



15 October 2013

(13-5617)

Page: 1/7

Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures

Original: English

## REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION SECRETARIAT (IPPC)

### REPORT FOR THE COMMITTEE ON SANITARY AND PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES MEETING OF 16-18 OCTOBER 2013

The following communication, received on 14 October 2013, is being circulated at the request of the International Plant Protection Convention secretariat (IPPC).

## 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1. This report covers the period July – October 2013.

1.2. As reported during the last meeting of this Committee, the Eighth Session of Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-8) took place on 8-12 April 2013. This report covers general activities subsequent to that meeting. Activities taking place in the areas of Capacity Development and Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) are presented in separate documents.

1.3. The Committee is invited to note that the number of contracting parties to the IPPC remains at 179.

1.4. A significant development for the IPPC Secretariat within FAO is that the organizational placement of the Secretariat within FAO has changed from the Agricultural Production and Protection (AGP) staff to the staff of the Assistant Director General. It is anticipated that this new organizational re-alignment will bring greater visibility for the IPPC within and outside of FAO.

1.5. In addition, the IPPC is very pleased to have had the opportunity to have a second virtual meeting with the SPS Committee Secretariat on 2 October 2013. Some of the key issues discussed related to the topics of intended use and responsibilities for conducting a PRA. These discussions are considered to be, on the part of the IPPC Secretariat, extremely useful in clarifying issues as well as in maintaining a good relationship between the two Secretariats.

## 2 STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK AND ISSUE SPECIFIC STRATEGIES

### 2.1 Strategic framework

2.1. As previously mentioned, implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework began immediately following adoption at CPM-7 (2012). The establishment of the four strategic objectives has provided the basis for outreach to non-traditional contacts and enhanced and/or renewed relationships with traditional partners. Also, the adoption of the new communications strategy at CPM-8 (2013) is another step in bringing about change in the way of doing business for the IPPC.

2.2. Also mentioned at the last meeting of this Committee, the IPPC Secretariat made a call for proposed topics for the upcoming meeting of the Strategic Planning Group (SPG). Formerly called the Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) group, with the creation of the Capacity Development and Financial Committees there was a general consensus that more emphasis needs to be placed on contracting party development of strategies for the future. Two significant

proposals resulted in response to the call, one on the topic of implementation, and the other related to the process of adopting recommendations by the CPM.

2.3. During the meeting of the SPG which took place from 8-11 October 2013, a simple process was proposed for the adoption of IPPC recommendations. This proposal will be presented to the CPM in April 2014. The topic of implementation also prompted several comments and suggestions. A paper reflecting the results of the SPG discussions and proposing a pilot approach will be presented to the CPM as well.

### **3 STANDARD SETTING WORK PROGRAMME**

#### **3.1 Adopted International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs)**

3.1. As previously noted, the ISPMs adopted at CPM-8 (2013) have been posted under the IPP webpage under the Adopted Standards section: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispm>.

#### **3.2 Framework for standards**

3.2. In addition, following one of CPM-7 (2012) decisions, a Framework for Standards Task Force meeting was organized in Canada on 18-20 September 2013. While the full list of recommendations is too long to be provided in this document, some of the key recommendations include a proposal that further gap analysis should be conducted for existing standards and the Standards Committee should consider how the gaps are to be addressed; a process to proactively identify emerging issues where harmonized guidance would be beneficial should be developed; and the framework for standards should be applied to identify issues of common interest to the "three sisters". The report of the Task Force meeting is posted on the IPP: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/framework-for-standards-task-force>. It will be presented to the Standards Committee (SC) during its November meeting (18-22) for further consideration.

#### **3.3 New IPPC standard setting procedure**

3.3. It is useful to remind the Committee that CPM-8 (2013) noted the current status of the implementation of the standard setting process adopted at CPM-7 (2012) and agreed to extend the review date to CPM-11 (2016).

