



Focus Group on the review of IPPC standard setting procedures

16-20 July 2007

FAO, Rome

Report

1. Welcome and opening of the meeting

1. The IPPC Secretariat welcomed the participants to the meeting (Annex 1), and noted that two members were unable to participate, Mr. John Hedley (New Zealand) had sent his regrets, and the Secretariat had been unable to contact Mr. Basim Mustafa Khalil (Iraq) even though attempts had been made through the FAO representative in Iraq and Iraq's permanent representative to FAO in Rome.

2. Election of the chairperson

2. Ms Bast-Tjeerde (Vice-Chairperson of the CPM) was elected as chairperson and Mr Jens Unger (Germany) as rapporteur.

3. Review and adoption of the agenda

3. The focus group reordered and adopted the agenda (Annex 2; list of documents in Annex 3).

4. The focus group noted that the extraordinary meeting of the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (ESPTA) had taken place recently to respond to the IPPC evaluation. It was agreed that the recommendations from the focus group should be cross-checked with those from the ESPTA to avoid contradicting conclusions¹.

4. Review of terms of reference for the focus group, related CPM-2 and SC decisions, and clarification of the anticipated outcome

5. The IPPC Secretariat introduced the focus group's terms of reference adopted by CPM-2, as well as CPM-2 and SC related decisions. In particular, the proposed improvements to the standard setting process which had been discussed in the SC were presented (as annexed to the May 2007 SC report). They included a proposed time schedule for adding a year to the standard setting process. Some focus group members, who are also SC members, noted that this document was the result of several years of discussion, and they were convinced that these recommendations addressed the core issues of the present standard setting process.

6. The focus group agreed that the main expected outcome of its meeting would be the following revised procedures for presentation to CPM-3 through the SPTA:

- a. Procedures and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme
- b. Annex I of the rules of procedure of the CPM on the development and adoption of international standards
- c. Terms of reference and rules of procedure for Technical Panels

7. Transparency items would be considered throughout.

8. The focus group also noted that an additional outcome could be identifying the impacts of the proposals on the rest of the standard setting process.

¹ No contradictions were noted after cross-checking.

9. It was noted that the SPTA would devote two days to discussing the outcome of the focus group.

5. Review of CPM papers

10. In order to prevent duplication of discussion, the focus group decided to consider three drafts returned by CPM (CPM 2007/5 - Terms of reference and rules of procedure for Technical Panels; CPM 2007/14 - Procedures and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme; CPM 2007/10 - Update of Annex I of the rules of procedure of the CPM on development and adoption of international standards) as separate agenda items, together with the relevant comments received from countries.

11. The document CPM 2007/31, "Improvement of transparency in the development of ISPMs", was considered to apply generally to the standard setting process and would be considered throughout the meeting.

12. Comments from countries not present at the meeting were presented by the Secretariat.

5.1 General considerations

13. Mr Lopian (Vice-Chairperson of the CPM) introduced a presentation on the findings of a desk study prepared by Mr Randall in 2005 at the beginning of the IPPC evaluation. This had been presented to the SPTA in 2005, and compared the standard setting processes of IPPC, OIE, Codex and ISO with regard to participation, transparency, turn-around time, efficiency and coverage. It was highlighted that the IPPC ranked well in comparison with the other organizations with regard to most criteria. Some members felt that the peer-review process of the IPPC evaluation had reached different conclusions on some of these aspects.

14. The focus group identified the main points for delivering standards, which should be kept in mind when reviewing the current procedures:

- high quality
- transparent process
- agreed priorities
- involvement/participation of all contracting parties (and through that, their domestic stakeholders)
- consistency in the process
- working within existing resources
- minimization of significant discussion at CPM (ISPMs ready for adoption by time they arrive at CPM)
- clear hierarchy and division of responsibility for groups involved in standard setting process
- flexibility
- efficiency, avoid unnecessarily bureaucratic steps which would reduce efficiency
- science-based content of standards.

15. The focus group agreed that although general discussion was necessary, it should work from the draft procedures returned by CPM and avoid "re-inventing the wheel". It should also consider existing ICPM/CPM procedures and decisions, including those which have not been implemented.

16. The focus group discussed the interpretation of the term "stakeholders" in relation to the IPPC standard setting process. It noted that it would cover any persons/groups with an interest in ISPMs. In the international context, any interested organization (e.g. the Convention on Biological Diversity - CBD, the International Seed Testing Association - ISTA, etc.) could be a stakeholder. The focus group recognized that interested organizations might want to input in the process, in the same way as the IPPC wishes to input into other organizations' processes and decision-making if relevant. At the national level, contracting parties have a responsibility to consult and involve their national stakeholders on standards that have potential impacts for them, including national agencies dealing with other treaties. It was also noted that this was often done through a contracting party's National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO).

5.2 Procedure and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme

17. One member reiterated that the CPM should approve all additions and/or adjustments of the standard setting work programme. He noted the importance of involving all contracting parties during the initial stage of the standard setting process. The focus group agreed that transparency is a priority but that, when the CPM has already approved a specified topic for treatments, individual treatments need to receive only SC approval.

18. The focus group discussed the meaning of the word “topic”, and the fact that “topics for standards” may cover very different cases (new or revised ISPMs, annex to an existing ISPM, definitions in the glossary, supplements, etc.). There were several concerns in relation to the use of the term “topics”.

19. For the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT), the focus group noted that broad categories had been added to the IPPC standard setting work programme by the CPM. Individual treatments within these broad categories could be submitted, reviewed and prioritized by the TPPT, and the SC could add these to the work programme. In the case of Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP), broad categories of diagnostic protocols, e.g. bacteria, fungi etc., had been added to the IPPC standard setting work programme by the CPM. Individual pests had now been placed on the work programme of that TP by the SC. It was suggested and agreed that, following regular calls for topics, proposals for new diagnostic protocols could be submitted by NPPOs and/or RPPOs through the Secretariat, and that these submissions would be reviewed by the TPDP, prioritized and agreed to by the SC. These issues would be considered separately when reviewing the terms of reference and rules of procedure for TPs.

20. The focus group noted that TPs could suggest topics (other than pests for diagnostic protocols or treatments) to the work programme in response to the general call for topics.

21. The focus group discussed whether the SC could propose topics in response to the call. The focus group noted that the SC was the group that reviewed the submissions and felt that the SC should not be able to submit topics in response to the call as it could be perceived as a conflict of interest.

22. It was agreed to recommend that international organizations could submit proposals for topics to the work programme via the Secretariat.

23. The focus group discussed whether it was appropriate for the SC to recommend that a specific topic be placed under the fast-track process. Some members felt that it would be difficult to evaluate whether or not a topic should be fast-tracked at this early stage, and thought it more appropriate for this decision to be made after reviewing the specification and draft ISPM. Mr Lopian (Vice-Chairperson of the CPM) reminded the focus group of the uses of the fast-track process adopted at ICPM-6 (2004):

- a. Where specific technical material and resources are available or simple to develop.
- b. Where non-concept or technical standards of potential global interest that are approved by RPPOs or other organizations are available.
- c. Where technical annexes to concept and other existing standards are needed.
- d. For minor revisions to existing standards where these revisions are not of a conceptual nature.
- e. Where specifically authorized by ICPM.

24. The focus group agreed that the SC would in fact be able to identify topics that may be processed under the fast-track, but the final decision would be made by the CPM.

25. The focus group reviewed the proposed criteria and identified some core criteria that should be met by all proposals. These criteria could be used to pre-screen the submissions.

