

Report of the Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7)

[in preparation of the Third meeting of the Standards Committee]

05-09 May 2003 – Roma

1 Opening

Niek van der Graaff welcomed the participants to the meeting: Nancy Klag (Chairman), Mohammad Katbeh-Bader, Christopher Hood, Asna Booty Othman, Alan Pemberton, Odilson Ribeiro e Silva, Wilson Songa.

2 Adoption of the agenda and points arising from the ICPM

Niek van der Graaff presented some points arising from ICPM-5 in relation to the standard-setting process:

- the need for transparency, especially with regard to country comments;
- the need for a fast-track procedure for the development of certain standards;
- the need to keep language as simple and as clear as possible;
- the fact that there were three working group sessions on standards during ICPM-5 and that most contracting parties feel that the ICPM is not the appropriate venue for text negotiation.

Some of these points are mentioned at various points in this report.

The agenda was reviewed and several topics added for discussion:

- additional specifications on phytosanitary measures for consignments in transit, guidelines for formatting specific diagnostic protocols for regulated pests, guidelines for the development and amendment of ISPMs;
- identification of possible stewards in relation to agreed specifications. The SC-7 also agreed that the relationship between SC-7 and SC-20 in relation to specifications, stewards and selection of Expert Working Groups would have to be discussed further by the SC.
- comments on the normal and fast-track standard-setting procedures (to be transmitted to the bureau, which met in the same week);
- relationship of ISPMs No. 11 and 19 to the SPS agreement;

The SC-7 decided to present a report of the meeting to the SC-20, giving the main points of discussion.

3 New or revised specifications

3.1 General considerations

The SC-7 agreed that specifications should be kept clear, focused and unambiguous so that the Expert Working Groups would be appropriately guided. Expert Working Groups on the revision of ISPMs should always envisage whether the titles of the ISPMs should be changed.

The format of specifications approved by the ISC in 2000 was distributed and all new or revised specifications will be reformatted to align them with this format. However, the SC-7 suggested two modifications to this model: the addition of a section on the *reason for the standard/reason for*

revision (for specifications for new and revised standards respectively) and the modification of the section *scope* to *scope and purpose*¹. The revised template is attached to this report [Annex I].

3.2 Distribution of specifications

The SC-7 suggested that any new/revised specification considered during this meeting should be attached to the report. Specifications would be made available to members and RPPOs by posting on the IPP, and by request from members. In accordance with the standard-setting procedures, they would not go for country consultation.

After the meeting, the Secretariat consulted the Chairman of the SC-20, Marc Vereecke. It was concluded that specifications would have to be approved by the SC-20, and that this could be done by e-mail, allowing for a limited time for comment².

The Secretariat noted after the meeting that one specification (PRA for LMOs) had never been numbered. In order to have a consistent collection of specifications, it was incorporated in the series as No. 10. All other specifications have subsequently been renumbered, and the numbers therefore do not correspond anymore to those given in the documents distributed to SC-7. A complete list of existing specifications is appended for information [Annex II].

3.3 Individual specifications

The SC-7 examined and modified the specifications presented to it. The resulting modified texts are appended to the report.

Specification 2 - Revision of ISPM No. 1 (*Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade*) [Annex III]

There was a discussion on whether it would be possible to develop this important concept ISPM by e-mail as directed by the ICPM. The SC-7 concluded that this should be attempted, with the additional use of conference calls as required, and that the group would then report to the SC-20.

It is important that the revised standard should be kept short, focused and unambiguous.

The SC-7 noted that the Glossary Working Group may provide a core of members for the future Expert Working Group on this standard.

Several existing documents on this topic would be used as a basis for discussion by the Expert Working Group.

Specification No. 3 – Revision of ISPM No. 2 (*Guidelines for pest risk analysis*) [Annex IV]

The SC-7 agreed that the revised standard would be a conceptual ISPM on pest risk analysis. It should apply to PRA for phytosanitary purposes.

Interaction with other standards should be considered (such as ISPM 1, 3, 11 etc.), and the revised standard would establish links to other specific standards dealing with PRA issues, especially the ISPMs on PRA for quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests. It should also cover points such as identification of whether an organism is or is not a pest, intentional and unintentional introduction, biocontrol agents, invasive plants, LMOs etc.

Specification No. 4 - Revision of ISPM No. 3 (*Code of conduct for the import and release of exotic biological control agents*) [Annex V]

The SC-7 agreed that the revised ISPM should cover biocontrol agents only in relation to phytosanitary issues. It discussed whether sterile insect techniques, genetically modified biocontrol agents, and other beneficial organisms should be covered. It was decided that the Expert Working

¹ When the draft report was circulated to the SC-20 for comment, one member did not agree with the new format of specifications, and this point should be discussed by the SC-20 at its next meeting.

² The specifications approved at the SC-7 meeting were consequently circulated to the SC-20 for comments. Comments received were integrated by the Chairmen of the SC-7 and of the SC-20 to produce the final versions, of specifications, which are attached to this report.

Group should consider either including these in the standard or making recommendations for future work.

The SC-7 recommended that the title should be in line with other ISPMs, and should not be called a "code of conduct".

The size of the future Expert Working Group was increased to accommodate a CBD expert.

The SC-7 added consideration of pre- and post-release monitoring to the tasks of the Expert Working Group.

Specification No. 11 – Guidelines for equivalence [Annex VI]

The SC-7 noted that the issue of equivalence was requested by the SPS Committee and considered that the specification should take into account the work done by the other two standard-setting organizations (OIE and Codex). The SC-7 agreed that equivalence can be applied at different levels (measure, programme or system level), but that the main priority of the Expert Working Group should be to focus on determining equivalence of individual measures such as treatments or inspection regimes.

The SC-7 agreed that the draft ISPM on the efficacy of phytosanitary measures is so fundamental to the concept of equivalence, that it is important for the Expert Working Group to consider the linkage between the two; this was added to the tasks of the Expert Working Group.

The SC-7 decided that the future ISPM should be a stand-alone standard, because it is a concept standard; reference to it being a supplement was deleted.

The SC-7 wanted the Expert Working Group to be clear that when discussing information required to be exchanged when determining equivalence, only appropriate information should be exchanged. At the moment, some countries requested too much information. The SC-7 therefore wanted to add discipline to the specification.

The SC-7 took note that EPPO had made an offer of partial funding for the meeting. The tentative date is the first week of September 2003 in Belgium.

