



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

WORKING GROUP FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE IPPC PEST STATUS GUIDE

Rome, Italy
16-20 September 2019
IPPC Secretariat

International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). 2019. *Working Group for the development of the IPPC Pest Status Guide*. Rome, Italy. 17 pages.
Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, [2019]



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: “This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original English edition shall be the authoritative edition.

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

Third-party materials. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org

Contents

Working Group For the development of the IPPC Pest Status guide..... 4

1. Opening of the meeting 4

2. Meeting Arrangements 4

2.1 Introduction of participants..... 4

2.2 Election of the Chairperson 4

2.3 Election of Rapporteur..... 4

2.4 Adoption of the Agenda..... 4

3. Administrative Matters 4

4. IPPC Guides and Training materials 4

5. Introduction to the IPPC Pest Status Guide 4

6. Review of ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) 5

7. Overview of the Outline for the Guide 5

8. Discussion papers 6

8.1. Background papers 6

8.2. Expert papers 6

9. Development of content for the Guide on Pest Status 7

10. Next steps: Follow-up Actions 8

11. Other Business 8

12. Close of the meeting 8

APPENDIX 1: Agenda..... 9

APPENDIX 2: Documents List..... 10

APPENDIX 3: Participants List 11

APPENDIX 4: Pest Status Examples and Case Studies..... 13

APPENDIX 5: Chapters assignment for development of Pest Status Guide (2017-048)..... 15

APPENDIX 6: Proposed Timeline for Development of the Pest Status Guide (2017-048)..... 16

WORKING GROUP FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE IPPC PEST STATUS GUIDE

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The Team Leader of Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU), International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat, opened the meeting and welcomed all participants to the Working Group (WG) to develop the Pest Status Guide to support the implementation of ISPM 8: *Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005)*, currently under revision and address gaps identified by The Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS). He highlighted the importance of completing a draft of the Pest Status Guide before the end of the calendar year. He wished a fruitful meeting and encouraged the experts to have productive discussions.
- [2] The IFU Lead for the guide also welcomed participants, emphasizing the value of each expert's contributions to the development of this guide both during and after the meeting.

2. Meeting Arrangements

2.1 Introduction of participants

- [3] The participants introduced themselves briefly.

2.2 Election of the Chairperson

- [4] Mr. Nelson LAVILLE (Dominica) was elected as Chairperson.

2.3 Election of Rapporteur

- [5] Mr. Ebenezer ABOAGYE (Ghana) was elected as Rapporteur.

2.4 Adoption of the Agenda

- [6] The WG adopted the agenda (Appendix 1).

3. Administrative Matters

- [7] The Secretariat introduced the documents list (Appendix 2); the participants list (Appendix 3); and directed experts to the link on the local information. Though the expert from China, Mr. Xubin PAN was unable to attend the meeting, he participated in some of the discussions via Skype.

4. IPPC Guides and Training materials

- [8] The Secretariat explained the general process for the development of IPPC Guides and Training Materials¹, and outlined the responsibilities of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC), the IPPC Secretariat and the WG participants.
- [9] This session also recalled the process for a peer review, and explained the differences between the three (3) different calls (Call 1: for submission of any exiting relevant materials, Call 2: for funds for the development of the approved topics and Call 3: nominating of experts for the working group).

5. Introduction to the IPPC Pest Status Guide

- [10] The IPPC Secretariat provided background on the topic and explained that the guide is intended to support the implementation of ISPM 8: *Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005)*, which is under revision and is currently out for second consultation. The consultation period would close on 30 September 2019. The Standards Committee (SC) will review the draft standard, which will be revised by the Steward, considering comments from the second consultation and is expected that the SC would recommend it to CPM-15 (2020) for adoption.

