



REPORT

Ottawa, Canada
18-20 September 2013

Framework for Standards Task Force September 2013



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

CONTENTS

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING	3
Selection of the Chairperson and Rapporteur	3
Adoption of the agenda.....	3
Participants List	3
Documents List.....	3
2. BACKGROUND.....	3
Overview of the creation of a Task Force to develop a framework for IPPC standards	3
3. AGREED TASKS.....	4
4. MAIN DISCUSSION POINTS - OUTCOMES SOUGHT	5
A framework for standards - a library	5
Visibility of existing standards and reference material developed by the IPPC.....	5
Searchable database system for IPPC members	6
Ease of use.....	6
Assist strategic discussions and work planning.....	6
Identify gaps	7
5. APPROACH TAKEN BY THE TASK FORCE	7
6. ANALYSIS OF IRSS SURVEYS.....	8
7. THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS.....	8

LIST OF APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1:	Agenda.....	10
APPENDIX 2:	Participants List.....	12
APPENDIX 3:	Documents List.....	15
APPENDIX 4:	Table 1 – Proposed Framework for Standards	16

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

- [1] The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat welcomed the participants of the Framework for Standards Task Force meeting. The meeting, held from 18 to 20 September 2013, was organized by the IPPC Secretariat and hosted by the North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO).
- [2] Ms Rebecca LEE, Technical Director from NAPPO, welcomed the participants to Ottawa, Canada and wished them a constructive meeting and a pleasant stay in Ottawa.

Selection of the Chairperson and Rapporteur

- [3] Ms Lois RANSON (New Zealand) was selected the chairperson and Ms Jane CHARD (United Kingdom) as the rapporteur.

Adoption of the agenda

- [4] The agenda was adopted as presented in Appendix 1 of this report.

Participants List

- [5] Participants were selected by the Secretariat. Considerations were given to expertise in strategic matters, an understanding of the IPPC standards, participant's contributions to the existing framework for standards and proposals for reorganization as well selections were made to help ensure geographic and gender representation. In addition the chairs of the Standards Committee (SC), the Capacity Development Committee and the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement were also invited. Some of the invited participants were unable to attend. The list of participants and their contact information is presented as Appendix 2 of this report.

Documents List

- [6] The Secretariat reviewed the Documents List as presented as Appendix 3 of this report. The participants reviewed the discussion papers and other reference material provided by the Secretariat. These documents collectively aimed at addressing the tasks for the Framework for Standards Task Force.

2. BACKGROUND

Overview of the creation of a Task Force to develop a framework for IPPC standards

- [7] The Secretariat presented background information on the strategic framework with reference to the previous meetings where this subject had been discussed. The report from this meeting should be presented to the SC but it would also be presented to the Strategic Planning Group (SPG), especially as it was felt that the work of this group might be relevant to the considerations of version two of the Implementation, Review and Support System (IRSS) and to the discussions on implementation. The SPG would be invited to provide strategic guidance to the SC. The Secretariat is keen that the IPPC Framework for Standards provides a long term vision for the IPPC standards over the next 20 years and that would be used to provide guidance for the development of future standards and their revision.
- [8] The Secretariat also presented the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (LOT) is the Standard Setting work programme and noted that the call for topics, which occurs every two years, has in its submission form a set of priorities approved by the Commission of Phytosanitary Measures (CPM). It was noted that the current Standard Setting process is complex and as a result there have been criticisms that the LOT is too big and that standards are no longer needed for some of the topics on the LOT. A revised Standards Setting process, adopted by the CPM-7 (2012), was intended to streamline the process. In the revised process, specifications for standards should be provided along with the call for topics which should help speed up the process. It was also noted that there are on-going discussions on the concept of a standard. The general view is that a framework for standards would help to clarify this issue.

- [9] It was noted that the concept of a standard is being discussed by the SC and administrative issues on what to include in a standard is not the scope of this Task Force (TF). It was also noted that there was no terms of reference for this meeting due the reduced time available from the confirmation of the budget source and the meeting date.
- [10] The Secretariat posed some questions for the TF participants:
1. What is the problem being addressed?
 2. What is the purpose of developing a framework?
 3. What are the components of the framework?
 4. What should be the format of the framework?
- [11] It further challenged the TF to undertake a gap analysis of the IPPC standards and provide advice on priorities for reviewing adopted standards or filling the gaps of new ones.