Specification No. 12 - Low pest prevalence [Annex VII]

The Expert Working Group will need to determine what is meant by the concept of low pest prevalence and then determine how areas of low pest prevalence are to be established, maintained, etc. It should also consider the need for surveillance etc. to achieve this.

The Expert Working Group should also consider how the concept of areas of low pest prevalence might be applied to regulated non-quarantine pests (RNQPs). It could be used as a way of achieving tolerances for RNQPs as applied to plants for planting.

The Expert Working Group should consider the relationship between areas of low pest prevalence and pest free areas, pest free places of production, pest free production sites, pest incursion, pest suppression, etc. It should also consider outbreaks, because action (i.e. emergency action and response) would have to be taken in the case of population increase.

The SC-7 agreed that the Expert Working Group should address the fact that official control measures may apply to areas of low pest prevalence and restrictions of movements of commodities would apply both domestically and internationally. It should also consider conditions under which this concept will not apply (e.g. entry of material into PFAs).

Specification No. 13 - Phytosanitary measures for consignments in transit [not appended]

The SC-7 did not have time to consider this specification, which will be worked on in November. Comments received from members of the SC-20 will be taken into account to develop a revised version for the November meeting.

Specification No. 14 – Guidelines for formatting specific diagnostic protocols for regulated pests [Annex VIII]

This specification had been provided at a late stage and had not been circulated to the SC-20. The SC-7 debated to which component of the programme it related. At ICPM-5, "Requirements for diagnostic

procedures for regulated pests" had been included amongst the topics and priorities for standards. The SC-7 was unsure of the exact mandate given by ICPM5 under this title. It suggested that the development of a specification for diagnostic protocols could be interpreted in two ways: either in relation to guidelines for the operation of diagnostic procedures (necessary expertise, resources, approved laboratories, maintenance of reference collections, ensuring sample identification, etc.) or for the preparation of a template within which specific diagnostic procedures for individual pests could be established.

The SC-7 considered that the priority should be given to the latter, and that this specification would therefore relate to the development of a template, to be used in support of a fast-track procedure. It felt that it would be useful to develop the specification with this understanding.

The specification was renamed *Guidelines for formatting specific diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*.

The SC-7 suggested that this specification should be presented to the focus group on standards development which will consider the fast-track procedure in June 2003.

The SC-7 suggested that it may be possible to develop the format for diagnostic protocol by e-mail.

Specification No. 15 - The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management of citrus fruit for citrus canker [Annex IX]

The SC-7 decided that guidelines should provide specific guidance on citrus canker, since there are already general guidelines on systems approaches (ISPM No. 14). The standard would concern phytosanitary measures applied domestically or for importation, and would apply to citrus fruit only. The aim of the systems approach would be to *facilitate trade*, rather than allow it (as originally written in the specification).

There was concern that the work programme would be too extensive if the scope of the standard was too large. The SC-7 wanted to limit the scope to achieving a workable standard on a systems approach for the movement of fresh citrus fruit.

The SC-7 noted that the Expert Working Group could consider the components of systems approaches, for example the types of treatments that might be used (and list them), and then indicate how these would fit into a systems approach. Specific standards could then be developed as appropriate.

It was noted that the only component standard on citrus canker that was in the work programme was the surveillance for citrus canker, that is to be completed by email. The systems approach for citrus canker is however in mentioned the list of topics and priorities for standards that can be funded if additional resources become available.

Specification No. 16 - Guidelines for the development and amendment of ISPMs

Narcy Klag had drafted a specification on guidelines for the development and amendment of ISPMs. In addition, he provided the SC-7 with copies of two documents: 1. Policy and Guidelines for Construction of International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (FAO 1994) and 2. NAPPO Regional Standards for Phytosanitary Measures RSPM #6: guideline for the development and amendment of NAPPO Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (NAPPO 2002). After discussion with the SC-7, Narcy Klag volunteered to become the Steward for this document. He agreed to review the specification and to draft a first version of the document. The SC-7 determined that this document would provide useful guidance on the standard-setting process (specifications, Expert Working Groups, stewards, SC, ICPM, revisions, etc.) and would also be useful for the fast-track process when developed. It agreed that the draft could be circulated to the SC by email, together with the revised specification, so that a more advanced version could be presented to the SC in November.

The SC-7 suggested that the final document would eventually be presented to the ICPM for approval as a guidance document for the Standards Committee and Secretariat.

3.4 Stewards in relation to the specifications

As agreed in the *Guidelines for the composition and organization of Expert Working Groups* recently agreed at ICPM-5, the SC should try to identify for each standard, as far as possible, a steward who is

a member of the SC. The SC-7 made provisional proposals for stewards for the specifications under study at the meeting. These will be proposed to the SC-20 by means of this report (and to the experts concerned when they were not present at the meeting).

Proposed Stewards³:

- Specification No. 2 - Revision of ISPM 1 (*Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade*): Reinouw Bast-Tjeerde – One member of the SC should take part in that Working Group.
- Specification No. 3 - Revision of ISPM 2 (*Guidelines for pest risk analysis*): Alan Pemberton.
- Specification No. 4- Revision of ISPM No. 3 (*Code of conduct for the import and release of exotic biological control agents*): Chris Hood.
- Specification No. 8- Efficacy of measures: concept and application (see point 4.3): John Hedley.
- Specification No. 11 - Guidelines for equivalence: Wilson Songa.
- Specification No. 12 - Low pest prevalence: Nancy Klag.
- Specification No. 13 – Phytosanitary measures for consignments in transit: to be discussed in November.
- Specification No. 14 - Guidelines for formatting specific diagnostic protocols for regulated pests: Asna Booty Othman.
- Specification No. 15 - The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management: Odilson Luiz Ribeiro e Silva.
- Specification No. 16 – Guidelines for the development and amendment of ISPMs: Nancy Klag.

These are tentative recommendations, and the SC 7 requests feedback from the SC on the proposed stewards, as well as proposals for names of other interested members.

4 Draft ISPMs

4.1 Guidelines for an import regulatory system

Alan Pemberton explained the history and background of the standard. In 2001 the Interim Standards Committee reviewed a draft standard. The opinions were divergent and it was decided that an additional Working Group should be held. This took place in Paris in April 2002 and a draft was presented to the Standards Committee in November 2002, which felt that many of the elements of the first draft had been lost and decided that an e-mail group (Alan Pemberton, Nancy Klag and John Hedley) should blend the two versions. The Standards Committee also asked that the section (on actions) which had been deleted from the draft ISPM on lists of regulated pests should also be incorporated into the draft. The SC-7 thanked the e-mail working group for their efforts.

