



REPORT

Edinburgh, United
Kingdom
20-24 July 2015

**Working Group on the
Concept of a Commodity
Standard
July 2015**



Food and Agriculture Organization of United Nations

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 of FAO.

CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting	4
1.2	Selection of the Chairperson	4
1.3	Selection of the Rapporteur.....	4
3.	Terms of reference.....	5
4.	Background.....	5
5.	Review of discussion papers.....	6
6.	Tasks from the Terms of reference for the working group.....	8
6.1	Concept of a commodity standard within the context of the suite of IPPC standards and the Framework for Standards and Implementation	8
6.2	Purpose, content and format of commodity standards	10
6.3	Process for the development of a commodity standard.....	12
6.4.	System to maintain and update commodity standards	14
7.	Conclusions and recommendations	15
8.	Other business.....	16
9.	Close	17

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome

- [1] The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat (hereafter Secretariat) welcomed the participants of the Working Group on the Concept of a Commodity Standard (hereafter WG), thanked them for their work in preparing this important meeting and hoped that the meeting would be productive. The meeting was hosted by the United Kingdom, Scottish Government, Science and Advice for Scottish Agriculture (SASA), on behalf of the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO).
- [2] Mr Jonathan Pryce, Director of Agriculture Food and Rural Communities (AFRC), and Mr Kevin O'Donnell, Head of SASA (Science and Advice for Scottish Agriculture), Deputy Director, welcomed the participants and wished them a constructive meeting and a pleasant stay in Edinburgh. Mr Kevin O'Donnell gave an introduction to the scientific work in SASA, which is a division within the AFRC Directorate.
- [3] Participants introduced themselves and the Secretariat reviewed the different roles and responsibilities of the participants and noted that the Secretariat's role is to facilitate the work of the experts. The Secretariat recalled that, according to the Terms of Reference (TORs) for the WG agreed by the tenth session of the Commission for Phytosanitary Measures in March 2015 (CPM-10 (2015)), the experts participating in this WG had been selected by the CPM Bureau, taking into account their knowledge of standard setting and of developing and setting of phytosanitary regulations. In addition, the CPM Bureau had agreed that a few experts from industry be invited to attend the meeting (see Appendix 4 for the full TORs).

1.2 Selection of the Chairperson

- [4] The WG selected Ms Jane CHARD (United Kingdom) as Chairperson.

1.3 Selection of the Rapporteur

- [5] The WG selected Mr Francisco GUTIERREZ (Belize) as Rapporteur.

1.4 Adoption of the agenda

- [6] The WG reviewed and adopted the agenda¹ (Appendix 1).

2. Administrative matters

Documents list

- [7] The WG reviewed and updated the documents list² (Appendix 2).

Participants list

- [8] The WG reviewed and updated the participants list³ (Appendix 3). It was noted that the Organizer Representative, Mr Roman VAGNER (European Commission), was unable to attend the meeting.

¹ 01_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July

² 02_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July

³ 03_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July

Local information

- [9] The Host Representative provided further information on local arrangements and referred to the local information document⁴.
- [10] A field trip followed by a dinner was organized by the Host on Wednesday 22 July. The group was joined by Ms Nicola SPENCE, the UK Chief Plant Health Officer, and Mr Mike PARKER, Head of Seed Certification branch at SASA (responsible for certification schemes for cereals and other crops (not potatoes) in Scotland). Ms Nicola SPENCE gave introductory remarks on how the plant health services operate in the United Kingdom and on barley exports. Then, Mr Andrew DIXON (Lead cereals inspector, Scottish government) gave a presentation to the group on inspections (including health and safety considerations) and phytosanitary certification for exports of malted barley. The presentation was followed by a visit to SASA plots to see barley varieties grown in Scotland and to the Glenkinchie distillery to see the process for how barley is malted and prepared for export as a commodity.

3. Terms of reference

- [11] The Secretariat presented the TORs⁵ for the working group (Appendix 4).
- [12] According to the TORs, the Secretariat issued a call for discussion papers to contracting parties (CPs), national plant protection organizations (NPPOs), regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) and relevant international organizations. Three contracting parties submitted discussion papers, as well several WG participants also submitted discussion papers (see agenda item 5).

4. Background

- [13] The Secretariat explained that discussions on the purpose, status and content of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) in general and more specifically on the concept of a commodity standard had recently taken place in various IPPC meetings.
- [14] As some Standards Committee (SC) members had felt that some draft ISPMs did not provide specific requirements, the SC initiated in their November 2013 meeting, a discussion on the purpose, status and content of ISPMs, and they further discussed the issue in their May 2014 and May 2015 meetings⁶. This issue was also brought to the attention of the Strategic Planning Group (SPG, October 2014)⁷ and the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) (December 2014)⁸.
- [15] During CPM-10 (2015), discussions took place on the concept of a commodity standard in relation to the draft ISPM on *International movement of wood* (2006-029), which had received a formal objection prior to the CPM-10 meeting and thus had not been adopted⁹. The formal objection stated that this draft ISPM was inconsistent with existing ISPMs, had no requirements and therefore should be an information document rather than an ISPM. Therefore, the CPM decided a working group should be convened to discuss the concept of a commodity standard and agreed on its ToRs.
- [16] In their June 2015 meeting¹⁰, the CDC had provided comments on the concept of a commodity standard, addressing the tasks contained in the ToRs.
- [17] Because the first task of the WG was to discuss the concept of a commodity standard within the context of the suite of IPPC standards and the *Framework for standards and implementation*, the

⁴ 04_Rev1_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July

⁵ 05_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July

⁶ See [May 2014 SC meeting report](#) (section 7.2) and [May 2015 SC meeting report](#) (section 5.2.5)

⁷ See [October 2014 SPG meeting report](#) (section 7.7)

⁸ See [December 2014 CDC meeting report](#) (section 6.5)

⁹ See [CPM-10 \(2015\) report](#), section 8.2 and document [CPM 2015/INF/15](#)

¹⁰ 16_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July, also see [CDC meeting report, June 2015](#), section 6.4

Secretariat provided to the WG an update on the development of a *Framework for standards and implementation*. This Framework is intended to provide a long-term vision for planning and prioritizing of the IPPC Secretariat's work programme and to help identify gaps and how they could be addressed. In November 2014, the SC had reviewed the standard setting part of the Framework for Standards and Implementation and an update on its development was presented to CPM-10 (2015)¹¹. The whole Framework for Standards and Implementation should be finalized in 2015 and recommended for adoption by CPM-11 (2016).

