



REPORT
Revised on 2014-10-07

Punta Leone, Costa Rica,
25 - 29 August

Framework for standards August, 2014



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Contents

1. Opening of the Meeting.....	3
2. Adoption of Agenda.....	3
3. Administrative Matters.....	3
4. Background	4
5. Terms of Reference	4
6. Review of other Discussion Papers.....	5
7. Gap Analysis	5
7.1 Areas of common interest to the International Standard Setting Bodies (ISSBs) recognized under the SPS Agreement.....	8
7.2 Proposed new topics	8
7.3 Changes to priorities on the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i>	10
8. Develop a Log Frame for an IPPC Framework for Standards and implementation.....	11
9. Next Steps	11
10. Decisions and Recommendations.....	13
11. Close of the Meeting	14

List of appendixes

Appendix 1: Agenda.....	15
Appendix 2: Documents List.....	18
Appendix 3: Participants List.....	19
Appendix 4: Terms of reference for the development of the framework for IPPC standards	22
Appendix 5: IPPC Framework for Standards and Implementation	24
Appendix 6: Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics.....	35

1. Opening of the Meeting

Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat and Host

- [1] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter Secretariat) welcomed the participants to the meeting to develop an IPPC Framework for standards. The meeting was held in Punta Leone, Costa Rica, 25 - 29 August 2014. It was an informal meeting to facilitate a creative approach to the work laid out by the Standards Committee (SC). It was hoped that the outcome of this meeting would have a broader effect on the whole IPPC, in particular those areas other than standard setting to help in the development and implementation of the Convention and its International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs).
- [2] The meeting was organized by the IPPC Secretariat and funded by trust fund resources. The Ministry of Agriculture and Husbandry, Costa Rica, hosted the meeting and logistical support was also provided in part by Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA). Ms Magda Gonzalez ARROYO, Director, Phytosanitary Services, Costa Rica, welcomed the participants and wished them a constructive meeting and a pleasant stay. Mr Jimmy RUIZ of OIRSA said it was an honour to support the meeting, thanked the participants for coming to Costa Rica and wished them an enjoyable stay and a successful meeting.

Introductions

- [3] The participants introduced themselves to each other and outlined their background.

Roles of the participants

- [4] The IPPC Secretariat outlined the roles of the participants reminding them that although they brought their regional experiences and the views of various IPPC groups with them, the main objective of the meeting was to develop a Framework for standards that would be globally acceptable.

Selection of Chairperson and Rapporteur

- [5] Mr Jan Bart ROSSEL (Australia) was selected as the Chairperson and Ms Shelia HARVEY (Jamaica) as the Rapporteur.

2. Adoption of Agenda

- [6] The agenda was adopted as presented in [Appendix 1](#) of this report.

3. Administrative Matters

Documents list

- [7] The Secretariat reviewed the Documents List as presented as [Appendix 2](#) of this report. Additional documents were distributed during the week; these too were added to the documents list.

Participants list

- [8] Participants were selected by the SC with input from the Secretariat. Considerations were given to expertise in strategic matters; an understanding of ISPMs; past contributions to previous work on the Framework for standards (including proposals for reorganization); and to ensure that there was balanced geographic and gender representation. In addition, the chairpersons of the SC and the National Reporting Obligations Advisory Group (NROAG) as well as a representative from the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) were invited. The list of participants and their contact information is presented as [Appendix 3](#) of this report.

Local information

- [9] The host introduced the Local information document¹. Logistical matters were discussed and the weekly schedule was reviewed.

4. Background

- [10] A Task Force on the Framework for IPPC standards met in Ottawa in September 2013 and the report of this meeting was presented to the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) and SC. In November 2013 the SC established a subgroup of the SC to continue work on the development of the IPPC Framework for standards and perform a gap analysis. The SC was urged by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) at CPM-9 (2014) to finalize the IPPC Framework for standards gap analysis and present it to the CPM once finalized. The SC in May 2014 revised and approved the Terms of Reference for the development of the Framework for IPPC standards and a gap analysis.
- [11] The report of this meeting will be presented to the SC, CPM Bureau and SPG. Written comments from the latter two will be provided to the SC for their consideration. The SC will review the report and associated appendixes and make recommendations to the CPM.
- [12] The IPPC Strategic Framework was developed over a two year period and adopted by CPM-7 (2012). This Framework is intended to provide CPM with strategic direction over an eight year time frame from 2012 to 2019. The four main strategic objectives of the IPPC Strategic Framework are to:
- (a) protect sustainable agriculture and enhance global food security through the prevention of pest spread
 - (b) protect the environment, forests and biodiversity from plant pests
 - (c) facilitate economic and trade development through the promotion of harmonized scientifically based phytosanitary measures
 - (d) develop phytosanitary capacity for members to accomplish A, B and C.
- [13] The strategic objectives are further divided into organizational results and it was decided by the group that it would be essential to align the IPPC Framework for standards with the IPPC Strategic Framework's strategic objectives (SOs) and related organizational results (ORs).

5. Terms of Reference

- [14] The Chairperson outlined the tasks in the Terms of Reference as set out in [Appendix 4](#) to this report. The group decided not to tackle the tasks one by one, as several overlapped, but to address them through a review of the outcomes of the Task Force meeting in 2013 and the discussion papers that were presented in this meeting. The Framework for standards would then be modified based on the discussions. Towards the end of the meeting the task list would be reviewed to ensure they had all been addressed.
- [15] The Chairperson introduced the questionnaire² that the participants had been asked to respond to in advance of the meeting. The participants discussed their expectations and desired outcomes of the meeting. Some of the ideas are listed below:
- (1) Review the work that was done by the Task Force that met in Ottawa in 2013 and fine tune the outcomes. Address the recommendations and also provide priorities for the development of additional standards and supporting material.
 - (2) Focus on identifying areas for standards that are essential and for which harmonization is needed. Help determine the future needs of the global phytosanitary community and put in place a Framework for standards to address both immediate and long term needs of countries.

¹ 04_FS_2014_Aug

² 06_FS_2014_Aug

- (3) Develop a basic suite of standards for the efficient operations of a national plant protection organization (NPPO). Learn from ISO processes and how their high level standards apply, like the ISO 9000 series on good management practices. This would assist in the selection and prioritization of topics submitted in response to calls for topics, and provide the basic standards for the operation of an NPPO. It would also help NPPOs with limited resources to understand which standards are most important for implementation, especially those that could affect trade.
- (4) Create a Framework for standards that is useful for the new IPPC work on implementation and help integrate, coordinate and prioritize standard setting with other IPPC areas to have a seamless IPPC work plan, which would help the SC, CDC and Implementation and review and support system (IRSS) deal with key implementation issues.
- (5) Try to identify and address concerns that resources are spent on developing standards that are reportedly difficult to implement by setting up a system to support the SC reject suggestions for topics that are considered to be covered by existing standards, do not require a standard or would not be implementable.
- (6) Provide guidance to deal with pests globally, share responsibility and move from defending borders to cooperation on target pests.
- (7) Help standardize reporting mechanisms for NPPOs for easy submission and retrieval of information.
- (8) Align standards with the IPPC Strategic Objectives.
- (9) Try to streamline the standard setting process so that standards are more relevant and timely. The current process produces standards that become outdated quickly. Also to deal with issues for developing country NPPOs that request topics such as phytosanitary treatments which are needed, as in a lot of cases the country that needs them does not have an approved NPPO treatment nor the data to support the submission.

