



AFRICAN UNION
**INTERAFRICAN BUREAU
FOR ANIMAL RESOURCES**

STANDARD SETTING PROCESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION (IPPC)

A Handbook for Guidance of Participation of African Countries



May 2014

All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of material in this information product for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders.

Published by AU-IBAR, Nairobi, Kenya

Copyright: © 2012 African Union – Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR)

ISBN 978-9966-077-03-5

Requests for such permission should be addressed to:

The Director
African Union – Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR)
Kenindia Business Park
Museum Hill, Westlands Road
P.O. Box 30786
00100, Nairobi, KENYA
or by e-mail to: ibar.office@au-ibar.org

**STANDARD SETTING PROCESS OF
THE INTERNATIONAL
PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION
(IPPC)**

A Handbook for Guidance of Participation of African Countries

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	vii
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	ix
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	xi
1. INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION	1
1.1 Description of the organization	1
1.2 IPPC Secretariat	6
1.3 National Plant Protection Organizations	6
1.4 Regional Plant Protection Organizations	7
1.5 Purpose of the IPPC	8
1.6 IPPC Partners	9
1.7 Obligations of contracting parties to the IPPC	9
2. IPPC STANDARDS	13
2.1 Overview of IPPC Standards	13
2.2 Framework for setting IPPC Standards	13
2.3. Outline of IPPC Standard Setting work programme	14
3. IPPC STANDARD SETTING PROCESS	17
3.1 Stage 1: Developing the List of topics for IPPC standards	17
3.2 Stage 2: Drafting	18
3.3 Stage 3: Member consultation on draft ISPMs	19
3.4 Stage 4: Adoption and publication	20
4. THE IPPC ONLINE COMMENT SYSTEM	23
4.1. Description of the IPPC Online Comment System	23
4.2. Roles and responsibilities under the OCS	23
4.3. Requirements for using the OCS	24
5. GUIDELINES FOR EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION IN IPPC STANDARD SETTING PROCESS	25
5.1. Overview of participation in standard setting	25
5.2. Participation in developing topics for ISPMs	26
5.3. Selecting/identifying experts for nomination to draft standards	30
5.4. How to operate functional and effective member consultations	31
5.5. Adoption and publication of a standard	36
6. GUIDELINES ON ELEMENTS OF GOOD PRACTICE IN CONTRIBUTING TO IPPC STANDARD SETTING	39

6.1	Other IPPC activities	39
6.2	How to enhance participation in IPPC Standard setting process	39
6.3	Regional Consultations	43
6.4	Feedback mechanisms and action planning	43
7.	DO REGIONAL ECONOMIC COMMUNITIES HAVE A ROLE IN THE IN STANDARDS SETTING ACTIVITIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION (IPPC)?	45
7.1	Regional Economic Communities in Africa	45
7.2	What roles should RECs play?	47
8.	CHECKLIST FOR SPECIFIC COUNTRY REQUIREMENTS FOR EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION IN IPPC STANDARD SETTING PROCESS	49
9.	EPILOGUE	51
10.	BIBLIOGRAPHY	53
	ANNEX I	55

FOREWORD

This handbook was initiated under the PANSPSO project of AU-IBAR and is intended to provide guidance to African countries on participation in the standard setting process of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). Chapter 1 gives background information on the IPPC, particularly its history, governance, subsidiary bodies and committees as well as its relationship with national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) and regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) and other IPPC partners that are expected to play a role in the core functions of the convention.

In various sections of the handbook, reference is made to IPPC members, IPPC contracting parties and countries in the context that should be construed by the readers to mean different entities. This should become apparent as one reads through Chapter 2 onwards in relation to which organizations and persons can participate in the IPPC standard setting process. Users of the handbook should note that countries, IPPC members and IPPC contracting parties are not useable interchangeably.

Although the focus of the book is participation of African countries in IPPC standard setting processes, the information in Chapters 2 to 4 are of global relevance. The handbook presents the information in a way largely informed by the scenario common to Africa, partly because it is one of the products of a project whose main objective was to enhance participation of African countries in activities of Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) standards setting bodies. The guidelines and recommendations in Chapters 5 and 6 are based on the prevailing circumstances in most African countries.

Participation in the IPPC standard setting process requires good understanding of the New Revised Text of the Convention, particularly its purpose and obligations of contracting parties. These are outlined in the handbook with the hope that it will be used to inform phytosanitary policy of government and earn NPPOs the support needed to develop capacity for participation in IPPC activities and collaboration in the implementation of the Convention and its standards. The handbook emphasises the need for contracting parties to have coordination mechanisms and action plans for consistent and relevant participation in IPPC activities including meetings of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), standard setting work programme and nomination of national experts to serve in the various IPPC bodies, committees, working groups and technical panels. An essential requirement for participation of contracting parties in setting IPPC standards is good understanding of the processes involved and the

provision, by governments, of the requisite resources to NPPOs for performance of roles and responsibilities provided in the convention. The current standard setting process of the IPPC (the Online Comment System) adopted in 2011 is described in Chapter 4. It simplifies contribution of relevant national experts of contracting parties in the standard setting process. However, its use requires that certain information Communication and Technology (ICT) infrastructure and human resources are dedicated by governments to the standard setting work at national level, preferably within NPPOs, as it is currently the ONLY system used to submit comments on draft standards.

