Submission form for topics for Standards and Implementation

Pacific Plant Protection Organisation on behalf of PPPO members

Introduction

In Accordance with CPM-13 decision, a combined call for topics for standards and tools for implementation is opened in 2018. IPPC contracting parties and RPPOs are invited to submit proposals for topics to be included as gaps in the Framework for Standards and Implementation for consideration to be put onto the IPPC work programme. Each submission should clearly define the problem needing resolution in sufficient detail to determine how it fits into the Framework for Standards and Implementation and the cost/benefit of the development of the standard or tool. Submitters are requested to consult the current IPPC Framework for Standards and Implementation (<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82439/>) to identify areas where the proposal can contribute.

Standards

This form covers submissions for new ISPMs, new components to an existing ISPM and revision or amendments to an ISPM, supplement, annex or appendix, including diagnostic protocols. Please note that a separate call for phytosanitary treatments (PTs) is made, more information on this call is available at <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/calls-treatments/>.

Please refer to the IPPC Standard Setting Procedure Manual[[1]](#footnote-1) for an explanation of the hierarchy of terms for standards (technical area, topic and subject). The list of topics for IPPC standards adopted by the CPM is available at <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards>.

Implementation

This form covers submissions for new IPPC implementation resources for implementation of the Convention, ISPMs and CPM recommendations or for revisions to IPPC implementation resources. Please refer to the IPPC Framework for Standards and Implementation on implementation resources that have been adopted/developed, are under development or are planned to be developed.

Submission

This completed form should be submitted by the IPPC official contact point, preferably via e-mail, to the IPPC Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) no later than **31 August 2018**. Please use one form per topic.

An electronic version of this form is available at <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-and-implementation/call-for-topics-standards-and-implementation/>.

Save and submit the completed submission form as:
2018\_TOPIC\_*PPPO Safe import of food and other aid*.docx.

 (Text in brackets given for explanatory purposes)

|  |
| --- |
| **Submission form for topics for Standards and Implementation** |
| 1. **Proposed by**: Pacific Plant Protection Organisation on behalf of PPPO members
 |
| 1. **Contact:** (Contact information of an individual able to clarify issues relating to this submission)

Name: Dr Visoni TIMOTE Position and organization: Executive Secretary, Pacific Plant Protection OrganisationMailing address: Pacific Community, Land Resources Division, Private Mail Bag, Suva FIJIPhone: +679 3370733 Ext: 35231E-mail: visonit@spc.int |
| 1. **Proposed Topic (Choose one box only)**

[\_X\_] Standard **(go to 4)** [ ] Implementation resource **(go to 5)** |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Standards**
	1. **Type of topic: (Choose one box only)**
 |
| A. New ISPM:[\_X\_] Concept[\_\_] Pest specific[\_\_] Commodity specific[\_\_] Reference | B. New component to an existing ISPM:[\_\_] Supplement[\_\_] Annex[\_\_] Appendix[\_\_] Technical panel (technical area)[\_\_] Diagnostic protocol (subject) | C. Revision/Amendment of:[\_\_] ISPM[\_\_] Supplement[\_\_] Annex[\_\_] Appendix |
| **Draft specification:**  Refer to Attachment 1 **(go to 6)** |

**OR**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Implementation**
	1. **Type of topic: (Choose one box only)**
 |
| 1. New implementation resource:

[\_\_] Guide (e.g. Manual)[\_\_] Training material (e.g. e-Learning)[\_\_] Awareness material[\_\_] Other (Please specify )  | 1. Revision of implementation resource

[\_\_] Guide (e.g. Manual)[\_\_] Training material (e.g. e-Learning)[\_\_] Awareness material[\_\_] Other (Please specify )  |
| * 1. Featured Convention articles, ISPMs and CPM recommendations in the proposed implementation resource