6. Review of other Discussion Papers

- [16] In reviewing the working papers the group discussed the purpose and content of a standard. A SC discussion paper entitled “Concept note: Purpose, status and content of ISPMs” was distributed to the group for information³. This will be discussed by the SPG in October 2014. Specifically, the group discussed the fact that ISPMs, are standards on “Phytosanitary Measures”. The group agreed that ISPMs do not need to be limited to topics that strictly describe phytosanitary measures but that they can be used to facilitate harmonization within other IPPC related areas.
- [17] For the purposes of the Framework for standards, the group agreed to use the ISPM 5 (*Glossary on Phytosanitary Terms*) definition of *standard* as presented below.

standard	Document established by consensus and approved by a recognized body, that provides, for common and repeated use, rules, guidelines or characteristics for activities or their results, aimed at the achievement of the optimum degree of order in a given context [FAO, 1995; ISO/IEC Guide 2:1991 definition]
-----------------	--

- [18] The group was reminded that standards were not meant to be used as a teaching tool but they are just one part of the overall process and additional supplementary information is needed to assist with their implementation

7. Gap Analysis

- [19] The group reviewed the gaps identified by the Task Force (2013) which had been grouped by roles, responsibilities and obligations in implementing the Convention. In addition, the group reviewed both the current *List of topics for IPPC standards*, which includes twenty-six (26) topics for regular standards (many in advanced stages), twenty-nine (29) diagnostic protocols and nineteen (19)

³ 08_FS_2014_Aug

phytosanitary treatments, and the currently adopted ISPMs (thirty-six (36) regular standards, six (6) diagnostic protocols and fifteen (15) phytosanitary treatments).

- [20] It was acknowledged that it would not always be necessary to develop an ISPM to fill the identified gaps, but that they may be relevant topics for work programmes in other areas of the IPPC. For those identified as suitable for the development of an ISPM, the SC could recommend the topic to the CPM. Those more suitable for manuals could be considered by the CDC or the CPM could consider developing some as CPM Recommendations. In reviewing the gap analysis, the group shifted some of the guidance needed from an ISPM to a supporting document and vice versa.
- [21] Several proposals were made to add references to materials to the Framework for standards that were developed by other organizations such as the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement), Codex Alimentarius risk communications manual or the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) emergency action plan for exotic pests and diseases. It was agreed that this information was useful but that the Phytosanitary Resources page should be the repository for this type of information. Hence the group did only added references to documents produced by the IPPC.
- [22] Other main discussion points were as follows:
- [23] Global recognition and implementation of ISPMs (to the same extent as ISO standards). Audit and certification procedures are used by NPPOs and may be relevant for this type of global recognition; however there are many constraints including the resources needed. ISO standards for this type of work may be sufficient.
- [24] Securing exports and surveillance. In reviewing requirements for an NPPO to implement the IPPC and its ISPMs, it was identified that securing exports is often a first priority. However, safeguarding plants and plant production is also a logical priority and in order to do this surveillance is essential.
- [25] It was agreed that the development of a Framework for standards, together with the new focus on implementation, could help to align the work of the IPPC and ensure it is better integrated. The CPM approved the pilot of work on implementation of surveillance for the next three years. An open-ended working group (OEWG) was convened in Rome 4-7 August 2014 to identify the issues that need to be addressed in dealing with implementation issues and it is hoped that the work on the Framework for standards would help align and integrate these issues over the next three years.
- [26] The supporting documents that the CDC is working on⁴, in accordance with their strategic plan, and the outcomes of the IRSS surveys were added to the Framework for standards and used to identify gaps.
- [27] It was proposed that the work done by the IPPC could be divided into three elements: analytical (setting strategy), process (development of standards) and supporting (awareness raising, development of advocacy material, communication and training materials).
- [28] The topic 'Pathways' was identified as a gap in overarching conceptual standards, however, it was finally agreed that the concept would be best explained in supporting documentation and that numerous commodity specific standards should be developed.
- [29] No specific gaps were identified for commodity standards as the group felt these could be addressed in a call for topics and would fit into the Framework for standards under the broader category.
- [30] One of the main objectives of contracting parties (CPs) is to ensure safe trade and in order to do so focus is needed on issues that support exports and imports such as surveillance, generating commodity or host pest lists, conducting pest risk analyses (PRAs) and determining their lists of regulated pests.

⁴ 09_FS_2014_Aug

[31] The group made suggestions for dealing with the development or revision of standards and agreed that the following points should be considered:

- (1) Whether conceptual standards should be priority.
- (2) Some topics already on work programme would remain with their existing priorities, especially as drafting groups have already been called and planned for in 2015 and 2016. This is in line with the CPM decision to give priority to draft ISPMs that have a developed text or for which work has already started.
- (3) Even though a gap may be identified it may not always be a top priority to fill it as some revisions may be more important.
- (4) Align the priorities with the focus of the new implementation programme. It was considered too late to align with the surveillance pilot but priorities could be adjusted to the next implementation topic(s).
- (5) The need for conceptual standards to be developed before developing specific implementation standards.
- (6) Whether to conduct structured calls for topics and encourage submitters to propose topics within the Framework for standards.
- (7) Use the Framework for standards as a tool for making decision for prioritization.
- (8) Communication of the Framework for standards to CPM members so they are part of the process.

[32] Several new topics were reviewed and discussed with reference to the *Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics*⁵ but not included. Those topics and the reasons for not including them are as follows:

- (1) Stakeholder engagement (was felt to be too broad and the word stakeholder is not globally understood)
- (2) Guidance on pest reporting (it was felt there was sufficient guidance available and that the work by the NROAG should help address any problems)
- (3) Clarification on how terms are used (it was felt that ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) along with the *Annotated Glossary* and the specific standards would provide such guidance)
- (4) Pest specific phytosanitary measures (too complicated and very region specific.)
- (5) Harmonization of knowledge management systems so pest information and distribution is widely accessible (this could be an enormous task and very difficult to get all NPPOs to modify existing reporting arrangements and comply with a harmonized system)
- (6) Sustainable intensification (although this is a FAO term, it was felt that it was not really a topic for a standard)
- (7) Environmental policy and climate change (although this was an important topic it was felt that it was already indirectly covered in IPPC work to protect wild areas and with PRA, which is adjusted as new information, such as changing climate, becomes available)
- (8) Surveillance of wild areas (general coverage already in surveillance standards and this would be a very complicated subject which would also be hard to implement)
- (9) Biofuels (already covered in relevant standards and other organizations are working in this area.)
- (10) Management of invasive alien species (IAS) (it was felt that good guidance was given in the IPPC publication: Identification of risks and management of invasive alien species using the IPPC framework⁶, Proceedings of a workshop in Braunschweig, Germany 22-26 September 2003 and the 2013 Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) publication:

⁵ 10_FS_2014_Aug

⁶ <http://www.fao.org/docrep/008/y5968e/y5968e00.htm>

International Trade and Invasive Alien Species⁷ and it could be covered in a more general standard)

7.1 Areas of common interest to the International Standard Setting Bodies (ISSBs) recognized under the SPS Agreement

[33] The group considered areas of common interest to the ISSBs and reviewed the *Summary report of the workshop on the relationship between the SPS Committee and the international standard-setting organizations, 26 October 2009*⁸.

[34] The group decided on the following areas of common interest (presented in alphabetical order, numbers to not indicate priority):

- (1) Audits including competent authorities
- (2) Contingency planning and response
- (3) Diagnostic
- (4) Dispute settlement
- (5) E-certification
- (6) Economic analysis
- (7) Effective participation for developing countries
- (8) Equivalence
- (9) Guidance for risk assessment
- (10) Import permits
- (11) Member consultations
- (12) Pest eradication
- (13) Resource mobilization
- (14) Risk Communications
- (15) Specific Trade concerns including pathways (e.g. used equipment, grains, waste management, air and sea containers)
- (16) Surveillance
- (17) Traceability
- (18) Trans-boundary issues (Regional or International Cooperation)
- (19) Treatments e.g. irradiations.

[35] From this list, the group only added 'equivalence' to the Framework for standards as a new topic because it was felt that the others were either already covered or not relevant to the gap analysis. It was agreed to invite the SC to inform the CPM of these areas of common interest.