#### **3.4 Relationship between ISPMs and standards created by other organizations**

3.4. In addition, it is important to stress once again that the relationship between ISPMs and standards created by other organizations be clear. As noted, and is important to remember, ISO standards are not mandatory for implementation of ISPMs and that in the phytosanitary area ISPMs take precedence over ISO standards and contracting parties are encouraged to take this into account. No response has yet been received to the letter sent from the Secretariat to ISO requesting their cooperation in ensuring that this message was communicated to stakeholders.

#### **3.5 Member consultation on draft ISPMs**

3.5. The IPPC would like to remind the SPS Committee that the following drafts ISPMs were approved for member consultation by the SC in May 2013:

Draft ISPMs:

- Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood (2006-029), Priority 1
- Preliminary draft: Minimizing pest movement by sea containers (2008-001), Priority 1
- Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004), Priority 1
- Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management (2005-010), Priority 2
- Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001).

Draft diagnostic protocols:

- Draft Annex to ISPM 27:2006 – *Potato spindle tuber viroid* (2006-022), Priority 1
- Draft Annex to ISPM 27:2006 – *Xanthomonas citri* subsp. *citri* (2004-011), Priority 1.

Draft phytosanitary treatment:

- Draft Annex to ISPM 28:2007: Irradiation for *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* BEARDSLEY, *Planococcus lilacinus* (COCKERELL) and *Planococcus minor* (MASKELL) (HEMIPTERA: PSEUDOCOCCIDAE) (2012-011), Priority 1
- The 2013 member consultation period lasts 150 days. It began on 1 July 2013 and ends on 1 December 2013. Comments must be submitted through the IPPC contact point in the IPPC Online Comment System (OCS: <http://ocs.ippc.int/#>). The draft ISPMs can be downloaded from the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/member-consultation-draft-ispms>) where background documents and power point presentations for the draft ISPMs are also posted.

3.6. Again this year, IPPC regional workshops are being organized to discuss phytosanitary issues as well as review draft ISPMs. The Secretariat will continue to use the OCS during the 2013 IPPC regional workshops for ease of collecting and sharing workshop comments among the participants. These comments will not be considered unless participants, after returning to their home countries, choose to submit these regional workshop comments as their own or use them as the basis for formulating their own comments. Workshop participants will be reminded to submit their comments via the OCS, even if they simply wish to submit they have no comments, as future provision of travel assistance to attend these regional workshops may be linked to their efforts made to submit comments.

### 3.6 Member consultation on draft specifications for ISPMs

3.7. The following draft specifications were submitted to member consultation:

- Wood products and handicrafts – made from raw wood (2008-008)
- Revision of ISPM 4:1995 Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (2009-002)
- Revision of ISPM 8:1998 Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005).

3.8. This consultation period started on 1 June 2013 and ended on 31 July 2013. The draft specifications can be downloaded from the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/member-consultation-draft-specifications-ispms>). All comments were submitted by the IPPC contact points in the IPPC OCS. These comments have been compiled and can be downloaded from the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/compiled-member-comments-draft-specifications>) and were forwarded to the stewards. The stewards will revise the draft specifications for presentation to the Standards Committee.

### 3.7 Substantial concerns commenting period for draft ISPMs

3.9. Draft ISPMs that have been revised by the SC-7 and recommended to the SC are made available to IPPC members through the OCS for the substantial concerns commenting period.

3.10. Thus, taking into account the comments that were received during the 2012 member consultation, the following draft ISPMs were reviewed by the Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) in May 2013 and recommended to the SC (see May 2013 SC-7 report):

- Appendix to ISPM 12 on Electronic certification, information on standard XML schemes and exchange mechanisms (2006-003), Priority 1
- Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak (for inclusion as Annex 1 of ISPM 26) (2009-007), Priority 3
- Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031), Priority 1.

3.11. The 2013 substantial concerns commenting period started on 1 June 2013 and ended on 30 September 2013. The draft ISPMs that went to substantial concerns commenting period can be downloaded from the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/substantial-concerns-commenting-period-sccp-draft-ispms>). All substantial concerns were submitted by the IPPC contact point in the IPPC OCS. These concerns have been compiled and are posted on the IPP: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/compiled-substantial-concerns-draft-ispms>. They have now been forwarded to the SC and steward who will study these comments and revise the draft ISPMs at their next meeting on 18-22 November 2013.