[\_\_] for Convention articles (Please specify ) [\_\_] for ISPM (Please specify ) [\_\_] for CPM Recommendation (Please specify )  |
| **Draft outline:**  Submissions for topics on implementation should be accompanied by a draft outline of implementation resource defining a scope and purpose, or a draft implementation resource. Commitment for financial/in-kind resources to support the development of the implementation resource may be included in the submission (non-obligatory).**(go to 6)** |

|  |
| --- |
| **6. Proposed title of document****Safe Import of Food and Other Aid** |
| **7. Proposed priority**  [\_X\_] 1 (high) [\_\_] 2 [\_\_] 3 [\_\_] 4 (low) Comments:This is proposed as priority 1 given the increasing number of extreme weather events occurring around the world, as a consequence of climate change and other natural or man-made disasters, necessitating the movement of humanitarian aid to affected areas and the risks posed by the international movement of food, machinery and other materials in these circumstances. |
| **8. Featured outcome of standard/implementation resource** The standard will guide aid agencies, private donors, exporters, importers and regulators on the phytosanitary risk management of food and other materials provided to assist response and recovery of countries after a natural disaster or other emergency situation. The standard will identify goods that pose little or no phytosanitary risk and which can be moved freely. It will provide examples of goods that pose a phytosanitary risk requiring management in order to prevent the introduction of quarantine pests, as well as risk management options that may reduce the risk to an acceptable level. |
| **9. Contribution to filling the gaps of the Framework for Standards and Implementation:** (2 lines max) Standards – complements ISPM 32, applies other standards including ISPMs 41, 39, 28, 15, 12 and 1 for non-commercial, emergency pathway |
| **10. Summary of justification for the proposal** (2 lines max)Countries receiving food and other humanitarian aid are exposed to pests that, unless appropriate risk management is applied, may become established and have a long term impact on the economy, environment and communities well after the country has recovered from the emergency situation.  |

**Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics[[2]](#footnote-2):**

|  |
| --- |
| Guidance is required to facilitate the safe movement of urgently needed humanitarian into areas impacted by disasters or other emergency situations, and particularly where normal regulatory risk management operations are compromised or impacted by the situation. Much of this aid is consolidated and shipped to areas that need it through processes and distributions networks that are outside of the normal commercial trading pathways. The awareness of phytosanitary risks and the need to meeting importing countries conditions may not be well known or understood by aid providers.There has been a significant increase in severe weather events, attributed to climate change, as well as ongoing man-made and natural disasters that have precipitated the urgent need for food, water and machinery to prevent or ameliorate humanitarian crises. For example, Tonga has experienced three category 4 cyclones and one category 5 (Cyclone Ian) since 2010, while the Pacific region as a whole is increasingly experiencing damaging storms and storm surges. These events are not limited to developing countries or the Pacific region, and have occurred in all regions of the world. Global impact requires global solutions, and a practical standard, which can address the safe movement of humanitarian aid, will have global application and implementation.NPPOs are impacted by these situations but are still bound by their role and function to effectively manage the phytosanitary risks associated with imports of this aid. This can be difficult where executive government demands that the goods are cleared and provided to those in need do not allow for normal risk-based clearance processes to occur, or when it is clear that phytosanitary risks cannot be managed and the goods must be exported or destroyed. Mixed consignments in shipping or air containers, which have a range of goods and risks, can experience delays in clearance and release as they require a full unpack to verify their phytosanitary status. Damaged infrastructure may prevent the application of phytosanitary treatments to remediate risks identified, and re-export may not be an option either – leaving the NPPO to deal with the risk.An international standard would allow low and high risk goods to be identified, along with risk management measures, so that risks could be addressed off shore. This approach has been applied in ISPM 32 for processed goods. It would enable aid and donor agencies to better plan their programs and standardise supply and distribution operations for multiple countries. A clearly defined list of permitted foods and types of processing know to reduce phytosanitary risk will benefit both donors and recipient countries and NPPO’s in a time of crisis. This would increase efficiency and potentially reduce regulatory burden to expedite clearance. In a recent response to a natural disaster, one NPPO requested a food aid item to be frozen to ensure it was not diverted to planting, knowing that the source area had a disease of quarantine concern. This was done and safe import occurred.The standard would also provide NPPOs with additional authority by nature of the ISPMs to manage in-country demands for rapid clearance with little regard for the potential medium and long term impacts of pests that become established as a result of inadequate risk management. These impacts might include the need for additional chemicals in crop production to reduce yield and quality losses, additional phytosanitary measures for existing markets and the risk of industry failure. The introduction of Great Grain borer*, Prostephanus truncatus*, into Africa via food aid grain shipments is one of the more powerful examples of well- intentioned food aid resulting in a catastrophic and enduring establishment of a stored product pest. Impact of pests is not limited to production agriculture. The weed known as giant mimosa (*Mimosa diplotricha*) was introduced into the Vava’u Islands (Tonga) with sand from Tahiti as part of French Aid reconstruction assistance following Cyclone Waqa in 2002.There is also the potential of phytosanitary risks associated with seeds given as aid. These seeds come in 100 – 500g seed lots and as relief starter seed packs. Vegetable seeds may be sourced from countries for which no risk analysis has been completed. Since it comes as aid, most countries accept the seeds and distribute them to farmers as relief packs. There is potential for viruses and other seed pathogens associated with these type of seed imports to become established. The proposing contracting parties acknowledge and appreciate the aid from countries, but are seeking clear guidance on the type of aid that is needed with due consideration of these phytosanitary risks and threats in the long term, to these already disaster prone island countries.  |
| **Core criteria (must provide information. It is expected that all submissions meet the following core****criteria)** |
| Contribution to the purpose of the IPPC as described in article I.1.IPPC – manage phytosanitary risks to prevent the international movement of pests |
| Linkage to IPPC Strategic Objectives (SOs) and Organizational results demonstrated.The action to prevent the international movement of pests to countries requiring immediate or long term humanitarian aid aligns will all the IPPC strategic objectives relevant to food security, environment protection and facilitation of safe trade. Pests entering with donated goods when normal phytosanitary risk management operations are compromised, are more likely to result in establishment.  |
| Feasibility of implementation at the global level (consider ease of implementation, technical complexity, capacity of NPPO(s) to implement, relevance for more than one region).As noted above. Natural and man-made emergencies and disasters occur in all regions of the world. Donor agencies and recipient countries require clear guidance on the types of food aid which can move freely without the need for further phytosanitary intervention, but also guidance on other types of food that present a phytosanitary risk and require specific intervention to render them safe as food aid. The development of guidance that is both practical and effective will help address the issues identified. In addition, there are a limited number of global aid agencies, which could drive implementation for the benefits they receive from efficiencies in sourcing materials that are assured of rapid border clearance and subsequent distribution. |
| Clear identification of the problems that need to be resolved through the development of the standard or implementation resource.As above. |
| Availability of, or possibility to collect, information in support of the proposed standard or implementation resource (e.g. scientific, historical, technical information, experience).Many countries have experience in this area and can help to formulate both the standard and implementation materials, enriched by experience. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Supporting criteria (information may be provided, as appropriate):** |
| **Supporting criteria (Practical)**1. Is there a regional standard and/or implementation resource on the same topic already available and used by NPPOs, RPPOs or international organizations.
2. Availability of expertise needed to develop the proposed standard and/or implementation resource.
 |
| **Supporting criteria (Economic)**1. Estimated value of the plants protected.
2. Estimated value of trade including new trade opportunities affected by the proposed standard and/or implementation resource (e.g. volume of trade, value of trade, the percentage of Gross Domestic Product of this trade) if appropriate.
 |
| **Supporting criteria (Environmental)**1. Utility to reduce the potential negative environmental consequences of certain phytosanitary measures, for example reduction in global emissions for the protection of the ozone layer.
2. Utility in the management of non-indigenous species which are pests of plants (such as some invasive alien species).
3. Contribution to the protection of the environment, through the protection of wild flora, and their habitats and ecosystems, and of agricultural biodiversity.
 |
| **Supporting criteria (Strategic)**1. Extent of support for the proposed standard and/or implementation resource (e.g. one or more NPPOs or RPPOs have requested it, or one or more RPPOs have adopted a standard on the same topic).
2. Frequency with which the issue to be addressed, as identified in the submission emerges as a source of trade disruption (e.g. disputes or need for repeated bilateral discussions, number of times per year trade is disrupted).
3. Relevance and utility to developing countries.
4. Coverage (application to a wide range of countries/pests/commodities).
5. Complements other standards and/or implementation resources (e.g. potential for the standard to be used as part of a systems approach for one pest, complement treatments for other pests).
6. Conceptual standard and/or implementation resource to address fundamental concepts (e.g. treatment efficacy, inspection methodology).
7. Urgent need for the standard and/or implementation resource.
 |
| **Diagnostic protocols are subject to additional criteria. For proposals for DPs, please elaborate on the following criteria to help the future consideration of the subject proposed:*** Need for international harmonization of the diagnostic techniques for the pest (e.g. due to difficulties in diagnosis or disputes on methodology)
* Relevance of the diagnosis to the protection of plants including measures to limit the impact of the pest.
* Importance of the plants protected on the global level (e.g. relevant to many countries or of major importance to a few countries).
* Volume/importance of trade of the commodity that is subjected to the diagnostic procedures (e.g. relevant to many countries or of major importance to a few countries).
* Other criteria for topics as determined by CPM that are relevant to determining priorities
* Balance between pests of importance in different climatic zones (temperate, tropics etc.) and commodity classes.
* Number of labs undertaking the diagnosis.
* Feasibility of production of a protocol, including availability of knowledge and expertise.
 |
| **Literature review**[[3]](#footnote-3) (This section will provide a **summary of the topic** based on scientific and technical publications, including a referenced **list of literature reviewed**. This will help provide the scientific basis for the content of the standard/implementation resource to be used by the selected experts during the development of the standard/implementation resource)**.** |