26. There was a discussion that, in order for a topic to be considered for the work programme, information should exist that supported the proposed topic (scientific, historical, and practical information and experience) to allow decisions on justification and prioritization. Some members felt this criterion could impede the submission of topics from developing countries which in some cases need a solution to a problem. It was felt that the standard setting process could sometimes help in the development of a solution by bringing together the appropriate experts. In some cases, such as the Technical Panel on Forest

Quarantine (TPFQ), some additional research and surveys had been commissioned. All focus group members felt that this was a good criterion but most felt that it should not be included in the core criteria.

27. Some modifications were made to the list of “other criteria” including the deletion of some points that were now addressed in the core criteria, the addition of several points and the rewording of others. The title of the category “Benefit/costs” was changed to “Economic”.

28. The criteria under the category “Economic” were adjusted to consider the value of plants protected and the benefits resulting from preventing the introduction of a pest.

29. The criteria related to methyl bromide under the category “Environmental” were modified to be more general in regards to protecting the ozone layer.

30. There was some discussion on the role of the IPPC in regards to protecting biodiversity and one member felt that this was not the role of the IPPC. Other members felt that the IPPC, through the protection of plants, could contribute to protecting biodiversity. Specific wording was agreed to in this regard and the group agreed that the criterion should be changed to “contribution to the protection of the environment”.

31. The group also noted that ISPMs are not often developed for emergencies as the standard development process is quite lengthy, so they agreed to the use of the terms “urgent need for a standard” instead of “emergency need for a standard”.

32. The draft revised procedure is given in Annex 4.

5.3 Annex I of the Rules of Procedure of the CPM on development and adoption of international standards

General discussion

33. Among other considerations, COSAVE document on Annex I suggested that Rule X of the CPM rules of procedure should be changed to no longer refer to an annex, and proposed, in order to provide more flexibility, that a document detailing the standard setting process be adopted by CPM and incorporated into the IPPC Procedural Manual.

34. Others in the group pointed out that CPM-1 had noted, based on FAO legal advice, that decisions taken by FAO Conference and the ICPM were valid until the CPM decided otherwise. The majority of members agreed with this and also agreed that the former Annex I would be the standard setting process even if it had not been formally adopted at CPM-1, until the CPM adopted a new Annex I.

35. The focus group noted that the draft procedure had included reference to general considerations for standard setting that had been agreed over time by ICPM. They decided to delete this paragraph because these considerations were a sub-set of the principles they had identified earlier (see paragraph 14). The focus group decided that, when the revised standard setting procedure would be presented to CPM for adoption, the full list of principles would be for the CPM to note as part of the proposed decisions.

36. There was a reference to the IPPC Procedural Manual in relation to ICPM/CPM decisions. The focus group noted that the procedural manual was not an official document, but considered that it was a useful reference source and should remain referenced in the standard setting procedure. They also agreed that it would be useful to have all the procedures and decisions consolidated into a single document, and Australia had produced a document which could form the basis of this. The IPPC Secretariat noted that the procedural manual had been reorganized to achieve a similar aim, and that such a consolidated document could be produced.

37. There was some discussion on changing the name of the “fast-track process” as the process was not necessarily faster but just different. The group decided to keep the name and suggested that this could be re-evaluated at a later date.

5.3.1 Discussion on specific steps

Step 3 - Development of a specification

38. One member of the focus group was concerned that the use of email as a method of development of a specification was not included in the procedure. The IPPC Secretariat pointed out that the SC had agreed that the only issues to be dealt with by email were approval of experts for expert drafting groups and other issues if previously agreed at a SC meeting. Consequently specifications could be finalized and approved by email only if this had been agreed at a SC meeting.

Step 4 - Preparation of a draft ISPM

39. The term “expert drafting group” had caused some confusion, because the term “drafting groups” in the terms of reference for the SC referred to a group of members of the SC and not to expert working groups and technical panels. However, it was pointed out that expert drafting groups were understood to be any expert group that was drafting text in the standard setting process, including expert working groups, technical panels and editorial teams working on diagnostic protocols.

40. Reference to the Standards Committee Working Group was changed to the SC-7 throughout the procedure to indicate the special role the SC-7 had in comparison to other Standards Committee working groups. Its limited composition was also noted.

41. The focus group noted that ICPM-6 had considered that a full meeting of the SC was preferred for consideration of draft ISPMs for member consultation and had approved a full meeting for two years (2004 and 2005). If funding precluded the SC meeting twice a year, the SC-7 would meet to approve draft ISPMs for country consultation.

42. The focus group amended the procedure to indicate that all SC members would be sent the draft ISPMs to be considered for member consultation. If the SC-7 met to review these texts, relevant comments from SC members would be considered.

Step 4 - Preparation of a draft ISPM - fast track

43. The focus group noted that there was no procedure in the fast-track process in the case where the SC does not clear a draft ISPM for member consultation. The focus group wished to ensure that there was flexibility in the process and adjusted the wording to confirm that the SC would make a decision.

44. The word “clear” was originally used in the fast-track process to indicate that the SC would check the format of the draft and ensure that it met the specification, because SC members might not have the appropriate technical expertise to make technical comments. It was noted that, in the case of diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments, there was no specification and the drafts should fulfil the content specified, respectively, in ISPM No. 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*) and ISPM No. 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*). It was noted however that in some cases the SC had detected and corrected some technical aspects of draft protocols or treatments.

45. The focus group agreed that the SC should not put on hold the drafts processed under the fast-track.

Step 5 - Member consultation

46. One member proposed to reduce the consultation period for draft ISPMs to 75 days in order to extend the time between the end of the consultation and the SC meeting. There was general support for continuing a 100-day consultation period. The focus group also noted that reduction would not be necessary if the standard setting procedure was extended by one year as suggested in the “Proposals to improve the standard setting process”.

47. The focus group discussed whether draft ISPMs should be sent to international organizations. It noted that this was a new procedure and a concern was expressed that international organizations should be limited to those which are observers to the CPM. It was acknowledged that there may be organizations with expertise of relevance to a draft ISPM, such as those the Secretariat liaises with and reports on to the CPM,

and it would be valuable to obtain their comments. The procedure was amended to include “relevant” international organizations, which have also CPM observer status.

48. The focus group agreed that the compiled comments from the consultation process should be posted on the IPP.

Step 5 - Member consultation – fast track

49. There was discussion on whether drafts should be submitted to member consultation at any time. Clearance of the drafts by the SC for consultation could be at any time, but one member thought that there should be only one consultation period in the year for draft ISPMs, because of lack of availability of staff resources in countries. From the point of view of work planning, other members pointed out that several periods were preferable in order to spread out the work related to member consultations throughout the year. The focus group was concerned that having only one consultation period would reduce flexibility and usefulness of the fast-track process. The Secretariat also noted that having only one consultation period for all ISPMs, including fast-track, would put extra strain on the Secretariat’s resources. This item was passed to the SPTA for its consideration.

Step 6 - Review of the draft ISPM prior to CPM

50. Some members were concerned that the comments from their countries had not been considered. It was noted that the SC received and considered all comments, but that no direct feedback on an individual country’s comments was currently provided.

51. The focus group noted that it was important for countries, especially developing countries, to have feedback on their comments, both to justify participation of individuals in the standard setting process (for example regional workshops on draft ISPMs), and to help with the learning process and improvement of the quality of comments.