[36] Other new topics for standards were proposed along with a suggested priority from one to four (following the existing prioritization scheme used in the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, where one is the highest and four the lowest).

[37] Below, are the main reasons for the inclusion of most of the new topics are provided.

7.2 Proposed new topics

[38] - *Audits*. It was felt that there would be an increasing need for third parties to assist NPPOs with auditing, and consistent oversight of third parties would be of high priority; priority two (2) was suggested.

⁷ http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/public/STDF_IAS_EN_0.pdf

⁸ 11_FS_2014_Aug

- [39] - *Elements of an effective NPPO* were considered fundamental for CPs to establish a good phytosanitary system. Although it was noted that most NPPOs have already been established, it was felt that this was very important. Priority one (1) was suggested and it was also agreed that work on this topic was urgent.
- [40] - *Revision of ISPM 19:2003 (Guidelines on lists of regulated pests)* was suggested by the NROAG, at their 2014 meeting, as it was noted that there is some confusion in the use of the phrase “pest listing”; priority of two (2) was suggested.
- [41] - *National legislation requirements* was felt to be an essential standard, however, since guidance from FAO legal service is available it was felt this should not be assigned a high priority; priority four (4) was suggested.
- [42] - *Efficacy of measures*, it was acknowledged that this topic had recently been deleted from the List of topics for IPPC standards but the group decided that it should be reinstated as guidance in this area is needed; priority four (4) was suggested.
- [43] - *Revision of ISPM 16:2002 (Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application)* was thought to be important because only the concept of a regulated non-quarantine pest is addressed, whereas there is a need for the scope of this standard be broadened to cover ‘pest’. Additionally, the concepts of ‘quarantine pests’ and ‘pests of national concern’ should also be explained, the latter being an area covered by the IPPC but not addressed by most NPPOs; priority Two (2) was suggested.
- [44] - *Host and non-host status* was felt to be very important as an overarching concept standard. It was noted that the implementation of the concept is being addressed for fruit fly hosts but that there is a need for guidance in relation to the broader application of the concept; priority three (3) was suggested.
- [45] - *Guidance on surveillance for a pest or a group of pests* was felt to be the next standard(s) needed after revision of ISPM 6:1997 (Guidelines for surveillance) and should be phased-in based on needs identified by CPs; priority three (3) was suggested.
- [46] - *Guidance on pest free area, pest free places of production and areas of low pest prevalence for a pest or a group of pests* was needed for implementation purposes and more specific guidance is needed; priority four (4) was suggested
- [47] - *Reorganization of all PRA standards*. It was felt reorganization might be useful. However, most participants felt there were very good standards for PRA and this work would eventually be needed but was not a high priority; priority four (4) was suggested.
- [48] - *Risk communication* was felt to be addressed in several places but was not consistent. This was not urgent but should be done before the PRA standards were reorganized; priority three (3) was suggested
- [49] - *Economic analysis in PRA*. It was felt this would be useful information but not a top priority; priority four (4) was suggested
- [50] - *Diversion from intended use* was felt to be a very important issue and it was one that had been brought up in the submissions for topics as well as during CPM sessions. The SPG would be discussing this issue in October 2014 and it was possible that development of supporting documentation would be recommended by the SPG instead of development of an ISPM; priority two (2) was suggested.
- [51] - *Pest management for regulated pests*. It was recognized that an overarching concept standard was necessary to provide guidance on different requirements used by NPPOs for pest management; priority four (4) was suggested.

- [52] - *Additional annexes to ISPM 28:2007 (Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests)* were needed for treatments that were not commodity specific, such as soil drenches or sterilization; priority four (4) was suggested.
- [53] - *Contingency planning and emergency response*. It was felt that this was a very important topic because CPs need guidance to prepare plans for future outbreaks and consider how they will respond; priority one (1) was suggested and it was also agreed that work on this topic was urgent.
- [54] - *Integrated measures and systems approach*. It was felt that a concept standard was needed before more specific standards were developed; priority four (4) was suggested.
- [55] - *Requirements for diagnostics* was felt to be closely linked with surveillance and should address the minimum requirements for both laboratory testing and related issues such as sample handling, tracking and traceability of results, reporting, etc.; priority two (2) was suggested.
- [56] The Framework for standards was again reviewed and the IPPC SOs and ORs were assigned to the broad areas of the Framework for standards.

7.3 Changes to priorities on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*

- [57] The group reviewed the priorities for topics currently on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. Most of the priorities were retained, however some adjustments were proposed as reported below.
- [58] - *Authorization of non-NPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)*. Proposed to change to priority two (2) from three (3) because it was noted that, due to increasingly shrinking budgets, NPPOs would need to use entities to undertake phytosanitary activities.
- [59] - *Requirements for the establishment of pests free areas (ISPM 4:1995)*. Proposed to change to priority four (4) from two (2) because some guidance is already available.
- [60] - *Guidance on pest risk management (2014-001)*. Proposed to change to priority two (2) from one (1) as some guidance exists, although scattered in several ISPMs, and there is plenty of information on PRA.
- [61] - *Revision of ISPM 18:2003 Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure (2014-007)*. Proposed to change to priority three (3) from two (2) because the IRSS survey identified irradiation is not yet widely implemented globally.
- [62] - It was felt that *fumigation (2014-004)* and *temperature (2014-005) treatment requirements* were the most urgently needed and their priorities should remain at one (1). The current priorities set for all the treatment requirements except for ISPM 18:2003 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) were felt to be appropriate.
- [63] - *Use of permits as import authorization (2008-006)* (new annex to ISPM 20:2004 Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system). Because the group found that countries which use import permits have well established programmes and some guidance exists in ISPM 20:2004 it was proposed to change to priority four (4) from three (3).
- [64] - *Phytosanitary pre-import clearance (2005-003)*, there was an in-depth discussion on lowering the priority of this topic because of the many different views on the meaning of “pre-clearance”. The group felt that although this was a complex issue, NPPOs would benefit of having a harmonized understanding of the various concepts related to this topic and finally agreed to leave the priority unchanged.
- [65] - *Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts (2008-002)*. This topic is currently pending the outcome of the sea container standard. Some participants felt that this was a less risky pathway and that it may be less feasible to implement the standard due to the quick turn around and high number of air flights that transport air containers, hence it was proposed to change to priority two (2) from one (1).

- [66] - *Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages* (2008-004). This topic was discussed at CPM-9 (2014) and many smaller island nations found this was a very important topic, also because of its potential effect on the environment. Additionally, some participants felt there could be increasing volumes of this type of waste and it was proposed to change to priority two (2) from three (3).
- [67] - *International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood* (2008-008). Although the study on internet trade⁹ highlighted that there were some risks associated with this commodity, the group did not feel this should be given the same priority as grain, seeds or sea containers, hence proposed to change to a priority two (2) from one (1).
- [68] A number of supporting documents to the Framework for standards were added and their priorities reviewed. The group felt that the priorities for this type of documentation should be in line with that for the standards and the implementation focus but did not assign specific priorities as it might conflict with other ways of setting priorities. The group, however, recommended the following items be given a high priority:
- (1) How standards are used in or relate to different areas (e.g. market access, IAS, climate change)
 - (2) Advocacy for NPPO resource mobilization
 - (3) Information exchange
 - (4) Technical justification
 - (5) Commodity and Host pest lists
 - (6) Diversion from intended use
 - (7) Traceability.
- [69] It was suggested that the title of the Framework for standards be broadened to correctly reflect that it encompasses more than only standards. The group considered including supporting documents in the title, changing the focus to standard setting, or simplifying the name to just the IPPC Framework. Some participants felt it was important to retain the name as it was, or to keep it as similar as possible, because it carries history and confusion could arise by introducing a new name. It was decided that the title should be expanded to include implementation. The modified title of the “IPPC Framework for standards and implementation” was agreed.
- [70] Modifications were incorporated into the proposed IPPC Framework for standards and implementation as presented in [Appendix 5](#) to this report.
- [71] It was suggested that the IPPC consider the use of the Multi Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) tool to help set priorities for standards. To use the MCDA criteria are set with weightings and the system helps rank the submissions objectively. It was decided it would not be possible to use this tool at this meeting but the Secretariat should investigate this further.