### 3.8 Call for topics

3.12. This summer, the IPPC Secretariat issued a call for new topics for IPPC standards. The call ended on 31 August 2013. The IPPC Secretariat will compile the submissions that have been received and they will be presented to the November SC meeting.

### 3.9 Expert working groups

3.13. An expert working group (EWG) meeting on the International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004) was held in Finland from 27 May to 31 May 2013. An expert working group (EWG) meeting on the International movement of seed (2009-003) was held in the Netherlands from 1 to 5 July 2013. The EWGs developed draft ISPMs which will be submitted to the SC for their review.

### 3.10 Technical panels

3.14. The Technical Panel for the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (TPG) met in Rome from 4 to 7 February 2013 and the outcomes of the meeting were presented to the 2013 May SC meeting.

3.15. The Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ) met from 10 to 14 June 2013 in Belem, Brazil and reviewed the draft Criteria for Treatments for Wood Packaging Material in International Trade (2006-010).

3.16. The Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) met in Paris, France from 24 to 28 June 2013. They reviewed 5 Diagnostic Protocols (DPs) to present to the SC for approval for member consultation. They also revised two draft DPs that are going to be submitted to the SC this year for approval for adoption.

3.17. The Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) met in Fukuoka, Japan from 8 to 12 July 2013. They reviewed 11 treatments; subsequently six phytosanitary treatments (PT) were recommended to the SC for approval for member consultation and one treatment to present to the SC for recommendation to CPM. The TPPT also worked on submissions in response to the 2013 call for topics, including the drafting of specifications for these proposals for new standards on treatment requirements and for the revision to ISPM 18:2003 and asked RPPOs support on these draft submissions.

### 3.11 Call for experts

3.18. The IPPC Secretariat made a call for authors for IPPC diagnostic protocols from 6 August to 27 September 2013 for: *Liberibacter* spp./*Liberobacter* spp. on *Citrus* spp. (2004-010), *Liberibacter solanacearum* (2013-001), *Conotrachelus nenuphar* (2013-002) and *Anguina* spp. (2013-003).

3.19. The IPPC Secretariat opened in September 2013 a call for qualified experts to take part in the TPPT, TPG and two EWGs to develop international standards on International movement of cut flowers and branches (2008-005) and Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004). Nominations are due 4 November 2013. For more details: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/calls/calls-for-experts/2013-september-ippc-call-for-experts>.

### 3.12 Standard setting work Plan for the remainder of 2013

3.20. The SC will meet in November 2013. They will review the draft standards and comments received from the 2013 substantial concerns commenting period and also the draft specifications and the comments received from the 2013 member consultation. They will also discuss the redrafting of the draft specification on the International movement of grain (2008-007) and the participation of experts in strategic matters will be arranged for the November SC meeting.

3.21. An Expert Consultation on Cold Treatments (ECCT) is planned for the 2-6 December 2013 in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

3.22. In addition, the IPPC secretariat continues to use web based technology to hold virtual meetings for technical panels.

## 4 NATIONAL REPORTING OBLIGATIONS

4.1. The CPM has agreed that the "IPPC Information Exchange Programme" will in future be known as the "IPPC National Reporting Programme" to more accurately indicate the focus and objectives of this programme.

### 4.1 Contact points

4.2. A significant number of IPPC contact points have updated their information in the last three months. This means that contracting parties communicating with other IPPC contact points should visit the IPP frequently to ensure they have the latest contact information. In addition, the secretariat continues to work with a small number of countries that need to nominate their IPPC contact points officially.

### 4.2 International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) <https://www.ippc.int>

4.3. There continues to be a lot of information being made available by countries through the IPPC website and the IPPC Secretariat. Countries are encouraged to periodically visit the site for updates. In addition, the website now provides Russian navigation and partial navigation in Chinese - this is being continuously improved. In addition, changes are being made to the IPP to increase its efficiency and improve the appearance and responsiveness. While this has caused some issues while the system is being transitioned, the ultimate result will be a much more responsive and informative IPPC webpage.