3. AGREED TASKS

- [12] The TF noted that as Contracting Parties, all IPPC members are bound to the rights and obligations of the (IPP) Convention. The concept of harmonization is integral to the implementation of the Convention and ISPMs are the mechanism for harmonized implementation and are supported by manuals, guidance material and explanatory documents. The Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) adopts international standards by consensus and this forms the basis of harmonized implementation processes. It was also noted that in the convention text there is no mention of “ISPMs” but “standards” implying that standards could be a broader category than ISPMs. The TF agreed that the task was to develop a framework for ISPMs only.
- [13] The TF agreed to recommend that the framework for standards is a framework for the implementation of the Convention and that standards are to assist this implementation through harmonized concept and practices, with manuals supporting their implementation.
- [14] The TF recognized that there are a number of documents that could be developed by the CPM in addition to ISPMs, including the recommendation on methyl bromide and procedures for the standards setting processes and other governance and administrative guidelines contained in the Procedure Manual. For clarity and simplicity the 36 adopted ISPMs and the LOT were used by the TF as the basis for developing the framework for standards and for identifying gaps where standards need to be developed.
- [15] The TF used the Convention and its provisions as the foundation for the framework because its rights and obligations are common to all Contracting Parties, and the standards that are developed and applied to deliver the Convention objectives are also adopted by all Contracting Parties.
- [16] The TF analyzed in general the content of existing standards to determine which of them describe essential concepts (“what”) that underpin the common interpretation of Convention provisions by Contracting Parties and which describe the processes for technical implementation (“how”). It was noted that some standards contain elements of both nature (“what” and “how”).
- [17] This analysis is presented in Table 1 of Appendix 4 as a proposed framework for standards in which the standards were divided into three categories:
- Concept standards (“what”)
 - Combination standards (“what/how”), in both columns
 - Implementation standards (“how”)
- [18] A fourth category captures supporting documents including manuals, recommendations and explanatory text. Also a category on guidance material needed was identified by the TF.

4. MAIN DISCUSSION POINTS - OUTCOMES SOUGHT

A framework for standards - a library

- [19] The vision for the framework was to have a library of standards that would guide the development of standards over the next 20 years and to be able to use the framework for planning and prioritizing work. A key driver for the reorganization of standards was to present adopted standards so that staff in National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) and Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) could easily find information on topics and access content. It was noted that a framework could also be used for seeking resources from donors. The TF noted that the framework provides visibility of key standards and gaps in core guidance and exploration of implementation needs.

Visibility of existing standards and reference material developed by the IPPC

- [20] An hierarchy of documentation was considered, starting with the IPPC Convention, taking into account the obligations and rights within it, standards (harmonized documents which were adopted with the intention that they should be implemented) and other supporting documents such as manuals and guidance (not harmonized and therefore available for contracting parties to use or not). Within this hierarchy the Convention and adopted standards are agreed by all Contracting Parties with a commitment for their implementation, while support documents are not adopted by CPM, are not intended to promote harmonized processes and are available for contracting parties to use or not.
- [21] Given the importance of common understanding of the IPPC, the TF noted that ISPM 1:2006 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*) bridges the IPPC and the principles of the Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Agreement, and provides the underlying principles for phytosanitary risk management. The TF agreed that the list of existing standards should be assessed against the Convention to determine whether any further concept standards are needed. The TF identified several fundamental concepts that are currently not described or insufficiently clear, including the definition of a quarantine pest and its regulation in trade with reference to regulated and regulated non-quarantine pests, and pest management. It was agreed that this topic should be addressed as a priority, and should draw on relevant material in the supplements to the glossary and other adopted standards. The TF also recommended that a more comprehensive analysis of gaps in core concepts of the Convention should be undertaken to ensure that elements of the Convention that should be harmonized are identified so that appropriate and standard guidance on their interpretation and implementation is developed.
- [22] The TF also noted that the glossary (ISPM 5:2012 *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) applies to all standards and ensures the appropriate and consistent interpretation of Convention terms as a basis for common understanding.
- [23] It was pointed out that some supplements to standards, specifically those included in the glossary (ISPM 5:2012) and ISPM 11:2013 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*), describe concepts and are sometimes difficult for contracting parties to find and suggested that they may be better presented as standards in their own right.
- [24] A number of implementation standards (see Table 1 in Appendix 4 – “how” standards) are in place but many of the adopted ISPMs combine both concepts and implementation guidance. The TF considered this to be acceptable as the implementation guidance usefully illustrated the concept. However, it recommends that this balance is considered as each standard comes up for review.
- [25] The TF recommended that gaps in concept guidance be addressed as a priority so that future focus of standard setting could be on implementation standards. Core guidance is unlikely to change as it is linked to the Convention concepts, whereas implementation standards will more directly impact on the ability of the CPM to deliver its nine-year strategic framework.