There was a discussion on the components of an import regulatory system and the need to include procedures in the regulatory framework.

In the section on international agreements, principles and standards (3.1), the SC-7 decided to keep only the titles, rather than the detailed wording. The reasons were that the text was not quite in line with ISPM no 1, which was due for review anyway.

There was discussion on the section on requirements of regional organizations (3.2). There was a concern that an international standard cannot endorse regional requirements. Other agreements may impinge on the requirements of import regulatory systems, but they are not mentioned and there is no intention to include them in the standard.

The draft was modified to clarify that Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) do not impose obligations under the IPPC (but that they rather cooperate in the exchange of information) and that regional cooperation/integration organizations, except from the EU, are not legally recognized by the IPPC as imposing obligations under the IPPC.

³ These proposals were later submitted to the SC-20 and the persons concerned. The final decision for each standard is indicated in the specifications which are appended to this report.

In section 4, the text was clarified in relation to the responsibilities of contracting parties and NPPOs, particularly with respect to issuing of regulations (contracting party obligation). As the NPPO usually formulates the regulations, wording was inserted to encourage contracting parties to provide NPPOs with the authority to formulate regulations.

The SC-7 noted that the Appendix which was originally attached to the draft, and which summarized the rights, obligations and responsibilities of contracting parties and NPPOs under the IPPC and the SPS Agreement was useful but should not be part of the standard. The Secretariat should decide whether it would use it as an information document or a training document.

4.2 Supplement to ISPM No. 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) on PRA for living modified organisms

Bill Roberts introduced the draft supplement. He explained that the Working Group had differing opinions on whether this should be a stand-alone standard, or whether it should be integrated within ISPM No. 11. The SC-7 discussed this issue and concluded that, in a first phase, the draft should be presented as boxed text within ISPM No. 11 (as had previously been done for the supplement on environmental impact) before being sent for country consultation. The ICPM-6 will have to decide whether the text should be integrated in ISPM No. 11, as decided by ICPM-5 for the supplement on environmental impact. It was suggested that, due to its length, the section on determining if a LMO is a pest could later be an Annex. Bill Roberts transformed the draft during the week.

The SC-7 was concerned that the draft seemed to cover all organisms with novel traits, i.e. those obtained through modern biotechnology, as well as those obtained through conventional techniques, which was broader than the scope of the specification. Several participants expressed the view that this would greatly increase regulation for conventional organisms, which are not submitted to PRA at the moment. In relation to the Cartagena Protocol, only the products of modern biotechnology should be covered in the text. The concept of novel traits was eliminated from the standard.

The Glossary Working Group comments on definitions were agreed to (Living organism was removed, Cartagena Protol was used instead of CP, direct and indirect affects were removed).

Enhanced virus recombination was mentioned amongst potential phytosanitary risks from LMOs, and there was a suggestion that it should be deleted because it had never been reported in practice. The SC-7 nevertheless supported that this element could still be considered during the assessment

In relation to biocontrol agents, which were mentioned at several points in the standard, the SC-7 emphasised that there was a need to ensure proper linkage to the various ISPMs when ISPM No. 2 would be revised.

The general considerations which were originally included at the beginning of the draft prepared by the Working Group were considered and relocated to other parts of the draft.

The SC-7 favoured that, for circulation for country consultation, the text on LMOs should be presented within ISPM No. 11. It was suggested that the Secretariat should integrate the supplement on environmental impact into ISPM No. 11 (as agreed at ICPM-5), and then insert boxed text for LMOs into the new ISPM No. 11.

The SC requested the Secretariat to prepare a detailed cover letter for this supplement explaining to countries how this ISPM had been prepared and explaining the integration process of the 2 supplements.

4.3 The efficacy of phytosanitary measures: concept and application

The SC-7 was presented with the draft ISPM *The efficacy of phytosanitary measures: concept and application* as prepared by an Expert Working Group in November 2002.

The SC-7 welcomed this draft and recognized the large amount of work which had been done on this complex issue. However, it felt that this draft ISPM was not ready to be sent for country consultation.

In particular, the following issues were identified:

- the draft standard should be simplified;
- it should not cover equivalence, which will be developed in another ISPM;
- it should not go into details on PRA, surveillance or appropriate level of protection;

- it is a conceptual document, but it lacks guidance on what should be done;
- it should focus on how to evaluate the efficacy of measures and give practical guidance;
- it sometimes appears to confuse measures and the effects of measures, qualitative and quantitative aspects, effectiveness and efficacy.

In order to help further progress and to better target additional work to be carried out on this draft, the SC-7 revised the specification No. 8. [Annex X].

The SC-7 felt that the task of setting up a method for the evaluation of treatments to be included in ISPMs was too big of a task. It was decided that the concept standard should be developed first and that a specific standard on this topic might then be needed.

The SC-7 debated on how this standard should be further developed. Several alternatives were envisaged. Either the steward, together with selected participants from the original Working Group and possibly some members of the SC-7, could use an e-mail consultation to obtain a version which could be presented to the SC, or a Working Group should be convened (with some participants from the first meeting, but also with some new members having expertise in the application of relevant principles). It was also suggested that RPPOs could be able to assist in an informal way to help with the further development of this draft. The Secretariat would consult the Bureau on this issue and should take account of the importance of this standard.

The SC-7 noted that this draft was a priority on last year's work programme, but was not mentioned on the current year programme. However, because this ISPM could not be completed last year, the SC-7 thought that it should remain a priority for the current year work programme.

4.4 Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests

Jane Chard introduced the draft, which had been prepared by an Expert Working Group in Wageningen, in 2002. The Expert Working Group had transmitted specifically three recommendations to the SC:

- ISPM No. 2, when revised, should take account of regulated non-quarantine pests;
- An early date for review should be planned for the ISPM on PRA for RNQPs once approved, because this was a new area for countries and there was a need to make sure that the PRA process functioned properly;
- With regard to the issue of the statistical guidance which is needed in relation to setting tolerances for RNQPs, the Expert Working Group suggested that this should be addressed in the draft ISPM on inspection methodology. This ISPM should take account of RNQPs and should be given a high priority for completion.

