



Criteria for posting contributed phytosanitary resources on the IPP¹

- 1) On the use of language :
 - Key words/flags to be taken into account for review are: Standards, guidelines, recommendations.
 - The resources can be proposed in any language; however less used languages are going to have less priority. Priority should be given to UN languages (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish). In the process of review of non-UN languages, in-kind translation services could be used by the IFU.
 - A general disclaimer is going to be added to contributed resources page as follows: Resources on this page are not intended to be interpretations of ISPMs and terminology used may not be consistent with ISPM 5. Unless otherwise indicated resources, or pest distributions contained within them are not endorsed/adopted/agreed by the CPM nor developed under the auspices of the IPPC Secretariat.
- 2) On the criteria for suitability of technical resources to be considered by the IC members when reviewing contributed materials:

| Suitable | Unsuitable |
|---|--|
| Assisting with the implementation of core IPPC provisions (obligations, rights and responsibilities) and ISPMs | Incompatible with the provisions of the IPPC text and ISPMs |
| Usefulness and relevance of information for NPPOs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applicability to the implementation of specific ISPMs - Relationship with the areas of the IPPC Strategic Framework and National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy - Support for implementing core functions of the NPPO - Practicality of the material | Non-ISPMs that could create confusion |
| Potentially globally applicable | Resources endorsed, approved or adopted by the CPM |
| Is IC reviewed | Detection of an infringement of copyright |
| Date of publication | Resources subject to confidentiality agreements, unless the parties agree to its publication |
| Format of the resource (Link, pdf ...) | Resources (except link) subject to frequent update |
| Regional Standards on Phytosanitary Measures, Diagnostic protocols and other documents approved by RPPOs | Resources published or intended to be published in journals and easily accessible |
| Phytosanitary Treatments | Resources addressing other SPS area |

- 3) On operational aspects:

¹ Agreed by IC 2019-05 see Appendix 15 to IC report.

- Any resource reviewed and noted by other IPPC Subsidiary bodies (not the IC) is automatically posted and the coordination responsibility relies in the pertinent subsidiary body (subject to meet suitability criteria for publication in the phytosanitary resources page).
 - The IC may seek advice from other Subsidiary Bodies regarding resources submitted.
 - PRA documents, bilateral agreements, comprehensive diagnostic resources, pest factsheets and specific pest control manuals are not subjected to review by the IC and are directly posted in the page.
 - The IPPC Secretariat will pre-review videos to consider if they need to be submitted for IC review.
 - The IPPC Secretariat is going to propose a priority list for review as per IC request based on the CPM priorities.
- 4) Prioritization of review:
- The resources addressing topic areas related to IPPC Technical Resources (IPPC Guides and training materials) and CPM priorities
 - The resources able to be applied by a wide range of NPPOs should be given priority over ones only applicable in specific NPPOs or regions.
- 5) Procedures of the IC to review resources:
- Among the resources contributed, the Secretariat selects five resources in line with the prioritization of review and they are reviewed by the IC with one month deadline.
 - In the case where all IC members agree suitability of resources, they would be posted on the IPP as contributed resources.
 - In the case where at least one IC member considers a resource unsuitable and/or requests further review, the IC lead for contributed resources will initiate a discussion process by electronic means involving the whole IC. If consensus is not reached, the resource should not be posted.
 - When requested, a reason for not posting or removing a resource should be given to proposers, based on the established criteria, including information on the possible process for revisiting the application.

The review process above is being conducted regularly.