¹ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87034/> (Procedure Manual for Implementation and Capacity Development, Section 1.3)

- [11] Aligning the development of IPPC guides with the development of ISPMs was intended to provide relevant resources in a timely manner and to facilitate the implementation of the revised ISPM 8 by IPPC Contracting Parties (CPs), after it has been adopted by CPM. Ideally, it would be desirable to start the resources mobilization for the implementation when a topic is adopted. The Secretariat explained that because of funding constraints, the development of the Guide on Pest Status was initiated prior to adoption of the revised ISPM 8. The development of the Pest Status Guide was supported by funding from the European Commission (GCP/GLO/725/EC “Implementation of the IPPC to facilitate safe trade and dispute avoidance”). The Secretariat indicated that the draft guide should be completed by the end of this calendar year but would not be published after the revised ISPM 8 has been adopted by CPM, in case minor adjustments are needed.
- [12] The Secretariat also noted that the Pest Status Guide has strong linkages to other ISPMs, for example ISPM 6 (*Guidelines for surveillance*)², ISPM 4: *Requirements for the establishment of pest free area*³, ISPM 10: *Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*⁴ and ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*)⁵.
- [13] Discussions highlighted the need to agree to a work plan with a clear timelines and to identify how to share the responsibilities for drafting the various chapters of the Guide to the WG members.

6. Review of ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*)

- [14] One WG expert also participated in the ISPM 8 EWG in Vietnam in September 2017. She mentioned that the existing standard is 20 years old and should be updated to include more recent information and to address a number of implementation issues that had been identified. She provided a summary of the discussions of the EWG and highlighted key implementation issues that were discussed during the EWG meeting, including:
- The importance of providing guidance on evaluating the reliability of information used to determine pest status and the quality of pest reporting.
 - The complexities of the existing categories to determinate pest status and the need for simplified categories.
 - Interpretation of the concept of “present: transient”, based on the situation of each country, especially in considering climatic aspects. In the revised draft ISPM 8, a pest is considered transient when a pest is either (1) temporarily present but establishment is not expected to occur based on unfavorable climate or unavailability of hosts or (2) eradication measures are applied promptly and effectively.
 - How much information is enough to determine the status of a pest? While it is recognized that monitoring activities are important, NPPOs sometimes face challenges in terms of insufficient human resources and laboratory equipment.

7. Overview of the Outline for the Guide

- [15] The Secretariat gave a brief overview of the chapter titles and section headings identified in the Outline for the Pest Status Guide.
- [16] The WG agreed that case studies and examples should be developed to enhance the information presented in the Guide. The IPPC Secretariat advised that case studies would be included as appendices to the Guide and experts were tasked to submit case studies by February 2020. The IPPC Secretariat presented a template for Case Studies to the WG. Some examples of case studies, which were developed for the Guide on Pest Free Areas (PFA), were shared with the WG experts.

² <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/615/>

³ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/614/>

⁴ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/610/>

⁵ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/606/>

- [17] The WG agreed that one or more flowcharts should be used to illustrate the steps an NPPO should follow when determining pest status.

8. Discussion papers

8.1. Background papers

- [18] The Secretariat introduced the background information to give a better understanding the issues discussed by the EWG, SC and SC-7 in the revisions of ISPM 8.
- [19] The Secretariat provided the Explanatory document on ISPM 5 *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*⁶ to the WG members to provide additional background information on some of the terms used in ISPM 8 and context for some key concepts used in the Guide.