It is trusted that the Handbook will assist African Member Countries to become better informed Delegates and help them to participate fully and with better understanding of the IPPC.

Finally, I would like to sincerely thank Dr Washington Otieno, consultant for AU-IBAR and author of this handbook, for his work.

Prof. Ahmed El-Sawalhy
Director of AU-IBAR

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

APPPC	Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission
CA	Comunidad Andina
AU	African Union
CBD	Convention on Biological diversity
CDC	Capacity Development committee of the IPPC
CEPM	Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures
COSAVE	Comité Regional de Sanidad Vegetal Para el Cono Sur
CPM	Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
CPPC	Caribbean Plant Protection Commission
EDG	Expert Drafting Group
EWG	Expert Working Group
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IBAR	Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources
ICPM	Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
ICT	Information, Communication & Technology
IPP	International Phytosanitary Portal
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
ISPM	International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures
EPPO	European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization
IAPSC	Inter-African Phytosanitary Council
LRG	Language Review group
NAPPO	North American Plant Protection Organization
NPPO	National Plant Protection Organization
OCS	Online Comment System
OIRSA	Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria
PPPO	Pacific Plant Protection Organization
PRA	Pest Risk Analysis
REC	Regional Economic Community
RPPO	Regional Plant Protection Organization
SBDS	Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement
SC	Standards Committee
SCCP	Substantial Concerns Comment Period
SPS	Sanitary and Phytosanitary
TP	Technical Panel
TPG	Technical Panel on Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms
TPDP	Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols
TPPT	Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Terms
WTO	World Trade Organization

WTO-SPS Agreement World Trade Organization Agreement on the application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Participation of African countries in the setting of IPPC standards has largely been facilitated by the IPPC Secretariat through use donor funds to run regional workshops on draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) as part of support to phytosanitary capacity development. Although the workshops have been held annually over many years, there has been no significant improvement in internal systems of countries in terms of ability to contribute technical and substantive comments on draft ISPMs by African countries. Participation in IPPC standard setting must be understood not only in the context of reviewing and providing comments on draft ISPMs but also in proposing topics for new standards, nominating suitable experts to serve in Expert Working Groups (EWGs) and Technical Panels (TPs) and Standards Committee (SC). This process has largely been driven by contributions from countries that actively engage in the work programme of the IPPC Secretariat. Effective participation of countries in standard setting entails having functional systems and requisite infrastructure and human resources with responsibilities aligned with roles and responsibilities matching the functions provided in the IPPC standard setting process within each contracting party. Such systems must enable expert review of draft standards and standards specifications to take place, generate technical and substantive comments and submit these to IPPC Secretariat during member consultation period on draft ISPMs. The framework under which this can be realized forms the core elements of for enhancing participation in the standard setting process described in this handbook.

Key features unique to countries that participate actively in standard setting is having well-structured organizational arrangement for NPPOs, with clear mandates, roles and responsibilities on plant health and membership of RPPOs that play coordinating role in addressing phytosanitary needs of the member countries. By outlining the roles and responsibilities of NPPOs and the inter-relationship of NPPO with RPPO functions in the governance structure of the IPPC, the handbook aims to clarify to IPPC contracting parties in Africa and the Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC) what they need to put in place to enhance their participation in the standard setting process. Among these is setting up suitable organizational arrangements for NPPOs and developing policy and legal instruments for ensuring compliance with the Convention and its standards, with provision of clear legal mandates over the functions envisaged for NPPOs under the IPPC. The use of this handbook should improve the understanding of NPPO managers, other plant health experts in Africa and policy makers, of the requirements for overcoming current constraints to effective participation of African IPPC contracting parties in the IPPC standard

setting process. In turn, this should inform all countries of inadequacies in their systems for participating in IPPC standard setting work, implementation of the convention and the ISPMs.

This handbook presents a simplified context in which African countries, both contracting parties and non-contracting parties to IPPC should apprise themselves of the requirements for enhancing participation in IPPC standard setting work, while giving cognizance to the fact that other areas of IPPC work are equally important, and warrant dedication of resources to set up systems that integrate IPPC related activities in regular work programmes of the NPPOs.

I. INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION

1.1 Description of the organization

The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) is an international agreement on plant health to which 179 signatories currently (2013) adhere. The goal of IPPC is to protect cultivated and natural plant resources of the world from the spread and introduction of pests¹ while minimizing interference with international movement of goods and people. The IPPC accomplishes this goal by providing an international framework for cooperation of countries in plant protection through development of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs); support to development of phytosanitary capacity of contracting parties that are developing countries and promotion of exchange of official information on pests.