52. The focus group noted that ICPM-6 had requested that a "generic summary of SC reactions to classes of comments made in country consultation" and this had not been implemented. It was suggested that the members' comments in the templates could be annotated with the outcome of discussions. However, it was pointed out that although the steward made recommendations, the SC does not go through drafts comment by comment, and changes to stewards' recommendations can be made both by the SC-7 and the SC. The Secretariat explained that recording detailed outcome in templates had been attempted previously, but it was very difficult to produce comment by comment decisions for feedback to countries and that some stewards had been reluctant to post their comments on the IPP because these comments were addressed to the SC which finally is responsible.

53. The focus group discussed the amount of detail required for the feedback. It agreed that a summary of major issues discussed by the SC and of SC reactions to substantive comments made in the member consultation which were not incorporated into the standard should be produced and posted on the IPP. This would include decisions taken by the SC-7 as well as the SC.

54. One member of the focus group suggested that there was a need for clear criteria for management of disagreements in the SC, as it was not clear how decisions on draft ISPMs were taken in the SC.

Step 7 - Adoption

55. The focus group considered a suggestion to hold working groups on draft ISPMs concurrently with the main CPM sessions. However, it decided that it would be difficult to arrange as it would require sufficient size delegations to be able to accommodate this approach.

56. One member noted that the translations of ISPMs adopted at CPM were subject, in the case of Spanish, to adjustment after the meeting and suggested that this issue be addressed. Changes to Spanish translations after adoption caused problems and this issue would be raised at CPM.

57. There was a discussion on whether SC members should answer queries on comments from countries in their region or whether they should report to countries in their region. The focus group deleted all

reference to SC members responding to queries on individual comments but maintained the reporting to countries in their region.

58. The focus group noted that there was a general principle that contracting parties had a right to make comments or intervene with comments at the CPM. For transparency they should be encouraged to provide comments to the Secretariat 14 days before CPM.

59. Under the fast track process, because countries have agreed to adopt ISPMs without discussion, contracting parties should not exercise their right to make comments at the CPM. Any formal objections on fast-track standards should be communicated during the consultation period. Problems of inconsistency between the principle of adoption without discussion and the operation of the fast-track procedure must be addressed when reviewing the fast-track process.

60. The draft revised procedure is given in Annex 5.

5.4 Terms of reference and rules of procedure of technical panels

5.4.1 General discussion on TPs

61. Members of the focus group expressed interest in clarifying the role of TPs, and how these may be different from expert working groups. It was noted that the technical panel for the glossary (TPG) may be of a different nature than other TPs. The focus group noted the intent from CPM-1 that the TPG would be reviewed by the SC.

62. The focus group discussed the length of term for TP members. Some expressed that TP members should serve terms of a fixed length which could be renewed. Others preferred that TP members continue to serve indefinite terms, noting the importance of collective memory in TP work. Many members of the focus group clarified that specific expertise, not national or regional representation, should be the critical factor in selection of TP members. There was a suggestion that the SC should review TP performance and membership, but it was noted that the SC functioned in a diplomatic atmosphere which presented challenges for giving critical reviews of performance.

63. The focus group confirmed that the SC is responsible for management and oversight of the TPs, and that this be highlighted in the terms of reference.

64. The focus group discussed whether the terms of reference and rules of procedure for TPs should be presented to the CPM to be noted as information, or to be adopted as a procedure. The focus group decided that the terms of reference and rules of procedure should be presented to CPM for adoption.

65. The focus group pointed out that currently TPs are regulated by the *guidelines for composition and organization of EWGs*. However, TPs operate and function differently and not everything about EWGs applies to TPs. The guidelines for EWG should not be referenced in the terms of reference and rules of procedure of TPs. The focus group also recognized that each TP operates and functions differently, and that this diversity should be noted while writing the terms of reference and rules of procedure.

5.4.2 Specific items in the terms of reference

Technical area, topic, subject

66. The focus group debated the terminology used for discussing topics and the functions of TPs. It noted that the CPM reports had used several terms which has led to confusion. The focus group discussed a range of terms including: “topics”, “subjects”, “subject areas”, “themes”, “individual topics”, “categories”, “specified working areas”, “specified technical areas”, and “types”. It was determined that any set of three terms would be suitable, provided that a hierarchy of the terms be established and that they be used consistently.

67. The group agreed on the following hierarchy of terms, with technical areas being the broadest.

Term	Use	Example
Technical area	CPM establishes a TP to work on a specified <i>technical area</i> (reflected in the title of the TP and described in its specification)	Technical panel on: - diagnostic protocols (TPDP), - forest quarantine (TPFQ) - pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies (TPFF) - phytosanitary treatments (TPPT) - glossary (TPG).
Topic	call for <i>topics</i> are made biennially and a <i>topic</i> is added to the work programme by the CPM	- revision to ISPM No. 15 - diagnostic protocols for bacteria - irradiation treatments, - areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies
Subject	approval by the CPM not required for a <i>subject</i> ; applies only to TPPT, TPDP and glossary definitions done by the TPG	-individual treatment within an approved <i>topic</i> -individual diagnostic protocols for a specific pest - new glossary term

Structure of TPs

68. There was a proposal that priority should be given to nominees from countries that did not already have a member on a TP or on the SC in order to increase the involvement of different countries. The focus group considered that the most important factor in selecting TP members was their level of expertise rather than geographical representation. However, when two nominations with the same expertise were available, geographical representation would be considered.

Functions of TPs

69. In discussing TP functions, one member was concerned that the SC could give the TP “other tasks as requested”, felt that this may be too broad and cited examples included in the document on “common procedures for technical panels” identified by the SC. Other members felt this was needed to ensure that there was flexibility for the SC to be able to request TPs to undertake tasks on its behalf. The phrase was changed to “other tasks as requested by the SC within the TP mandate and to progress the objectives of the TP”. The text was also altered to specify that TPs operate under both the guidance and the supervision of the SC. In addition, the focus group noted that CPM specifies whether or not subjects under a particular topic within a TP technical area should go through the fast-track process. Consequently, reference to fast track standards was removed from the terms of reference and included in the *Procedure and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme*.

Establishment and disestablishment of technical panels

70. The focus group decided that establishment and disestablishment of TPs should be considered together and moved them to the last point of the terms of reference. They determined that the CPM establishes a TP and that the SC can recommend that the CPM disestablished it.

5.4.3 Specific items in the rules of procedure

Membership

71. The TP steward is considered a member of the TP. There was additional discussion of various participants at TP meetings such as hosts and rapporteurs, and the focus group decided to set up one rule to deal with stewards, observers and non-member participants.

Procedure for nomination and selection of TP members

72. There was a discussion on nomination of experts for TPs. It was decided that, in addition to contracting parties, NPPOs and RPPOs, the IPPC Secretariat could make nominations. The focus group pointed out that there had been benefits from participation of several international organizations, including the chairperson of the International Forest Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG) in the TPFQ and a representative from the FAO/IAEA Joint Division in the TPFF. The group agreed that the possibility for the

IPPC Secretariat to propose nominations would allow flexibility without specifying that there was a right of any organization, other than those listed, to nominate members of TPs.

73. The focus group clarified the process used for nomination and selection of experts for TPs, and defined the role of the Secretariat and of the Bureau in this process. The focus group decided that the IPPC Secretariat would prepare a summary of the nominations received, would provide comments on the nominations, and would submit this to both the SC and the Bureau. The SC would select TP members based on the nominees' presented experience, and communicate its decision to the Secretariat. The focus group removed the role of the CPM Bureau in the selection of nominees.