8.2. Expert papers

- [20] The experts presented their expert papers with emphasis on their suggested contributions to the Pest Status Guide.
- [21] It was emphasized that the importance of determining pest status should be clearly developed at the beginning of the Guide and that how pest status is determined could help to support exports and to reduce production losses. Some ideas for information that should be included in pest records was presented as well as which factors should be considered in the determination of validity of pest records and the importance of pest diagnostics.
- [22] It was also suggested that the Guide could provide criteria to assist an NPPO to determine the pest status. In the process of determining pest status, it is very important to consider the mobility and climatic tolerances of the species. The importance of communication with the scientific community was mentioned (having strong relationships with the local scientific community to find out about new pest detections and to ensure they are aware of the status of key pests in their country).
- [23] Another aspect set out by experts was the importance of determining pest status. The determination of pest status are needed for establishing phytosanitary regulations to prevent the introduction, establishment and spread of an exotic pest. Pest status information may also be used to obtain or preserve market access with trade partners. In addition to the basic information collected, pest reports should provide information about the frequency of interception during surveys, observations, and collection.
- [24] Furthermore, it was suggested that the Pest Status Guide should include an introductory section, which clearly explains the purpose of the Guide. The Guide should clearly state that the NPPO, must lead the process of pest status determination in their country. The Guide should also describe the steps that an NPPO should follow in situations where there is a single old or unreliable pest record. It was mentioned that National legislation should provide the appropriate framework to enable the NPPO to fulfill its responsibilities in determining pest status in the national territory. In addition, in some parts of the Outline for the Guide, the terms ‘‘Pest Record’’ and ‘‘Pest Report’’ have been used incorrectly. For a better understanding, the use of these terms needs to be clarified.
- [25] One expert was highlighted the case of Australia, which is a Federal state with significant regional differences in pest status, particularly in areas that are geographically isolated and separated from other areas by arid desert or by sea. The Commonwealth Government is responsible for biosecurity at Australia’s national border and the state and territory governments are responsible for biosecurity within their own borders. It was indicated that Australia is developing a pest and disease repository to assist with recording decisions on pest status and changes over time.
- [26] Moreover, It was emphasized that Guide should clearly describe the steps required to determine pest status and suggested that the Guide should remain focused on the scope of ISPM 8.

⁶ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87049/>

9. Development of content for the Guide on Pest Status

- [27] The WG discussed the fundamental steps in the process used for the determination of pest status. These discussions led to the development of a series of flow charts that summarizes the steps that an NPPO should follow when making a determination of pest status in an area. The experts described the successive steps to be followed for the determination of pest status in an area. Two (2) flow charts described how to further categorize a pest when it has been determined to be either “present” or “absent”.
- [28] The WG reviewed the Outline for the Guide and identified key information to be included in each section of the Guide.
- [29] The following aspects were highlighted:
- The Guide should provide clarification of the concept of ‘area’ with respect to pest status determination. A description of the area under consideration should be included the pest status determination. In determining Pest Free Areas (PFA), the boundaries of the area should be clearly defined e.g. regional or legislative boundaries, roads, rivers etc.
 - The Guide should provide clear guidance on the use of “present: transient” and should clarify that transience is a temporary status category. The pest status should ultimately be revised either to “present” or “absent”. The difference between the status of “present: transient” and “absent: pest no longer present” and “absent: eradicated” should be clarified and practical examples of each should be provided.
 - The Guide should also describe the options available and offer guidance on using pest status to negotiate market access with another country in situations where a pest is “present”.
 - The Pest Status Guide should provide references to other relevant IPPC implementation resources and training materials.
 - When gathering information to determine pest status in an area, the NPPO should evaluate the data obtained from different sources in terms of its reliability.
 - In some cases, it may be advisable / necessary to provide additional information about pest presence (e.g. only on specific hosts, in enclosed structures, in botanical gardens, in the environment but not on crop plants, or at certain times of year).
 - NPPOs may consider a number of factors when they prioritize the list of pests for which they need to determinate the status (e.g. potential for new or existing market access, pest impact on biodiversity, specific national priorities or to justify an emergency measure).
 - The Guide should provide a clear explanation of the concepts of “not widely distributed” and “official control”.
 - The Guide should clarify the different sub-categories of presence, and take into account that determination of pest status must also consider other aspects such as distribution, prevalence, occurrence in time etc.
 - The WG discussed the category “present except in PFPP and PFPS” and considered that the concepts of PFPP and PFPS are not related to the distribution of a pest within a country and should be considered as potential risk mitigation measures, rather than pest status categories. It was noted that PFPP and PFPS are generally defined in bilateral agreements.
 - The WG noted that the Guide should clarify that “unable to determine” is not a pest status category.
- [30] During the WG meeting, the experts considered potential implementation issues related to the draft revision to ISPM 8. The following aspects were highlighted:
- There was a general consensus that the table in Appendix 1 of revised ISPM 8 is too prescriptive and that the large number of reliability categories will make it difficult to apply. The WG developed a revised table which listed key factors to consider when evaluating the level of reliability of an information source.
 - The WG also suggested that PFPP and PFPS are not related to the distribution of a pest within a country and should not be considered as pest status categories.