Although the primary focus of IPPC is on plants and plant products moving in international trade, the Convention also covers research materials, biological control agents, germplasm banks, containment facilities and other articles such as containers, packaging materials, soil, vehicles, vessels and machinery that can spread pests.

1.1.1 History of IPPC

The concept of international plant protection began in 1881 when five countries signed an agreement to control the spread of grape Phylloxera, a North American aphid that was accidentally introduced into Europe around 1865 and that subsequently devastated much of grape-growing regions of the continent. The next major step was the development of the International Convention for the Protection of Plants which was signed in Rome in 1929. In 1951, the International Convention for the Protection of Plants was updated and adopted by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) as the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). The IPPC came into force in April 1952, superseding all the previous international plant protection agreements. The IPPC was revised in 1979 and the amendments came into force in 1991.

The IPPC was recognized by the 1989 Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade as a standard setting organization for the Agreement on the

¹Any species, strain or biotype of a plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to plants or plant products [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; IPPC, 1997; revised CPM 2012]

Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (the SPS Agreement). In 1995 contracting parties to the IPPC requested its revision to reflect contemporary phytosanitary concepts and the role of the Convention in relation to the Uruguay Round Agreements of the World Trade Organization, particularly the Agreement on application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary measures (WTO-SPS Agreement). The revision approved by the FAO Conference of parties in 1997 updated and strengthened the Convention to bring it in conformance with the WTO-SPS Agreement that had come to force in January 1995. The 29th FAO Conference in 1997 unanimously adopted the New Revised Text of the IPPC, which came into force in 2005.

Under the WTO-SPS Agreement, the IPPC provides international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs) which are implemented by governments to protect their plant resources from pests, while ensuring that these measures are justified and are not used as unjustified barriers to international trade. The WTO-SPS Agreement identifies the IPPC as the official international body for setting standards to help ensure that measures taken by governments to protect plant health (phytosanitary measures) are harmonized and are not used as unjustified barriers to trade.

1.1.2 Governance of IPPC

The governance structures established by the IPPC are determined by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) whose purpose is to promote the full implementation of the objectives of the Convention.

1.1.2.1 Commission on Phytosanitary Measures

The New Revised Text of the International Plant Protection Convention provides for the establishment of a Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) - Article XI).

The CPM serves as the governing body of the IPPC. Its functions are to:

- i. review the state of plant protection around the world
- ii. identify actions to control the spread of pests into new areas
- iii. develop and adopt international standards
- iv. establish rules and procedures for resolving disputes relating to application of phytosanitary measures
- v. adopt guidelines for the recognition of regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs)
- vi. cooperate with other international organizations on matters covered by the Convention

- vii. promote technical assistance to develop phytosanitary capacity of members
- viii. The CPM meets every year during March or April each year at FAO headquarters in Rome, Italy, to promote cooperation to help implement the objectives of the IPPC.

1.1.2.2 The CPM Bureau

The CPM has a Bureau with a chair-person, two vice-chair persons and four members who represent each of the 7 FAO regions. Members of the CPM Bureau are elected every two years by the CPM. The purpose of the CPM Bureau is to provide guidance to the CPM on the strategic direction, financial and operational management of its activities in cooperation with others as approved by CPM.

1.1.2.3 The Strategic Planning Group

The Strategic Planning Group (SPG) is an informal working group which undertakes specific activities relating to the planning and prioritization of the various elements of the work programme including with the main focus on strategic issues on behalf of the CPM.

1.1.3 The Standards Committee

The first session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-I (2006)) established the Standards Committee (SC). The SC consists of 25 members from each of the seven FAO regions: four members each from Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Near East; two from North America; and three from Southwest Pacific. The current membership of the Standards Committee is posted below.

- i. overseeing the IPPC standard setting process
- ii. managing the development of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures
- iii. providing guidance and oversight to the work of Technical Panels and Expert Working Groups

1.1.3.1 The Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7)

Seven SC members (one from each region) are selected by the SC to form the SC Working Group (SC-7). The SC-7 supports the work of the SC in the detailed consideration of draft ISPMs and standard specifications.

The SC-7 is responsible for:

- i. examining all of the substantive member comments (including proposed amendments) from member consultation on draft ISPMs, identified by the

steward

- ii. reviewing and revising draft ISPMs prepared by the stewards in response to member comments and proposing revisions to the SC
- iii. drafting SC responses to substantive member comments not incorporated into the draft ISPM, as identified by the steward
- iv. proposing which changes to draft ISPM should be considered further by the SC
- v. explaining the proposed revisions to draft ISPMs to the SC as required
- vi. performing other functions regarding draft standards and specifications as directed by the SC

1.1.3.2 Technical panels (TPs)

To improve the quality and efficiency in the development of ISPMs, the ICPM-6 (2004) approved the establishment of technical panels (TPs) under the supervision of the SC.