The Expert Working Group had insisted on the establishment of an appropriate tolerance for regulated non-quarantine pests. For COSAVE, the only phytosanitary measure with regard to regulated non-quarantine pest was the tolerance. Some members were concerned that this might be contradictory to ISPM No. 16. Although the SC-7 recognized the link between measures and tolerance, most members believed that the tolerance was not a measure in itself, but that measures were necessary to achieve the specified tolerance. It was noted that the way the tolerance could be achieved by the exporting country would not be necessarily indicated by the importing country, although the standard would give some examples of how it could be achieved. It was stated that an auditing system would be necessary to check that the tolerance had been met, but that it would not be applied systematically to all consignments.

European countries were concerned that plants for planting should be "a" main source of pest infestation for RNQPs, but might not be "the" main source. Firstly, it might be difficult to demonstrate that plants for planting were the main source of pest infestation. Secondly, there might be cases when the main source of infestation might not be the plants for planting, for example at specific points in time, and that the country might still want to regulate the pest as a RNQP (e.g. regulating plants for planting of *Prunus* with respect to *Plum pox potyvirus*, even if the virus was present in the environment and might enter the field through infested plants from outside the orchard under certain circumstances). The rest of the SC did not agree with this view, and supported that plants for planting should be "the" main source of pest infestation, which was also consistent with ISPM No. 16.

5 Issues arising from the Glossary Working Group

The SC-7 discussed some issues arising from the meeting of the Glossary Working Group. The recommendations made by the Glossary Working Group will be transmitted to the SC-20 for its consideration.

The Working Group had recommended that the Glossary should be the reference to all ISPMs, even those adopted prior to a glossary change. The SC-7 recommended that the Glossary should be kept up to date, but that definitions in previous standards should be modified only when the standards were revised.

The Working Group had also proposed that all standards should be republished every year in a book format. The SC-7 was generally in favour of this idea, but thought that it might have consequences which needed to be studied. There would be a need to keep track of the definitions which have a certain meaning in one ISPM, but have been modified afterwards in others.

The Glossary Working Group was asked to consider whether the term *phytosanitary* should be defined, or whether adding wording to appropriate terms where it is used would be sufficient. The SC-7 believed that there should be an agreed interpretation of this term in relation to the IPPC. This should be discussed and reconsidered by the Standards Committee at its next meeting in November.

The Glossary Working Group proposed modifications to the Glossary, including editorial modifications, which would have immediate consequences for the next publication of the Glossary. The SC-7 agreed with these and recommended that the SC-20 should be asked to approve some of these by e-mail.

The Glossary Working Group had suggested that the terms which are given in Annex of the supplement no. 2 on economic importance should be reviewed for incorporation in the Glossary. The SC-7 noted that these definitions had only be provided for information, but that the Glossary Group could review them and consider incorporating them in the Glossary.

The Glossary Working Group had proposed that one of its tasks could be to do a preliminary review of standards and identify where revision was needed. The SC-7 thought that the Glossary Group should limit itself to the revision of definitions, and did not have a mandate for reviewing or modifying ISPMs. However, one role of the Glossary Working Group could be to report on the impact of modification of a definition on existing ISPMs.

The SC-7 noted that the priority for revision of ISPMs should be decided by the ICPM based on recommendations by the SC. It was suggested that the Secretariat could look at date of reviews indicated in individual ISPMs, and would report to the SC.

The Glossary Group had suggested that ISPM No. 3 and No. 4 needed revision. Revision of ISPM No. 3 had already been decided. The need for revision of ISPM No. 4 should be considered by the SC.

The Glossary Working Group had noted that the new definition for *incursion* (ICPM-5, 2003) would have consequences for the approved ISPM No. 17 on pest reporting, and had proposed some rewriting of sections 5 and 5.2. The SC-20 would have to decide what should be done regarding the proposed modification.

The Glossary Group had suggested that the format of standards should be harmonized, and the SC-7 agreed that this could be done by the Secretariat.

The Glossary Group had made several recommendations with regard to harmonization with other organizations, like CBD. The SC-7 agreed with the suggestions, and suggested that the IPPC Secretariat forward comments on terms to these organizations (OIE, CBD, FAO Glossary on Biotechnology).

6 Issues arising from ICPM-5

6.1 Discussion on the normal standard-setting procedure

The SC-7 recognized countries' concerns expressed at ICPM-5 that transparency on the consideration of comments by SC-7/SC-20 should be improved. It was noted that implementing suitable procedures might help avoiding that countries propose changing the text at the ICPM or resubmit comments which have already been considered by the SC.

Several suggestions were made, such as generating a report giving a response on each comment (which would be very resource-intensive), or reporting only on controversial discussions. It was

suggested that more guidance on how to submit comments should also be given to countries at the time when the documents are sent out for country consultation; in particular, comments should be specific and should propose text as appropriate. It was noted that submitting country comments through the IPP over the Internet had been discussed.

The SC-7 discussed two other points in relation to country comments, and they might be decided upon by the SC-20. Firstly, to improve transparency, the table of country comments studied at the SC could be made available on the IPP (countries would have to be informed and consent to this) in order for countries to verify that their comments had been presented and considered. Alternatively, this document could be provided at the ICPM, for the same purpose. In addition, the reaction of the SC could also be posted on the IPP.

Secondly, it was noted that some comments raised during the ICPM originated from a misunderstanding of the drafts. It was envisaged that some points could be resolved in advance of the ICPM if delegates could provide their written comments in advance of the meeting, and that these could be considered by a subset of the SC. This step however should only be for exceptional comments and should not replace the normal country consultation process.

The SC-7 emphasised the importance of involving countries in the standard-setting process in order for them to gain ownership of the standards. The importance of Regional Technical Consultations (planned well in advance to allow suitable participation) on draft ISPMs, prior to the ICPM was highlighted. It was suggested that at least one member of the SC from the region concerned should be present at the consultation in order to explain issues as appropriate and to provide feedback to the SC. In addition, it would be useful that, when draft ISPMs are sent for country consultation, they should also be sent to the SC-20 so that they can circulate them through their regional networks where necessary. It was also suggested that it might be possible at a later date that an e-mail notification should be (automatically) be sent out to contact points when ICPM or country comment documents are posted on the Internet.