8. Develop a Log Frame for an IPPC Framework for Standards and implementation

- [72] The group briefly discussed developing a log frame for IPPC standards but this was not considered a priority at this time.

9. Next Steps

- [73] Several forms of a framework were discussed such as organizing the Framework for standards and implementation in line with the Convention, to address environmental issues, in line with the IPPC Strategic Framework and in line with functions of an NPPO. It was agreed to present this version of the Framework for standards and implementation in line with the Convention but to inform the SC of this discussion and propose that other ways of presenting the Framework for standards and implementation could be considered after adoption.

⁹ CPM Recommendation CPM-9/2014/2 - Internet Trade (E-Commerce) in Plants and other Regulated Articles

- [74] The group identified two topics that they felt were urgently needed: (i) *Elements of an effective NPPO* and (ii) *Contingency planning and emergency response*. The group agreed that they would invite the SC to recommend these two topics for immediate inclusion to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*. To facilitate this some participants volunteered to prepare the two draft specifications to be presented along with the proposal to the SC. Ms GONZALEZ-ARROYO (Costa Rica) supported by Mr SOSA (Secretariat) will draft the specification for *Elements of an effective NPPO* and Ms CHARD (UK) supported by Mr ROSSEL (Australia) will draft the specification for *Contingency planning and emergency response*. The leads would develop their respective drafts, circulate them for comments in the group and submit them to the Secretariat no later than 26 September 2014 for submission to the SC.
- [75] Regarding the implementation component, the Secretariat described the outcomes of the OEWG on implementation meeting to discuss a pilot programme on implementation of surveillance. The programme will be developed by the Secretariat although initiation will be dependent on external funding. The IRSS has not gathered enough information to identify the next topic for implementation. Therefore, the OEWG would like to have additional information gathered and reviewed. To this end, additional information on opportunities will be provided by CPs and the Secretariat would provide an analysis of this information and propose two options for future implementation programmes to the CPM for their consideration and selection. The group agreed that the Framework for standards and implementation should be used for the selection of the future implementation topics.
- [76] During this discussion, the group identified two broad areas that required most urgent input for implementation: (i) Requirements for effective NPPOs and (ii) Guidance on pest management. These areas would also link well with the two urgently needed standards identified above.
- [77] The issues discussed and incorporated into the IPPC Framework for standards and implementation were broader than just standards. The participants agreed that this was a good initiative but would need to be considered widely by different areas of the IPPC. The group noted that the Framework would be presented to the Bureau and SPG and these groups would be invited to provide comments. It was also noted that representatives of the various areas participated in this meeting but in addition it was felt that the Framework should be circulated to the chairs of the various IPPC bodies and invite them to also submit comments, noting that the Framework would ultimately be presented to the CPM for adoption.
- [78] The group considered how to incorporate the new Framework for standards and implementation into the standard setting procedure and several options were discussed. For example, the call for topics could be delayed until the Framework for standards and implementation would be adopted; the next implementation topic would be decided; or both. It was recalled that the CPM-9 (2014) considered rejecting additions to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* until the Framework for standards and implementation was adopted, so it was though unlikely that a normal biennial call would be agreed to without the new Framework for standards and implementation.
- [79] The group finally agreed that a structured approach for the next call for topics should be made using the Framework for standards and implementation in combination with the IPPC Strategic Framework. Countries would be encouraged to submit topics that would fill the gaps identified in the Framework for standards and implementation but they would also be able to suggest other topics by demonstrating how they were aligned to both frameworks. In addition, topics should be prioritized in accordance with the priorities for the next implementation programme. This would help produce an integrated approach to support the implementation programme and identify overall CPM work programme priorities as well as aligning the Secretariat work programmes.
- [80] To facilitate the next call for topics some minor modifications to the *Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics* were suggested. Namely to include the demonstration that a proposed topic aligned with the Framework for standards and implementation, the IPPC Strategic Framework and the area of focus for the implementation programme. The group also felt that there may not be a need to supply information on all the supporting criteria so it was proposed to make this

optional in the submission form. Additionally, it would be stated that priority will be given to topics with the largest global impact and within the priority ranking system (1-4). Generally, concept standards would be considered to be higher priority than implementation standards. Suggested modifications are presented in [Appendix 6](#).

- [81] Some participants felt it would be useful to have representatives from all the CPM bodies discuss priorities, and it was noted that the SPG did provide such a forum.
- [82] The group agreed that it would be useful for the IPPC Secretariat to use the Framework for standards and implementation when they develop their work plans.
- [83] The group briefly discussed how emerging issues which would require either a standard or supporting documents would be identified and addressed, and it was agreed that this should be the role of the SPG. In addition the CDC conducts horizon scans and in the past has identified emerging issues. The group suggested this be considered as a standing item on the SPG agenda and that the SPG could recommend updates to the Framework for standards and implementation annually as appropriate and present to the CPM as needed.
- [84] As the Framework for standards and implementation was aligned to the IPPC Strategic Framework, it was agreed that the Framework for standards and implementation should be revised when the IPPC Strategic Framework is updated.
- [85] There was some discussion on how CPs no longer had an opportunity to discuss issues with each other related to standards, as the CPM evening sessions for the negotiation of draft standards no longer take place. It was felt that these discussions were valuable in helping exchange ideas and information related to new standards. The group agreed to invite the SC to recommend that the CPM should set some time aside to discuss issues related to recently adopted standards to help ensure CPs understood the different viewpoints.

10. Decisions and Recommendations

- [86] The group:
- (1) *decided* that a standard dealing with climate change was not needed as it is generally covered in a number of standards.
 - (2) *considered* many documents were relevant for the implementation of standards, however documents that were developed or approved outside of the IPPC context would not be presented in this Framework.
 - (3) *decided* that the report of this meeting should be circulated to the Chairs of the various IPPC bodies and invite them to provide comments on the IPPC Framework for Standards and Implementation.
- [87] The Working Group on the development of the Framework for standards and implementation reviewed the Framework, identified gaps and how to fill them, assigned priorities to proposed standards, proposed revisions to existing standards and proposed adjustments to some current priorities and *recommended* that:
- (1) the SC recommends the IPPC Framework for standards and implementation based on areas of the Convention to the CPM for adoption (presented in Appendix 5 of this report).
 - (2) the SC agrees with the proposed changes to priorities for topics on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and recommends these changes to the CPM.
 - (3) the development of the following supporting materials is a priority:
 1. How standards are used in or relate to different areas (e.g. market access, IAS, climate change)
 2. Advocacy for NPPO resource mobilization
 3. Information exchange
 4. Technical justification

5. Commodity and host pest lists
 6. Diversion from intended use
 7. Traceability.
- (4) once adopted, CPM consider additional presentations of the Framework for standards and implementation (e.g. IPPC Strategic Objectives, trade facilitation etc.) and how they will be developed.
 - (5) the Secretariat explore the value of applying the Multi Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) tool to the prioritization of topics and report the result to SC.
 - (6) the following to help ensure gaps identified in the Framework for standards and implementation are appropriately filled:
 1. delay the next call for topics until the IPPC Framework for standards and implementation is adopted by the CPM and the second implementation programme priority is identified
 2. the SC recommend to the CPM to add the following two topics (with draft specifications) to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* as a matter of urgency:
 - Elements of an Effective NPPO
 - Contingency Planning and Response.
 - (7) for future calls for topics the modified *Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics* be used (as presented in Appendix 6 of this report).
 - (8) in the process of selecting future implementation programmes, the Framework for standards and implementation should be considered.
 - (9) the Secretariat uses the Framework for standards and implementation and the identified priorities to guide the development of the Secretariat work plan.
 - (10) the SPG puts as a standing agenda item the identification of emerging issues that may require harmonized guidance for inclusion in the Framework for standards and implementation.
 - (11) the SC recommends that the SPG updates the Framework for standards and implementation annually as appropriate and presents to CPM for adoption as needed.
 - (12) the IPPC Framework for standards and implementation be realigned to the next version of the IPPC Strategic Framework once it is revised and approved.
 - (13) the SC inform the CPM of areas of common interest to the IPPC, CODEX and OIE as presented in this report (Section 7.1).
 - (14) the CPM reserve time for discussions on concepts and implementation issues related to draft or newly adopted standards, especially high priority issues.