4.4. Usage of the webpage continues to increase but it is clear that this can be improved in certain regions and in certain countries. Countries that are reporting certain IPPC obligatory information to the WTO are encouraged to provide this information (minimal modification is necessary) through the IPP to ensure they meet their IPPC reporting obligations.

4.5. An IPPC study comparing WTO Members notifying "IPPC Obligatory" information through the WTO has shown that of the information reported to the WTO, less than 5% is reported to the IPPC (although it is an obligation under the IPPC). This indicates the IPPC information is available but merely not reported to the IPPC, possibly due to:

- i. a lack of understanding of national obligations under the IPPC in specific areas of the national governments;
- ii. a lack of coordination and/or communication between SPS authorities and IPPC contact points in countries;
- iii. governments not understanding that meeting their WTO notification obligations does not in any way automatically meet their IPPC reporting obligations i.e. they are two totally legally independent multi-lateral instruments of equal status; and
- iv. the national IPPC contacts points being ineffective due to competency or resources.

4.6. The IPPC Secretariat believes points ii) and iii) are most relevant in most cases. The Secretariat is also aware that some national SPS Coordination Committees are incorrectly assuming the legal and operational responsibilities of the NPPOs under the IPPC.

4.7. The information available through the IPPC has substantially increased the number of information resources available to support standard and IPPC implementation, capacity development and the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS). This information is being increased continually and is available through:

- i. Resources in Support of IPPC Implementation: <http://www.phytosanitary.info>
- ii. IRSS: <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1111059&L=0#irssactivities>
- iii. IRSS Help Desk: <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1111059&L=0#helpdesk>
- iv. IPPC Projects Database: <http://projects.phytosanitary.info>
- v. eLearning: <http://elearning.phytosanitary.info>
- vi. A summary of IPPC Publications: <https://www.ippc.int/about/mediakit>

### 4.3 Pest reporting

4.8. National pest reporting continues to improve but there is still potential for further improvement. The Secretariat is working on this information to allow users to access this information in a more constructive and analytical manner.

4.9. The Secretariat is also working with the European Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) to allow countries to undertake pest reporting through the Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) (as agreed in CPM), and once this pilot project is functional it will be made available to other RPPOs. This should significantly increase the number, accuracy and timeliness of pest reports received.

4.10. The Secretariat is exploring with CABI ways of ensuring Plantwise does not undermine pest reporting and other IPPC processes. Without significant adjustments, the risk of this happening is very high.

### 4.4 Communications

4.11. The IPPC Communications Strategy was adopted by CPM-8 (2013). The Secretariat is now engaged in an effort to develop and implement a communications workplan. An initial activity taking place soon will be the conduct of a communications needs assessment. This will provide the IPPC a clearer understanding of who the audiences are and the messages that are needed for them. It is intended that the needs assessment will allow the Secretariat to have a greater focus in its communications activities into the future.

4.12. The following social media pages for the IPPC are available:

- i. Facebook: [http://www.facebook.com/pages/International-Plant-Protection-Convention-IPPC/113230338690380?ref=tn\\_tnmn](http://www.facebook.com/pages/International-Plant-Protection-Convention-IPPC/113230338690380?ref=tn_tnmn)
- ii. Twitter: <https://twitter.com/#!/ippcnews>
- iii. LinkedIn: [http://www.linkedin.com/groups?gid=3175642&trk=hb\\_side\\_g](http://www.linkedin.com/groups?gid=3175642&trk=hb_side_g)
- iv. Flickr: [http://www.flickr.com/groups/international\\_plant\\_protection\\_convention/](http://www.flickr.com/groups/international_plant_protection_convention/)
- v. YouTube: <http://www.youtube.com/IPPCnews>

## 5 DISPUTE SETTLEMENT

5.1. With regard to dispute settlement, even while the IPPC is in the process of reviewing the IPPC Dispute Settlement system, the Secretariat offers the IPPC dispute settlement mechanism as a reasonable approach for the resolution of phytosanitary disputes.