74. There was a proposal that the complete list of nominees, with their contact information, be published on the IPP. The focus group agreed that, for reasons of privacy and because of the potential negative impact on professional reputation if not selected, only a list of selected nominees would be posted on the IPP.

Period of membership

75. It was pointed out that if it was implied that TP members serve for an undefined period, some employers may not allow individuals to be nominated because of the possible resource implications. It was noted that there is difficulty for countries to sign a commitment form which contains the expectation of providing resources for the nominees travel and time. In addition, for countries with a smaller population, long-term commitment occupies the expertise available to the contracting party.

76. The focus group agreed to a compromise text which balanced the need for a period of membership (five years) with the need for continuity of panel membership (by allowing the SC to be able to reconfirm a member for additional terms).

77. A proposal to change "should" to "shall" in several rules was not accepted because some members felt that the word "shall" should only be used when referring to treaty obligations.

Stewards

78. There was a discussion on whether there should always be a member of the SC on a TP in order to fulfil the supervisory role required. Most members of the focus group considered that it was important to have a SC member on each TP. However, it was also noted that the steward not necessarily needs to be a SC member. One concern with having a steward who is not a SC member would be that the steward may need to be funded to attend SC meetings.

79. The focus group decided to reference both the steward of the TP and the steward(s) of draft ISPMs that were being considered at a particular meeting of the TP.

Observers and participation by non-members

80. The focus group amalgamated several rules to clarify who were the individuals that may participate in TP meetings as non-members. It decided that TPs may invite individuals with specific expertise to a meeting or part of a meeting, after informing the SC and not receiving any objection. The host country and/or organization involved in the logistics of the meeting may both be invited to participate in a TP meeting. These non-members may participate in discussions but not in the decisions of the TP.

81. The focus group discussed the participation of members of the Bureau in TP meetings. It noted that from 2008 the CPM Bureau would be expanded to comprise 7 members. The focus group recommended that the Bureau, when determining its own rules of procedure, defines how it will deal with participation in standard setting meetings such as TP meeting.

Sessions

82. The focus group decided that the TP would meet as necessary, but generally once a year to allow flexibility.

83. There was a discussion on whether the SC needed to approve the working procedures for the TPs. These had been presented to the SC, but had not always been noted. Members of the SC taking part in the focus group expressed concern about the amount of time available to the SC to review and approve this type of procedures. They also pointed out that the SC was already overburdened with work and was unable to deal with more administrative work. In addition, they thought that harmonizing completely the procedures of the TPs may compromise the work of one or more TPs as these do not all function in the same way.

84. A compromise was reached to state that TPs work to their “specification” approved by the SC. However, the member from Latin America and the Caribbean region wanted to note her objection to the wording and considered that the SC should approve all the procedures used by the TPs. She stated that this was the minimum that would be acceptable and that the rules of procedure should clearly ensure that TPs are managed effectively by the SC.

Approval

85. The focus group noted that the proposed text did not address procedures on how TPs would deal with contentious issues. A sentence was added indicating that contentious issues should be detailed in the report of the TP meeting and brought to the attention of the SC.

Reports

86. The focus group specified that reports of TP meetings should contain information on discussion points and the rationale for the conclusions reached. Reports would be posted on the IPP once finalized by the TP.

87. The focus group noted that, since the reference to the “Guidelines on the composition and organization of expert working groups” had been deleted, there was now no guidance on the funding of participants travel.

88. The focus group referred to the statement of commitment, which included the decision of ICPM-2 on funding. The focus group noted that the “Statement of commitment” had been noted by CPM-2 and that the Secretariat was now requesting new nominees to complete and submit it along with their nomination. The form informs the nominee of the funding commitment. The focus group noted that many decisions had been made regarding funding and that there is confusion regarding the current policy. They therefore urged the SPTA to produce a consistent and defined policy on funding for all aspects of the standard-setting process, which should be presented to the CPM for adoption.

89. Regarding operational aspects of running TP meetings, the focus group noted that the Secretariat will continue to use the “Guidelines on the operation of EWGs” when planning and preparing for TP meetings, but that this will not specifically be referenced in the rules of procedure as not all points apply to TPs.

90. The focus group agreed that the expertise of the participant is the most important consideration when selecting nominations. The experts' access to funding for their travel should not influence their selection.

91. The Secretariat requested guidance from the focus group on how to classify participants in standard setting meetings for the purposes of both determining which participants would receive travel funding and for compiling statistics on meeting participation. It was decided that the country in which the person was employed should be used; for those participants from regional and international organizations, it would be the organization that they represented

92. The draft revised terms of reference and rules of procedure for TPs are given in Annex 6.

5.5 Improvement of transparency in the development of international standards for phytosanitary measures

93. The focus group considered document CPM 2007/31 on transparency. It noted that it had already confirmed in earlier discussions that :

- all country comments should be published in the IPP

- the IPPC Secretariat should produce and make accessible a summary of SC reactions to comments made in the country consultation, both for draft ISPMs and draft specifications
- members of the SC should report back to countries in their regions.

94. The focus group noted that “Guidelines on the duties of members of the SC” should be amended to incorporate guidance on the reporting function of SC members.

95. In relation to the “Recommendation on the use of modern communications”, the focus group noted that the SC had decided that it could use email decisions in two cases for making decisions: for approving the selection of experts; and for a specific issue if the SC had previously agreed during a SC meeting to take an email decision for that issue.

96. The focus group discussed the proposal to publish all documents relevant to the standard setting process on the IPP. It was pointed out that documents for technical panels and expert working groups were often draft documents, and may contain personal or proprietary information. In addition some documents may contain unpublished scientific information that scientists might be reluctant to publicly share before their papers were published. Members of the focus group pointed out that a policy consisting in posting all documents on the IPP could lead to authors refusing to provide information, to verbal reporting during the meeting instead of documented reporting, or to sending documents directly to participants by email bypassing the IPPC Secretariat. The focus group considered that it could be misleading to have wide public access to some documents which are in the early stages of drafting.

97. The focus group also agreed that stewards' comments on draft ISPMs should not be publicly posted.

98. The focus group discussed in-depth which documents would be posted on the IPP. Some felt that the types of documents which could be posted should be specified in a “positive list”, whereas others favoured a “negative list” of documents which should not be posted (where all documents would be posted except those considered confidential or working documents by the SC).

99. In addition to the elements listed in paragraph 93, the focus group finally considered that appropriate transparency in the standard setting process is ensured by the following:

- All documents approved by the SC during its meetings should be made available to contracting parties on the IPP.
- Reports from TPs and other expert drafting groups, the compilation of member comments, the SC agenda and list of participants, revised draft ISPMs and draft specifications presented to the SC, and the list of SC documents should also be made available in that way before the SC meeting.
- Any other document or type of document may be made available in that way on request of a SC member or of contracting party's contact point, with agreement of the SC and, if applicable, of the author of the document.

100. The focus group urged the SPTA to note the issues discussed, to consider further the issue, and to provide an opinion for the CPM.

101. It was clarified that “publicly available” as used in CPM 2007/31 meant, available to the IPPC contact point.

102. The focus group discussed transparency during the nomination process and determined that the Secretariat does not have resources to notify unsuccessful nominees of the result of the selection process. It decided that SC members should notify unsuccessful candidates in their region and the “Guidelines on the duties of members of the SC” should be updated accordingly.

6. Proposals to improve the standard setting process

103. The SC had considered options to improve the standard setting process during several meetings, and presented a document for the focus group to consider. It was pointed out that an increase in time for the standard setting process was considered beneficial by the external evaluation of the IPPC.