- [31] The IPPC Secretariat invited experts to consider the issues discussed during the meeting and, if they wish, they could consider submit any comments on the draft revision to ISPM 8 through their IPPC Contact Points at the national level prior to 30 September, 2019 deadline.
- [32] The WG suggested examples and case studies that could be developed to enhance or support the information in the guide. These examples are detailed in Appendix 4.
- [33] Each expert identified chapters of the Pest Status Guide which they would be responsible for the drafting (see Appendix 5).
- [34] The WG reviewed the timelines proposed by the Secretariat and agreed to a work plan for completing the Pest Status Guide with clear deliverables, and deadlines. Dates were assigned for completing various key milestones (see Appendix 6).
- [35] One expert suggested that it could be helpful to prepare a table to compare status between the original and the revised ISPM 8 and consider how the old sub-categories 'translate' across to the revised sub-categories. After further discussion it was determined that such table might be more appropriate as part of presentations and other materials that support the implementation of the ISPM 8 and use of the Pest Status Guide.
- [36] One expert suggested that a Fact Sheet with flow chart / simple infographic that provides pest status basics could be developed as a new supplemental resource to support the Pest Status Guide.

10. Next steps: Follow-up Actions

- [37] The following key action items were identified to help develop the draft guide by mid-November 2019:
- [38] The Secretariat agreed to clean up the draft Pest Status Guide document that was developed during the WG meeting, incorporate the items discussed, and then, circulate the document to the WG members by 28 September 2019 along with the chapter assignments and the work plan.
- [39] The WG members will finish drafting their chapters and submit all written materials (chapters and revised flowcharts) to the IPPC Secretariat by 25 October 2019.
- [40] The IPPC Secretariat will compile the experts' contributions into a single document that will be shared using Google Doc by 15 November, 2019. If necessary, an e-forum will be created to discuss specific issues.
- [41] A copy of the SC-approved ISPM 8 will be shared with the WG in mid-November, 2019 (if possible) and the experts will be asked to make adjustments to the Guide, as needed.
- [42] The IPP Secretariat will provide the WG members with a revised case study template that includes the specifications for photos and charts/graphs.

11. Other Business

- [43] There was no other business.

12. Close of the meeting

- [44] The Secretariat informed the WG that an online meeting evaluation would be conducted to gather their comments and opinions about the meeting, to help the Secretariat improve future WG meetings and the process for Guide development.
- [45] The Chairperson, thanked participants for their participation and productive discussions during the meeting. He encouraged experts to continue the work with the same determination to achieve the purpose of the meeting by the deadlines. He expressed his sincere gratitude to the Secretariat for its immense contribution in organizing the meeting and asked for the continuous support to complete the document.
- [46] The Secretariat thanked the participants for their efforts and acknowledged that it had been a productive week which had resulted in a strong base for completing the development of the draft Guide.

APPENDIX 1: Agenda

Agenda Item		Document No.	Presenter
1.	Opening of the Meeting		IPPC Secretariat
2.	Meeting Arrangements		IPPC Secretariat
2.1	Introduction of participants		All participants
2.2	Election of the Chairperson		IPPC Secretariat All participants
2.3	Election of the Rapporteur		CHAIRPERSON
2.4	Adoption of the Agenda	01_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	CHAIRPERSON
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1	Documents lists	02_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	IPPC Secretariat
3.2	Participants lists	03_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	IPPC Secretariat
3.3	Local information	Local information	IPPC Secretariat
4.	Introduction to the IPPC Pest Status Guide: objectives and expected outcomes of the project		PETERSON
5.	Overview of ISPM 8 (adopted and revised draft)	04_WG_PSG_2019_Sep 05_WG_PSG_2019_Sep 06_WG_PSG_2019_Sep 08_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	ODGERS/ PETERSON
6.	Overview of the Draft Outline for the Guide	07_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	PETERSON
7.	Review of discussion papers	10_WG_PSG_2019_Sep 10a_WG_PSG_2019_Sep 10b_WG_PSG_2019_Sep 10c_WG_PSG_2019_Sep 10d_WG_PSG_2019_Sep 11_WG_PSG_2019_Sep 12_WG_PSG_2019_Sep 13_WG_PSG_2019_Sep 14_WG_PSG_2019_Sep 15_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	CHAIRPERSON EXPERTS
8.	Development of the text for the Guide on Pest Status		CHAIRPERSON
8.1	Review the Outline for the Guide and identify key information that should be included in each section and other resources that could enhance or support that information (e.g. case studies, infographics, good practices, national/regional manuals, etc.)		All participants Open discussion
8.2	Start writing the text of the Guide		All participants Open discussion
9.0	Identify Follow-up Actions		CHAIRPERSON
9.1	Establish a workplan for completing the guide with clear deliverables and time lines.	09_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	All participants
9.2	Identify which experts will be responsible for completing each section of the guide		All participants
9.3	Identify any new resources that should be developed for inclusion in the guide and follow-up actions for each	16_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	All participants
10.	Any Other Business		CHAIRPERSON
11.	Close of the Meeting		CHAIRPERSON