11. Close of the Meeting

[88] The Secretariat thanked all the participants for their contributions, with special thanks to the Rapporteur and Chairperson. In addition, he expressed gratitude towards the Host and Organizer for their efforts and kind hospitality for arranging the venue and transportation. The Host, in turn, expressed her pleasure in hosting this meeting and hoped the newly developed IPPC Framework for standards and implementation would have a speedy approval so it could be used very soon.

[89] The Chairperson closed the meeting.

Appendix 1: Agenda

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat and Host	n/a	LARSON / SOSA HOST
Introductions	n/a	LARSON / SOSA
Roles of the Participants	n/a	LARSON / SOSA
Selection of the Chair and Rapporteur	n/a	LARSON
2. Adoption of the Agenda	01_FS_2014_Aug	CHAIR
3. Administrative Matters		
Documents List	02_FS_2014_Aug	
Participants List	03_FS_2014_Aug	
Local Information	04_FS_2014_Aug	
4. Background		
➤ Report of the meeting of the Framework for Standards Task Force, September 2013	2013 Report	LARSON / SOSA
➤ IPPC Strategic Framework (2012-2019)	https://www.ippc.int/publications/ippc-strategic-framework-2012-2019	LARSON
5. Terms of Reference		
➤ TOR_Development of the framework for IPPC standards	05_FS_2014_Aug	LARSON / SOSA
6. Review of other discussion papers		ALL
➤ Questions to consider prior to the meeting	06_FS_2014_Aug	LARSON / SOSA
➤ Proposed steps for development, approval and management of strategic work plan on implementation	07_FS_2014_Aug	OEWG
➤ Concept note: purpose, status and content of ISPMs	08_FS_2014_Aug	SC
➤ CDC Operational Task List		
➤ Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics	09_FS_2014_Aug	CDC
➤ Summary Report of the Workshop on the Relationship between the SPS Committee and the International Standard-Setting Organizations	10_FS_2014_Aug	
	11_FS_2014_Aug	WTO
7. Gap Analysis (number tasks from Task Force meeting 2013)		ALL
➤ review, analyse and modify the proposed <i>Framework for IPPC standards</i> as needed (as presented in appendix 4 of the Task Force on the Framework for IPPC standards 2013 meeting report)		
➤ perform a gap analysis for standards by reviewing both adopted standards and topics on the IPPC List of Topics for standards (LOT) and make suggestions for priorities for the development or revision of standards		

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 8. Further gap analysis should be conducted for existing standards and the SC should consider how the gaps are to be addressed. ➤ 13. The Framework for IPPC standards should be used to help identify areas where specific standards, like ISPM 15:2009 (<i>Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade</i>), could be developed and implemented for global benefit. ➤ 14. Take into account the results of Implementation and Review Support System (IRSS) general surveys that shows trade standards (especially those related to exports) are generally well implemented; more collective effort should be given to prioritize support to Contracting Parties to implement the standards underpinning protection of plants and trade of plants and plant products, e.g. surveillance, pest status, pest management, diagnostics, infrastructure. ➤ 15. The criteria for prioritizing topics for standards may need to be reviewed to be in line with the policies and principles underpinning the framework. 		
8. Develop a log frame for a framework for IPPC standards (number tasks from Task Force meeting 2013)		SOSA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consider and develop proposals for other possible presentations for different purposes e.g. by IPPC strategic objectives if appropriate - consider how gaps should be brought to the next call for topics and review of the <i>List of topics for IPPC standards</i>, or processed as supporting documents - consider how the <i>Framework for IPPC standards</i> could be introduced in the overall prioritization process - review, analyse and modify the following Task Force recommendations: 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15 (with recommendations 5 and 9 to be combined) which are listed below: - 5. The Framework for IPPC standards should be used for achieving the Convention objectives which is in Appendix 4 of the 2014-09 Task Force report. - 9. A process to proactively identify emerging issues where harmonized guidance would be beneficial should be developed. - 10. The Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) should make efforts to continue discussions on concepts in standards with the reference to achieving Convention objectives through appropriate and effective harmonization. - 12. The Framework for IPPC standards should be applied to identify issues of common interest to the “three sisters” (IPPC, Codex Alimentarius and World Organization for Animal Health (OIE)). 		
9. Next steps		SOSA
10. Close of the meeting		

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
10.1 Adoption of the report		CHAIR
10.2 Close		CHAIR

Appendix 2: Documents List

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	PREPARED BY	DATE POSTED/ DISTRIBUTED
01_FS_2014_Aug	02	Agenda	Secretariat	23-06-2014
02_FS_2014_Aug	03	Documents list	Secretariat	23-06-2014
03_FS_2014_Aug	03	Participants list	Secretariat	23-06-2014
04_FS_2014_Aug	03	Local information	Organizer - Secretariat	
05_FS_2014_Aug	04	Terms of Reference: Development of the framework for IPPC standards	SC May 2014	23-06-2014
06_FS_2014_Aug	06	Questions to consider prior to the meeting	Secretariat	12-08-2014
07_FS_2014_Aug	06	Proposed steps for development, approval and management of strategic work plan on implementation	OEWG	16-09-2014
08_FS_2014_Aug	06	Concept note: purpose, status and content of ISPMs	SC	16-09-2014
09_FS_2014_Aug	06	CDC Operational Task List	CDC	16-09-2014
10_FS_2014_Aug	06	Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics	SC	16-09-2014
11_FS_2014_Aug	06	Summary Report of the Workshop on the Relationship between the SPS Committee and the International Standard-Setting Organizations	WTO SPS	16-09-2014

LINKS:	Agenda item	Content
2013 Report	04	Report of the meeting of the Framework for Standards Task Force, September 2013
https://www.ippc.int/publications/ippc-strategic-framework-2012-2019	04	IPPC Strategic Framework (2012-2019)
https://www.ippc.int/publications/framework-standards	-	Framework for standards
https://www.ippc.int/publications/list-adopted-standards-july-2013	-	List of adopted ISPMs
https://www.ippc.int/publications/list-topics-ippc-standards	-	List of topics for IPPC standards

Appendix 3: Participants List

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates confirmed attendance at the meeting.

Participant invited but not attending are listed at the end.