6.2 Discussion on the fast-track procedure

The SC-7 noted that it should be considered to recommend the use of other organizations' standards rather than taking ownership of these standards. Ratification by e-mail could be considered. The Secretariat would have editorial responsibilities in the process, which might require additional resources. In any case, the SC-7 foresaw that it would not be straightforward to approve standards which had been developed in other organizations.

6.3 Composition of Expert Working Groups

The ICPM recommended that the SC should approve the names of experts for Expert Working Groups. The SC could approve these lists of experts by e-mail. However, some flexibility was required, so that the Secretariat could finalize lists of experts for Working Groups.

The issue of the need to provide CVs for experts was raised, and the SC-7 concluded that a basic description of expertise and contact information was essential. However, the addition of a CV would be helpful in making the final selection.

There was some discussion of setting-up and maintaining a roster of experts on the IPP, and it was suggested that it might be difficult to keep up to date.

[Note added by the Secretariat: The issues raised in section 6 will be referred to the focus group on standard development for consideration.]

7 Others

Felipe Canale noted that, in ISPM No. 11, section 3.1 might lead to a misinterpretation that phytosanitary measures can determine the appropriate level of protection, which is contradictory with the SPS agreement. There might be a need to consider this point when revising ISPM No. 11.

In ISPM No. 19, it was noted that there was reference to *harmful pests* which is not defined in the Glossary. The SC judged that this point was editorial and could be modified by the Secretariat.

FORMAT FOR ISPM SPECIFICATIONS

adopted by the First Interim Standards Committee -- May 2000
revised by the SC-7 – May 2003

Title or proposed title:

Identify (by agreed or proposed title) the topic or document which is the basis for the specification.

Reason for the standard/Reason for revision:

Describe the reason for preparing or revising the standard.

Scope and purpose:

Describe the scope and purpose of the standard.

Tasks:

Describe specific needs, what is to be done, i.e., review, revise, update, formulate, etc. and expectations as well as the modus operandi for completing the task.

Provision of resources:

Identify source(s) of resources.

Proposed work programme:

Indicate expected timeframe for completion and tentative/proposed meeting dates if known.

Steward:

Identify individual responsible for management of the task.

Collaborator:

Identify any organization(s) providing support.

Expertise:

Identify the nature of expertise required and the number of experts needed.

Participants:

Identify experts or other individuals involved or proposed in accomplishing the task.

Approval:

Note the date and session of approval by the Standards Committee and the session when introduced into the work programme by the ICPM.

References

Identify discussion papers, draft standards, other relevant documents or literature.

LIST OF EXISTING SPECIFICATIONS - FOR INFORMATION

The brackets refer to the meetings having approved the specifications (or to the situation of a draft specification).

<u>Specification No. 1</u>	Review and updating of the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (ISC3, 2001)
<u>Specification No. 2</u>	Revision of ISPM No. 1 (<i>Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade</i>) (SC-7, May 2003; SC-20 by e-mail, June 2003)
<u>Specification No. 3</u>	Revision of ISPM No. 2 (<i>Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis</i>) (SC-7, May 2003; SC-20 by e-mail, June 2003)
<u>Specification No. 4</u>	Revision of ISPM No. 3 (<i>Code of conduct for the import and release of exotic biological control agents</i>) (SC-7, May 2003; SC-20 by e-mail, June 2003)
<u>Specification No. 5</u>	Risk analysis for environmental hazards of plant pests (ISC 3, 2001)
<u>Specification No. 6</u>	Pest Risk Analysis for Regulated Non-quarantine Pests (ISC3, 2001)
<u>Specification No. 7</u>	Irradiation as a treatment for phytosanitary purposes (ISC3, 2001)
<u>Specification No. 8</u>	Efficacy of measures: concept and application (SC-7, May 2003; SC-20 by e-mail, June 2003)
<u>Specification No. 9</u>	PRA for regulated non-quarantine pests (SC-1, May 2002)
<u>Specification No. 10</u>	PRA for LMOs (ICPM-4, 2002)
<u>Specification No. 11</u>	Equivalence (last modified by: SC-7, May 2003)
<u>Specification No. 12</u>	Low pest prevalence (SC-7, May 2003; SC-20 by e-mail, June 2003)
<u>Specification No. 13</u>	Transit (to be studied by SC-7/SC-20, November 2003)
<u>Specification No. 14</u>	Guidelines for formatting specific diagnostic protocols for regulated pests (last modified by: SC-7, May 2003; SC-20 by e-mail, June 2003)
<u>Specification No. 15</u>	The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management of citrus fruit for citrus canker (SC-7, May 2003; SC-20 by e-mail, June 2003)
<u>Specification No. 16</u>	Guidelines for the development and amendment of ISPMs (specification being prepared following SC-7 in May 2003)

SPECIFICATION NO. 2 (REVISED)

Title: Revision of ISPM No. 1 (*Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade*)

Reason for revision: FAO Conference adopted ISPM No. 1 in 1993. This was before the revision of the IPPC and also before the completion of the GATT Uruguay Round negotiations that resulted in the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement) and the establishment of the World Trade Organization. The adoption and coming into force of the SPS Agreement (1995) and the adoption of IPPC (1997) represent further development of the original concepts that formed the basis for ISPM No. 1. This means that the standard is now inconsistent with the IPPC (1997) and describes principles differently than equivalent concepts in the SPS Agreement. Revision of ISPM No. 1 is needed to correct and update the standard.

Scope and purpose: The standard identifies and describes general and specific principles as related to the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade. It is a reference standard that aids the understanding of obligations in the IPPC and the SPS Agreement and provides guidance for the evaluation of fundamental elements in phytosanitary systems.

Tasks:

The overall task is to undertake a complete review of ISPM No. 1 with the aim of updating the standard for consistency with the IPPC (1997) and to improve clarity as well as completeness.

In particular, attention should be given to:

- ensuring that each principle is short, focused and unambiguous;
- revising the title and text as phytosanitary principles;
- full alignment with the IPPC (1997) and the agreed interpretation of the term phytosanitary measure;
- consideration of whether non-discrimination is two principles as in the SPS Agreement (Art. II.3 and Art. V.5);
- consideration of whether the titles of “technical justification” or “risk analysis” is more appropriate;
- principles which should be deleted;
- principles which should be combined, modified or added.

Provision of resources: It was agreed at the Fifth Session of the ICPM to convene a working group to undertake the revision of ISPM No. 1 primarily by e-mail and/or conference calls.