The TPs, established for specific phytosanitary technical areas, develop ISPMs and provide guidance to the SC regarding specific phytosanitary issues. A steward, who is usually a member of the SC, supports and guides members in the development of draft ISPMs. The SC then reviews, revises and recommends the draft ISPM for member consultation.

The SC selects TP members after a call for experts and each TP member is selected for a five year term. The SC annually reviews the progress of the TP and considers issues regarding the panel's work programme, its relationship to other panels and its organization.

Currently, there are five TPs:

- i. Technical panel on diagnostic protocols (TPDP)
- ii. Technical panel on forest quarantine (TPFQ)
- iii. Technical panel on fruit flies (TPFF)
- iv. Technical Panel on glossary (TPG)
- v. Technical panel on phytosanitary treatments (TPPT)

1.1.3.3 Expert Working Groups (EWGs)

Once the SC approves a specification and resources are identified to hold an expert working group (EWG) meeting, the IPPC Secretariat contacts NPPOs and RPPOs to nominate experts to be members of the EWG to develop a draft ISPM. The SC selects the technical experts identified by the NPPOs and RPPOs for the EWG. The EWG meets and produces a draft ISPM and a meeting report.

The draft ISPM is then approved for member consultation by the SC. Expert Working Groups have 6–10 participants that represent a wide geographic area (including proportional developing country participation) and a member from the SC, if possible (e.g. a steward).

1.1.7 Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement (SBDS)

The third Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM-3) established the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement (SBDS) in 2005 to manage the dispute settlement system under the IPPC aimed at assisting contracting parties with settlement of disputes that may arise from application of phytosanitary measures.

The SBDS consists of seven members, one from each of the FAO regions: Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, Near East, North America, and Southwest Pacific. The SBDS:

- i. provides guidance to the Secretariat and disputing parties in selecting dispute resolution methods, and may help with consultation, good offices, mediation or arbitration
- ii. proposes nominations for independent experts in IPPC Expert Committee procedures where disputing parties cannot agree on experts proposed by the Secretariat approves reports of Expert Committees, including verification of all points in Expert Committee procedures
- iii. undertakes other functions, including
 - a. helping the Secretariat with requests from WTO or other organizations
 - b. reporting on IPPC dispute settlement activities as well as dispute settlement activities by other organizations that have implications for the phytosanitary community, and
 - c. identifying appropriate experts

The IPPC Secretariat provides administrative and technical support for the SBDS and is responsible for reporting and keeping records on dispute settlement activities.

1.1.8 Capacity Development Committee

The IPPC established the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) as the successor to the Expert Working Group for Capacity Development (EWG-CDC) during CPM-7(2012). The CDC has technical representatives drawn from each of the 7 FAO regions and is charged with the development of technical resources and guidelines for implementation of IPPC globally. It serves as the steering committee for various phytosanitary capacity development projects

run by the IPPC Secretariat and oversees the implementation of the National Phytosanitary Capacity Development strategy of the IPPC.

1.2 IPPC Secretariat

The IPPC Secretariat was established in 1992 at FAO headquarters in Rome and began its international standard-setting program which was adopted by FAO in 1993. Besides standard setting, the work of IPPC Secretariat also focuses on the exchange of official phytosanitary information and developing capacity of contracting parties.

1.3 National Plant Protection Organizations

Each contracting party to the IPPC is expected to make provision within its government for an official national plant protection organization (NPPO) with the main responsibilities set out in Article IV of the Convention. National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) are established by contracting party governments with the responsibilities that enables them to discharge the following functions:

- a. the issuance of certificates relating to the phytosanitary regulations of the importing contracting party for consignments of plants, plant products and other regulated articles;
- b. the surveillance of growing plants, including both areas under cultivation (inter alia, fields, plantations, nurseries, gardens, greenhouses and laboratories) and wild flora, and of plants and plant products in storage or in transportation, particularly with the object of reporting the occurrence, outbreak and spread of pests, and of controlling those pests, including the reporting referred to under Article VIII paragraph I(a) of the Convention
- c. the inspection of consignments² of plants and plant products moving in international traffic and, where appropriate, the inspection of other regulated articles, particularly with the object of preventing the introduction and/or spread of pests
- d. the disinfestation or disinfection of consignments of plants, plant products and other regulated articles moving in international traffic, to meet phytosanitary requirements
- e. the protection of endangered areas and the designation, maintenance and surveillance of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence
- f. the conduct of pest risk analyses
- g. ensuring, through appropriate procedures, that the phytosanitary security of consignments after certification regarding composition,

²A quantity of plants, plant products and/or other articles being moved from one country to another and covered, when required, by a single phytosanitary certificate (a consignment may be composed of one or more commodities or lots) [FAO, 1990; revised ICPM, 2001]

substitution and re-infestation is maintained prior to export and
h. training and development of staff.