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Representing Standards Committee	Ms Jane CHARD Head of Plant Biosecurity Branch Science and Advice for Scottish Agriculture (SASA) Roddinglaw Road, Edinburgh EH12 9FJ UNITED KINGDOM Phone: +44 131 2448863	Jane.Chard@sasa.gsi.gov.uk ;
✓	Participant	Ms Lottie ERIKSON Export Coordinator USDA APHIS PPQ PERAL 1730 Varsity Drive Suite 300 Raleigh NC 27606 USA	Lottie.L.Erikson@aphis.usda.gov
✓	Participant	Ms Marie-Claude FOREST National Manager and International Standards Advisor Plant Biosecurity and Forestry Division Import, Export and Technical Standards Section Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 CANADA Tel: (+1) 613-773-7235 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7204	marie-claude.forest@inspection.gc.ca ; jppc-contact@inspection.gc.ca
✓	Participant	Mr John HEDLEY Principal Adviser International Organizations Policy Branch Ministry for Primary Industries P.O. Box 2526 Wellington NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Mobile: (+64) 29890428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0742	john.hedley@mpi.govt.nz ;

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Host	Ms Magda GONZÁLEZ ARROYO Directora Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería Sabana Sur, Antiguo Edificio La Salle San José, COSTA RICA Phone: (+506) 2549 3563 Fax: (+506) 2549 3598	mgonzalez@sfe.go.cr ;
✓	Representing Capacity Development Committee	Ms Shelia Yvonne HARVEY Chief Plant Quarantine/ Produce Officer Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries 193 Old Hope Rd. Kingston 6, JAMAICA Tel: 1-876-977-0637 Mobile: (+1)-876-507-7951 Fax: (+1)-876-977-6992	syharvey@moa.gov.jm ; sheharv@yahoo.com ;
✓	Participant	Mr Imad NAHHAL Head of Plant Protection Service Ministry of Agriculture Bir Hassan Embassies Street Beirut LEBANON Office Tel: (+961) 1 849639 Mobile:(+961) 3 894679	imadnahhal@gmail.com ; inahhal@agriculture.gov.lb ;
✓	Participant	Mr Jan Bart ROSSEL Director International Plant Health Program Office of the Australia Chief Plant Protection Officer Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry AUSTRALIA Tel: (+61) 2 6272 5056 / 0408625413 Fax: (+61) 2 6272 5835	bart.rossel@daff.gov.au ;
✓	Participant	Mr Motoi SAKAMURA Administrator -Operation, Kobe Plant Protection Station, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 1-1,Hatobacho, Chuouku Kobe 6500042 JAPAN Tel: +81 78 331 3430 Fax: +81 78 391 1757	sakamuram@pps.maff.go.jp ;

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Participant	Mr Guillermo SIBAJA CHINCHILLA Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado. MAG PO Box 1521-1200 COSTA RICA Tel: + (506)25493663 (Office) Tel: + (506) 8813-2061 (Mobile)	gsibaja@sfe.go.cr ; gsibaja@yahoo.com ;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Brent LARSON FAO, Viale della Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome ITALY Phone: +39 06 570 54915	Brent.Larson@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Orlando SOSA FAO, Viale della Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome ITALY Phone: +39 06 570 53613	Orlando.Sosa@fao.org

Appendix 4: Terms of reference for the development of the framework for IPPC standards

Background

A Task Force on the Framework for IPPC standards met in Ottawa in September 2013 and the report¹⁰ of this meeting was presented to the SPG and SC. The November 2013 SC established a subgroup of the SC to continue work on the development of the Framework for IPPC standards and a gap analysis. The SC was urged by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) at CPM-9 (2014) to finalize the Framework for IPPC standards gap analysis and present it to the CPM once finalized. The SC in May 2014 revised the Terms of Reference for the development of the Framework for IPPC standards and a gap analysis and approved them.

Process

A small group of experts *will* meet and complete the tasks outlined below. The report of this meeting will be presented to the CPM Bureau and SPG who will provide written input to the SC. The SC will make recommendations to the CPM considering the input from both the Bureau and SPG.

Tasks

The experts will:

- review, analyse and modify the proposed *Framework for IPPC standards* as needed (as presented in appendix 4 of the Task Force on the Framework for IPPC standards 2013 meeting report)
- consider and develop proposals for other possible presentations for different purposes e.g. by IPPC strategic objectives if appropriate
- perform a gap analysis for standards by reviewing both adopted standards and topics on the IPPC List of Topics for standards (LOT) and make suggestions for priorities for the development or revision of standards
- consider how gaps should be brought to the next call for topics and review of the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, or processed as supporting documents
- consider how the *Framework for IPPC standards* could be introduced in the overall prioritization process
- review, analyse and modify the following Task Force recommendations: 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15 (with recommendations 5 and 9 to be combined) which are listed below:
 - 5. The Framework for IPPC standards should be used for achieving the Convention objectives which is in Appendix 4 of the 2014-09 Task Force report.
 - 8. Further gap analysis should be conducted for existing standards and the SC should consider how the gaps are to be addressed.
 - 9. A process to proactively identify emerging issues where harmonized guidance would be beneficial should be developed.
 - 10. The Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) should make efforts to continue discussions on concepts in standards with the reference to achieving Convention objectives through appropriate and effective harmonization.
 - 12. The Framework for IPPC standards should be applied to identify issues of common interest to the “three sisters” (IPPC, Codex Alimentarius and World Organization for Animal Health (OIE)).

¹⁰ Task Force Report: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/framework-for-standards-task-force>

- 13. The Framework for IPPC standards should be used to help identify areas where specific standards, like ISPM 15:2009 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*), could be developed and implemented for global benefit.
- 14. Take into account the results of Implementation and Review Support System (IRSS) general surveys that shows trade standards (especially those related to exports) are generally well implemented; more collective effort should be given to prioritize support to Contracting Parties to implement the standards underpinning protection of plants and trade of plants and plant products, e.g. surveillance, pest status, pest management, diagnostics, infrastructure.
- 15. The criteria for prioritizing topics for standards may need to be reviewed to be in line with the policies and principles underpinning the framework.

The following experts, as determined by the SC in November 2013 will be invited to meet to continue the work on the development of the Framework for IPPC standards:

SC members:

- Ms Jane CHARD (United Kingdom), Chair of the Standards Committee,
- Ms Marie-Claude FOREST (Canada)
- Mr John HEDLEY (New Zealand)
- Mr Imad NAHHAL (Lebanon)
- Mr Bart ROSSEL (Australia)
- Mr Motoi SAKAMURA (Japan)
- Mr Guillermo SIBAJA CHINCHILLA (Costa Rica)

Others:

- Ms Magda GONZÁLEZ ARROYO (Costa Rica)
- Chair of the National Reporting Obligations Advisory Group
- Chair of the Capacity Development Committee

The work of this group will be supported by the IPPC Secretariat.

Funding

The IPPC Secretariat will use extra budgetary resources for this meeting and will consider providing funding assistance for participants who request it. Costa Rica has offered to host this meeting between 25-29 August 2014.

Appendix 5: IPPC Framework for Standards and Implementation

LEGEND:

For standards, the priority is given (1 highest, 4 lowest), followed by the title and the topic number (presented in brackets). For those topics on the IPPC list of topics for ISPMs, the **title is bolded** to indicate the ISPM is under development and the title is underlined if the proposed revision has been agreed to.

Guidance needed	Concept standards - “what”	Operational - “how”	Supporting documents
IPPC Area: GENERAL IPPC Strategic Objectives (SOs): A3, A4, B1, B2, B3, D2, D4			
1. Organization and provision of information on technical resources (Supporting Docs)			Phytosanitary resource page (roster of experts, projects database, activities calendar, technical documents)
2. Cooperation with other Organizations e.g. environmental (Supporting Docs)			Memorandums of Understanding: - Ozone Secretariat - CBD Partnership paper (CPM 9/2014/21)
3. Environmental protection and climate change e.g. surveillance of wild flora (Supporting Docs)			Guide to implementation of phytosanitary standard in forestry ICPM-7 decisions in relationship to Cooperation with the CBD: Threats to biodiversity by IAS
4. International cooperation between NPPOs: e.g. regional centers of expertise (Supporting Docs)			
5. How standards are used in or relate to different areas (e.g. Market access, IAS, climate change) (Supporting Docs)			
6. Audits (Concept Std/Supporting Docs) (Priority 2)			

