

January 2013



منظمة الأغذية
والزراعة للأمم
المتحدة

联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food and
Agriculture
Organization
of the
United Nations

Organisation des
Nations Unies
pour
l'alimentation
et l'agriculture

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная
организация
Объединенных
Наций

Organización
de las
Naciones Unidas
para la
Alimentación y la
Agricultura

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Eighth Session
Rome, 8-12 April 2013
Issues relating to the IPPC standard setting process
Agenda item 8.1.8
Prepared by IPPC Secretariat

I. Introduction

1. This document covers the following issues relating to the standard setting process:
 - 1) Implementation update on the new IPPC standard setting process
 - 2) Relationship between International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) and standards created by other organizations
 - 3) Request from the Standards Committee (SC) for a CPM decision on implementation issues
 - 4) Copublishing agreements

II. Implementation update on the new standard setting process

2. The standard setting group of the IPPC Secretariat has begun implementing the new standard setting process¹ and provides the following update on the CPM-7 (2012) decisions on improving the standard setting process²:
3. Decisions 1, 3, 4-7, 10-13, 19 and 23-24 have all been implemented. Other decisions are being implemented gradually, as detailed below.

¹ CPM-7 (2012) Meeting Report: <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13330>. See Appendix 5.

² CPM-7 (2012) Meeting Report: <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13330>. See Appendix 4.

- Decision 2 has been partly implemented and the Secretariat has invited the SC to find a solution to the coordination within regions for reviewing comments made during the substantial concerns commenting period (SCCP).
- Decision 8 is interpreted as intending that only drafts from the Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) are submitted to the SCCP, whereas diagnostic protocols (DPs) and phytosanitary treatments (PTs) are not.
- Decision 9: A process will be needed when the first DP is presented under the new process.
- Decision 14 will be addressed after the biennial call for topics of 2013.
- Decision 15: Regarding a task force, no resources are available and the SC has been encouraged to advocate for funding for the implementation of this decision.
- Decision 16: The Secretariat advises that it is already a challenge to find stewards for all topics and this decision to select assistant stewards could increase the complexity of the standard setting process. The SC will try to apply this decision when it reviews the List of Topics for IPPC standards and assigns stewards.
- Decision 17: A training manual for new SC members has been initiated and the Secretariat suggests also initiating a mentorship programme, pairing experienced and new SC members, each from different regions.
- Decision 18: SC members were encouraged to assign one or more members to coordinate with national and regional plant protection organizations (NPPOs and RPPOs) in their region.
- Decision 20: No call for an editorial team has been made so far.
- Decision 21: Regarding whether regions should stagger membership of the SC, it is a regional decision to be implemented when regions nominate SC members.
- Decision 22 will need to be addressed in the future.

A. Stage 1 – Developing the List of topics for IPPC standards

4. The List of topics for IPPC standards includes:
 - Technical areas (technical panels (TPs))
 - Topics (including DP and PT topics such as bacteria and irradiation treatments)
 - Subjects (diagnostic protocols (DPs), phytosanitary treatments (PTs) and glossary terms)
5. In general, these are all referred to as “topics”. The Secretariat will compile topic submissions, publish them on the IPP and present them to the SC for review (not to the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) as done in the past). Also the SC and TPs can submit topics, but they would have to also complete the submission form, and submit a draft specification and literature review.
6. The standard setting process does not provide dates for the call for topics, but the Secretariat is considering making biennial calls for topics from June to the end of July.

B. Stage 2 - drafting

7. The member consultation on draft specifications (60 days) is likely to commence after the SC meeting and last until the end July. The Secretariat will strive to provide draft specifications for member consultation in English, French and Spanish. This should help increase engagement as the initial stage of standard development of a topic is crucial.
8. IPPC members will be notified, via a news item on the IPP, on the several steps in the drafting process, including calls for experts, selection of experts, member consultation, posting of compiled comments, etc. The results of the calls (e.g. selected nominations) and consultations (e.g. compiled comments) will also be posted on the IPP.