NPPOs are the official service organizations established by governments to discharge the functions specified above. They are central to the protection of plant resources of their respective contracting parties and hence the functioning and effectiveness of the IPPC at country levels. They should therefore contribute in establishing and implementing phytosanitary regulations issued by governments and issuance of phytosanitary certificates (when these are required) to confirm that exported plants and plant products meet importing country phytosanitary requirements. Of particular importance is the responsibility over the implementation of standards on phytosanitary certification, surveillance for pests, inspection and disinfestation of consignments of plants and plant products in order to ensure phytosanitary security not only of consignments post-certification but also of national plant resources from exotic pests of potential economic importance.

1.4 Regional Plant Protection Organizations

Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) are intergovernmental organizations that provide coordination for the activities and objectives of the IPPC at regional levels. There may be specific tensions between trading partners as importers, exporters or as competitors, but in the wider context of the RPPOs, these countries can work together to achieve the IPPC mission of preventing the spread of pests of plants and plant products and of promoting measures for their control.

According to Article IX of the Convention, IPPC contracting parties undertake to cooperate with one another in establishing RPPOs in appropriate areas. RPPOs are expected to participate in various activities of the IPPC to achieve the objectives of the Convention and, where appropriate, gather and disseminate IPPC information.

RPPOs should therefore cooperate with the Secretary to the IPPC in achieving the objectives of the Convention and, where appropriate, cooperate with the Secretary and the CPM in developing international standards. To help ensure realization of this, the IPPC Secretariat convenes regular Technical Consultations of representatives of RPPOs annually to promote and facilitate the development, adoption and harmonization of phytosanitary measures, discuss shared concerns and encourage inter-regional cooperation in promoting harmonized phytosanitary measures for controlling pests and in preventing their spread

and/or introduction.

RPPOs function as coordinating bodies at regional levels for activities in order to achieve the objectives of the IPPC

Note

- i. Not all IPPC contracting parties are members of RPPOs, nor are all members of RPPOs contracting parties to the IPPC. Some contracting parties may also belong to more than one RPPO.
- ii. There are currently nine RPPOs viz. Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC), with 24 member countries; Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC), with 22 member countries; Comité Regional de Sanidad Vegetal Para el Cono Sur (COSAVE), with 5 member countries; Comunidad Andina (CA), with 5 member countries; European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO), with 50 member countries; Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC), with 51 member countries; North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO), with 3 member countries; Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA), with 8 member countries; and Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO), with 21 member countries.
- iii. Details of establishment and contact details for the RPPOs are published on the IPPC web site – <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13310>.

1.5 Purpose of the IPPC

The IPPC provides a framework and forum for international cooperation, harmonization and technical exchange among contracting parties. Implementation of the Convention involves collaboration of NPPOs and RPPOs to achieve a common action to protect plant resources through prevention of introduction and spread of pests.

In ratifying and acceding to IPPC, countries agree to the rights and obligations of the Convention thereby accepting to observe certain principles for phytosanitary measures that provide the following requirements:

- i. *Necessity* – restrictive measures must be applied only when made necessary by phytosanitary considerations
- ii. *Technical justification* – measures must be based on sound science
- iii. *Transparency* – measures must be published promptly and the rationale made available to other parties
- iv. *Minimal impact* – measures must be consistent with the risks and must cause minimum impediment to international movement of people and

commodities, and

- v. *Non-discrimination* – measures must be applied without discrimination between countries of the same phytosanitary status. For a particular quarantine pest³, phytosanitary measures can be no more stringent when applied to imported goods than when applied to the same pest within the contracting party's own territory

1.6 IPPC Partners

To effectively implement the Convention, set international standards and implement international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs), IPPC works with many partners. Within the Convention itself, NPPOs, RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat are explicitly identified as key partners in implementation of the IPPC. Other provisions of the Convention may require institutions such as national ministries and agencies, international organizations, industry, academia and civil society to play crucial roles for effective protection of plant resources from pests in different countries and/or regions.

Inter-organizational cooperation in delivery and coordination of IPPC activities are central to success of the work of IPPC. Therefore IPPC maintains strong links with organizations that share common interests such as, inter alia, the World Trade Organization (WTO), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Ozone Secretariat (OS), the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC), Codex Alimentarius (CA), Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP), International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), International Seed Federation (ISF), International Seed Testing Association (ISTA), Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) and World Organization for Animal Health (OIE).

1.7 Obligations of contracting parties to the IPPC

By becoming a contracting party to the IPPC, a country commits to obligations relating to necessity for international cooperation in controlling pests of plants and plant products and preventing their international spread especially into endangered areas⁴; technical justification, transparency non-discrimination in the application of phytosanitary measures and unnecessary restrictions in international trade; coordination of measures; framework for development and application of harmonized phytosanitary measures as the internationally approved principles of plant, human and animal health protection in accordance with the WTO-SPS Agreement as well as protection of the environment.

