	01 July – 30 August	Consultation period on draft specifications	-	Consultation period
	July	Tentative – Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP)	TBD	Expert input: Drafting standards
	July	Tentative – Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT)	TBD	Expert input: Drafting standards
	24 -28 August	IPPC Regional Workshops	(various)	Expert input / Capacity development
	31 Aug – 04 September	IPPC Regional Workshops	(various)	Expert input / Capacity development
	28-29 September	Tentative – SC focused meeting	Virtual meeting	Governance
	27-30 September	Tentative - Phytosanitary Measures Research Group (PMRG)	TBC (Rome, IT (FAO HQ))	External meeting: Liaison and support
4 th	October	Tentative – EWG Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (Annex to ISPM 39: International movement of wood) 2015-004	TBD	Expert input: Drafting standards
	11-14 October	Tentative - Strategic Planning Group	Virtual meeting	Other
	October	Technical Panel on Phytosanitary treatments (TPPT) – to address comments on PTs from second consultation	Virtual meeting	Expert input: Drafting standards
	14-18 November	Standards Committee (SC)	Rome, IT (FAO HQ)	Governance
	December	Tentative – Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG)	Rome, IT (FAO HQ)	Expert input: Drafting standards