APPENDIX 2: Documents List

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
01_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	2.4	Agenda	2019-07-19 2019-09-05 2019-09-06 2019-09-10
02_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	3.1	Documents list	2019-0-06 2019-09-10 2019-09-13
03_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	3.2	Participants lists	2019-07-19 2019-09-03
04_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	5	ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area (2017)	2019-07-26
05_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	5	Draft Revision of ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area (2009-05)	2019-07-26
06_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	5	Specification 59 - Revision of ISPM 8	2019-07-26
07_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	6	Outline: IPPC Guide on Pest Status (2017-048)	2019-08-12 2019-09-05
08_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	5	Background information on the revision of ISPM 8 Determination of Pest Status in an area (2009-005)	2019-09-05
09_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	9.1	Proposed Timeline for Development of the Pest Status Guide (2017-048)	2019-09-05 2019-09-06 2019-09-13
10_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	7	EWG Member Discussion Paper prepared by Ms Odgers	2019-09-06
10a_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	7	Draft National Guideline for Regulated Non-Quarantine Pest and Official control of plants for planting	2019-09-10
10b_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	7	Official Control Status Report	2019-09-10
10c_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	7	NATIONAL POLICY: Plant quarantine pest and official control	2019-09-10
10d_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	7	NATIONAL POLICY: Regulated non-quarantine pest and official control of plants for planting	2019-09-10
11_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	7	EWG Member Discussion paper prepared by Mr Pan	2019-09-06
12_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	7	EWG Member Discussion paper prepared by Mr Laville	2019-09-06
13_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	7	EWG Member Discussion Paper prepared by Mr Eyre	2019-09-06
14_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	7	EWG Member Discussion Paper prepared by Ms Montes	2019-09-06
15_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	7	EWG Member Discussion Paper prepared by Mr Aboagye	2019-09-09
16_WG_PSG_2019_Sep	9.3	Case study template for IPPC Guides and training materials	2019-09-10

IPP LINKS:	Agenda item
Local Information	3.3

APPENDIX 3: Participants List

Region/ Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
Argentina	Ms Guadalupe MONTES National Food Safety and Quality Service (SENASA) Av. Paseo Colón N° 367 ACD1063 - Buenos Aires, ARGENTINA Tel: (011) 4121-5196	gmontes@senasa.gob.ar
Australia expert	Ms Wendy ODGERS Director, Plant Sciences and Risk Assessment, Plant Division Australian Department of Agriculture GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Tel: +61 2 6272 5322	wendy.odgers@agriculture.gov.au
China expert	Mr Xubin PAN Pest Risk Analysis Expert Chinese Academy of Inspection and Quarantine Ronghuananlu 11, Yizhung, Beijing 10176, China Tel: +86 10 5389 7664	xubin.hu.pan@gmail.com
Dominica expert	Mr Nelson LAVILLE Head of Plant Protection and Quarantine Service Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Botanic Gardens, Roseau, Commonwealth of Dominica Tel: +1 767 266 3802 Tel: +1 767 277 5353	nelson.laville@gmail.com
Ghana expert	Mr Ebenezer ABOAGYE Deputy Director Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate P. O. Box M37, Accra, Ghana Tel: +233 26 127 4671	aboagyee@gmail.com
United Kingdom expert	Mr Dominic EYRE Plant Health Entomologist Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs Nafic, Room 11F18, Sand Hutton, York, YO41 1LZ, United Kingdom +44 (0)7818 468594	dominic.eyre@defra.gov.uk
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Barbara PETERSON Implementation and Facilitation Unit Officer, IPPC Secretariat, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations 4321 Still Creek Drive, Suite 400 Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada	barbara.peterson@canada.ca