³A pest of potential economic importance to the area endangered thereby and not yet present there, or present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; IPPC 1997]

⁴An area where ecological factors favour the establishment of a pest whose presence in the area will result in economically important loss see Glossary Supplement 2) [FAO, 1995];

These obligations relate to work of NPPOs, IPPC Secretariat and RPPOs. Key elements of the obligations concern information on the requirements for movement of plants and plant products across national borders particularly safe trade or movement of plants, plant products, conveyances or beneficial organisms with the objectives of ensuring food security, protecting agricultural ecosystems and environment and market access. The aims of the obligations are to ensure that same rules apply to all contracting parties and that there is consistency, timeliness, accuracy and completeness of information on phytosanitary measures applied by countries.

Since contracting parties to IPPC are not expected to be selective on which obligations to meet, the obligation on information exchange is closely linked to WTO system for notification of SPS measures particularly in regard to consistency in reporting. This puts specific requirements on contracting parties to publicly provide a description of their National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) including its structure and to have Official IPPC Contact Point which must be a single point preferably in the Ministry of Agriculture.

Contracting parties are expected to provide information on points of entry i.e. which ports are able to process imports of plants and plant products and their phytosanitary restrictions i.e. requirements and prohibitions in legislation and regulations should be notified. Any modifications/updates to such restrictions that may be made from time to time should also be notified.

In addition, contracting parties have obligations to make official pest reports in accordance with ISPM 17:2002 (Pest reporting), noting that a single report should be made per pest. Reports should also be made on lists of regulated pests⁵ (**not a list of pests occurring in the country**), emergency actions⁶ and emergency measures⁷ against specified pests.

Optional reporting may also be made on non-compliance (ISPM 13:2001 (Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action) relative to certification requirements presented in ISPM 12:2011 (Phytosanitary certificates- originally adopted in 2001, revised in 2011). It should be recognized by all contracting parties that non-compliance in the context of ISPM 13:2001 (Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action) does

⁵A quarantine pest or a regulated non-quarantine pest [IPPC, 1997] (see definitions in ISPM 5)

⁶A prompt phytosanitary action undertaken in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation [ICPM, 2001]

⁷A phytosanitary measure established as a matter of urgency in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation. An emergency measure may or may not be a provisional measure [ICPM, 2001; revised ICPM, 2005]

NOT mean non-compliance with the IPPC in general.

Reporting may also be made on functional arrangements of NPPOs, pest status⁸ (ISPM 08:1998 (Determination of pest status in an area) in relation to pest reporting and/or reporting of survey results, rationale for phytosanitary requirements [ISPM 2:2007 (Framework for pest risk analysis- originally adopted in 1995, revised in 2007); ISPM 11:2013 (Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests) - originally adopted in 2001, revised in 2004 and 2013) and ISPM 21:2004 (Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests] relating to pest risk analyses⁹ (PRAs) and/or any other thing a contracting party would like to report that a trading partners could find useful

⁸ Presence or absence, at the present time, of a pest in an area, including where appropriate its distribution, as officially determined using expert judgement on the basis of current and historical pest records and other information [CEPM, 1997; revised ICPM, 1998]

⁹ The process of evaluating biological or other scientific and economic evidence to determine whether an organism is a pest, whether it should be regulated, and the strength of any phytosanitary measures to be taken against it [FAO, 1995; revised IPPC, 1997; ISPM No. 2, 2007]

2. IPPC STANDARDS

2.1 Overview of IPPC Standards

Although the IPPC has been in force since 1952, its recognition as an international agreement changed markedly in the 1990s when it was named in the WTO-SPS Agreement as the international standard-setting body for plant health. At the same time, NPPOs began formulating International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) to allow countries to analyse pest risks to their plant resources and to use science-based measures to safeguard the health of cultivated and wild plants. The development of phytosanitary standards accelerated further with the formation of the CPM in 1997. Currently there are 36 ISPMs (Annex 1) that are designed to harmonize practices applied in international trade and to protect biodiversity by preventing movement of pests to new areas, particularly where prevailing ecological conditions favour their potential to establish and cause economic damage to plants. The binding status of ISPMs to contracting is assured because the WTO-SPS Agreement stipulates that members of the WTO shall base their phytosanitary measures on international standards set out by the IPPC.

2.2 Framework for setting IPPC Standards

The Standards Committee (SC) established under the IPPC steers the development of ISPMs. The work of the SC is guided by the decisions of the CPM which, among other things, revises the IPPC standard setting process at least every 5 years to improve efficiency and transparency, while maintaining quality and maximum participation of IPPC members. Opportunities for participation of contracting parties and other IPPC partners occur at all of the following 4 stages of standard setting:

1. Submission of a proposal on a topic for a standard by IPPC members (NPPOs, RPPOs or other international organizations). Any of the IPPC members can propose a topic to be considered for development into a standard
2. Drafting a draft standard. A specification for a draft standard can be developed that take into account what a contracting party or contracting parties consider technically relevant in justifying the need for a standard in a topic of interest to them. At this stage, NPPOs and RPPOs have an opportunity to review and submit comments on specifications for proposed ISPMs

3. During member consultation on draft ISPMs, IPPC members have an opportunity to review and submit comments to be considered in further revision of a standard
4. The CPM stage when a draft standard is presented for adoption is preceded by the Substantial Concerns Comment Period (SCCP) and period when formal objection to adoption of a standard can be submitted. IPPC members therefore have further opportunity to review and submit comments on substantial concerns during (SCCP) and lodge formal objections to adopting a standard. Knowledge of the criteria and procedures for submitting formal objection by NPPOs is fundamental to success of such an objection.