Guidance needed	Concept standards - “what”	Operational - “how”	Supporting documents
7. Advocacy for NPPO resource mobilisation (Supporting Docs)			
IPPC Area: GENERAL RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS IPPC SOs: A1, A2, B2, B3, B4, C3, D3, Y4			
8. International Cooperation between contracting parties (Supporting Docs)			Stakeholder relations (draft manual)
9. Elements of an effective NPPO (Concept Std) e.g. training, engagement of stakeholders, competency (Priority 1)			NPPO management (draft manual) PCE tool Explanatory document (2005) on ISPM 20:2004 (<i>Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system</i>) (includes appendix on rights, roles & responsibilities in relation to the IPPC, ISPMs and SPS)
10. Elements of an effective RPPO (Supporting Docs)			Procedure for the recognition of new RPPOs ICPM-4 (2002) Role and functions of the Technical Consultation among RPPOs ICPM-5 (2003)
11. Information exchange (Supporting Docs)			Recommendation information exchange (ICPM 2/1) Role of IPPC contact points (CPM 1/1)
12. <i>Guidelines on lists of regulated pests</i> (ISPM 19:2003) Revision needed (Concept Std) (Priority 2)	<i>Pest reporting</i> (ISPM 17:2002) (Concept Std) <i>Guidelines on lists of regulated pests</i> (ISPM 19:2003) (Concept Std)	<i>Pest reporting</i> (ISPM 17:2002) (Implementation Std) <i>Guidelines on lists of regulated pests</i> (ISPM 19:2003) (Implementation Std)	Explanatory document (2005) on ISPM 17:2005 (<i>Pest reporting</i>) Regulated pest lists clarification of terminology and its use in ISPM 19:2003

Guidance needed	Concept standards - “what”	Operational - “how”	Supporting documents
13.	<i>Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action</i> (ISPM 13:2001) (Concept Std)	<i>Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action</i> (ISPM 13:2001) (Implementation Std)	
14. National legislation requirements (Concept Std) (Priority 4)			Guidelines for the revision of national phytosanitary legislation - FAO
IPPC Area: PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES (interpretation of the Convention) IPPC SOs: B2, B3, C3, D1, D3			
15. Undue delay and prompt action (Supporting Docs)	<i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade</i> (ISPM 1:2006) (Concept Std)		
16.	<i>Glossary</i> (ISPM 5) (Concept Std) <i>Terminology of the Convention on Biological Diversity in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> (ISPM 5 – Appendix 1) (Concept Std)		Annotated Glossary: Explanatory document (2013) on ISPM 5 (<i>The Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>)
17. Efficacy of measures (Supporting Docs) <i>Efficacy of measures</i> (Concept Std) (Priority 4)			
18. Technical Justification including reliability of scientific information (Supporting Docs)		<i>Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence</i> (ISPM 29:2007) (Implementation Std)	
19.	<i>Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures</i> (ISPM 24:2005) (Concept Std)	<i>Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures</i> (ISPM 24:2005) (Implementation Std)	Equivalence (draft manual)

Guidance needed	Concept standards - “what”	Operational - “how”	Supporting documents
20. Appropriate level of protection (Supporting Docs)			
21. State of plant protection in the world (Supporting Docs)			
22.	Authorization of non-NPPO entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002) (Concept Std) (Priority 2 (from 3))		
IPPC Area: PEST STATUS IPPC SOs: A1, A2, B1			
23.	<u>Determination of pest status in an area (ISPM 8:1998)</u> (Concept Std) (Priority 1)	<u>Determination of pest status in an area (ISPM 8:1998)</u> (Implementation Std) (Priority 1)	
24. Revision of ISPM 16 to broaden to pests and clarify the concepts related to quarantine pests, RNQP and pests of national concern (Concept Std) (Priority 2)	<i>Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application</i> (ISPM 16:2002) (Concept Std) <i>Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests</i> (ISPM 5 - Supplement 1) (Concept Std)		IPPC coverage of aquatic plants (CPM recommendation CPM-9/2014/01) GMOs, Biosafety and Invasive Species: ICPM 3 (2001) decision
25. Host and non host status (Concept Std) (Priority 3)		Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (<i>Tephritidae</i>) (2006-031) (Implementation Std) (Priority 1)	
26. Guidance on surveillance for a pest or a group of pests (Implementation Std) (Priority 3)	<u>Guidelines for surveillance</u> (ISPM 6:1997) (Concept Std)	<u>Guidelines for surveillance</u> (ISPM 6:1997) (Implementation Std) (Priority 1)	Surveillance (draft manual)

Guidance needed	Concept standards - “what”	Operational - “how”	Supporting documents
<p>27. Guidance on PFA, PFPP and ALPP for a pest or a group of pests (Implementation Std) (Priority 4)</p>	<p><i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (ISPM 4:1995) (Concept Std) (Priority 4 (from 2))</i></p> <p><i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites (ISPM 10:1999) (Concept Std)</i></p> <p><i>Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence (ISPM 22:2005) (Concept Std)</i></p>	<p><i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (ISPM 4:1995) (Implementation Std) (Priority 4 (from 2))</i></p> <p><i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites (ISPM 10:1999) (Implementation Std)</i></p> <p><i>Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence (ISPM 22:2005) (Implementation Std)</i></p> <p><i>Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (ISPM 30:2008) (Implementation Std)</i></p> <p><i>Control measures for an outbreak within a fruit fly-pest free area (ISPM 26:2006 - Annex 2) (Implementation Std)</i></p>	
<p>IPPC Area: PEST RISK ANALYSIS IPPC SOs: C2, C3, B2, B3, B4</p>			
<p>28. Reorganization of all PRA standards required (Concept Std & Implementation Std) (Priority 4)</p> <p>Commodity and host pest lists (Supporting Docs)</p>	<p><i>Framework for pest risk analysis (ISPM 2:2007) (Concept Std)</i></p>	<p><i>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests (ISPM 11:2013) (Implementation Std)</i></p> <p><i>Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests (ISPM 21:2004) (Implementation Std)</i></p> <p><i>Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk (ISPM 32:2012) (Implementation Std)</i></p> <p><i>Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms (ISPM 3:2005)</i></p>	<p>PRA awareness toolkit (proposed manual)</p> <p>PRA training (manual and eLearning)</p>

Guidance needed	Concept standards - “what”	Operational - “how”	Supporting documents
		(Implementation Std)	
29. Pest risk management for pests or group of pests (Implementation Std) (Priority 3)	Guidance on pest risk management (2014-001) (Concept Std) (Priority (from 1))		
30. Risk communication (Concept Std & Implementation Std) (Priority 3)			
31. Economic analysis in PRA (Implementation Std) (Priority 4)	<i>Guidelines on the understanding of potential economic importance and related terms including reference to environmental considerations</i> (ISPM 5 - Supplement 2) (Concept Std)		
32. Diversion from intended use (Concept Std/Implementation Std /Supporting Doc) (Priority 2)			
IPPC Area: PEST MANAGEMENT IPPC SOs: A1, A2, B1, B2, B4, C2, D1			
33. Pest management for regulated pests (Concept Std) (Priority 4)			CDC document on Phytosanitary Treatments
34. Pest management options (Supporting Docs)			
35. Contingency Planning and emergency response (Concept Std) (Priority 1)			
36.		Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010) (draft annex to ISPM 15:2009) (Implementation Std)	Replacement of MeBr (CPM 3/1)

Guidance needed	Concept standards - “what”	Operational - “how”	Supporting documents
		(Priority 2)	
37. (ISPM 28) <i>Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests</i> annexes non commodity specific treatments, e.g. soil drench, sterilization) (Implementation Std) (Priority 4)	<u><i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i> (ISPM 18:2003) (2014-007)</u> (Concept Std) (Priority 3 (from 2))	<u><i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i> (ISPM 18:2003) (2014-007)</u> (Implementation Std) (Priority 3 (from 2))	Explanatory document (2006) on ISPM 18:2003 (<i>Guidelines on the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary treatment</i>)
38.	<i>Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pest</i> (ISPM 28:2007) (Concept Std)	<i>Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure</i> (2014-004) (Implementation Std) (Priority 1)	
39.		<i>Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure</i> (2014-005) (Implementation Std) (Priority 1)	
40.		<i>Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure</i> (2014-006) (Implementation Std) (Priority 2)	
41.		<i>Requirements for the use of chemical treatments as a phytosanitary measure</i> (2014-003) (Implementation Std) (Priority 3)	
42.	<i>Guidelines for pest eradication programmes</i> (ISPM 9:1998) (Concept Std)	<i>Guidelines for pest eradication programmes</i> (ISPM 9:1998) (Implementation Std)	
43.		<i>Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management</i> (2005-010)	