	(+1) 604 292 5665	
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Ketevan LOMSADZE Implementation and Facilitation Unit Officer, IPPC Secretariat, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, ITALY Tel: (+39) 06 570 53035	ketevan.lomsadze@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Descartes Larios KOUMBA MOUENDOU Implementation Facilitation Officer International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, ITALY Tel.: +39 06 570551302	Descartes.Koumba@fao.org

APPENDIX 4: Pest Status Examples and Case Studies

N°	PSG WG SUGGESTIONS	EXPERTS
1	False codling moth (<i>Thaumatotibia leucotreta</i>) in Ghana	E. ABOAGYE
2	A checklist or a case study based on Australia's policy and guidelines for regulated non-quarantine pests	W. ODGERS
3	"Absent: no longer present": A single outdated pest record affecting a host located out of the main production area (i.e. few specimens affecting an isolated fruit plant in a backyard located out and far from the fruit production area).	G.MONTES
4	In the Caribbean region, especially in the OECS where we traded as a block, banana exports to the UK and the European Union are consolidated. Pest status varied between islands, for example banana flower thrips did not exist in Dominica. Specific surveillance was used to support the status of Dominica as a pest free area.	N. LAVILLE
5	The determination of pest status in an area should be supported by phytosanitary legislation and policies that ensure that authority, responsibilities and financial resources are assigned to the appropriate administrative levels. In Ghana Plants and Fertilizer Act, 2010 (Act 803) and Plant Protection Regulation (L.I. 2193) provide the legal basis for NPPO to carry out surveillance to define areas of low pest prevalence and pest free areas.	E. ABOAGYE
6	Recording pest status and changes in pest status over time: Australia is developing a pest and disease repository to assist with recording decisions on pest status and changes over time.	W. ODGERS
7	Example of <i>Thrips palmi</i> interceptions by the UK on products originating from Ghana. The NPPO of Ghana is currently conducting detection surveys in areas of vegetable production to determine the status of this insect.	E. ABOAGYE
8	Across Australia there are significant regional differences in pest status, particularly in areas that are geographically isolated and separated from other areas by arid desert (such as the states of Western Australia and South Australia) or by sea (the state of Tasmania). Subject to scientific evidence and appropriate official controls, Australian governments have agreed to support the development and maintenance of regional pest and disease status. For example: fruit flies in PFA in southern Australia and Tasmania.	W. ODGERS
9	Example where a pest record included only the common name and host of a regulated pest. This raised quite a few questions regarding the authenticity of the record. It was later discovered that the pest had been misidentified.	N. LAVILLE
10	Fruit fly PFA in China as an example of "present: except in specified pest free area"	X. PAN
11	Codling moth in Canada as an example of "present: at low prevalence"	
12	Example or case study from a member of the new ISPM on seed EWG.	
13	Case study from Belize to illustrate "present: except in specified pest free area"	N. LAVILLE
14	Examples that illustrate how to evaluate the reliability of a pest record	ALL EXPERTS

15	The case of Locust in Dominica could be used as an example to illustrate a case of “present: transient”.	N. LAVILLE
----	--	------------

APPENDIX 5: Chapters assignment for development of Pest Status Guide (2017-048)