[18] Finally, the Secretariat provided information on a *Format for commodity specific data sheets* which had been developed in 2005 by the Expert Working Group on *Guidelines for formatting / drafting pest and commodity specific ISPMs*¹². The WG noted the *Format for commodity specific data sheets*, which had been incorporated into the IPPC Procedure Manual until 2008, but not used (as updating commodity specific data sheets would have required significant resources) and later removed from the IPPC Procedure Manual after the publication of the IPPC Style Guide.

5. Review of discussion papers

[19] The Secretariat presented SC agreed discussions papers.¹³

[20] The draft ISPM on the *International movement of wood* (2006-029)¹⁴, the draft ISPM on the *International movement of seed* (2009-003)¹⁵, ISPM 33 (*Pest free potato (Solanum spp.) micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade*)¹⁶ and the Specification 60 (*International movement of grain*)¹⁷ had been identified by the SC as examples to be used by the WG. Besides, the Secretariat indicated that ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) and ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*) may also be useful for the WG discussions.

[21] Examples of regional standards on commodities were also mentioned by some WG experts, such as:

- the North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) 3 on *Movement of Potatoes into a NAPPO Member Country*
- NAPPO RSPM 35 on *Guidelines for the Movement of Stone and Pome Fruit Trees and Grapevines into a NAPPO Member Country*
- the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) commodity-specific phytosanitary measures for Potato, *Coniferae*, *Quercus* and *Castanea*.

[22] An overview of Codex Alimentarius work on commodity standards¹⁸ was presented to the WG and helped stimulate the discussions. The responsibility to adopt draft standards lies with the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC). The work of the Codex Alimentarius is divided between three types of committees (CAC subsidiary bodies): general subject (horizontal) committees, commodity (vertical) committees that deal with a specific type of food class or group (e.g. fresh fruits and vegetables, dairy and dairy products, fish and fish products) and Ad hoc Intergovernmental Task Forces (established to deal with specific issues within a limited time frame).

¹¹ 18_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July , also see [CPM-10 \(2015\) report](#), section 8.6 and document [CPM 2015/19](#)

¹² 20_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July , also see [2005 EWG meeting report](#)

¹³ 11_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July

¹⁴ 06_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July

¹⁵ 12_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July

¹⁶ 13_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July

¹⁷ 14_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July

¹⁸ 19_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July

- [23] At the time of its establishment in the early '60s, Codex work was mainly focused on commodity standards, which were largely dealing with quality characteristics. The emphasis on commodity standards started to decrease in the 1990s following the FAO/WHO Conference on “Food Standards, Chemicals in Food and Food Trade having Implications for the Codex Alimentarius Commission” (1991), which highlighted the need for a horizontal approach and to focus on the development of provisions related to the protection of consumers (i.e. health and safety) and facilitation of international trade. Another important shift in the work of Codex on commodity standards has been the development of more general/overarching standards, which focus on common characteristics of groups of commodities, rather than individual commodities and this shift led to the development of less prescriptive standards which address in particular those aspects related to product definition. Where there is a need to address specific requirements related to a particular commodity within a general standard (i.e. asparagus in the *Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables*), commodity-specific annexes, which do not repeat the common provisions in the general standard, are added.
- [24] Furthermore, it was highlighted that, according to the *Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius*, the CAC and its subsidiary bodies are responsible for risk management. When developing standards, they rely on the independent scientific advice provided by expert bodies and consultations organized by FAO/WHO (responsible for risk assessment).
- [25] The WG reviewed the remaining discussion papers¹⁹ which collectively aimed at addressing the tasks laid out in the ToRs.
- [26] Based on discussions, the group identified and addressed the following general issues prior to addressing the specific tasks listed in the ToR:
- [27] ***Commodity standards, commodity class standards and pathway standards***
- [28] Reference was made to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) definitions for the terms “commodity”, “commodity class” and “pathway”. The Secretariat highlighted that, taking into account these terms, the WG may need to clarify what should be considered a commodity standard, a commodity class standard or a pathway standard and whether such a classification was relevant. Except for ISPM 33 which would be an example of a commodity standard, the other examples identified by CPM and SC and listed above would be examples of topics for commodity classes (wood, grain and seeds). Besides, the draft standard on *International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment* (2006-004) which was mentioned in several discussion papers could be considered as an example of a pathway standard.
- [29] The WG acknowledged that, while its scope from the CPM agreed ToRs only referred to “commodity standards”, the “commodity” topics on the *List of Topics for IPPC standards* for which draft ISPMs were currently being developed were actually topics for “commodity class” standards or “pathway” standards. The WG recognized that, if in their discussions they were to limit the understanding of “commodity standards” to the ISPM 5 definition, it may not help the CPM to address the issues regarding the development of all commodity related standards. Thus, they agreed that commodities with similar requirements could be grouped together in one standard and they felt that it would be clearer to refer to these commodities as a “group of commodities” (e.g. seeds of different species, grain of different species, wood of different species, cut flowers, wood handicrafts) rather than as “a commodity class”. They agreed to consider broadly the concept of commodity standards (i.e. including standards for commodities and groups of commodities). The WG also suggested that the SC reconsider the terms “commodity”, “commodity class” and “pathway” in this context.
- [30] They discussed whether a standard on a group of commodities would be needed before standards on specific commodities within that group could be developed, but did not feel this was necessary.

¹⁹ 07, 08, 09, 10, 15, 17, 21 & 22:WGCommodityStandards_2015_July

[31] One of the discussion papers had proposed that an expert working group (EWG) should develop an overarching concept commodity standard that would provide the framework and criteria for commodity standards and to which specific annexes or appendices for different commodities would be appended. The WG found that it was one of their own tasks to agree on the common elements and content for commodity standards and it may not be necessary to develop such an overarching concept commodity standard.

International standards, ISPMs and other tools

[32] In their December 2014 and June 2015 comments, the CDC had indicated that, within the framework of the IPPC, different types of international standards could be set (ISPMs could be one type of international standards) and other tools (such as CPM recommendations, manuals, brochures, etc...) could also be produced to implement the International Plant Protection Convention. The WG discussed further these comments in the context of commodity standards.

[33] First of all, the WG used the ISPM 5 definition for the term “standards”. They noted that, although some adopted ISPMs (ISPM 1 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*) and ISPM 5 for instance) do not contain phytosanitary measures, they are called ISPMs, as all other IPPC standards, and in some way they relate to phytosanitary measures. In this regard, ISPM is merely the title that was originally chosen to refer to the standards being developed within the IPPC framework. The WG agreed that the development of a commodity standard would be justified when there is a unique phytosanitary risk in relation to the commodity and that, regardless of the fact they contain phytosanitary measures or not, commodity standards should also be considered as any other ISPM.