5.2. The review of the IPPC dispute settlement system is almost complete and will be discussed in detail at CPM9 in 2014.

## 6 RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

6.1. The Secretariat would like to thank all those contracting parties and other donors who contributed to the 2012 budget and activities of the IPPC. The IPPC encourages them to consider future, sustainable contributions. It will be greatly appreciated if donors are able to express their intention for further contributions in order to facilitate planning for the coming year. These donations will help to ensure the core work programme will be delivered. A full list of in-kind

support is made available to CPM each year – [https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110798&frompage=13330&tx\\_publication\\_pi1\[showUId\]=2183770&type=publication&L=0](https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110798&frompage=13330&tx_publication_pi1[showUId]=2183770&type=publication&L=0).

6.2. The sustainability of the IPPC secretariat, and hence the work programme of the IPPC, continues to be addressed as a high priority on an on-going basis. The current resource allocation (financial and human resources) measured against projected tasks is simply not sustainable, and although 2014 will be manageable, some activities may have to be put in abeyance. The Secretary continues to give this his highest priority. The Secretary and staff have engaged in discussions with the governing body as well as traditional and non-traditional partners in ongoing efforts to improve the situation.

6.3. It cannot be stressed enough that it is essential the IPPC receive regular and predictable contributions to allow appropriate planning and delivery of the core IPPC work programme, i.e. to provide sustainability to the programme. It should also be noted that FAO, the organization hosting the IPPC secretariat, continues to face severe financial challenges and is seeking cost reduction efforts in most areas; the resources available to the IPPC activities have been affected, specifically in the area of information technology and support for the On-line Comment System.

6.4. The secretariat is always open to any discussion with members or partner organizations that could provide solutions to the current challenges, particularly in the medium to long term.

## 7 ELECTRONIC CERTIFICATION IN THE IPPC (EPHYTO)

7.1. ePhyto is a high priority for CPM and the revised Appendix 1 (Electronic certification, information on standard XML schemes and exchange mechanisms (2006-003)) to ISPM 12:2011 is out for member consultation (see above, section 3.3). The IPPC Secretariat has created an ePhyto web page (<http://ephyto.ippc.int/>) on the IPP containing information on codes and schema to be used in ePhytos.

7.2. A feasibility study is currently being conducted by a consultant to the Secretariat, and an update was presented to the Strategic Planning Group of the IPPC last week in Rome. The IPPC believes this represents a potential opportunity for future collaboration with OIE and Codex.

7.3. General information on ePhyto can be found on the IPPC Website at: <http://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1111140> or obtained from the IPPC Secretariat ([ippc@fao.org](mailto:ippc@fao.org)).

## 8 COOPERATION WITH THE WTO STANDARD SETTING ORGANIZATIONS

8.1. The IPPC secretariat would like to draw attention to the following current on-going activities with Codex and OIE:

- i. Codex and the IPPC continue to explore ways of addressing their IT needs in a more sustainable manner and share tools and skills when appropriate, especially in view of forthcoming organizational changes within FAO;
- ii. Codex is currently using a Codex specific version of the Online Comment System. This is an important collaborative milestone that is worthy of broader recognition and allows both organization to cost share the continued maintenance of the system. OIE is also examining the OCS more closely and may also consider using this system in the future;
- iii. Codex, OIE and the IPPC continue to engage in consultations on Standard Trade and Development Facility (STDF) activities to understand each other's positions and coordinate activities and responses;
- iv. There is ongoing cooperation between the "three sisters" on SPS-related capacity development projects, if and when appropriate;
- v. The Secretariat has initiated coordination meetings between the "three sisters" to improve coordination and collaboration in SPS Committee meetings;
- vi. Ad-hoc consultations are undertaken as and when subjects arise that are of mutual interest; and
- vii. The Secretariat looks forward to establishing a broader consultation meeting between the "three sisters" and the SPS Committee Secretariat in the near future.