**Send submissions to:** **Address:** IPPC Secretariat (AGDI)

**E-mail:** ippc@fao.org Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN

(Subject line: “Call for topics 2018”) Viale delle Terme di Caracalla

 00153 Rome, Italy

Attachment 1

**DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ISPM**

1. **Safe Import of Food and Other Aid**.
2. Countries receiving food and other humanitarian aid are exposed to pests that, unless appropriate risk management is applied, may become established and have a long term impact on the economy, environment and communities long after the country has recovered from the emergency situation.

**Scope**

1. This standard will address phytosanitary risks and their effective management under emergency or disaster response and recovery situation associated with humanitarian aid including food, water, building materials, people, machinery and equipment, as well as plants and plant products that may be imported to re-establish recovery of food and other production industries.

**Purpose**

The standard will guide aid agencies, exporters and importers and regulators on the phytosanitary risk management of food and other materials provided to assist response and recovery of countries after a natural disaster or other emergency situation. The standard will identify goods that pose little or no phytosanitary risk and which can be moved freely. It will provide examples of goods that pose a phytosanitary risk requiring management in order to prevent the introduction of quarantine pests, as well as risk management options that may reduce the risk to an acceptable level.

**Tasks**

1. The expert drafting group (EDG) should undertake the following tasks:
2. Identify frequently accessed goods and materials provided as humanitarian aid, in consultation with countries or areas that have received such aid within the last five years.
3. Consider both actual and potential phytosanitary risks associated with the import of these goods.
4. Identify risk management options to manage these risks, including widely available commercial manufacturing processes which are recognized as effective in addressing phytosanitary risk. particularly in circumstances where risk assessment and risk management options in the importing country have been impacted by the emergency or disaster situation.
5. Consider the risk associated with certain high risk practices to deliver food aid, such as air drops of grain or other seeds and how this may contribute to unintended pest spread.
6. Generate a table to collate materials, risks and possible risk management options, with reference to existing ISPMs and implementation resources.
7. Consider the short, medium and long-term consequences of establishment of pests associated with humanitarian aid
8. Consider pre-clearance or off-shore options to address risks prior to export.
9. Identify mechanisms for providing information to potential donors, aid agencies, importers and exports to reduce the approach of risk goods in an emergency situation.
10. Document examples of actual pest establishments attributed to food aid and the impact of these pests.
11. Consider whether the ISPM could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft ISPM.
12. 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 Standards Committee (SC).

**Provision of resources**

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

**Collaborator**

1. Potential collaborators include FAO, UN Food Programme, UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), International Red Cross, Oxfam, World Vision, various churches, other international organisations for example, the Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) Humanitarian Reference Group.

**Steward**

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

**Expertise**

1. Five to seven experts with a wide knowledge and experience in providing or receiving humanitarian aid and the management of phytosanitary risks associated with traded goods, including at least one person knowledgeable in procurement and supply of humanitarian aid in the private sector and one from the public sector; and at least one person knowledgeable in the clearance and risk management of imported goods under operating conditions compromised by emergency or disaster constraints.

**Participants**

1. [To be determined.]

**References**

1. The IPPC, relevant ISPMs and other national, regional and international standards and agreements as may be applicable to the tasks, and discussion papers submitted in relation to this work. There will be published information on pests introduced through food aid, possibly by FAO eg. Great Grain Beetle introduction into Africa.

**Discussion papers**

1. Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat (ippc@fao.org) for consideration by the EDG.
1. IPPC Standard Setting Procedure Manual URL: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85024/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. As agreed by CPM-13 (2018) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. As agreed by CPM-7 (2012) and CPM-11 (2016). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)