[34] They noted that, for commodity topics as for other topics, different types of documents may be needed for different purposes:

- documents developed for harmonization purposes. These would be adopted by the CPM, for instance ISPMs and CPM recommendations (these types of documents are recognized by the Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Agreement of the World Trade Organization (WTO)).
- documents developed to support the implementation of the Convention and the ISPMs. These would be documents that would not be adopted by the CPM, for instance the technical resources developed under the CDC direction (manuals, training kits, fact sheets, etc...).

[35] The WG questioned the legal status of any material or document that was not adopted by the CPM but referenced in a document adopted by the CPM. It was pointed out that any material referenced in a standard, its annexes or appendices, might be considered as part of the standard in the event of a dispute. The WG requested the Secretariat to consult with FAO legal services to get clarification on this matter.

6. Tasks from the Terms of reference for the working group

6.1 Concept of a commodity standard within the context of the suite of IPPC standards and the Framework for Standards and Implementation

[36] As a principle, the WG agreed that commodity ISPMs as other ISPMs should contain requirements and should be used to achieve harmonization.

Benefits of commodity standards versus difficulties related to their development

[37] Some of the WG participants and discussion papers suggested arguments to support the development of commodity standards within the IPPC framework:

- Unnecessary impedance of international trade through various and complex commodity-based import requirements could be avoided by harmonization of such requirements through IPPC commodity standards.

- Additionally, with declining national resources to conduct pest risk analysis, import monitoring and inspection, or to implement costly eradication or management programs for newly introduced pests, there will be an increasing need to rely on international standards to help prevent the introduction and spread of pests.

[38] However, other experts highlighted important challenges related to the development of commodity standards such as:

- high volume and diversity of commodities and groups of commodities for which standards could be developed and the high costs associated with their development,
- difficulty to prioritize commodities for which CPs have a common interest,
- existing difficulties in getting technical data, in agreeing on list of pests, on phytosanitary measures applicable to commodities and on their efficacy,
- limited number of CPM adopted phytosanitary treatments and difficulties in developing more phytosanitary treatments,
- the creation of any new commodity standard could result in contracting parties imposing measures in the standard for commodities that were previously permitted unrestricted entry, regardless of risk.

[39] Looking at the draft *Framework for standards and implementation*, the WG noted that, except ISPM 33 which fell under the “Pest management” area, all other topics for commodity standards were falling under the “Phytosanitary import & export regulatory systems” area.

[40] The WG discussed further in which cases the development of commodity standards would be particularly beneficial. They agreed that commodity standards should have a defined scope and aim to resolve one or several problems. The problems to be addressed by the commodity standard should already be identified when the proposal for the new topic is made (as part of the core criteria to be addressed in the submission form for the topic). Particular examples where commodity standards would be beneficial could be situations where there is:

- complexity
- diversification of national regulations / legislations impeding trade
- high volume / high value trade where harmonization is needed
- need for harmonization of procedures
- specific risk factors for pest risk analysis (PRA)
- a wish to set globally agreed requirements, particularly where this will assist developing countries.

[41] As the development of a large number of specific commodity standards containing detailed requirements would potentially require significant resources, the WG felt that a system for justifying and prioritizing the global need for such commodity standards should be put in place (see also section 6.3). Although commodity class and pathway topics are already on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, the WG acknowledged that it was not clear if the development of specific commodity standards was considered as a priority by the CPM and if the CPM would be ready to agree on potential global requirements set in commodity standards. They felt that this point should be clarified and the WG recommended that CPM should discuss and decide whether the development of commodity standards is highly relevant, feasible and of priority for the CPM and if so the CPM should identify the resources to do this work.

[42] Some experts suggested that a survey be conducted to help understand the views of CPs about the benefits and costs related to the development of commodity standards and whether or not it should be considered as a priority for the CPM. However, other experts considered it was too early to conduct such a survey and the WG did not agree on this proposal.

Setting global requirements for international trade in commodity standards

[43] The WG discussed whether global requirements for international trade should be set in commodity standards (i.e. minimum requirements considered to be suitable for global use, as for instance in ISPM 15). They recognized that this was a critical point and that may not be possible to agree on this type of global requirements for international trade for all commodity standards because for some countries, the pest risk analysis (PRA) may not indicate a specific pest risk and therefore specific import requirements may not be necessary.

The WG recommended that CPM should discuss and decide whether standards for commodities, groups of commodities and pathways should contain such minimum requirements (i.e. like those agreed to in ISPM 15).

Development of standards for groups of commodities

[44] As indicated previously, the WG felt that commodities which would have similar requirements could be grouped together in one standard (with different possible levels of grouping), especially where specific or unique pest risks could be collectively addressed, taking into account production and industry practices. Such standards should be concise documents, referring to groups of pests transmitted by the pathway and to the generic phytosanitary measures that would apply to the group of commodities.

[45] However, the WG recognized that, because of their broad coverage, it may be difficult to develop ISPMs for groups of commodities containing specific requirements and to get CPs agreement on the specific requirements. The WG considered that guidance to NPPOs on procedures and terminology that are used for the production and trade of groups of commodities was valuable and needed, and the WG noted that the development of manuals may be a more appropriate and quicker way to provide such guidance.

Other mechanisms to deal with issues that require global action

[46] The WG noted that, for some issues which require global action (such as actions to combat the spread of emerging pests like citrus greening and Panama disease, tropical race 4), mechanisms other than ISPMs (e.g. CPM Recommendations) may be more appropriate to trigger action by CPs or raise global awareness. The WG suggested that such a proposal should be considered further by the CPM.

Availability of material relevant to commodity standards in the phytosanitary resources page

[47] The WG considered that the phytosanitary resources page is a useful repository for information (e.g. protocols used by NPPOs, phytosanitary treatments approved by NPPOs) relevant to particular commodity standards. New information could be added continuously. The working group noted that such information is not adopted by the CPM.

[48] If the CPM decides the development of commodity standards is of priority, the WG recommended the collection of resources relevant to commodity standards in the Phytosanitary resource page, and that a search function could retrieve all information related to each specific commodity.

6.2 Purpose, content and format of commodity standards

Purpose of commodity standards

[49] The WG agreed that a commodity standard should only be developed if a specific problem related to trade of that commodity had been identified and it was felt that a commodity standard would address the issue.