C. Stage 3 - Member consultation

9. For draft ISPMs, the member consultation (150 days) will be from 1 July to 30 November. The start of the member consultation may be subject to change if the Secretariat considers that there is not enough time to process the two types of standards (those for member consultation and those for SCCP) in the same period.
10. For ISPMs (not including PTs and DPs), the comments are compiled and forwarded to the steward, who reviews the comments, provides responses and prepares a revised draft ISPM. These are posted as SC-7 documents by 1 March and are also available to SC members.
11. SC-7 versions of draft ISPMs are submitted to the SCCP (120 days) from 1 June to 30 September. Because these versions were previously SC documents only, they were posted in the SC restricted work area on the IPP. Now the SCCP drafts will be posted on the IPPC Online Comment System (OCS)³ and made available to NPPOs and RPPOs who log into the OCS.
12. In 2013, when the SCCP ends, SC members will review comments from their region to decide which comments are the most important and forward them to the stewards; this regional review will be carried out via the OCS. For each region, it will be the SC-7 members (or another designated SC member of the same region, if this is communicated to the Secretariat in advance), that will decide on the final selection of the most important comments for their region.
13. Comments on DPs are submitted to the TPDP discipline lead and comments on PTs are submitted to the TPPT treatment lead, who reviews the comments, provides responses and revises the drafts, which are then sent to the respective TP. Following review by the relevant TP, DPs and PTs are sent to the SC for e-decision and, once approved by the SC, are posted on the IPP. PTs are recommended to the CPM for adoption; DPs are subject to a 45-day formal objection period, and, if no objections are received, they are adopted by the SC on behalf of the CPM.
14. Concerns have been raised by the SC that contracting parties do not get the possibility to review PTs and DPs in the SCCP before the adoption stage. However, the Secretariat clarified that this process is unchanged from the past, because DPs and TP were previously submitted to the SC by e-decision and were not presented at the SC meeting as SC papers. They were therefore not made available to NPPOs or RPPOs.
15. The SC Chair noted that having SCCP comments beforehand made discussion in the SC more structured compared to previous sessions.

D. Stage 4 - adoption

16. The new process enforces the concept that there should be no drafting of ISPMs at CPM.
17. For DPs, the SC decided that should there be repeated formal objections, the SC may propose to CPM that it should move to a vote.
18. The Secretariat noted that there are no direct changes to the language review group (LRG) process, but that LRGs are experiencing increasing challenges to maintain a coordinator and meet established deadlines. A member who is part of the LRG for French suggested that the challenges for the LRGs are connected to the amount of time needed to solve language preferences issues.
19. The CPM is invited to:
- 1) *note* the current status of the implementation of the standard setting process adopted at CPM-7 (2012)
 - 2) *comment* on the usefulness of the new substantial concerns commenting period (SCCP)
 - 3) *provide* suggestions to facilitate the implementation of the new standard setting process.

³ <http://ocs.ippc.int/>

III. Relationship between ISPMs and standards created by other organizations

A. Background

20. At its June 2012 meeting, the Bureau discussed the relationship between International Standards Organization (ISO) standards and ISPMs, agreeing that ISO standards are not mandatory, are not applied by all countries, and are not required to fulfil trade obligations. The Bureau discussed how to handle standards created by other organizations.

21. The Bureau was informed that other organizations produce standards similar to ISPMs (e.g. the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Seed potato standard) and the Bureau asked the Secretariat to follow up with these organizations as, in some cases, these standards were being referred to as international standards.

22. The Bureau asked the Secretariat to contact ISO to clarify the relationship between the two organizations, as well as with other regional and private standard setting groups.

23. In addition, the Bureau:

- 1) *decided the SC should advise its members to go back to their respective regions and advise CPs in their regions to ask other standard-setting organizations to stop producing confusing guidance*
- 2) *asked the Secretariat to ensure a consistent message stating that ISO standards are not mandatory for the implementation of ISPMs and to include an item under which this message could be passed on in the agendas of the regional workshops to review draft standards, and.*
- 3) *asked the Secretariat to maintain contacts and liaison with other organizations producing standards with possible conflicts with ISPMs.*

24. At its November 2012 meeting, the SC considered the Bureau's proposals. The IPPC Coordinator noted that part of the discussion arose from the belief in some countries that ISPMs cannot be implemented without first implementing ISO standards. The Bureau had proposed that the SC play a part in ensuring that there is no confusion on these types of regional standards.

25. One SC member noted that the important message to be sent to contracting parties was that ISPMs take precedence in the field of phytosanitary matters and should be followed; this should also be clarified to CPM.

26. One member questioned the role of SC members in ensuring communication with contracting parties in their regions on this type of issue. However, if SC members had this role, it would be clearer if one member per region was responsible. The Secretariat noted that the CPM-7 (2012) has already encouraged regional coordination by SC members of a same region to ensure communication with countries in the region⁴. The SC Chair noted that this decision had been intended to apply to standard setting issues and not to liaison with other organizations. Several SC members noted that, if SC members were expected to communicate in their region on the type of issues discussed here, a single uniform message should be provided for SC members to use.