Proposed work programme: The revision of ISPM No. 1 has been identified as a priority in the work programme. An e-mail working group may be convened during 2003-4 depending on the availability of IPPC Secretariat resources to coordinate the group.

Steward: Reinouw Baast-Tjeerde / John Hedley

Expertise: A working group of 5-7 experts having broad familiarity with phytosanitary systems and specific familiarity with the IPPC and the SPS Agreement, and representing diverse geographical regions.

Participants: to be determined - the Glossary working group may provide a core of participants

Approval: Incorporated into the work programme at the Fifth Session of the ICPM in 2003. Specification modified by the SC-7 in May 2003, and then following SC-20 comments obtained by e-mail.

References: ISPM No. 1, discussion papers from the IPPC Secretariat, including drafts that have been previously prepared, including the discussion paper from March 2001.

SPECIFICATION NO. 3 (REVISED)

Title: Revision of ISPM No. 2 (*Guidelines for pest risk analysis*)

Reason for revision: FAO Conference adopted ISPM No. 2 (*Guidelines for pest risk analysis*) in November 1995. This was before the revision of the IPPC and also before many National Plant Protection Organizations had experience with pest risk analysis. Subsequent revision of the IPPC and the rapid advancement of pest risk analysis in practice create the need for updating the guidance provided by ISPM No. 2. In particular, the standard provides no guidance in certain situations such as regulated non-quarantine pests, LMOs or biological control agents, and it has certain key deficiencies such as not considering the feasibility of measures in risk management.

Scope and purpose: ISPM No. 2 describes the process of pest risk analysis for phytosanitary purposes. The standard should provide general and conceptual guidance to pest risk analysis and an introduction to the more specific standards dealing with risk analysis under the IPPC.

Tasks:

The overall task is to undertake a review of ISPM No. 2 with the aim of reformulation into a new standard, general guidelines for PRA for phytosanitary purposes.

In particular, attention should be given to:

- consideration of an appropriate title;
- full alignment with IPPC (1997) and the agreed interpretation of the term phytosanitary measure;
- for initiation points beginning with an organism, consideration of whether it is or is not a pest;
- consideration of PRA as it applies to RNQPs;
- consideration of whether elements of the PRA process that are common to all regulated pests, such as the initiation and categorization processes, should be covered in detail in ISPM No. 2, rather than in the specific PRA standards (ISPM No. 11 and the PRA for RNQP draft);
- consideration of measures in risk management (taking into account rights and obligations, including feasibility);
- revision of the figures;
- those situations where the original standard provided no guidance on intentional or unintentional introduction of:
 - living modified organisms (LMOs)
 - invasive plants
 - biocontrol agents, etc.

The review should take into account ISPM No. 11, including the supplement on environmental risks adopted at the Fifth session of the ICPM, the draft standard on PRA for regulated non-quarantine pests and the draft supplement to ISPM No. 11 on PRA for LMOs.

Provision of resources: Funding for meetings is provided from the regular programme of the IPPC Secretariat (FAO) except where expert participation is voluntarily funded by the expert's government.

Proposed work programme: Scheduled in the work programme for 2003-4.

Steward: Alan Pemberton

Expertise: A working group of 5-7 experts having a combination of skills and experience, including a familiarity with SPS and IPPC principles and the development and application of PRA, a general knowledge of standard setting and representing diverse geographical regions.

Participants: to be determined

Approval: Incorporated into the work programme at the Fifth Session of the ICPM in 2003. Specification modified by the SC-7 in May 2003, and then following SC-20 comments obtained by e-mail.

References: ISPM No. 1; ISPM No. 2; ISPM No. 3; ISPM No. 11, including the supplement on environmental risks; draft standard on PRA for regulated non-quarantine pests; draft supplement on PRA for LMOs.

SPECIFICATION NO. 4 (REVISED)

Title: Revision of ISPM No. 3 (*Code of conduct for the import and release of exotic biological control agents*)

Reason for revision: FAO Conference adopted ISPM No. 3 (*Code of Conduct for the Import and Release of Exotic Biological Control Agents*) in November 1995, which was before the revision of the IPPC in 1997. The standard was due for review in 2001 and issues such as the rapid increase in the use of and trade in biological control agents, and developments in biological control practices have created the need to update this standard. The standard also needs to be brought in line with other more recently developed ISPMs and phytosanitary concepts within the framework of the IPPC.

Scope and purpose:

The standard describes responsibilities of authorities of governments, importers, and exporters for the import and release of biological control agents. It provides guidance on the application of phytosanitary measures for regulating the export, shipment, import and release of organisms used as biological control agents for plants and plant pests. It lists the responsibilities of governments, and the responsibilities of the exporters and importers of biological control agents.

The standard addresses the importation of exotic biological control agents capable of self-replication (parasitoids, predators, parasites, nematodes, phytophagous invertebrates [e.g. arthropods, molluscs, echinoderms, etc.] and beneficial micro-organisms). This includes addressing the phytosanitary risks associated with biological control agents that are packaged or formulated as commercial products but does not include product registration.

Tasks:

Items that should be reviewed include:

- revision of title and text;
- pest risk analysis procedures appropriate for biological control agents;
- regulatory guidance developed by OECD since publication of the standard;
- issues related to the transport and handling of biological control agents;
- possibilities for clarification and emphasis as regards invasive species and other impacts on the environment; and
- issues related to pre and post release monitoring.

Other tasks for consideration are to address the following matters in this standard **or** to make proposals for future action on them:

- sterile insect technique (SIT) issues;
- beneficial organism issues; and
- the use of biological control agents that have been genetically modified using modern biotechnology techniques.

Provision of resources: Funding for meetings is provided from the extra-budgetary funding through the IPPC Secretariat (FAO), except where expert participation is voluntarily funded by the expert's government.

Proposed work programme: Included in the work programme adopted at ICPM-4, April 2002 - currently not scheduled.

Steward: Gregory Wolff.

Collaborator: IPM Facility, FAO and CABI.

Expertise: A working group of 6-8 phytosanitary experts having familiarity with biological control agents, ISPMs and the SPS Agreement or IPM.

Participants: to be determined, but to include a CBD representative.

Approval: Incorporated into the work programme at the Fourth Session of the ICPM in 2002. Specification modified by the SC-7 in May 2003, and then following SC-20 comments obtained by e-mail.