[50] The WG agreed that commodity standards or standards for a group of similar commodities would fulfil one or more of the following purposes:

- preventing the introduction and spread of pests by:

- increasing compliance with phytosanitary import requirements (through greater industry engagement and eventually inclusion of phytosanitary measures in commercial contracts)
- helping NPPOs in establishing more appropriate requirements
- facilitating safe trade taking into account specific business practices
- addressing a phytosanitary problem identified for the commodity or group of commodities
- identifying unique characteristics of the commodity or group of commodities where harmonization would facilitate safe trade
- harmonizing requirements for international trade, and, where appropriate, to set global requirements for international trade (i.e. minimum requirements considered to be suitable for global use, as for instance in ISPM 15)
- identifying pest risk factors specific to the commodity or group of commodities that should be considered in the pest risk analysis
- helping the NPPOs focus on the necessary phytosanitary import requirements
- where appropriate, harmonizing systems, procedures or operations relating to a commodity or a group of commodities
- providing phytosanitary measures specific to the commodity or groups of commodities and associated pests
- where appropriate, identifying equivalent phytosanitary measures
- providing a level of consistency and predictability of phytosanitary measures and procedures
- reducing the dependence on bilateral agreements.

Phytosanitary measures listed in the standard could be used without any further justification. Other phytosanitary measures could be used as long as they are technically justified.

Content of commodity standards

[51] The WG discussed the possible contents for commodity standards and standards on groups of commodities separately, but concluded that the outcome of their discussions could apply to both types of standards.

[52] Regarding lists of pests, some experts highlighted that it would be difficult to agree on a list of quarantine pests for a commodity or group of commodities as different countries would have different quarantine pests. They indicated that it may be more relevant to list the pests or groups of pests that are associated with the pathway (irrespective of the pest status within different countries). The WG agreed with this proposal, recognizing that in some cases, only the most important pests may be listed in the standard.

[53] The WG agreed to the following content for commodity and group of commodities standards, acknowledging that the content will vary depending on the problem(s) being addressed by the standards:

- Global requirements for international trade (i.e. minimum requirements considered to be suitable for global use, as for instance in ISPM 15).
- Unique characteristics of the commodity or group of commodities that would benefit from harmonized phytosanitary measures.

- Elements specific to the production and trade of the commodity or group of commodities which may affect the pest risks and need to be taken into account by importing countries. These should include official procedures and industry processes or activities.
- Pest risk factors specific to the commodity or group of commodities.
- Globally agreed phytosanitary measures for the commodity or group of commodities.
- Identified requirements for the commodity or group of commodities presented in a way that can be easily referred to or used in phytosanitary import requirements.
- References to concepts in other ISPMs and specific requirements and phytosanitary measures relevant to the commodity or group of commodities, as appropriate. The standard should not replicate text from other ISPMs.
- List of pests or groups of pests associated with the pathway (the standard may have to focus on most important pests).
- Guidance on pest risks associated with different intended uses and on phytosanitary measures that are proportional to the pest risks associated with the intended uses.

[54] As regards globally agreed phytosanitary measures for the commodity or group of commodities, the WG acknowledged that there was currently no mechanism for determining or evaluating effectiveness of phytosanitary measures other than phytosanitary treatments (PTs). More technical work on this aspect would be needed.

Format of commodity standards

[55] The WG felt that “format” should be understood as “structure”. Using proposals made in some discussion papers, the WG agreed in principle to the benefits of a template structure for commodity standards and proposed the structure shown in Appendix 5. The WG stressed that this template should be used for standards on specific commodities (e.g. mango, orange) and would not be applicable to standards on groups of commodities (e.g. seeds, wood, grain).

[56] The proposed structure did not contain any “Outline of requirements” section because the WG considered commodity standards would simply focus on requirements directly related to that specific commodity.

[57] The WG indicated that a commodity standard would be most useful if terminology that was common to the specific commodity was used.

6.3 Process for the development of a commodity standard

[58] The WG experts discussed whether a different standard setting procedure for the development of commodity standards was needed: some felt that the current standard setting procedure should be used whereas others preferred a more flexible and faster procedure. In the end, the WG agreed that the existing standard setting procedure should be used. They also proposed that the call for topics for IPPC standards should be broadened to include suggestions for other types of documents (such as manuals, recommendations etc.). They made some other suggestions to help facilitate the development of commodity standards in a faster and more flexible way.

Proposals made by the WG in regards to calling for topics related to commodities and adding them to the work programme

Following on discussions under section 5 (*International standards, ISPMs and other tools*), the WG suggested that one combined call for topics be launched for the development of ISPMs, recommendations and phytosanitary resources related to commodities or groups of commodities taking into account the *Framework for standards and implementation* (once adopted).

- [59] The WG agreed that CPs would need guidance on the type of document that should be developed as a result of their proposal (ISPM, CPM Recommendation or manual). The WG noted that *Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics for ISPMs* already exist²⁰ but additional guidance on criteria to determine if a CPM recommendation²¹ or a manual would be the more appropriate tool is needed. The proposals would be evaluated by the SC against the criteria for ISPMs and the CDC or other relevant IPPC bodies should evaluate them to determine whether a different type of tool should be added to the work programme (eg. an issue that was proposed to be addressed by a standard, after evaluation, might be better addressed by a manual).
- [60] The WG discussed whether there was a need for additional criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics for commodity ISPMs. They agreed that the existing criteria are sufficient but that core criterion 4 (Clear identification of the problems that need to be resolved through the development of the standard) should be given a higher weighting for commodity standards (e.g. the need for harmonization where there is diverse national legislation). Given that commodity standards are particularly trade related, the economic supporting criterion was also found to be highly relevant. Lastly, it was noted that the strategic supporting criterion 15 (Complements other standards (e.g. potential for the standard to be used as part of a systems approach for one pest, complement treatments for other pests)) was also particularly relevant for commodity standards.
- [61] The WG suggested that the CPM Chair could discuss with the SC and CDC Chairs and the Secretariat whether to expand the call for topics to other documents than just ISPMs and how such a call could be coordinated.
- [62] In this connection, the WG stressed that work should not be duplicated and it was not proposing a new decision-making body be set up. However, the group did advocate for better coordination between existing bodies to ensure consistent decision-making, avoid duplication and make sure that proposals for new or revised standards, CPM recommendations and manuals etc. made by CPs are considered by the appropriate body(ies) and the CPM and be presented in a transparent manner.
- [63] The WG noted that there is currently no overall prioritization process for the development of the IPPC work programme and that this lack would need to be addressed if there is to be a broader call for topics related to commodities or groups of commodities.
- [64] Additionally, to allow for some flexibility and to help facilitate the faster development of the commodity standards, the WG proposed the following options:
- having an open call for topics for commodity standards (i.e. in addition to the biennial call, CPs could submit a topic at any time)
 - requesting the submission of a draft standard in addition to the normally requested information in response to the call for topics
 - delegating authority to the SC to add proposals for commodity standards as subjects in the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (as is currently done for diagnostic protocols, phytosanitary treatments and Glossary terms)
 - allowing CP(s) to volunteer to prepare or revise a draft commodity standard for submission to the SC.