104. The focus group discussed the document and considered that it provided useful options for the future. It acknowledged the considerable work done by Mr Hedley in preparing many drafts for consideration by the SC.

105. The focus group noted that there was already considerable flexibility in the standard setting process and that the SC had the ability to vary the length of time taken to develop standards. The SC could also implement many of the proposals, such as introducing a schedule for each draft ISPM.

106. The focus group agreed that it is essential to ensure flexibility which could include that, for some standards, the present time schedule may continue to be applicable. The focus group discussed the possibility of holding an annual open-ended workshop on the review of draft ISPMs before each CPM, and noted that the SC had discussed this as part of the possible actions for the improvement of standard setting process (as noted in the May 2007 SC report). They noted the resource implications of such a workshop. One member suggested that financial priorities could be switched from regional workshops on draft ISPMs to such an annual open-ended workshop. The Secretariat informed the focus group that funding for regional workshops on draft ISPMs was from trust funds; there may not be agreement to use these funds for an open-ended workshop prior to the CPM instead of for regional workshops. There was strong support from other members of the focus group for regional workshops on draft ISPMs, which provide an opportunity for countries to meet not only to discuss draft ISPMs, but also to discuss a variety of other related issues. The focus group suggested that the SPTA may further discuss this proposal.

107. The focus group discussed the option of a possible increase in the consultation period, but they considered that it should not be changed from 100 days.

108. The focus group discussed the proposed changes that would need to be implemented in an extended time schedule for the regular standard setting process. It considered that the CPM should be notified if a change of this sort was to be implemented by the SC. The focus group adjusted the schedule to reflect its recommendations from the discussions during the week and noted that the schedule will be presented to the SPTA for its consideration (Annex 7), and that CPM would be informed that the regular standard setting process time schedule may be extended for individual standards.

109. The focus group discussed the fast-track process. It noted that CPM had decided that it was a provisional process and it should be reviewed after two years. The focus group recommended that the fast-track process be reviewed once there is more experience, in two or three years. It also noted that a document had been submitted from COSAVE on "Special procedures for standard setting". It had not been considered during the meeting and the focus group recommended that this paper be considered when the fast track process is reviewed, including the consideration for a change of the name of the process.

110. The focus group was reminded that interested parties were welcome to submit discussion papers when expert drafting groups were convened and this was stated on each specification for a new ISPM. Such discussion papers could also contribute to an improved quality of standards but contributors were encouraged to avoid developing non-negotiable positions through this method.

7. Repercussions of the recommendations

111. On reviewing the outcome of its meeting and previous ICPM/CPM decisions that related to standard setting, the focus group identified the following actions:

For SPTA (in 2007)

112. Consider the documents from the focus group meeting:
1. Report of the focus group
 2. Procedure and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the standard setting programme,
 3. Standard setting procedure (Annex I of the Rules of Procedure of the CPM),
 4. Terms of reference and rules of procedure for technical panels,
 5. Regarding extending the time schedule for the regular standard setting process, consider the time schedule diagram,

113. and forward documents 2 to 4 above to the CPM for adoption.
114. Consider whether an annual open-ended workshop to review draft ISPMs prior to each CPM should be called.
115. Regarding Annex I to Rule X of the rules of procedure of the CPM and improvements to the standard setting process:
- consider whether, in the case of the fast track process, there should be member consultation at any time of the year, or only at specific time period(s)
 - consider whether Rule X should be changed to not refer to an annex, and have the text currently contained in the proposed revised Annex I presented as a separate document to CPM for adoption.
116. Consider the document on funding policy produced by the Secretariat in order to determine a consistent and defined policy for all aspects of the standard-setting process.
117. Regarding transparency in the standard setting process, consider whether there should be a list of SC documents for posting on the IPP (positive list) or whether all documents should be posted unless they are considered confidential or working documents by the SC (negative list).

For SC (after adoption of the revised procedures by CPM)

118. Update the “Terms of reference and rules of procedure for the Standards Committee” to:
- remove the ability of the SC to disestablish TPs (now CPM function; note: SC can recommend disestablishment)
 - manage, oversee, guide and supervise TPs
 - include a requirement for SC members to report back to countries in their region
 - ensure that transparency issues are addressed.
119. Update the “Guidelines on the duties of members of the SC” to include:
- guidance on the reporting function of SC members back to countries in their region
 - the duty of informing unsuccessful nominees of their region of the selection decisions for EWGs and TPs.
120. Check the document “Common procedures for TPs” for consistency with the new revised procedures proposed.
121. Review the fast track procedure in 2 or 3 years. Include a review of the name of the process and a consideration of the COSAVE paper (Focus Group Document 14).
122. Inform the CPM that more flexibility will be introduced to the regular standard setting process time schedule and that it may be extended for certain draft standards (include the time schedule diagram).

For Bureau (after adoption of the revised procedures by CPM)

123. When developing its rules of procedure, consider how to participate in standard setting meetings.

For TPs (after adoption of the revised procedures by CPM)

124. Under the guidance of the SC, check each TP working procedure to make sure that it is not contradictory to changes in the standard setting procedures.

For the IPPC Secretariat

125. Update and consolidate the standard setting procedures for incorporation in the procedural manual (after adoption of the revised procedures by CPM).
126. Develop guidance on the practical uses of the words *should*, *shall*, *must* and *may* (as per CPM-1 decision, preferably for the November 2007 SC).
127. Address the issue of adoption of standards in languages.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Focus group members	
Mr Prabhakar CHANDURKAR Plant Protection Advisor to the Government of India Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and Storage Department of Agriculture and Cooperation Ministry of Agriculture, NH IV Faridabad 121001 INDIA Tel: (+91) 12 9241 3985 Fax: (+91) 12 9241 2125 E-mail: ppa@nic.in	Ms Ana PERALTA Comite de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE) Avda. Presidente Bulnes n° 107 Piso 2, Depto 24 Santiago CHILE Tel: (+56) 2 671 0722 Fax: (+56) 2 671 2947 E-mail: ana.peralta@sag.gob.cl ; cosave@cosave.org
Ms Lois RANSOM Chief Plant Protection Officer Product Integrity, Animal and Plant Health Department of Agriculture Fisheries and Forestry GPO Box 858 Canberra AUSTRALIA Tel: (+61) 2 6272 4888 Fax: (+61) 2 6272 5835 E-mail: lois.ransom@daff.gov.au	Mr. Motoi SAKAMURA Principal Officer - Export and Domestic Quarantine Kobe Plant Protection Station Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 1-1, Hatoba-cho, Chuou-ku Kobe 6500042 JAPAN Tel: (+81) 78 331 1350 Fax: (+81) 78 391 1757 E-mail: sakamuram@pps.go.jp
Mr Vesper SUGLO Director Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate Ministry of Food and Agriculture P.O. Box MB 37 Accra GHANA Tel: (+233) 21 302 638 Fax: (+233) 21 665 282 E-mail: spsghana@africaonline.com.gh ; jackvesper@yahoo.com	Mr Jens-Georg UNGER Head Department for National and International Plant Health Biological Research Centre for Agriculture and Forestry Messeweg 11/12 38104 Braunschweig GERMANY Tel: (+49) 531 299 3370 Fax: (+49) 531 299 3007 E-mail: j.g.unger@bba.de
Mr Marc VEREECKE Head of Sector Directorate-General - Health and Consumer Protection Phytosanitary Unit European Commission Rue de la Loi 200 B-1049 Bruxelles BELGIUM Tel: (+32) 2 296 3260 Fax: (+32) 2 296 9399 E-mail: marc.vereecke@ec.europa.eu	Mr Greg WOLFF International Standards Adviser Plant Health Division Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, ON K1A 0Y9 CANADA Tel: (+1) 613 221 4354 Fax: (+1) 613 228 6602 E-mail: wolffg@inspection.gc.ca
CPM Bureau members	
Ms Reinouw BAST-TJEERDE CPM Vice-chairperson	Mr Ralf LOPIAN CPM Vice-chairperson
IPPC Secretariat	
Peter KENMORE (Secretary), Richard IVESS (Coordinator), Brent LARSON, Jane CHARD, Fabienne GROUSSET, Sonya HAMMONS, Stacie JOHNSTON	
Focus group members - Unable to attend	
Mr John HEDLEY Principal Adviser International Coordination Biosecurity New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry P.O. Box 2526 Wellington NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428; Fax: (+64) 4 894 0731 E-mail: john.hedley@maf.govt.nz	Mr Basim Mustafa KHALIL Director of Plant Quarantine State Board of Plant Protection Agriculture Ministry Baghdad IRAQ Tel: (+964) 790 721 480; 740 3335; 790 1721 E-mail: plantprotection75@hotmail.com