Searchable database system for IPPC members

- [26] The TF was aware of the need for adopted standards to be readily searchable to facilitate their use by NPPOs from IPPC contracting parties and RPPOs, which are the main target audience of ISPMs to have a process to quickly and easily find information in ISPMs. This would be enabled by an easy and user-friendly way to categorize and search ISPMs and related guidance material.
- [27] The TF noted that searchable “pdf” databases has been developed by the Secretariat, but may not be accessible to all contracting parties in its current format. Some consideration should be given to making this fundamental resource globally available. This searchable database is available for download from the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP)¹. The PDF databases for current ISPMs and approved specifications, Bureau reports, SPG-SPTA reports, CPM Reports, SC Reports, TPs (TPDP, TPFQ, TPG-GWG, TPPT) and EWG Reports allow rapid searching for key terms in a user-friendly manner and text can be searched using key words and phrases. The TF considered that this innovation delivered a baseline level of searchable needed to assist NPPOs and RPPOs and its use should be encouraged.

Ease of use

- [28] The TF acknowledged that there are many possible ways of setting out and documenting a framework for standards, but that by linking standards to the implementation of the Convention, the resulting framework would provide both visibility of the standards needed to deliver its objectives, and a vision for prioritizing their development and future review.

Assist strategic discussions and work planning

- [29] The TF discussed the need for an on-going range of activities and strategic actions to implement the Convention. A number of these were identified as the framework was developed, highlighting additional benefits from ensuring standards are visible and gaps are filled. Some of the points discussed are outlined below.
- [30] The TF:
- Agreed that a framework can be offered as a vehicle to document benefits and leverage investment in the IPPC against defined outcomes;
 - Found the framework to be an effective vehicle for focusing discussions within a more strategic context. This should support a shift to a more proactive focus on program delivery from the current reactive approach, with enhance opportunities to test emerging risks against the framework;
 - Recognized that there is a need to be flexible and respond in identifying the needs of Contracting Parties and achieve Convention objectives, for harmonized guidance when emerging issues arise. A comprehensive gap analysis against the fundamentals for delivery, taking into account the CPM strategic objectives and criteria for standard-setting priorities would be a valuable tool for demonstrating the benefits of the IPPC to stakeholders and potentially leverage additional funding and support from political and non-political sources;
 - Considered that case studies on the impact of pests and trade could be useful tools to illustrate the value of the IPPC and links with both the communications and resource mobilisation strategies.
- [31] The TF noted that due to the revised standard setting process (CPM-7) there were no evening sessions during CPM on detailed drafting of standards. Although the fact that drafting no longer took place during the CPM was a positive development, it was noted that there was no longer an opportunity for CPM members to discuss concepts or practical aspects of the standards in the standard setting process

¹ Searchable PDF database on IPP: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/searchable-pdf-database>

or those presented to the CPM for adoption. If this continued, it was felt that there would be missed opportunities at CPM for these types of discussions.

[32] The TF also noted that the framework could be used as a tool to focus public communication and relations on the benefits of the IPPC together with the other two 'sisters' (Codex Alimentarius and World Organization for Animal Health (OIE)).