Need for Technical Panel(s) on commodities

²⁰ Adopted by CPM-8 (2008) and revised by CPM-10 (2015), posted on the IPP: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81156/>

²¹ Criteria for CPM Recommendations were proposed for adoption by CPM-10 (2015). However, CPs felt more time was required to reflect on the need for and content of possible criteria and CPM-10 (2015) agreed to delay adopting criteria for CPM recommendations until CPM-11 (2016).

[65] The WG discussed the need for technical panels for different commodity groups but it was felt this was premature and depended on if the CPM decides that the development of commodity standards is of priority. It will also depend on allocation of appropriate resources for their development. The WG provided advice on different possible options:

- If the CPM decided that the development of commodity standards was a high priority, some WG participants felt it might be more efficient to set up one or some TP(s) on commodities than to have numerous EWGs. Such an “oversight” TP could act in similar way as the Technical Panel for Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP), which works with numerous virtual drafting groups. The TP would then ensure consistency between drafts and oversee the production of drafts by experts nominated by NPPOs or RPPOs and selected by the SC or the TP.
- However, the WG recognized that, in some cases, where specific expertise relevant to a particular commodity would be needed, it may be necessary to have a EWG meeting to draft the standard to ensure the adequate expertise is mobilized and ensure the diverse geographical views were represented.

[66] The WG felt it was too early to make a decision on this issue and that all related decisions should be taken after CPM has decided on the priority for the development of commodity standards.

Industry involvement in the process of developing commodity standards

[67] The EWG discussed whether international industry associations should be allowed to propose topics for standards for a commodity or a group of commodities. But they did not reach agreement on this aspect, as some experts felt that topics should be proposed only through CPs.

[68] However, they agreed that international industry associations’ involvement from an early stage was particularly important for commodity standards: for instance, having invited experts from industry participating in the drafting of the standard, allowing international industry associations to comment on draft specifications and draft standards, helping with advocacy and implementation of the standards.

6.4. System to maintain and update commodity standards

[69] Some EWG participants highlighted that commodity standards would need frequent updating as, for example, lists of pests and the applicable phytosanitary measures would have to be kept up to date.

[70] The WG agreed that flexibility was needed in regards to a system to maintain and update commodity standards or standards on groups of commodities and they agreed to the following:

- Proposals for revisions and updating of adopted standards could be submitted as needed (i.e. through an open call (request submitted at any time), not only during the biennial call for topics).
- For an update of a standard, a full specification would not be needed and the sections on reason, purpose and scope would suffice.
- Authority could be delegated to the SC for adopting a revision or an update to a commodity or group of commodities standard.

[71] The WG acknowledged that first versions of commodity or group of commodities standards may not address all risks and procedures related to a commodity or group of commodities and that further elements may be added afterwards as needed.

Resources and funding issues

[72] The WG felt that the CPM and CPM Bureau should consider resource implications in relation to the development and maintenance of commodity standards or standards for group of commodities as well as to building capacity for their implementation.

- [73] The WG discussed possible sponsorship for commodity standards. It was highlighted that direct sponsorship by industry (i.e. for a specific standard) would raise issues of possible conflicts of interest and undue influence. Broader sponsorship for all activities related to commodity topics and not targeting a specific standard may be more appropriate. The Secretariat recalled that the CPM decides on the topics to be added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and on their priority, and that sponsorships would not necessarily impact which standards would be developed; this would be dependent on the priority assigned by the CPM.
- [74] The WG suggested that possible mechanisms for funding by international industry associations and other possible donors should be considered further.

7. Conclusions and recommendations

[75] The WG invited the SPG and the SC to:

- (1) Note and discuss further the benefits and difficulties associated with the development of commodity standards.
- (2) Consider inviting the CPM to discuss and decide whether the development of commodity standards is highly relevant, feasible and of priority for the IPPC work programme.
- (3) Consider requesting the CPM to consider and develop a mechanism to deal with urgent issues that require global action.
- (4) Request the Secretariat to consult with FAO legal services to get clarification on the legal status of any material or document that was not adopted by the CPM but referenced in a document adopted by the CPM and if this referenced material would have any status in relation to the WTO-SPS agreement.
- (5) Consider further the issues discussed by the WG and reflected in this report.

As regards to the concept of a commodity standard (section 6.1):

[76] The WG invited the SPG and the SC to:

- (6) agree that commodity ISPMs, as other ISPMs, should contain requirements and should be used to achieve harmonization.
- (7) agree that commodity ISPMs should have a defined scope and aim to resolve one or several problems
- (8) agree that commodities which would have similar requirements could be grouped together in one standard (with different possible levels of grouping), referred to as a “group of commodities”, and that standards for groups of commodities may be produced, especially where there are specific/unique pest risks to address, taking into account production and industry practices.
- (9) consider inviting the CPM to discuss and decide whether standards for further commodities, groups of commodities and pathways should contain specific requirements for specific circumstances (e.g. for a pest free area) and where appropriate, set global requirements (i.e. minimum requirements considered to be suitable for global use, as for instance in ISPM 15).

[77] The WG invited the SC to:

- (10) reconsider the terms “commodity”, “commodity class” and “pathway” in this context.

[78] The WG invited the SPG to:

- (11) If the CPM decides the development of commodity standards is of priority, consider inviting the CDC to collect phytosanitary resources relevant to the commodity standards under

consideration in the Phytosanitary resource page, and ensure a search function could retrieve all information related to each specific commodity.

As regards to the purpose, content and format of commodity standards (section 6.2):

[79] The WG invited the SPG and the SC to:

- (12) consider and agree that commodity standards or standards for a group of commodities may be developed to fulfil one or more of the purposes proposed by the WG (as listed in [50]).
- (13) consider and agree to the content for commodity or group of commodities standards proposed by the WG, acknowledging that the content will vary depending on the problem(s) being addressed by the standards (as shown in [53]).
- (14) consider and agree to the template structure (as shown in Appendix 5).

As regards to the process for the development of a commodity standard (section 6.3) and the system to maintain and update commodity standards (section 6.4) :

[80] The WG invited the SPG and the SC to:

- (15) consider the WG discussions and agree that the current standard setting procedure should be generally followed for commodity standards.
- (16) If the CPM decides that high priority should be given to the development of commodity standards, take into account the WG proposals made in section 6.3 to make their development faster and more flexible.
- (17) consider the proposal for a system to maintain and update commodity or group of commodities standards in a flexible manner as suggested in section 6.4

[81] The WG invited the SPG to:

- (18) Consider recommending to CPM that a combined call for topics for the development of ISPMs, CPM Recommendations or manuals related to commodities or groups of commodities be launched, taking into account the *Framework for standards and implementation* (once adopted).
- (19) Consider the need for additional guidance on criteria to determine if a CPM recommendation²² or a manual is needed.