2.3. Outline of IPPC Standard Setting work programme

The IPPC standard setting procedures are not static and have experienced significant improvements over the period from 2002 to 2012. The procedures and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the List of Topics for IPPC standards were adopted in 2002 and revised in 2008 and 2012. The ICPM-2 (1999) originally adopted an Annex I to the Rules of Procedure for the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM). Upon adoption of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission at the CPM-1 (2006), a revision of the procedures was initiated and the revised standard setting procedures adopted as Annex I of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission by the CPM-3 (2008). Another revision of the procedures was initiated at the CPM-6 (2011). A Focus Group reviewed the standard setting procedure and other procedures relating to standard setting work. Following the consideration of the Focus Group, CPM-7 (2012) adopted the revised standard setting procedures. Currently, the process consists of 4 stages and 8 steps outlined below.

The following are the 4 stages of the process for developing ISPMs:

- i. Stage 1: Developing the IPPC standard setting work programme
- ii. Stage 2: Drafting
- iii. Stage 3: Member consultation on draft ISPMs
- iv. Adoption and publication

Within each of the stages there are two steps outlined below:

- | | |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Stage 1: | Developing the List of topics for IPPC standards |
| | Step 1: Call for topics |
| | Step 2: Adjustment and adoption of the List of topics for IPPC standards |
| Stage 2: | Drafting |
| | Step 3: Development of a specification |

- Step 4: Preparation of a draft ISPM
- Stage 3: Member consultation for draft ISPMs
- Step 5: Member consultation on draft ISPMs
- Step 6: Review of the draft ISPM prior to the CPM meeting
- Stage 4: Adoption and publication
- Step 7: Adoption
- Step 8: Publication

The procedures and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the List of Topics for IPPC standards were adopted in 2002 and revised in 2008 and 2012. The ICPM-4 (2002) adopted the procedures for identifying topics and priorities for standards. Revised procedures were adopted by the CPM-3 (2008). Modified procedures and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme were adopted, following consideration of outcomes of a Focus Group (CPM-3 (2008), Paragraph 89.3 and Appendix 8). Revised standard setting procedures were adopted by the CPM-7 (2012) as Annex I of the Rules of procedures of the Commission.

CHAPTER 3

3. IPPC STANDARD SETTING PROCESS

3.1 Stage 1: Developing the List of topics for IPPC standards

3.1.1 Step 1: Call for topics

The IPPC Secretariat makes a call for topics every two years. The calls include “technical area”, “topic” and “subject”. Members of the IPPC (contracting parties, NPPOs, RPPOs and relevant international organizations) and Technical Panels (TPs) submit detailed proposals for new topics or for the revision of existing ISPMs to the IPPC Secretariat.

Submission of each topic should be accompanied with a draft specification for the proposed standard, literature review and justification that the proposed topic meets the CPM-approved criteria for topics to be considered for development into a standard. To indicate a broader need for the proposed topic, the IPPC members submitting a topic are encouraged to gain support their proposed standard from other IPPC members and/or regions.

The IPPC Secretariat compiles a list of the proposed topics from the submissions received. Submissions from previous years are not included the new list compiled by the IPPC Secretariat. However, IPPC members may re-submit these for reconsideration.

3.1.2 Step 2: Adjustment and adoption of the List of topics for IPPC standards

The Standards Committee (SC), taking into account the IPPC Strategic Framework and the Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics, reviews the existing List of Topics and the newly compiled list of proposed topics and recommends a revised List of Topics for IPPC standards (including subjects), adding topics from the compiled list, deleting or modifying topics in the existing list as appropriate and gives each topic a priority rating and recommends the list to the CPM.

The CPM reviews the List of Topics recommended by the SC, adjusts, adopts it and assigns a priority for each topic. A revised List of Topics is made available and posted on the IPP

Note: when a situation arises in which an ISPM is required urgently, the CPM may insert such a topic into the List of Topics for IPPC standards.

3.2 Stage 2: Drafting

3.2.1 Step 3: Development of a specification

The SC assigns a lead steward and one or two assistants for each topic. The assistants could be from outside the SC, such as potential SC replacement members, former SC members, TP members or expert working group members. The steward drafts specification and submits the draft to the SC.

The SC reviews the draft specification and approves it for member consultation. Once approved for member consultation, the draft specification, the IPPC Secretariat makes the draft publicly available by posting it on the IPP and notifying IPPC members. The length of member consultation for draft specifications is 60 days. During this period IPPC members need to subject the draft specification to expert technical review in order to generate comments.