27. The SC:

- 1) *agreed that ISO standards are not mandatory for implementation of ISPMs*
- 2) *agreed that SC members, pending a single uniform message being developed by the IPPC Secretariat, should go back to their respective regions and explain to contracting parties that in the phytosanitary area, ISPMs take precedence over ISO standards and ask contracting parties to take this into account*
- 3) *agreed that the CPM should also be reminded that in the phytosanitary area, ISPMs take precedence over ISO standards and ask contracting parties to take this into account.*

⁴ CPM-7 (2012) meeting report, Decision 18 on improvements to the standard setting process

28. The CPM is invited to:

- 1) *note* the SC discussion and *agree* with their conclusions in 1,2 and 3 above.

IV. Request for CPM decision by SC on implementation issues

29. The Secretariat informed the CPM Bureau that the SC, at their November 2011 meeting, had added a task to all specifications for standards to include implementation issues. The SC had also proposed that the CPM be asked to note that the SC was actively working in this area.

30. The Bureau considered the matter and decided that the SC's role is to address standard setting and the feasibility of implementation. The capacity development area should focus on improving the ability of NPPOs to implement the standards.

31. In addition, the development of guidance materials by TPs or expert working groups was discussed. It was pointed out that the development of guidance material was not in the terms of reference of the SC and this activity could overlap with the mandate of the CD area of the IPPC. It was also recognized that the adoption of some standards may be delayed because of the lack of good operational guidance for the implementation of the standard (e.g. dielectric heat treatment for ISPM 15:2009 *Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*). It was suggested that the Secretariat discuss and resolve the issue internally.

32. The Bureau thought that the wording of the task in the specifications regarding implementation should be reconsidered and made some suggestions for the SC to consider. The SC, at their November 2012 meeting considered the changes suggested by the Bureau and further revised the wording to address some of the concerns raised⁵. The revised text for the new task is as follows:

Consider implementation of the standard by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the SC

33. The Bureau also agreed to present the following wording to the CPM:

The CPM is asked to note that the SC has added a new task (see above wording for the task) to each specification relating to the identification of potential implementation issues of the standard, accompanied by the corresponding information. The CPM is requested to note that the SC will review and submit information on the issue to the Secretariat for further consideration.

34. The CPM is invited to:

- 1) *note* that the SC has added a new task (see above wording for the task) to each specification relating to the identification of potential implementation issues of the standard, accompanied by the corresponding information
- 2) *ask* the SC to review and submit information on the issue of implementation to the Secretariat for further consideration.

V. Copublishing agreements

35. Making ISPMs available in many languages facilitates understanding and implementation of ISPMs by as many NPPOs as possible. For this reason, the Secretariat encourages the production of ISPMs in non-official languages by external publishers using a FAO copublishing agreement which allows members to translate ISPMs and publish them under joint copyright with the IPPC/FAO.

36. Copublishers are responsible for translating, editing and publishing the ISPMs and are invited to follow the publishing and editorial style of the IPPC, as well as the general adopted definitions in ISPM 5 Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms. This will ensure that ISPMs in all languages (official and

⁵ See Report of SC November 2012 meeting, <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355>

non) will have the same look and format, and that they abide to the same principles of terminology, hereby increasing the credibility of the publications in local languages as well as aiding the correct implementation and interpretation of the standards.

37. The non-official FAO language versions of the ISPMs are recommended primarily for online publishing to ensure wide distribution, and the IPPC Secretariat will provide links to them on the IPP, or alternatively post them on the IPP directly, noting that these versions have not been adopted by the CPM.

38. Once a member country has agreed to proceed with a copublishing arrangement, FAO Publishing Policy and Support Branch will draw up a specific agreement that can be amended to match the copublisher's needs, if necessary.

39. In 2012, the IPPC Secretariat signed a copublishing agreement with Viet Nam. ISPMs translated into Vietnamese are already available on the IPP (ISPMs that have been translated will have a link to the unofficial translation on its respective IPP site).

40. Copublishing agreements with Brazil, Japan and Korea are still in effect and once the IPPC Secretariat is notified, these translated ISPMs are made available on the IPP.

41. The longstanding copublishing agreement with the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) for the translation of ISPMs into Russian has been terminated because FAO (since Russian has become an official FAO language) is now responsible for translating them.

42. The IPPC Secretariat wishes to thank EPPO for its past great efforts under the copublishing agreement to translate and distribute ISPMs in Russian.

43. The CPM is invited to:

- 1) *encourage* members or groups of members using the same non-FAO language to enter into a copublishing agreement with FAO when planning to translate or publish standards
- 2) *thank* the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization for their past translations of ISPMs into Russian, produced and distributed under a copublishing agreement with the IPPC Secretariat.