Guidance needed	Concept standards - “what”	Operational - “how”	Supporting documents
<p>44. Integrated measures & systems approach (Concept Std) (Priority 4)</p>	<p><i>Integrated measures plants for planting</i> (ISPM 36:2012) (Concept Std)</p> <p>Systems approach (ISPM 14:2002) (Concept Std)</p>	<p>(Implementation Std)</p> <p><i>Integrated measures plants for planting</i> (ISPM 36:2012) (Implementation Std)</p> <p><i>Pest free potato (Solanum spp.) micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade</i> (ISPM 33:2010) (Implementation Std)</p> <p><i>Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i> (ISPM 35:2012) (Implementation Std)</p>	
<p>IPPC Area: PHYTOSANITARY IMPORT & EXPORT REGULATORY SYSTEMS IPPC SOs: A3, B4, C1, C2, C3, D3</p>			
<p>45.</p>	<p><i>Phytosanitary certification system</i> (ISPM 7:2011) (Concept Std)</p>	<p><i>Phytosanitary certificates</i> (ISPM 12:2011) (Implementation Std)</p> <p><i>Electronic certification, information on standard XML schemes and exchange mechanisms</i> (ISPM 12:2011 - Appendix 1) (Implementation Std)</p>	<p>Import – export procedures (proposed manual)</p> <p>e-Phyto (proposed system)</p>
<p>46.</p>	<p><i>Consignments in transit</i> (ISPM 25:2006) (Concept Std)</p>	<p><i>Consignments in transit</i> (ISPM 25:2006) (Implementation Std)</p>	<p>Transit (proposed manual)</p>
<p>47.</p>		<p><i>Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms</i> (ISPM 3:2005) (Implementation Std)</p> <p><i>Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests</i> (ISPM 28:2007 – Annexes 1 to 15) (Implementation)</p>	<p>Phytosanitary treatments based on historical evidence (Position paper-TPPT draft)</p>

Guidance needed	Concept standards - “what”	Operational - “how”	Supporting documents
		Std)	
48.	<i>Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system</i> (ISPM 20:2004) (Concept Std)	<i>Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system</i> (ISPM 20:2004) (Implementation Std) <i>Use of permits as import authorization (2008-006) (ISPM 20:2004, new annex) (Implementation Std)</i> (Priority 4 (from 3))	Explanatory document (2005) on ISPM 20:2004 (<i>Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system</i>)
49.		Guidelines for inspection (ISPM 23:2005) (Implementation Std)	
50.	<i>Methodologies for sampling of consignments</i> (ISPM 31:2008) (Concept Std)	<i>Methodologies for sampling of consignments</i> (ISPM 31:2008) (Implementation Std)	Explanatory document (2009) on ISPM 31:2008 (<i>Methodologies for sampling of consignments</i>)
51.		<i>Design and operation of post-entry quarantine stations for plants</i> (ISPM 34:2010) (Implementation Std)	
52.			Dispute settlement manual
53.	<i>Phytosanitary pre-import clearance (2005-003)</i> (Concept Std) (Priority 3)		
54. Traceability (Supporting Docs)			Proposed Traceback Guidance Market access (manual)
55. Pathways (Supporting Docs)		<i>Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts (2008-002) (Implementation Std)</i> (Priority 2 (from 1))	
56.		<i>International movement of cut flowers and branches (2008-005)</i>	

Guidance needed	Concept standards - “what”	Operational - “how”	Supporting documents
		(Implementation Std) (Priority 4)	
57.		Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004) (Implementation Std) (Priority 2 (from 3))	
58.		International movement of growing media in association with plants for planting (2005-004) (Implementation Std) (Priority 1)	
59.		Minimizing pest movement by sea containers (2008-001) (Priority 1)	CPM Recommendation on sea containers
60.		International movement of grain (2008-007) (Priority 1)	Internet trade (e-commerce) in plants and other regulated articles (CPM recommendation CPM-9/2014/2)
61.		ISPM 15:2009 (<i>Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade</i>)	Explanatory document (2014) on ISPM 15:2009 (<i>Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade</i>) Dielectric heat treatment (draft manual) Quick guide to Dielectric heating
62.		International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004) (Implementation Std) (Priority 3)	
63.		International movement of seeds (2009-003) (Implementation Std) (Priority 1)	

Guidance needed	Concept standards - “what”	Operational - “how”	Supporting documents
64.		<i>International movement of wood (2006-029) (Implementation Std) (Priority 1)</i>	
65.		<i>International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood (2008-008) (Implementation Std) (Priority 2 (from 1))</i>	
IPPC Area: DIAGNOSTICS IPPC SOs: A1, B1, B4			
66. Requirements for diagnostics (Implementation Std) (Priority 2)	<i>Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests (ISPM 27:2006) (Concept Std)</i>	<i>Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests (ISPM 27:2006 – DP Annexes 1 to 6) (Implementation Std)</i>	
67. International or regional cooperation for diagnostics (e.g. Regional centers of expertise (Supporting Docs)			

Appendix 6: Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics

Criteria listed in Annex 3: Submission form for topics for IPPC Standards

IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard setting (2013)

Modifications proposed by the Framework for standards and implementation group (August 2014)

Priority will be given to topics with the largest global impact and within the priority ranking system (1-4), concept standards are considered to have higher weighting than implementation standards.

Core criteria (must provide information)

1. Contribution to the purpose of the IPPC as described in article I.

2.Strong linkage to IPPC Strategic Objectives (SOs) and Organizational results and Framework demonstrated

~~23.~~ Feasibility of implementation at the global level (includes ease of implementation, technical complexity, capacity of NPPOs to implement, relevance for more than one region).

~~34.~~ Clear identification of the problems that need to be resolved through the development of the standard.

~~45.~~ Availability of, or possibility to collect, information in support of the proposed standard (e.g. scientific, historical, technical information, experience).

Supporting criteria (provide information as appropriate)

~~(Practical)~~

1. Feasibility of adopting the proposed standard within a reasonable time frame.

2. Stage of development of the proposed standard (is a standard on the same topic already widely used by NPPOs, RPPOs or a relevant international organization).

3. Availability of expertise needed to develop the proposed standard.

Economic

4. Estimated value of the plants protected.

5. Estimated value of trade affected by the proposed standard (e.g. volume of trade, value of trade, the percentage of Gross Domestic Product of this trade) if appropriate.

6. Estimated value of new trade opportunities provided by the approval of the proposed standard.

7. Potential benefits in terms of pest control or quarantine activities.

Environmental

8. 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.

9. Utility in the management of non indigenous species which are pests of plants (such as some invasive alien species).

10. Contribution to the protection of the environment, through the protection of wild flora, and their habitats and ecosystems, and of agricultural biodiversity.

Strategic

11. Extent of support for the proposed standard (e.g. one or more NPPOs or RPPOs have requested it, or one or more RPPOs have adopted a standard on the same topic).

12. Frequency with which the issue addressed by the proposed standard emerges as a source of trade disruption (e.g. disputes or need for repeated bilateral discussions, number of times per year trade is disrupted).

13. Relevance and utility to developing countries.
14. Coverage (application to a wide range of countries/pests/commodities).
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).
16. Foundation standards to address fundamental concepts (e.g. treatment efficacy, inspection methodology).
17. Expected standard longevity (e.g. future trade needs, suggested use of easily outdated technology or products).
18. Urgent need for the standard.