As regards resources and funding issues

[82] The WG invited the SPG to:

- (20) Consider inviting the CPM Bureau to:
 - Consider resource implications in relation to the development and maintenance of commodity or group of commodities standards as well as to building capacity for their implementation.
 - Consider possible mechanisms for funding by international industry associations and other possible donors.

8. Other business

[83] None.

²² Criteria for CPM Recommendations were proposed for adoption by CPM-10 (2015). However, CPs felt more time was required to reflect on the need for and content of possible criteria and CPM-10 (2015) agreed to delay adopting criteria for CPM recommendations until CPM-11 (2016).

9. Close

- [84] The group thanked the United Kingdom, Scottish Government, SASA, for hosting and organizing the meeting, and the representative of the host country for her help during the meeting. They also thanked the Chairperson and the Rapporteur.
- [85] The Secretariat thanked all those who helped to make logistical arrangements for the meeting and all the experts for their participation. The Secretariat informed that an electronic evaluation form had been created and invited all WG participants to submit their evaluation for future improvement of IPPC Secretariat meetings.
- [86] The Chairperson thanked all the participants for all their good and hard work and closed the meeting.

APPENDIX 1 - Agenda

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
1.1 Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat Welcome by the meeting host 	--	LARSON
1.2 Selection of the Chairperson	--	GERMAIN
1.3 Selection of the Rapporteur	--	CHAIRPERSON
1.4 Adoption of the Agenda	01_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	CHAIRPERSON
2. Administrative Matters		CHAIRPERSON
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents List Participants List Local Information 	02_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July 03_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July 04_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	GERMAIN
3. Terms of reference	05_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	GERMAIN
4. Background		
4.1. Background information from CPM, SPG, SC and CDC discussions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 2015 CDC comments on the concept of commodity standards 	11_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July 16_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	GERMAIN
4.2. List of adopted ISPMs (May 2015) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) 	Link to the List of Adopted ISPMs Link to ISPM 5	GERMAIN
4.3. Examples of commodity adopted standard, draft standard or specification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ISPM 33 on <i>Pest free potato (Solanum spp.) micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade</i> Draft ISPM on the <i>International movement of wood</i> (2006-029) Draft ISPM on the <i>International movement of seeds</i> (2009-003) Specification 60 on the <i>International movement of grain</i> (2008-007) 	13_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July 06_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July 12_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July 14_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	GERMAIN
4.4. Update on the development of a Framework for Standards and Implementation	18_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	GERMAIN
4.5. Background information: Format for commodity specific data sheets	20_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	GERMAIN
5. Review of other discussion papers		
5.1. Discussion paper from Australia	08_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	MAGEE
5.2. Discussion paper from Canada	07_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	
5.3. Discussion paper from Codex alimentarius	19_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	BRUNO
5.4. Discussion paper from Costa Rica	09_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	GONZÁLEZ A.
5.5. Discussion paper from New Zealand	17_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	HEDLEY
5.6. Letter from ISF	15_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	MEIJERINK
5.7. Discussion paper from USA	10_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	ZINK

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
5.8. Comments submitted by Argentina	21_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	MELCHO
5.9. Discussion document on commodity standards – a European perspective	22_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	CHARD
6. Tasks from the Terms of reference for the working group	23_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	HEDLEY
6.1. Discuss the concept of a commodity standard within the context of the suite of IPPC standards and the Framework for Standards and Implementation		CHAIRPERSON
6.2. Discuss and propose the purpose, content and format of commodity standards		CHAIRPERSON
6.3. Consider and propose a process for the development of a commodity standard, including, if relevant, how to consult with stakeholders from industry and other relevant international organizations		CHAIRPERSON
6.4. Analyse and propose a system to maintain and update commodity standards.	--	CHAIRPERSON
7. Conclusions and recommendations		CHAIRPERSON
8. Other business		CHAIRPERSON
9. Close of the meeting		IPPC SECRETARIAT / CHAIRPERSON

APPENDIX 2 – Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
01_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	1.4	Draft agenda	WG members	2015-07-03
02_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	2	Documents list	WG members	2015-07-03
03_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	2	Participants list	WG members	2015-07-01
04_Rev1_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	2	Local information	WG members	2015-06-09
05_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	3	TORs for a WG to discuss the Concept of a Commodity Standards	WG members	2015-06-24
06_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	4.3	Example of a commodity draft standard - <i>International movement of wood</i> (2006-029)	WG members	2015-06-24
07_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	5.2	Discussion paper by Canada	WG members	2015-06-24
08_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	5.1	Discussion paper by Australia	WG members	2015-06-24
09_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	5.4	Discussion paper by Costa Rica	WG members	2015-06-24
10_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	5.7	Discussion paper by US	WG members	2015-06-24
11_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	4.1	Background infor from CPM, SPG and CDC discussions	WG members	2015-06-24
12_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	4.3	Example of a commodity draft standard - <i>International movement of seeds</i> (2009-003)	WG members	2015-06-24
13_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	4.3	ISPM 33 - <i>Pest free potato (Solanum spp.) micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade</i>	WG members	2015-06-24
14_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	4.3	Specification 60 - International movement of grain	WG members	2015-06-24
15_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	5.6	Letter from ISF	WG members	2015-06-24
16_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	4.1	Concept of Commodity Standards – CDC comments	WG members	2015-06-24
17_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	5.5	Notes on the ISPMs for the Commodity Standards meeting	WG members	2015-06-24

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
18_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	4.4	Update on the development of a Framework for standards and implementation	<i>WG members</i>	2015-06-24
19_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	5.3	Codex work on Commodity Standards	<i>WG members</i>	2015-06-24
20_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	4.5	Background information: format for commodity specific data sheets	<i>WG members</i>	2015-06-24
21_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	5.8	Comments on the purpose, status and content of ISPMs and on the concept of commodity standards	<i>WG members</i>	2015-07-01
22_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	5.9	Discussion document on commodity standards – a European perspective	<i>WG members</i>	2015-07-01
23_WGCommodityStandards_2015_July	6	Questions for the Working Group on Concept of a Commodity Standard	<i>WG members</i>	2015-07-21