Annex 2

AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT
1. Welcome and opening of the meeting	--
2. Meeting logistics and arrangements	--
3. Introductions	03
4. Selection of the chair	--
5. Review and adoption of agenda and order	01 and 02
6. Review of terms of reference for the focus group	04
7. Related CPM-2 and SC decisions and clarification of the anticipated outcome	05, 15, 20
8. Review of CPM papers and comments received in response to CPM-2 decision	--
8.1 Procedure and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme	CPM 2007/14
8.2 Update of Annex I of the Rules of Procedure of the CPM on development and adoption of international standards	CPM 2007/10
8.3 Terms of reference and rules of procedure for technical panels	CPM 2007/05
8.4 Japan's comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Example of Codex report • Example of OIE report 	06 06 Annex 1 06 Annex 2
8.5 Canada's comments	07
8.6 Republic of Korea's comments	09
8.7 COSAVE's comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of reference and rules of procedure for technical panels • Procedure and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme • Summary of COSAVE proposal on transparency • Annex 1 of the rules of procedure of the CPM 	10 11 12 13
8.8 Discussion papers submitted by Australia	16, 17, 18
9. Improvement of transparency in the development of international standards for phytosanitary measures	CPM 2007/31, 12
10. Papers in relation to improvements of standard setting	--
10.1 Standards Committee proposal	part of 15
10.2 Discussion paper submitted by COSAVE	14
10.3 Discussion paper submitted by John Hedley	19
11. Repercussions of decisions on other adopted standard setting procedures	--
12. Adoption of report and recommendations	--
13. Close	--

Annex 3

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

DOC. NUMBER	AGENDA ITEM	TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
01	5	Provisional agenda	6 July 2007
02	5	Documents list	4 July 2007
03	3	Participants list	25 June 2007
04	6	Terms of reference for the Focus Group	25 June 2007
05	7	Extracts from the CPM-2 report on standard setting procedures	26 June 2007
06	9.1	Comments of the Government of Japan on Agenda Items 9.4, 9.5, 9.7 and 10.1.2 of the CPM-2	25 June 2007
06 Annex 1	9.1	Report of the fifteenth session of the Codex committee on food import and export inspection and certification systems	25 June 2007
06 Annex 2	9.1	Report of the meeting of the OIE aquatic animal health standards commission	25 June 2007
07	9.2	Discussion paper from Canada	25 June 2007
08*	9.3	Australian comments on the standard setting process	25 June 2007
09	9.4	Comments of Korea on the standard setting procedure	25 June 2007
10	9.5	COSAVE comments ¹ on terms of reference and rules of procedure for technical panels	26 June 2007
11	9.5	COSAVE comments on procedure and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme	26 June 2007
12	9.5	Summary of COSAVE proposal on transparency	26 June 2007
13	9.5	COSAVE comments on annex 1 of the rules of procedure of the CPM	26 June 2007
14	10.1	COSAVE proposal on special procedures for standard setting	26 June 2007
15	7	Extracts from Standards Committee reports on standard setting procedures	29 June 2007
16	10.2	Australian discussion paper on the standard setting process	4 July 2007
17	10.2	Australia-Standard setting procedures in the IPPC	4 July 2007
18	10.2	Australia-Drafting standards in the IPPC	4 July 2007
19	10.3	Comments for the Focus Group from John Hedley	4 July 2007
20	7	Presentation on the results of a desk study on standard setting organizations	16 July 2007
CPM 2007/05	8	Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for Technical Panels	25 June 2007
CPM 2007/10	8	Update of Annex I of the Rules of Procedure of the CPM on Development and Adoption of International Standards	25 June 2007
CPM 2007/14	8	Procedure and Criteria for Identifying Topics for Inclusion in the IPPC Standard Setting Work Programme	25 June 2007
CPM 2007/31	8	Improvement of transparency in the development of International standards for phytosanitary measures	25 June 2007
CPM 2007/ CRP/10*	8	Comments from the Government of Chile on the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for Technical Panels	26 June 2007

* on recommendation of the focus group members concerned, documents 8 and CPM 2007/CRP/10 were considered as superseded by other documents on the agenda.

¹ The participant from the Latin America and Caribbean region informed the focus group that the documents produced by COSAVE member countries (documents 10 to 14 of this meeting), have been consulted with the IPPC contact points in the region. Document 15 provided by the IPPC Secretariat had only been consulted with COSAVE member countries.

Annex 4

**PROCEDURE AND CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFYING TOPICS FOR INCLUSION IN
THE IPPC STANDARD SETTING WORK PROGRAMME**

In establishing topics for standards to be included in the IPPC standard setting work programme, the following procedure should be used¹:

1. The IPPC Secretariat calls for submissions for topics to be included in the standard setting work programme. A call is made every two years. It is sent to contracting parties, NPPOs, RPPOs and the WTO-SPS Secretary, and is also posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP, www.ippc.int). Other organizations (such as the Convention on Biological Diversity) and CPM technical panels can also respond to the call.
2. Detailed proposals for new topics or for the revision of existing ISPMs are submitted to the Secretariat (IPPC@fao.org) no later than the 31 July of the year the call for topics is made, using the submission form for CPM standard setting work programme topics available on the IPP. Submissions should address the applicable criteria for justification of the proposed topic (as listed below). Where possible, information in support of the justification and that may assist in the prioritization should be indicated. Submissions should preferably be made in an electronic format.
3. A list of topics is compiled by the IPPC Secretariat from the submissions received. Submissions from previous years which were not added to the standard setting work programme are not included in this compilation. They may be re-submitted, as appropriate.
4. The compiled list of detailed proposals is presented to the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) and posted on the IPP. The SPTA reviews these submissions and identifies strategic priorities using the criteria for justification of proposed topics (as listed below).
5. The Standards Committee, taking into account the SPTA strategic priorities and the criteria listed below, reviews the existing work programme and the compiled list of detailed proposals. It develops a revised work programme, adding, deleting or modifying topics as appropriate, giving each topic a recommended priority (high or normal), and identifying those topics that may be processed under the fast-track standard setting process.
6. The CPM reviews the work programme recommended by the Standards Committee. The CPM adjusts and adopts the standard setting work programme, including for each topic its priority and whether the topic may be processed under the fast-track standard setting process. A revised standard setting work programme is attached as an appendix to the CPM meeting report.
7. In any year, when a situation arises in which a standard is required urgently, the CPM may insert such a topic into the standard setting work programme.