References:

ISPM No. 1: *Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade*

ISPM No. 2: *Guidelines for pest risk analysis*

ISPM No. 3: *Code of conduct for the import and release of exotic biological control agents*

ISPM No. 6: *Guidelines for surveillance*

ISPM No. 11: *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*

ISPM No. 14: *The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest management*

Guidance for registration requirements for microbial pesticides – OECD Guidelines

Guidance for registration requirements for invertebrates as biological control agents (IBCA) – OECD Guidelines

IAEA documents related to SIT, if appropriate

Guidelines for the petition for the release of exotic phytophagous agents for the biological control of weeds

NAPPO Standard No. 4

Guidelines for the petition for the release of exotic entomophagous agents for the biological control of pests

NAPPO Standard No. 12

Discussion papers and meeting reports from the IPPC Secretariat, and specifically from the Wye workshop.

SPECIFICATION NO. 11

Title: Guidelines for equivalence

Reason for the standard: A request was made by the SPS Committee to the three standard-setting organizations for the concept of equivalence. This was endorsed by ICPM-4 & ICPM-5. This is needed by countries in determining equivalence.

Scope and purpose: This standard should be a concept standard on equivalence as applied in the context of the IPPC. It should provide guidance on the principles to be considered by NPPOs when determining equivalence. It should cover the concept of equivalence as implemented in the context of the IPPC taking into account the elements of other ISPMs that relate to equivalence, particularly: ISPM No. 1 (*Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade*); ISPM No. 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*); ISPM No. 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*); and the draft ISPM on *Efficacy of measures*.

Tasks:

- Consider the linkage to the *Efficacy of phytosanitary measures* draft standard.
- Determine whether equivalence could be applied and if so, how:
 - at the individual measure level or a combination of measures;
 - to a process or programme; or
 - to a phytosanitary regulatory system or service.
- Priority should be given on the provision of guidance for equivalence at the individual measures or combination of measures.
- Review existing standards, draft standards, discussion and reference papers and other information available on the concept of equivalence, in particular from Codex, OIE and the SPS Committee.
- Formulate a standard that describes the fundamental principles and concepts of equivalence and identify approaches that are most useful for phytosanitary purposes.
- Consider the sequence of steps that would be involved in evaluating and making a determination of equivalence, including the information that is appropriate to be exchanged during this process.
- Note for the Standards Committee any points to be considered for the future development of related standards.
- Note also any problems or concerns anticipated by the application of the standard in practice.

Provision of resources: Funding for meetings is provided by the Regular Programme of the IPPC Secretariat (FAO) [and partially funded by EPPO], except where expert participation is voluntarily funded by the expert's government.

Proposed work programme: Expert working group to formulate first draft (tentative 1-5 September 2003).

Steward: Wilson Songa

Collaborator: EPPO

Expertise: 5-7 international phytosanitary experts that have an interest and expertise in equivalence and relevant aspects of other standards and draft standards.

Participants: to be determined.

Approval: Introduced into the work programme by the ICPM at its Fifth Session in 2003. Specification modified by the SC-7 in May 2003, and then following SC-20 comments obtained by e-mail.

References: ICPM 03 / INF/3: Equivalence; IPPC Secretariat's introduction paper; NAPPO discussion paper: The concept of equivalence in the phytosanitary area: practical considerations in developing an IPPC standard; ISPM No. 1 (*Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade*); ISPM No. 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*); ISPM No. 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*); draft ISPM on *Efficacy of measures*; OIE and Codex [draft] guidelines on equivalence.

SPECIFICATION NO. 12

Title: Low pest prevalence

Reason for the standard: The concept of areas of low pest prevalence is addressed in the IPPC and the WTO-SPS Agreement and the standard should take into account provisions for areas of low pest prevalence as well as least trade restrictive measures under both the IPPC and the WTO-SPS Agreement. Relevant guidance in existing ISPMs should also be considered, including ISPMs No. 4, 6, 8 and 14 (see references below). Other ISPMs, such as ISPM No. 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*) and ISPM No 10 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*), will also need to be taken into account in considering the concept.

Scope and purpose: The standard is to provide guidance on the application of the concept of areas of low pest prevalence in the context of the application of phytosanitary measures, particularly in pest risk management and its relationship to the use of least trade restrictive measures. The standard should explore the concept of areas of low pest prevalence and provide guidance on the application of the concept.

Tasks:

The overall task is to provide guidance on the application of the concept of areas of low pest prevalence for phytosanitary purposes.

In particular, attention should be given to:

- an explanation of the concept and its relevance for plant protection;
- criteria for defining, describing and determining areas of low pest prevalence;
- consideration of the need for guidance on surveillance, monitoring and maintenance procedures with a view to establishing, maintaining and verifying areas of low pest prevalence and to use these in pest risk management;
- consideration of regulatory concepts such as
 - relationship to PFA and pest free places of production,
 - role of phytosanitary procedures such as pest suppression, monitoring, emergency planning and response to an outbreak,
 - suspension, termination and reinstatement of areas;
- consideration of the relationship of official control and the areas of low pest prevalence;
- consideration of situations where this standard may or may not apply;
- consideration of the relevance of the concept to regulated non-quarantine pests;
- ensuring consistency with other ISPMs and the concept as mentioned in the WTO-SPS Agreement (Art. VI).

Provision of resources: Funding for meetings is provided from the regular programme of the IPPC Secretariat (FAO) [partially funded by NAPPO] except where expert participation is voluntarily funded by the expert's government.

Proposed work programme: to be determined.

Steward: Nancy Klag

Collaborator: NAPPO

Expertise: A working group of 5-7 phytosanitary experts having familiarity with phytosanitary systems, ISPMs or surveillance, monitoring or eradication programmes for regulated pests.

Participants: to be determined

Approval: Introduced into the work programme by the ICPM at its Fifth Session, April 2003. Specification modified by the SC-7 in May 2003, and then following SC-20 comments obtained by e-mail.

References:

IPPC 1997; WTO-SPS Agreement; ISPM No. 4: *Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*; ISPM No. 6: *Guidelines for surveillance*; ISPM No. 8: *Determination of pest status in an area*; ISPM No. 14: *The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*; NAPPO draft standard (on web site).

SPECIFICATION NO. 14

Title: Guidelines for formatting specific diagnostic protocols for regulated pests

Reason for the standard: The ICPM-5 identified the need for international guidance on specific diagnostic protocols and wished to provide a fast-track process, when appropriate, for their adoption. This standard will provide a template for the presentation of information in a consistent manner.