IPP LINKS:	Agenda item
Link to the List of Adopted ISPMs	4.2
Link to ISPM 5	4.2

APPENDIX 3 - Participants List

	Participant role / Country	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
✓	Member / Germany	<p>Mr Jens-Georg UNGER Julius Kühn-Institut Institute for National and International Plant Health Messeweg 11/12 D 38104 Braunschweig GERMANY Phone: (+49) 531 2993370 Fax: (+49) 531 2993007</p>	<p>Jens-Georg.Unger@jki.bund.de;</p>
✓	Member / New Zealand	<p>Mr John HEDLEY Principal Adviser International Organizations Policy Trade Branch Ministry for Primary Industries P.O. Box 2526 Wellington NEW ZEALAND Phone: (+64) 4 894 0428 Mobile: (+64) 29890428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0742</p>	<p>john.hedley@mpi.govt.nz;</p>
✓	Member / USA	<p>Mr Richard T. ZINK USDA APHIS PPQ Laboratory Director Fort Collins and Phoenix 2301 Research Blvd., Fort Collins, CO 80526 USA Phone: (+1) 970-490-4472 Cell: (+1) 970-214-5322 Fax: 970-482-0924</p>	<p>Richard.T.Zink@aphis.usda.gov;</p>
✓	Member / Uruguay	<p>Ms Beatriz MELCHO Plant Protection Divison (DGSA) Avda. Millan 4703- Montevideo URUGUAY Phone/Fax: (+598) 2309 8410 extension 267</p>	<p>bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy; Alternate e-mails: beatrizmelcho@gmail.com; bemelcho@hotmail.com</p>
✓	Member / Costa Rica	<p>Ms Magda GONZÁLEZ ARROYO Head of the Department of Standards and Regulations Plant Protection Service Ministry of Agriculture Sabana Sur. Contiguo MAG. San Jose COSTA RICA Phone: (+506)25493600 Mobile: (+506)8399352 Fax: (+506)25493456 Email: mgonzalez@sfe.go.cr</p>	<p>mgonzalez@sfe.go.cr; Personal email: magdacr2858@yahoo.com;</p>

	Participant role / Country	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
✓	Member / Belize	Mr Francisco GUTIERREZ Technical Director, Plant Health Services Belize Agricultural Health Authority Belmopan City BELIZE Phone: (+501) 8244899 Fax: (+501) 8243773 Email: frankpest@yahoo.com	frankpest@yahoo.com ;
✓	Member / Republic of Korea	Ms Kyu-Ock YIM Senior Researcher Export Management Division, Department of Plant Quarantine, Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs 178 Anyang-ro Manan-gu Anyang city, Gyunggi-do REPUBLIC OF KOREA Ph.: (+82) 31 4207664 Fax: (+82) 31 4207605	koyim@korea.kr ;
✓	Member / Codex alimentarius representative	Ms Annamaria BRUNO Senior Food Standards Officer Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome ITALY Tel: +39 06 5705 6254	annamaria.bruno@fao.org;
✓	Host representative/ United Kingdom	Ms Jane CHARD SASA, Scottish Government Roddinglaw Road Edinburgh EH12 9FJ UNITED KINGDOM Tel: (+44) 131 2448863 Fax: (+44) 131 2448940	jane.chard@sasa.gsi.gov.uk ;
✓	Invited expert (grain industry)	Mr William (Bill) Stuart MAGEE 20 Robe Street Deakin A.C.T. 2600 AUSTRALIA Phone: +61 2 407935236 (mobile)	b.magee@pbcrc.com.au ; bill.magee04@gmail.com ;

	Participant role / Country	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
✓	Invited expert (International Seed Federation (ISF) representative)	Mr Gerard MEIJERINK Senior Government Relations Advocate Seeds Syngenta Avenue Louise 489 B-1050 Brussels BELGIUM Phone NL +31 228 366402 Phone BE +32 26422714 Fax BE +32 26422720 Mobile +31 6 51206913	gerard.meijerink@syngenta.com ;
✓	Invited expert (European Federation of Wooden Pallet and Packaging Manufacturers (FEFPEB) representative)	Ms Filipa PICO Secretary-general Embar - National Association of Recovery and Recycling of Packaging and Wood Wastes Av. António Serpa, 23 - 2º Esq. 1050-026 Lisboa PORTUGAL Phone: +351 217 972 639 / +351 962 075 386	Filipa.pico@embar.pt ;
NOT ATTENDING			
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Brent LARSON FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 1 00153 - Rome ITALY Phone: +39 06 570 54 915	Brent.Larson@fao.org ;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Céline GERMAIN FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 1 00153 - Rome ITALY Phone: +39 06 570 54 468	Celine.Germain@fao.org ;
	Organizer representative / European Commission	Mr Roman VAGNER Policy Officer Plant Health Directorate-General Health and Food Safety (SANTE) European Commission in Brussels Rue de la Loi, 149 Brussels BELGIUM Phone: (+32) 02 2959664 Fax: (+32) 02 2969399	Roman.Vagner@ec.europa.eu

APPENDIX 4 - Terms of Reference for a Working Group to discuss the Concept of a commodity standard

(Agreed by CPM-10 (2015))

Background

- [1] The Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) – 10 in 2015 has identified the need to have further and in depth discussions and analysis about the concept of a commodity standard.

Process

- [2] A small group will meet and complete the tasks outlined below. The report of this meeting will be presented to the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) in 2015 that will provide written input on strategic aspects to the Standards Committee (SC) November 2015. The SC will make recommendations to the CPM - 11 (2016).
- [3] The IPPC Secretariat will issue a call for discussion papers to contracting parties, National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs), Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) and relevant international organizations with a deadline of 12 June 2015.

Scope

- [4] Consider the concept and content of a commodity standard and the process for development.

Tasks

- [5] The working group will:
- discuss the concept of a commodity standard within the context of the suite of IPPC standards and the Framework for Standards and Implementation
 - discuss and propose the purpose, content and format of commodity standards
 - consider and propose a process for the development of a commodity standard, including, if relevant, how to consult with stakeholders from industry and other relevant international organizations
 - analyze and propose a system to maintain and update commodity standards.

Members and expertise

- [6] Approximately 6-10 experts will be selected by the CPM Bureau.
- [7] Experts should have a combined knowledge of the IPPC Standard Setting process and developing and setting phytosanitary regulations (in particular where industry stakeholders are engaged).
- [8] In addition, a few invited experts from industry will be invited.

Date and venue

- [9] The meeting is tentatively scheduled to be held from 20 to 24 July 2015 and hosted by the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) in Edinburgh, Scotland, UK. The work of this group will be supported by the IPPC Secretariat.