¹ Other than proposals for subjects related to topics previously adopted by the CPM related to annexes and appendices to be worked on by technical panels.

Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics

Core criteria

1. Contribution to the purpose of the IPPC as described in article I.1.
2. Feasibility of implementation at the global level (includes ease of implementation, technical complexity, capacity of NPPOs to implement, relevance for more than one region).
3. Clear identification of the problems that need to be resolved through the development of the standard.

Other criteria

Technical

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

Practical

5. Feasibility of adopting the proposed standard within a reasonable time frame.
6. Stage of development of the proposed standard (is a standard on the same topic already widely used by NPPOs, RPPOs or a relevant international organization).
7. Availability of expertise needed to develop the proposed standard.

Economic

8. Estimated value of the plants protected.
9. Estimated value of trade affected by the proposed standard (e.g. volume of trade, value of trade, the percentage of Gross Domestic Product of this trade) if appropriate.
10. Estimated value of new trade opportunities provided by the approval of the proposed standard.
11. Estimated reductions in cost of pest control or quarantine activities.

Environmental

12. Utility to reduce the potential negative environmental consequences of certain phytosanitary measures, for example reduction in global emissions for the protection of the ozone layer.
13. Utility in the management of non indigenous species which are pests of plants (such as some invasive alien species).
14. Contribution to the protection of the environment, through the protection of wild flora, and their habitats and ecosystems, and of agricultural biodiversity.

Strategic

15. Extent of support for the proposed standard (e.g. one or more NPPOs or RPPOs have requested it, or one or more RPPOs have adopted a standard on the same topic).
16. Frequency with which the issue addressed by the proposed standard emerges as a source of trade disruption (e.g. disputes or need for repeated bilateral discussions, number of times per year trade is disrupted).
17. Relevance and utility to developing countries.
18. Coverage (application to a wide range of countries/pests/commodities).
19. Complements other standards (e.g. potential for the standard to be used as part of a systems approach for one pest, complement treatments for other pests).
20. Foundation standards to address fundamental concepts (e.g. treatment efficacy, inspection methodology).
21. Expected standard longevity (e.g. future trade needs, suggested use of easily outdated technology or products).
22. Urgent need for the standard.

Annex 5

**Draft IPPC STANDARD SETTING PROCEDURE
(ANNEX 1 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE CPM)**

The process for the development of international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs) is divided into four stages:

- developing the IPPC standard setting work programme,
- drafting,
- member consultation,
- adoption and publication.

Relevant ICPM/CPM decisions on many aspects of the standard setting process have been compiled in the IPPC Procedural Manual which is updated annually.

STAGES

Stage 1: Developing the IPPC standard setting work programme

Step 1: Call for topics

A call for topics is made by the IPPC Secretariat every two years. Detailed proposals for new topics or for the revision of existing ISPMs are submitted to the IPPC Secretariat.

Step 2: Adjustment and adoption of the IPPC standard setting work programme

The CPM adjusts and adopts the IPPC standard setting work programme, taking account of the strategic priorities identified by the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance and the revised work programme proposed by the Standards Committee.

Stage 2: Drafting

Step 3: Development of a specification

For each topic or technical panel, the Standards Committee appoints steward(s), who, in collaboration with the Secretariat, drafts a specification, taking into account the proposal(s) for the topic.

The draft specification is reviewed by the Standards Committee and, once approved for member consultation, is then made available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) for a 60 day consultation period. Comments received by the IPPC Secretariat are compiled, posted on the IPP and submitted to the steward(s) and Standards Committee for consideration. The specification is amended as necessary, finalized and approved by the Standards Committee, and published on the IPP.

Step 4: Preparation of a draft ISPM¹

The standard is drafted or revised by an expert drafting group (expert working group or technical panel) in accordance with the relevant specification.

<p>Regular process:</p> <p>The resulting draft standard is submitted to the Standards Committee.</p> <p>The Standards Committee or SC-7 reviews the draft at a meeting and decides whether to send it for member consultation, or to return it to the steward(s) or to an expert drafting group, or to put it on hold. If the SC-7 meets, comments from any SC members will be taken into account.</p>	<p>Fast-track process:</p> <p>The resulting draft standard is submitted to the Standards Committee at any time by e-mail.</p> <p>As far as possible the Standards Committee decides by e-mail whether to send it for member consultation, or to return it to the steward(s) or to an expert drafting group, or to place it on the Standards Committee agenda for a decision on how to proceed.</p>
--	--

¹ This procedure refers to "draft ISPMs" and "standards" to simplify wording, but also applies to any part of an ISPM, including annexes, appendices or supplements.

Stage 3: Member consultation**Step 5: Member consultation**

The draft standard is sent by the IPPC Secretariat to contracting parties, National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs), Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) and relevant international organizations for consultation. The draft standard is also posted on the IPP. The length of the consultation period is 100 days. Comments are submitted through the IPPC contact point.

<p>Regular process:</p> <p>The draft standard is sent for member consultation.</p> <p>Comments are by written submission to the Secretariat following guidelines.</p> <p>Comments are compiled by the Secretariat and submitted to the steward and the Standards Committee for consideration.</p> <p>Compiled comments are posted on the IPP at the time of submission to the SC.</p>	<p>Fast-track process:</p> <p>The draft standard is sent for member consultation following clearance by the Standards Committee, in appropriate FAO languages.</p>
--	---

Step 6: Review of the draft ISPM prior to CPM

<p>Regular process:</p> <p>The draft standard is revised by the SC-7 and Standards Committee taking comments into account.</p> <p>The Standards Committee decides whether to forward the modified draft to the CPM for adoption, or to put it on hold, return it to the steward or to an expert drafting group, or submit it for another round of member consultation.</p> <p>A summary of major issues discussed and of SC reactions to substantive comments that were not incorporated into the standard is produced and posted on the IPP.</p>	<p>Fast-track process:</p> <p>If no formal objections² are received, the draft standard is submitted to the CPM for adoption without discussion.</p> <p>If one or more formal objections are received from contracting parties, the Secretariat tries to resolve the issue(s) with the contracting parties concerned.</p> <p>If these issues are resolved without change to the draft text, the draft standard is submitted to the CPM for adoption without discussion.</p> <p>If these issues are not resolved, the draft is submitted to the Standards Committee. In consultation with the relevant technical panel, the Standards Committee and/or SC-7 examine the objections and review the draft standard, and if appropriate modifies it.</p> <p>The Standards Committee decides how to proceed with the modified draft standard.</p>
--	--

Members of the SC report back to countries in their regions.

² A formal objection should be a technically supported objection to the adoption of the draft standard in its current form, sent through the official IPPC contact point. The Secretariat would not make any judgement about the validity of the objection – an objection with some technical discussion of the issue would be accepted as a formal objection.

Stage 4: Adoption and publicationStep 7: Adoption

<p>Regular process:</p> <p>Following approval by the Standards Committee, the draft standard is included on the agenda of the CPM for discussion and adoption.</p> <p>Comments on standards are sent to the IPPC Secretariat at least 14 days before the CPM meeting, following recommendations on procedures for comments on standards at CPM.</p>	<p>Fast track process:</p> <p>The draft standard is included on the agenda of the CPM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - for adoption without discussion if no formal objections were received, or if objections were resolved by the Secretariat with countries. - for discussion and adoption following the regular process if objections were discussed by the Standards Committee.
---	---

The ISPM is formally adopted by the CPM according to Rule X of the Rules of Procedure of the CPM.