Identify gaps

[33] The TF identified a number of gaps related to obligations in implementing the Convention. Implications of this gap analysis for the existing call for topics process were raised. It was acknowledged that it would not always be necessary to create an ISPM for these, but the topics could be added into appropriate work programmes (e.g. for those identified as suitable for the development of an ISPM, the SC could recommend the topic to the CPM or those more suitable for manuals could be considered by the CDC or the CPM could consider developing some as recommendations). Examples included:

- quarantine pest (supplements from ISPM 5:2012 plus a clear conceptual overview of the term and guidelines for applying it)
- NPPO arrangements (guidance on setting up and operating an NPPO - not an ISPM)
- legislation (an FAO document on elements for national regulations already exists)
- information exchange
- appropriate level of protection (with the guidance from SPS committee on this concept)
- audits
- authorization
- principles (e.g. undue delay, prompt action)
- reliability of scientific information (including table 1 in ISPM 8: 1998 *Determination of pest status in an area*)
- host status
- pest risk management and communication
- integrated measures and systems approaches
- pathways
- some clarifications to ISPM 11, including incorporating guidance on diversion from intended use into PRA and providing clearer guidance to PRA practitioners on economic analysis.

5. APPROACH TAKEN BY THE TASK FORCE

[34] The Task Force analyzed the ISPMs and the LOT with reference to the plant protection systems established by the Convention. A Contracting Party undertakes national activities to define, document and protect its plant health status. A first model was proposed as it is surrounded by a border, where the import and export of plants and plant products are regulated through the actions of its NPPO. The potential pest risks from imports and exports are represented from/to other Contracting Parties. The TF concluded that these actions are either functions of the NPPO of the Contracting Party to implement the Convention or systems for delivering its objectives.

[35] Each ISPM and topic (LOT) was assessed for its function and application within this first proposed model. The TF noted that while some actions or functions occurred at discrete places, many occurred at multiple places, for example, import and export operations, diagnostic activities, or spanned the system. This made the compartmentalization of functions meaningless and complex. This approach to documenting the framework for standards therefore was not preferred by the TF.

[36] In an alternative approach, the TF identified core provisions of the Convention and cross-checked these with the principles in ISPM 1:2006. Existing standards and topics were compared with these fundamental provisions and the standards (topics) were grouped together, where appropriate, and gaps identified. The framework is presented as Table 1 in Appendix 4 of this report. This approach was preferred by the TF as it most closely reflects the commitments of Contracting Parties to the Convention. The table includes gaps identified by the TF and the TF recommended the review and potential integration of existing standards (topics) to provide clearer guidance on core concepts and their implementation, where replication or gaps exist. The framework should generate further discussions on gaps or groups of standards that should be consolidated. The framework should link to the strategic goals and strategic policies of the IPPC/CPM, having technical and political support and should demonstrate benefits, i.e. the value or impact that a standard can have.

6. ANALYSIS OF IRSS SURVEYS

[37] An analysis of the outcomes of the survey of Contracting Parties on their implementation of the standards (conducted under the IRSS) highlighted that:

- Trade-driven standards were well implemented.
- Technical standards, including those that underpin and support import-export standards, were not well implemented.
- Pest reporting, pest free areas and surveillance standards were least implemented due to limited technical skills and funding.
- Gaps in standards in the general survey on implementation of the IPPC were not assessed, but could be in future.
- Principles (ISPM 1:2006) and the glossary (ISPM 5:2012) have been well implemented.

[38] It was noted that all surveys undertaken by the IRSS to date have identified gaps in implementation of existing standards.

[39] It was also noted that the framework for standards could make trade-supporting standards such as pest free areas and surveillance more visible to policy makers and funding bodies and elicit increased funding for these activities.

7. THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

[40] Based on the discussions, the Framework for Standards Task Force recommended the following:

1. This report on the framework should be presented to the Standards Committee (SC) for further consideration.
2. The IPPC Convention should be used as the foundation for the framework.
3. Standards should be developed and used by Contracting Parties as the basis for harmonization and assist delivery of the Convention objectives.
4. Some provisions of the Convention do not need to be harmonized.
5. The framework for standards should be used for achieving the Convention objectives which is in Appendix 4 of this report.
6. This report on the framework should be shared with the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) with an invitation for them to provide strategic inputs to the SC.
7. The SPG should consider this report in their deliberations on implementation.
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.
11. The Bureau should be requested to take the opportunity of the evening sessions of CPM to discuss concepts in standards relevant in achieving the Convention objectives such as including implementation.
12. The framework for standards should be applied to identify issues of common interest to the “three sisters” (IPPC, Codex Alimentarius and World Organization for Animal Health (OIE)).
13. The framework for 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.
16. The TF strongly supported the maintenance of the current numbering system of standards.

APPENDIX 1: Agenda**MEETING OF THE TASK FORCE TO DEVELOP AN IPPC FRAMEWORK FOR STANDARDS**

18-20 SEPTEMBER 2013

**Residence Inn by Marriott Ottawa Downtown
Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA****Room: MONTCALM, (2nd floor)**

18 September start time: 10:00 hrs (welcome coffee at 09:30hrs)

Daily Schedule:

09:00-12:30 and 14:00-17:30

Coffee: Wednesday welcome coffee 9:30 and 15:30. Rest of the week at 10:30 and 15:30

18 September, Wednesday **Dinner** 19:00**AGENDA**

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat and Host	n/a	LARSON / HOST
Introductions	n/a	LARSON
Roles of the Participants	n/a	LARSON
Selection of the Chair and Rapporteur	n/a	LARSON
2. Adoption of the Agenda	01_TF_2013_Sep	CHAIR
3. Administrative Matters		
Documents List	02_TF_2013_Sep	
Participants List	03_TF_2013_Sep	
Local Information	04_TF_2013_Sep	
4. Background		
4.1 Overview of the creation of a Task Force to develop a framework for IPPC standards.	05_TF_2013_Sep	LARSON
5. Gap Analysis		
5.1 Framework for ISPMs by John Hedley	https://www.ippc.int/publications/framework-standards	LARSON
5.2 Standards Committee Framework for standards and concept note on the nature of a standard	09_TF_2013_Sep 10-A_TF_2013_Sep 10-B_TF_2013_Sep	LARSON

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
5.3 Review of IRSS studies	http://irss.ippc.int/activities 13_TF_2013_Sep	SOSA
5.4 Review the List of Topics for IPPC standards	https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards	MOREIRA
5.5 Review of adopted standards	https://www.ippc.int/publications/list-adopted-standards-july-2013	LARSON
6. Review of other discussion papers	06_TF_2013_Sep 07-A_TF_2013_Sep 07-B_TF_2013_Sep 07-C_TF_2013_Sep 08_TF_2013_Sep 11_TF_2013_Sep 14_TF_2013_Sep	ALL
7. Develop a log frame		
7.1 Overview of the concept of log frames	12_TF_2013_Sep	SOSA
7.2 Development of the log frame for IPPC standards	--	SOSA
8. Close of the meeting		
8.1 Adoption of the report		CHAIR
8.2 Close		CHAIR

APPENDIX 2: Participants List

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

Members not attending are listed at the end.

Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓ Member	<p>Mr Yusof OTHMAN Acting Director, NPPO contact point for Malaysia Crop Protection and Plant Quarantine Division - Department of Agriculture Wisma Tani Jalan Sultan Sallahuddin 50632 Kuala Lumpur MALAYSIA Phone: +606 3 20301400 Fax: +606 3 2691 3530</p>	yusofothman@doa.gov.my
✓ Member	<p>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</p>	Jane.Chard@sasa.gsi.gov.uk
✓ Member	<p>Mr Diego QUIROGA¹ National Director of the Plant Protection SENASA Paseo Colón 315 Piso 4º Dpto. B Ciudad de Buenos Aires (1063) ARGENTINA Tel. +54 11 4121 5495/5176</p>	dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar
✓ Member	<p>Mr Mike WOOD Director Canadian Food Inspection Agency Plant Biosecurity and Forestry Division 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, ON K1A 0Y9 CANADA Phone: +1 613 7737630 Fax: +1 613 7737204</p>	Michael.Wood@inspection.gc.ca
✓ Member	<p>Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN Coordinating policy officer plant health Ministry of Economic Affairs Directorate-General for Agro Plant Supply Chain and Food Quality Department THE NETHERLANDS Phone: + 31 70 3785552 Mobile: + 31 618596867</p>	c.a.m.vanalphen@minez.nl

¹ Attendance via virtual tool (Skype).