APPENDIX 5 - Template structure for commodity standards

[87] INTRODUCTION

[88] Scope

[89] *[A short statement that delineates what is covered by the standard. Define what you will address: the commodity covered by the standard, all intended uses or limited number of intended uses, all pests or limited pests, harmonization of procedures for the commodity, elements for pest risk analysis for the commodity]*

[90] References

[91] Definitions

[92] PURPOSE

[93] *[Why the standard was drafted and other information that aids in the understanding of the history of the development of the standard. When a standard is being revised, this section should include relevant information on the reasons for and scope of the revision. Describe here the commodity, its context, and the reason for the standard (problem being addressed). Describe the unique characteristics of the commodity that need harmonized phytosanitary measures]*

[94] IMPACT ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

[95] REQUIREMENTS

[96] 1. Pests associated with the pathway

[97] *[If the standard only addresses the procedures, the section may not be necessary. Some standards may only concentrate on major pests or pest groups of global relevance. There may be circumstances where the standards can include a full list of pests associated with the pathway]*

[98] 2. Pest Risk Factors related to *(name of the commodity)*

[99] 2.1 Intended use

[100] *[Describe pest risk factors related to the intended use. Pest risk may vary depending on whether the commodity is intended for processing, for consumption or for planting.]*

[101] 2.2 Activities of production practices for the commodity

[102] *[Describe elements specific to the production from planting to packing and trade of the commodity which may affect the pest risks and need to be taken into account by importing countries. These should include official procedures and industry processes or activities].*

[103] 3. Phytosanitary Measures

[104] *[This section describes phytosanitary measures that are applicable to the commodity to mitigate pest risk and that are proportional to the risks associated with the intended uses. The pests to which the phytosanitary measures apply must be stated along with the quantitative or qualitative expected outcome. This section should present the identified phytosanitary measures in a way that can be referred to or used in phytosanitary legislations and regulations.*

[105] *Standards should remind NPPOs that phytosanitary measures should be technically justified.*

[106] *Commodity standards may set global requirements for commodities (i.e. minimum requirements considered to be suitable for global use, as for instance in ISPM 15).*

[107] *Where numerous pests or measures are to be included, it may be appropriate to list these specific measures related to specific pests in an annex.*

[108] *The standard should indicate which phytosanitary measures could be considered as equivalent.*

[109] *The standard should not replicate text from other ISPMs. The phytosanitary treatments and the concepts (such as Pest free area (PFA), Area of low pest prevalence (ALPP), etc..) listed are those included in adopted ISPMs.*

[110] *Phytosanitary measures listed should be deemed to be appropriate for use in safe international trade (i.e. have already been approved by a NPPO).*

[111] *Two approaches may be considered:*

- *Option 1: listing phytosanitary measures against the pests or pest groups associated with each phytosanitary measure, which would allow to provide as many details as needed. In that case, the the following sub-sections may be used.*
- *Option 2: listing pests against the phytosanitary measures used with each pest. In that case, the table format shown below may be used.]*

[112] *[Option 1 for section 3:]*

[113] **3.1 Inspection and testing (field or consignments)**

[114] **3.2 Pest free areas; pest free places of production; pest free production sites; areas of low pest prevalence**

[115] **3.3 Treatments**

[116] **3.4 Others (Systems approaches; Post-entry quarantine; etc.)**

[117] *[Option 2 for section 3:]*

[118] **Mock example of Table X: available phytosanitary measures for orange (*Citrus sinensis*)**

Pest	Phytosanitary measure	Summary description
Queensland Fruit Fly (<i>Bactrocera tryoni</i>)	Pest free area	Keys elements of appropriate PFA may be listed (ISPM 4 and ISPM 26)
	Areas of low pest prevalence	Areas of low pest prevalence (ISPM 8:1998; ISPM 22:2005; ISPM 29:2007) may be established to reduce the pest risk associated with the movement of oranges (<i>Citrus sinensis</i>).
		Biological control may be used as an option in achieving the requirements for an area of low pest prevalence. Area wide suppression using sterile male release Release of XX sterile males at every point on a 1km grid every XX weeks. Sterile males were produced by exposing pupae to 40 Gy irradiation. Efficacy and confidence level of the area wide suppression is 99% at the 95% confidence level.

	Inspection	<p>Guidance on inspection and sampling is provided in ISPM 23 and ISPM 31.</p> <p>Visual inspection of a 600 sample of <i>Citrus sinensis</i></p> <p>Visual inspection of each of 600 dissected fruit randomly sampled from a consignment of fruit.</p> <p>Efficacy of detection and confidence level of the inspection is a contamination rate of 1.13% at the 95% confidence level.</p>
	Treatment	<p>Irradiation treatment: ISPM 18, ISPM 28 and PT5: Minimum absorbed dose of 100 Gy to prevent the emergence of adults. Efficacy and confidence level of the treatment is ED99.9978 at the 95% confidence level.</p> <p>Cold Treatment: ISPM 28 and PT16: Fruit of <i>Citrus sinensis</i> (orange) 3 °C or below for 16 continuous days For cultivar “Navel” the efficacy is effective dose (ED)99.9981 at the 95% confidence level. For cultivar “Valencia” the efficacy is ED99.9973 at the 95% confidence level.</p>
	Systems approach	The pest risk may be managed effectively by developing systems approaches that integrate measures for pest risk management in a defined manner (ISPM 14 and ISPM 35).
Gray pineapple mealybug (<i>Dysmicoccus neobrevipes</i>)	Pest free area	Keys elements of appropriate PFA may be listed (ISPM 4) <i>[Main elements of PFA may be identified.]</i>
	Areas of low pest prevalence	Areas of low pest prevalence (ISPM 8:1998; ISPM 22:2005; ISPM 29:2007) may be established to reduce the pest risk associated with the movement of oranges (<i>Citrus sinensis</i>).
	Inspection	<p>Guidance on inspection and sampling is provided in ISPM 23 and ISPM 31.</p> <p>Visual inspection of each of 600 citrus fruit randomly sampled from a consignment.</p> <p>Efficacy of detection and confidence level of the inspection is a contamination rate of at the 95% confidence level.</p>
	Treatment	<p>Irradiation treatment: ISPM 18, ISPM 28 and PT19: Minimum absorbed dose of 231 Gy to prevent the reproduction of adult females Efficacy and confidence level of the treatment is ED99.99023 at the 95% confidence level.</p>
	Systems approach	<p>The pest risk may be managed effectively by developing systems approaches that integrate measures for pest risk management in a defined manner (ISPM 14).</p> <p><i>[Main elements of such approaches may be identified for different situations.]</i></p>

[119] 4. Record keeping

[120] [Annexes may be added as appropriate.]