Step 8: Publication

The ISPM is appended to the report of the CPM and published by the IPPC Secretariat, including posting on the IPP.

Annex 6**Draft TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR TECHNICAL PANELS****Terms of reference****1. Scope of Technical Panels**

Technical Panels (TPs) assist the SC in the development of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) in their specified technical areas on topics which have been determined by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM).

2. Objective

The main objective of TPs is to develop specific draft standards, annexes, supplements, amendments or additions to standards on topics in their specified technical areas requiring continuous work, as well as advising the Standards Committee (SC) on scientific or technical matters.

3. Structure of Technical Panels

TPs should consist of 6-10 members representing a wide geographic area (including proportional developing country participation). In specific cases and depending on the technical area, a TP may consist of more or less members according to the SC's decision.

4. Functions of Technical Panels

TPs operate under the guidance and supervision of the SC, and serve as a forum for providing:

- draft standards, annexes, supplements, amendments or additions to standards in their specified technical areas
- advice on member comments in their technical area
- advice on topics and priorities for technical standard development in their technical area, and
- other tasks as requested by the SC within its mandate and to progress the objectives of the TP.

5. IPPC Secretariat

The Secretariat provides administrative, technical and editorial support as required by TPs. The Secretariat is responsible for reporting and record keeping.

6. Establishment of Technical Panels

TPs are established by the CPM and work on an ongoing basis until disestablished by the CPM on the recommendation of the SC.

Rules of procedure**Rule 1. Membership**

Members of TPs should have the necessary scientific expertise and subject matter experience, and should be able to participate and contribute to the proceedings. A steward is considered a member of the TP.

Membership of TPs should be reviewed by the SC on a regular basis and may be adjusted as necessary, taking into account, in particular, changes in the needs of scientific or other expertise required and in the professional duties of the experts.

Rule 2. Procedure for Nomination and Selection of Technical Panel Members

Members of TPs are nominated and selected according to the following:

- nominations are requested by the Secretariat as directed by the SC;
- contracting parties, NPPOs, RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat submit nominations of experts;
- the Secretariat summarizes and comments on the nominations, and submits them to the SC and the Bureau. The SC selects the members based on their demonstrated expertise and communicates this to the Secretariat; and
- lists of Technical Panel members are maintained on the IPP.

Rule 3. Period of Membership

Members of TPs may serve for a 5 year period, after which, with the member's agreement, the SC may extend membership for additional terms. The SC may, in accordance with Rule 1 of these Rules of Procedure, change or amend the membership of TPs at any time. Membership should be reviewed regularly by the SC, and membership may be confirmed. Extension of membership does not require the application of the nomination procedure according to Rule 2. Members may at any time withdraw from the TP.

Rule 4. Chair

The Chairpersons of TPs are elected at each meeting by their members.

Rule 5. Steward(s)

Each TP should have a steward selected by the SC and, where possible, the steward should be a member of the SC. The steward is responsible for liaison between the SC and the TP, ensuring the TP follows the guidance given by the SC.

Where a TP is providing advice on or drafting a standard, annex or supplement for which another steward is assigned, the steward for this document, if not a member of the TP, may also participate in the meeting.

Rule 6. Observers and participation of non-members of the Technical Panel

TPs should not allow observers.

In specific cases, and without objection of the SC, the TP may decide to invite individuals with specific expertise to participate on an *ad hoc* basis at a specified meeting or part of a meeting of a TP.

A representative of the host country and/or organization may participate in the meeting of a TP, and assist the IPPC Secretariat in the organization and efficient running of the meeting.

Participants who are not members of the TPs, as indicated in the two previous paragraphs, may fully contribute to the discussions of the TP. Decisions of TPs, however, are taken by their members only.

Rule 7. Sessions

TPs should meet as necessary, generally once a year. E-mail, teleconferencing and other modern communication methods should be used where possible to prepare and supplement face to face meetings of TPs.

TP members should work according to the specification for each TP approved by the SC and the procedures of the TP, which are included in the IPPC Procedural Manual and which should be in accordance with other procedures approved by the SC.

Rule 8. Approval

Approvals relating to draft documents and agreement on advice provided to the SC should be sought by consensus and communicated to the SC by the steward. If consensus is not reached, contentious issues should be noted in the report and brought to the attention of the SC.

Rule 9. Reports

The report of each TP meeting should be published on the IPP. Major discussion issues should be noted in the report and the rationale for conclusions should be recorded.

The report should be presented to the SC by the steward of the TP advising the SC of the specific actions that they are requested to take.

Rule 10. Working Language

English should be the working language of TP meetings.

Rule 11. Amendments

Future amendments to the Terms of reference and Rules of procedures, if required, should be approved by the CPM.

EXAMPLE OF A TIME SCHEDULE FOR A SPECIFIC STANDARD WITHIN THE REGULAR STANDARD SETTING PROCESS¹

The beginning of each step in the draft IPPC standard setting procedure (Annex I of CPM rules of procedure) is also indicated

	Specification		ISPM (or annex, supplement, etc.)				
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3		
June	Secretariat calls for topics for standards ▶ <i>Step 1 begins</i>	Steward with Secretariat drafts specification	Secretariat convenes EWG or TP (call for experts, selection by SC, organization of meeting, meeting) [Note: drafting may take place in the year the specification was finalized, or in subsequent years] ▶ <i>Step 4 begins</i>	Member consultation (100 days) [Note: Regional workshops to review draft ISPMs are held in regions during the same period] ▶ <i>Step 5 begins</i>	SC receives SC-7 redraft	June	
July						July	
August	Secretariat compiles submissions of topics for standards					August	
September					Steward may prepare reaction to SC-7 redraft	September	
October	SPTA develops strategic directions for SC to use when reviewing submissions of topics for standards				Secretariat compiles comments on draft ISPM from member consultation	October	
November (SC meeting)	SC proposes adjustments to IPPC standard setting work programme (and takes account whether topics might be too difficult to develop)	SC reviews draft specification and approves it for member consultation				SC reviews SC-7 redraft and steward's reaction (if any) and approves draft ISPM for submission to CPM	November (SC meeting)
December		Member consultation (60 days) for draft specification posted on the IPP			Steward incorporates comments on draft ISPM from member consultation and responds to comments		December
January						January	
February		Secretariat compiles comments on draft specification from member consultation			Secretariat sends steward's draft ISPM and response to comments along with comments to SC ▶ <i>Step 6 begins</i>		February
March	CPM adopts IPPC standard setting work programme with additions ▶ <i>Step 2 begins</i>	Steward incorporates comments into draft specification				[open-end wkshop for SPTA discussion] Comments 14 days prior to CPM [/to workshop] CPM adopts ISPM ▶ <i>Step 7 begins</i>	March
April						April	
May (SC meeting)	SC assigns steward(s) to topic ▶ <i>Step 3 begins</i>	SC approves specification	SC or SC-7 reviews draft ISPM* and approves it for member consultation	SC-7 meets in the week following the SC or SC-7 meeting to consider steward's draft ISPM		May (SC meeting)	

*Draft ISPMs to be sent to SC at least 1 month prior to the meeting

¹ It is envisaged that an individual schedule will be developed for each standard, and therefore the actual time may be shorter or longer.