Scope and purpose: This standard provides the format/template for specific diagnostic protocols to be developed as international standards. Specific diagnostic protocols for regulated pests provide all the information necessary for a named pest to be detected and positively identified.

Specific diagnostic protocols briefly present pests and then gives details on the detection, identification, comparison with similar species, requirements for a positive diagnosis, list of institutes or individuals where further information on that organism can be obtained, references (on the diagnosis, detection/extraction method, test methods).

Tasks:

- Review EPPO and NAPPO templates for specific diagnostic protocol and other related documents.
- Develop a standardized format for specific diagnostic protocols for the ICPM.
- Suggest a format and description of each heading and its contents.
- Consider providing an example that illustrates the use of the template in an appendix.
- Ensure provision of flexibility within specific protocols for a range of methodologies for different situations.

Provision of resources: Funding for meetings is provided from the regular programme of the IPPC Secretariat (FAO) except where expert participation is voluntarily funded by the expert's government.

Proposed work programme: to be determined.[Possible consideration for this standard to be developed by e-mail.]

Steward: Asna Booty Othman

Expertise: 5-7 participants comprised primarily of diagnostic experts from a variety of disciplines, and to include practical expertise in phytosanitary procedures.

Participants: to be determined

Approval: Specification modified by the SC-7 working group in May 2003, and then following SC-20 comments obtained by e-mail.

References: EPPO "Suggested format and content of a diagnostic protocol" (presented as a working document to SC-7 in May 2003); NAPPO template.

SPECIFICATION NO. 15

Title: The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management of citrus fruit for citrus canker (*Xanthomonas axonopodis* pv. *citri*)

Reason for the standard:

ISPM No. 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*) provides the general guidelines related to the pest risk management options by the application of integrated measures in a systems approach, as an alternative to the application of a single phytosanitary measure or restrictive phytosanitary measures with the objective of satisfying phytosanitary requirements.

Following the guidelines provided in the Fourth Session of Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures that recommended to the IPPC members to develop conceptual, concrete or specific standards by pest or plant products, there is a need (according to the report of ICPM-4, paragraph 67) to develop a citrus canker (*Xanthomonas axonopodis* p.v. *citri*) risk management specific standard for citrus fruit.

Based in the pest biological characteristics, it is possible to offer different phytosanitary measures, integrated in a systems approach for the risk management of pest entry and its establishment, that could be required by importing countries with the aim to facilitate citrus fruit trade.

Scope and purpose: This standard provides specific guidelines on options for citrus canker risk management by applying integrated phytosanitary measures in a systems approach to facilitate the movement of citrus fruit.

Tasks:

- Consider existing standards, such as ISPMs 6, 8, 9, 4, 10, draft standard on the surveillance of citrus canker;
- Incorporate relevant concepts of systems approach (ISPM No. 14), including consideration of items such as:
 - laboratory diagnostics
 - treatments
 - relationship between infested areas and pest free areas.

Provision of resources: Funding for meetings will be provided by the COSAVE region.

Proposed work programme: to be determined.

Steward: Odilson Ribeiro e Silva

Collaborators: NPPOs from COSAVE region - Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay

Expertise: A working group of 6-8 phytosanitary experts having familiarity with phytosanitary systems, ISPMs, systems approaches and citrus canker expertise.

Participants: to be determined

Approval: Specification modified by the SC-7 in May 2003, and then following SC-20 comments obtained by e-mail.

References:

IPPC 1997; WTO-SPS Agreement, ISPM No. 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*); ISPM No. 6 (*Guidelines for surveillance*); ISPM No. 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*); ISPM No. 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*); ISPM No. 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*); ISPM No. 10 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*); draft standard on citrus canker.

SPECIFICATION NO. 8 (REVISED)

Title: Efficacy of measures: concept and application

Reason for the standard: This standard is to provide technical guidance for a framework for measuring and evaluating the efficacy of phytosanitary measures. It should provide the basis for a procedure for the evaluation of measures and also provide the fundamental elements to be elaborated in greater detail in supporting documents (e.g. supplemental standards).

Scope and purpose: This standard provides guidance on the evaluation of the efficacy of phytosanitary measures for pest risk management. It describes the main components of efficacy, including approaches for evaluating efficacy.

This should be a concept standard. It should provide a framework for the practical application of such concepts. The standard should form the basis for supplemental standards dealing with practical aspects of specific measures and methodologies. This standard does not cover the concept of equivalence - which is being developed separately.

Tasks:

- Review the draft standard on *the efficacy of phytosanitary measures: concept and application* (May 2003).
- Review background papers used in preparing the draft, including the report of the Expert Working Group (November 2002).
- Establish a framework for the revised draft, what to achieve, identifying the essential elements, and put them in a logical order to support a practical approach to the application of efficacy evaluation.
- Apply the elements from the draft standard to the framework and draft new text as appropriate, e.g. practical applications.
- Review the terms effectiveness and efficacy, and use them consistently throughout the text.
- Use of the concepts qualitative and quantitative need to be clarified and their use organized systematically throughout the text.
- Use simple, clear, unambiguous and focused language throughout the text and consider the use of bulleted text to achieve clarity.
- Ensure the standard describes specific approaches and/or methodologies most useful for phytosanitary purposes.
- Note for the Standards Committee any points to be considered for the future development of related standards and identify those standards considered to be highest priority.
- Propose a framework and strategy for future supporting work, including the development of procedures by the ICPM for evaluating measures to be adopted in standards.
- Note also for the Standards Committee any problems or concerns anticipated by application of the standard in practice.
- To consider the necessity to differentiate between guidance to the NPPOs with respect to the evaluation of measures and guidance to the ICPM for measures that are being proposed for inclusion in ISPMs.

Provision of resources: Funded by the FAO Regular Programme for the IPPC Secretariat.

Proposed work programme: Report back to the SC with draft documents, reference material, and the draft report from the meeting as soon as available. Use e-mail to address these issues.

Steward: John Hedley

Expertise: The steward, in addition to selected participants from the original expert working group and the SC-7.

Participants: to be determined.

Approval: First Session of the Standards Committee, May 2002. Specification modified by the SC-7 in May 2003, and then following SC-20 comments obtained by e-mail.

References : Provided by the IPPC Secretariat.