Participant role		Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Member	<p>Ms Lois RANSOM Manager – GIA Secretariat 25 The Terrace PO BOX 2526 Wellington 6140 NEW ZEALAND Phone: + 64 4 8940419 Mobile: + 64 218 94048</p>	lois.ransom@mpi.govt.nz;
✓	Member	<p>Ms Carol THOMAS International Agricultural Health and Food Safety Specialist Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) 3rd Floor Baobab Tower Warrens, St. Michael BB22026 BARBADOS Tel: +1 246 271 9210/11/12 Fax: +1 246 271 9213</p>	Carol.Thomas@iica.int;
✓	Member	<p>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</p>	sakamuram@pps.maff.go.jp ;
✓	Member	<p>Ms Lottie ERIKSON Export Coordinator USDA APHIS PPQ PERAL 1730 Varsity Drive Suite 300 Raleigh NC 27606 USA Phone: +1 919 8557517</p>	Lottie.L.Erikson@aphis.usda.gov

Others

Participant role		Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Host	<p>Ms Rebecca Lee Technical Director North American Plant Protection Organization 1431 Merivale Rd., 3rd Floor, Room 140 Ottawa, Ontario - K1A OY9 CANADA Phone: +1 613 221 8176 Fax: +1 613 228 2540</p>	rebecca.lee@nappo.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<p>Mr Brent LARSON FAO, Viale della Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome ITALY Phone: +39 06 570 54915</p>	Brent.Larson@fao.org

Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓ IPPC Secretariat	Ms Adriana MOREIRA FAO, Viale della Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome ITALY Phone: +39 06 570 55809	Adriana.Moreira@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
✓ IPPC Secretariat	Nadia VILLASENOR FAO, Viale della Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome ITALY Phone: +39 06 570 53035	Nadia.Villasenor@fao.org

Not attending²

Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
Member	Mr M Amal Mohamed RAHEL Chef de la Division de la Protection des Végétaux Office National de Sécurité Sanitaire des Produits Alimentaires (ONSSA) Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Pêche Maritime Point focal CIPV B.P. 1308 Rabat, MOROCCO Phone: +212 37 676538 Fax: +212 537 682049	mohammedamal.rahel@onssa.gov.ma ;
Member	Mr Washington OTIENO Regional Coordinator, Plantwise Programme CABI Africa United Nations Avenue P.O.Box 633-00621 Nairobi KENYA Telephone: +254 20 7224450; Cellphone +254 722 427097 Fax: +254 20 7122150	W.Otieno@cabi.org ;
Host	Mr Ian MCDONELL Executive Director North American Plant Protection Organization 1431 Merivale Rd., 3rd Floor, Room 140 Ottawa, Ontario - K1A OY9 CANADA Phone: +1 613 221 5144 Fax: +1 613 228 2540	ian.mcdonell@nappo.org

² Mr John HEDLEY (New Zealand), Ms Mennie GERRISTEN-WIERLARD (The Netherlands), Mr Avetik NERSISYAN (FAO) and Mr Mekki CHOUIBANI (NEPPO) were previously invited but were unable to attend due to agenda conflicts.

