



## TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR A FOCUS GROUP ON COMMODITY AND PATHWAY STANDARDS

*(prepared and approved by CPM Bureau June 2018)*

### Background

- [1] The Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) in its thirteenth session (CPM-13, 2018) has identified the need for further analysis on the purpose, benefits and use of commodity and pathway standards as the basis for guidance to the IPPC Standards Committee (SC) on their development, and to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) on their implementation.
- [2] CPM-13 requested the Bureau and Secretariat, in consultation with the SC and IC to develop Terms of Reference for a small focus group, with geographical representation, to be convened adjacent to the October 2018 Strategic and Planning Group (SPG) meeting to:
- i. analyze, and consequently define, the strategic value and purpose of commodity and pathway standards against the IPPC strategic objectives,
  - ii. capture principles and criteria for their development and use with reference to practical examples,
  - iii. assess processes used to develop and use them,
  - iv. illustrate those aspects with examples of possible commodity or pathways standards, and,
  - v. evaluate the role of the pest risk analysis on this approach.
- [3] Additionally, the CPM-13 requested Contracting Parties and Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) to provide reference materials that could help the focus group with its tasks, including country comments on the questions posed by the Standards Committee<sup>1</sup>.

### Process

- [4] The focus group will meet on 3 - 5 October 2018 in Rome and complete the tasks outlined below. The report of this meeting will be presented to the SPG during its meeting on 9 – 11 October 2018. The SPG will make recommendations on purpose, benefits and use of commodity and pathway standards to the CPM-14 in 2019.
- [5] The questions posed by the SC on commodity standards, as contained in CPM2018/29, will be informed both by the SPG's advice provided to CPM-14, as well as any resultant CPM comments and decisions. This should result in clear guidance to the SC.
- [6] The SC and IC will be invited to review the draft CPM paper at their November 2018 meetings, before it is finalized by the Bureau.
- [7] The IPPC Secretariat will invite National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs), Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) and relevant international organizations to provide reference materials that could help the focus group with its tasks, including country comments on the questions posed by the SC by 31 August 2018.

---

<sup>1</sup> CPM-13 document: CPM 2018/29 - Conceptual challenges in standards development in terms of implementation - Commodity and pathway specific International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85583/>)

## Membership

[8] The focus group is skills - and knowledge-based with geographical representation and it should be composed of:

- Maximum of 8 experts, and
- At least one representative of the Bureau
- One representative of the SC and one of IC.

[9] Its membership should have collective experience and expertise in:

- the development and application of practical measures for managing phytosanitary risks;
- the development and implementation of international and/or regional and national standards;
- undertaking pest risk analysis and the establishment of risk-based phytosanitary measures.

[10] Together with:

- a practical knowledge of production and trading pathways and processes for plants and plant products;
- a broader, global perspective of trade in plant commodities and the strategies and policies that impact the trade;
- understanding of commercial marketing and trading practices that impact or are impacted by phytosanitary requirements.

[11] The Bureau will decide the membership and make-up of the focus group.

## Tasks

[12] The focus group will:

- (i) Analyse, and consequently define, the strategic value and purpose of commodity and pathway standards against the IPPC strategic objectives
- (ii) Capture principles and criteria for their development and use with reference to practical examples
- (iii) Assess processes used to develop and use them
- (iv) Illustrate those aspects with examples of possible commodity or pathways standards
- (v) Evaluate the role of the pest risk analysis on this approach.

[13] This would be informed by analysis of practical examples drawn from the following or other options:

1. The development and adoption of commodity standards for mango fruit for consumption and chilli seed by the APPPC
2. Other commodity and pathway standards under development or in use
3. The establishment of production systems that enable exports to multiple markets with harmonized import requirements
4. Identifying and describing common elements from existing import/export conditions or protocols for a number of plant products that are widely traded
5. Integrating new measures into existing pathways for new pests (e.g. control measures for *Tuta absoluta*)
6. Replacing existing pest control measures with integrated pest management options for specific or general pests
7. Topics that may be provided in response to the 2018 call for topics for standards and implementation
8. The development of harmonized phytosanitary measures to support the risk management of pests

9. Lessons learnt from previous and current attempts at developing commodity standards through the standard setting process.

[14] The focus group will also consider:

- When commodity or pathway standards cannot or should not apply
- Tension between commodity and pathway standards, sovereign rights, PRA and justification of measures
- Using the concept of commodity or pathway
- Where do they fit in the standards and implementation framework
- What are elements of a commodity or pathway standard that could be harmonised because they have wide application, are adopted as international standards or are commonly used, for example treatments, clean packaging, verification processes, sampling and inspection, end use considerations, processing (ISPM 32: Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk), additional declarations, standard requirements or import conditions

## **Funding**

[15] The organization that employs an IPPC meeting participant is responsible for funding the travel and daily subsistence allowance for that person to attend. If the employer is unable to allocate sufficient funds, participants are first encouraged to seek assistance from sources other than the IPPC Secretariat. Where such demonstrated efforts to secure assistance have been unsuccessful, requests for assistance (i.e. travel and subsistence costs) from the IPPC Secretariat may be made. However, any support is subject to available funds. The IPPC Secretariat will consider funding assistance for participants following IPPC criteria for funding. Full details on these criteria can be found on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/publications/criteria-used-prioritizing-participants-receive-travel-assistance-attend-meetings>).

## **Other background information and context**

[16] A Friends of the Chair meeting was held on 17 April 2018 during CPM-13 to define the purpose, benefits and outcomes of commodity and pathway standards. A large number of friends from each FAO region participated in a lively and wide-ranging discussion to better understand the drivers for these types of standards, with reference to existing standards and those under development. Questions on what can be lost or gained from commodity and pathway standards focussed discussion on the risks and benefits from pursuing them.

[17] It was clear that there is not a “one size fits all” solution, and a number of variables will need to be considered when determining whether a commodity or pathway standard is appropriate or justified by the outcome achieved.

[18] The Friends of the Chair proposed to learn from practice and felt that a focus group could be convened to consolidate these lessons in a policy paper to CPM-14 through SPG 2018.

[19] A brief summary of key points discussed follows.

## **What could we gain if we develop commodity and pathway standards?**

### ***Opportunities to:***

- Simplify the phytosanitary regulation of traded goods - consistent, predictable and harmonised risk analysis and the application of risk management measures
- Facilitate safe trade
- Reduce costs - compliance, intervention
- Deregulate

- Apply equivalence
- Reduce replication, for example risk analysis on the same host, pathway, pest
- Apply other international standards in support of safe trade (e.g. surveillance, diagnostics, systems approaches, pest free areas, treatments, PRA, etc.).
- Establish baseline risk management practices using common elements to make trade easier
- Provide developing countries with the opportunity to participate in safe trade, both import and export, where capacity constraints may limit current access.

***What could we lose if we did not develop commodity and pathway standards?***

- The relevance and influence of the IPPC
- Positive perception of the IPPC
- Sovereignty of countries to define rules
- The relevance of PRA in import decisions

***Drivers for commodity and pathway standards***

- Diminishing resources
- Harmonisation
- Reducing pests moving in trade: facilitating safe trade
- Global problems that cannot be managed by bilateral or regional regulation

***Moving forward - learn from experience***

- Refine benefits, purpose and outcomes from doing