Section / Chapter	Name of expert
Summary	IFU to complete draft; review by all
Purpose	IFU to complete draft; review by all
Introduction	IFU to complete draft; review by all
1. Pest Status in the international framework: WTO-SPS Agreement	IFU to complete draft; review by all
2. Requirements for national legislation	IFU to complete draft; review all
3. Responsibilities of NPPO	E. ABOAGYE
4. Pest records	E. ABOAGYE
5. Evaluating the reliability of information sources and pest records (RELIABILITY TABLE)	D. EYRE
6. How are pest records used to determine pest status in an area?	D. EYRE
7. Presence (FLOW CHART & CUBE GRAPHIC)	G.MONTES and W. ODGERS (official control)
8. Absence (FLOW CHART)	G.MONTES
9. Unable to determine pest status	N. LAVILLE
10. Importance of pest status determination	W. ODGERS
11. Recommendations for good reporting practices related to pest status	W. ODGERS
12. Information exchange platforms and international collaboration	N. LAVILLE
ISPMs Directly Related to Pest Status	IFU to complete draft; review by all
Other IPPC guides and training materials related to Pest Status	IFU to complete draft; review by all
Bibliography	All

APPENDIX 6: Proposed Timeline for Development of the Pest Status Guide (2017-048)

Proposed Timeline for development of the Pest Status Guide	
Dates	Meetings and tasks
16-20 September	Pest Status Guide Working Group (WG) meeting at FAO HQ in Rome, Italy
28 October	IPPC Secretariat provide draft Pest Status Guide document to WG members
11 October	IPPC Secretariat completes meeting report and clears it with the Rapporteur
23 September – 25 October	WG members finish drafting the chapters assigned to them, as agreed during WG meeting
25 October	WG members submit all written materials (chapters and any changes to flowcharts) to the IPPC Secretariat
28 October – 15 November	IPPC Secretariat assembles the materials submitted by the WG members to complete Draft Guide (version 1) and provides the document to WG members for review by 15 November
15 November	SC finalizes the revision of ISPM 8 for presentation to CPM-15. A copy is provided to the WG members.
15-29 November	WG members review the entire Draft Guide (version 1). They also ensure the Draft Guide aligns with the SC-approved revision of ISPM 8
29 November	WG member comments on the entire Draft Guide (version 1) are due. WG members should also identify case studies, info graphics and/or photos that they would like to provide to enhance the content of the Guide.
3 December (<i>tbc</i>)	A WG call may be organized to discuss the Draft Guide (version 1), if needed
3-10 December	WG members revise their assigned chapters based on comments received from other members of the WG by 10 December
10 December	WG member revisions to their assigned chapters the Draft Guide (version 2) are due.
10-14 December	IFU Lead reviews the Draft Guide (version 2) and works with WG members to address inconsistencies / comments. Any substantive changes are referred to the WG.
18 December	WG invites the IPPC Secretariat, IC and SC to provide comments on the Draft Guide (version 2).
20 December	IPPC Secretariat provides a copy of the Draft Guide on Pest Status (version 2) to the European Commission
15 December 2019 - 28 January, 2020	The IPPC Secretariat, IC and SC comment period on the Draft Guide (version 2) closes.
28 January 2020	WG members recommend individuals for consideration to peer review the Guide
15 February 2020	Deadline for WG members to complete the bibliography, submit case studies, photographs and infographics
<i>IC Lead to confirm</i>	The IC Lead for the Pest Status Guide may ask WG members to review and/or contribute to the development of an Implementation Plan for the Guide. (<i>tbc</i>)
February 2020	WG members review the comments received from the Secretariat, IC and SC and revise the document to complete Draft Guide (version 3).
February 2020	IPPC Secretariat identifies peer reviewers and seeks their agreement.
March 2020	Peer review of the Draft Guide (version 3)
30 March – 3 April 2020	CPM-15 (2020): Revision of ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005) is presented to CPM-15 (2020) (based on recommendation from SC)
April 2020	The WG considers any relevant outcomes from CPM-15 and reviews the comments received through the peer review process. The WG revises the document to complete Draft Guide (version 4).
May 2020	The Draft Guide (version 4) is submitted for professional editing.

	The edited version of the Draft Guide is finalized, in consultation with members of the WG, as appropriate.
	The IPPC Secretariat submits the final version of the IPPC Guide on Pest Status for publishing.
	IPPC Secretariat provides a copy of the IPPC Guide on Pest Status (final) to the EC and notifies the EC when the Guide is published to the IPP.
December 2020	IPPC Guide on Pest Status is published to the IPP.