APPENDIX 3: Documents List

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	PREPARED BY
01_TF_2013_Sep	02	Agenda	Secretariat
02_TF_2013_Sep	03	Documents list	Secretariat
03_TF_2013_Sep	03	Participants list	Secretariat
04_TF_2013_Sep	03	Local information_Rev1	Organizer - Secretariat
05_TF_2013_Sep	04	Overview of the creation of a Task Force to develop a framework for IPPC standards.	Secretariat
06_TF_2013_Sep	06	Concept paper: Purpose, status and content of ISPMs	Mr NORDBO
07-A_TF_2013_Sep	06	Reorganization of ISPMs	Secretariat
07-B_TF_2013_Sep	06	Reorganization of ISPMs: Consultant's Report	Secretariat
07-C_TF_2013_Sep	06	Reorganization of ISPMs: OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards	Secretariat
08_TF_2013_Sep	06	Discussion paper on Framework for International Standards	Mr SAKAMURA
09_TF_2013_Sep	05.2	Concept note: nature of a standard	Small SC group (Mr John HEDLEY (lead), Ms Jane CHARD, Ms Marie-Claude FOREST, Mr Motoi SAKAMURA)
10-A_TF_2013_Sep	05.2	A consideration of frameworks for IPPC ISPMs	Small SC group (Mr John HEDLEY (lead), Ms Jane CHARD, Ms Marie-Claude FOREST, Mr Motoi SAKAMURA)
10-B_TF_2013_Sep	05.2	Forum summary for SC e-decision	Secretariat
11_TF_2013_Sep	06	United States discussion paper	United States of America
12_TF_2013_Sep	07.1	The Logical Framework	Secretariat
13_TF_2013_Sep	05.3	Review of IRSS studies	Secretariat
14_TF_2013_Sep	06	Draft - Implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs: A Discussion Paper for the Strategic Planning Group (October 2013)	New Zealand

LINKS:

http://irss.ippc.int/activities	IRSS reports from Surveys (Secretariat): General Survey (to be posted in July 2013) ISPM 4; ISPM 6; ISPM 9; ISPM17 and 19
https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards	List of topics for IPPC standards (Secretariat)
https://www.ippc.int/publications/list-adopted-standards-july-2013	List of Adopted Standards (Secretariat)
https://www.ippc.int/publications/framework-standards	Framework for standards

APPENDIX 4: Table 1 – Proposed Framework for Standards

Area - IPPC	Guidance needed	Concept (concept standards – “what”)	Specifics (implementation standards – “how”)	Supporting documents
General				Phytosanitary resource page (roster of experts, projects database, activities calendar, technical documents)
Rights and obligations	Organization of NPPO (c) e.g. training, engagement of stakeholders, competency			Role of IPPC contact points (CPM 1/1) NPPO management (proposed manual) External international relations (proposed manual) PCE tool ISPM 20:2004 (explanatory doc – Appendix on roles & responsibilities)
	Information exchange (c)	Pest Reporting (ISPM 17:2002)	Pest Reporting (ISPM 17:2002)	Recommendation information exchange (ICPM 2/1) Pest reporting (explan. doc)
		Non-compliance & Emergency action (ISPM 13:2001)	Non-compliance & Emergency action (ISPM 13:2001)	
	National legislation requirements (c)			FAO Model legislation (guidance)
Principles and policies (interpretation of the Convention)		Phytosanitary principles (ISPM 1:2006)		
		Glossary (ISPM 5:2012) CBD terminology (ISPM 5:2012 – Appendix 1)		Annotated glossary (ISPM 5:2012 – explanatory doc)
		Efficacy of measures		
			Recognition of PFA&LPP (ISPM 29:2007)	

Area - IPPC	Guidance needed	Concept (concept standards – “what”)	Specifics (implementation standards – “how”)	Supporting documents
		Equivalence (ISPM 24:2005)	Equivalence (ISPM 24:2005)	Equivalence(proposed manual)
	Appropriate level of protection (better guidance from SPS committee)			
	Audits			
	Authorization			
	Undue delay			
	Prompt action			
	Reliability of scientific information		Pest status table (ISPM 8:1998)	
Pest status	Clarification of terms related to pests including regulated, pests, quarantine pests, RNQP, and other concepts under Convention, e.g. campaigns, locusts, national pests (c)	<u>Pest status (ISPM 8:1998)</u>	<u>Pest status (ISPM 8:1998)</u>	Threats to biodiversity by AS (ICPM 7/1)
	Regulated pests (c) Quarantine pests (c&i) [include existing information]	RNQP (ISPM 16:2002) Lists of regulated pests (ISPM 19:2003) Official control & Not widely distributed (ISPM 5:2012 - suppl. 1) Environmental/economic considerations (ISPM 5:2012 - suppl. 2)	Lists of regulated pests (ISPM 19:2003)	Aquatic plants (proposed recommendation) LMO-biosecurity-AIS (ICPM 3/1)
	Host status - non host (c)		Host status FF	
	Specific guidance on surveillance for pest or groups of pests (i)	<u>Surveillance (ISPM 6:1997)</u>	<u>Surveillance (ISPM 6:1997)</u> Citrus canker	Surveillance (proposed manual)

Area - IPPC	Guidance needed	Concept (concept standards – “what”)	Specifics (implementation standards – “how”)	Supporting documents
	Specific guidance on PFA, PFPP, ALPP for pest or groups of pests (i)	<p><u>PFA (ISPM 4:1995)</u> PFPP (ISPM 10:1999) ALPP (ISPM 22:2005)</p>	<p><u>PFA (ISPM 4:1995)</u> PFPP (ISPM 10:1999) ALPP (ISPM 22:2005) PFA FF (ISPM 26:2006) ALPP FF (ISPM 30:2008) Outbreak FF (ISPM 26:2006, new Annex)</p>	
PRA	Reorganization of all PRA standards required	PRA Framework (ISPM 2:2007)	PRA for quarantine pests (ISPM 11:2013) PRA for RNQP (ISPM 21:2004) Categorization of commodities (ISPM 32:2012), Biocontrol (ISPM 3:2005)	PRA awareness toolkit (proposed manual) PRA training (manual and eLearning)
	Pest risk management (c&i)			
	Risk communication (c&i)			
	Economic analysis in PRA (i)			
Pest management	Pest management (c)		Management of FF Criteria for ISPM 15:2009	
		Treatments (ISPM 28:2007)	PTs (ISPM 28:2007 - annexes)	Replacement of MeBr (CPM 3/1) Dielectric heat treatment (proposed manual)
		Pest eradication (ISPM 9:1998)	Pest eradication (ISPM 9:1998)	
	Integrated measures & systems approach (c)	Irradiation (ISPM 18:2003) Plants for Planting (ISPM 36:2012) Systems approach (ISPM 14:2002)	Irradiation (ISPM 18:2003) Plants for Planting (ISPM 36:2012) Potato (ISPM 33:2010) Systems FF (ISPM 35:2012) Citrus canker	Irradiation (explanatory doc)

Area - IPPC	Guidance needed	Concept (concept standards – “what”)	Specifics (implementation standards – “how”)	Supporting documents
Import & export regulatory system		Phytosanitary certification system (ISPM 7:2011)	Phytosanitary certificates (ISPM 12:2011) ePhyto (ISPM 12:2011, Appendix 1)	Import – export procedures (proposed manual)
		Transit (ISPM 25:2006)	Transit (ISPM 25:2006)	Transit (proposed manual)
			Biocontrol (ISPM 3:2005)	
		Imports (ISPM 20:2004)	Imports (ISPM 20:2004) Import permits (ISPM 20:2004, new Annex)	Imports (explanatory doc)
			Inspections (ISPM 23:2005)	
		Sampling (ISPM 31:2008)	Sampling (ISPM 31:2008)	Sampling (explanatory doc)
			PEQ (ISPM 34:2010)	
		Pre-import clearance		
				Market access (proposed manual)
	Pathways (c)		Specific Pathways & commodities: Air containers Cut flowers & foliage Grain Growing media International waste Sea containers Seeds Used equipment Wood Wood handicrafts Wood packaging (ISPM 15:2009)	Internet trade (proposed recommendation)
Diagnostics		Diagnostic protocols (ISPM 27:2006)	DPs (ISPM 27:2006 - annexes)	

LEGEND:

(c) – concept document required; (i) – implementation document required; **xxxx** – in progress (**bold**); xxxx – under revision (underline)

Note: The ISPMs are represented in parenthesis and the titles are abbreviated.