The comments are submitted to the IPPC Secretariat by the IPPC contact points using the Online Comment System (OCS) located at: ocs.ippc.int/index.html.

Note: Currently the OCS is the only method for submitting comments on draft specifications and draft ISPMs to IPPC Secretariat (See Chapter 4) for additional information on the OCS.

The IPPC Secretariat compiles the comments received, makes them publicly available and submits them to the steward(s) and the SC for consideration.

The specification is then revised and approved by the SC and made publicly available on the IPP.

3.2.2 Step 4: Preparation of a draft ISPM

An expert drafting group (EWG or TP) drafts a new ISPM or revises the existing ISPM in accordance with the relevant specification and recommends the resulting draft ISPM to the SC. The SC or SC-7 reviews the draft ISPM at a meeting or electronically and decides whether to

- i. approve it for member consultation
- ii. return it to the steward(s) or an EDG or
- iii. put it on hold.

When the SC-7 meets, comments from any SC members are taken into account.

3.3 Stage 3: Member consultation on draft ISPMs

3.3.1 Step 5: Member consultations

Once the SC approves the draft ISPM for member consultation, the IPPC Secretariat makes it publicly available and notifies IPPC members. The length of member consultation for a draft ISPM is 150 days. During this period IPPC members are expected to review the draft standards and make comments. The comments are submitted to the IPPC Secretariat by the IPPC contact point using the OCS.

The Secretariat compiles the comments received from members, makes them publicly available and submits them to the steward for consideration. The steward reviews the comments, prepares responses to the comments, revises the draft ISPM and submits it, together with the comments and his/her responses to IPPC Secretariat.

Note: The revised draft ISPM, the comments from IPPC members and the responses made to each comment by the steward are made available to the SC.

3.3.2 Step 6: Review of draft ISPMs prior to the CPM

Taking the comments from the Steward (3.3.1 above) into account, the SC-7 or TP (for DPs or PTs) revises the draft ISPM and recommends the draft ISPM to the SC. Once the SC-7 or TP recommends the draft ISPM to the SC, the IPPC Secretariat makes it available to IPPC members for the substantial concerns commenting period (SCCP) and notifies IPPC members.

The length of the SCCP for draft ISPMs is 120 days. During this period IPPC members should focus their review on substantial concerns. The comments generated by IPPC members during the SCCP are submitted to the IPPC Secretariat by the IPPC contact point using the OCS.

Members of the SC review the comments submitted from their regions and identify those deemed to be most important to the Steward and the accompanying suggestions on how to address them. The Steward reviews the comments, prepares responses to each comment, revises the draft ISPM and submits it, together with the comments and his responses, to the IPPC Secretariat. The comments and the responses by the Steward are made available to the SC and the draft ISPM is made available to IPPC members.

The SC reviews the comments, the steward's responses to the comments and the revised draft ISPM and provides a summary of the major issues discussed by the SC on the draft ISPM. The summaries for each draft ISPM are recorded in the report of the meeting of the SC. The SC decides whether to

- i. recommend the draft ISPM to the CPM
- ii. put it on hold, return it to the steward(s) or an EDG
- iii. submit it for another round of member consultation.

The IPPC Secretariat makes the draft ISPM available in the languages of FAO as soon as possible and at least six weeks prior to the opening of the CPM meeting.

3.4 Stage 4: Adoption and publication

3.4.1 Step 7: Adoption

Following approval by the SC, the draft ISPM is included in the agenda of the CPM meeting for adoption. All draft ISPMs presented to the CPM are subject to formal objection by IPPC members. A formal objection should be a technically supported objection to the adoption of a draft standard in its current form. Any IPPC member raising a formal objection to a draft standard must send it to the IPPC Secretariat through the IPPC contact point. An objection with some technical discussion of the issue would be accepted as a formal objection. An IPPC member that has a formal objection must submit the objection along with the technical justification and suggestions for improvement of the draft ISPM to the IPPC Secretariat at least 14 days prior to the CPM meeting.

Note: The IPPC Secretariat does not make any judgment about the validity of the objection.

The draft ISPM thus objected is returned to the SC. In exceptional circumstances, not including DPs and PTs, the CPM Chair, in consultation with the SC Chair and the IPPC Secretariat, may have an opportunity to propose a discussion of a formal objection at the CPM meeting with the aim that the formal objection can be lifted and the ISPM be adopted.

If no formal objection is received, the CPM should adopt the ISPM without discussion. If the draft ISPM had been previously included on the agenda of the CPM and was subjected to a formal objection, the SC may decide to forward the draft ISPM to the CPM for a vote with no option for a formal objection.

For DPs, the CPM has delegated the authority for adoption to the SC on behalf of the CPM. Once the SC approves the DP, the IPPC Secretariat makes it publicly available and notifies IPPC members. For translation of DPs, members follow the mechanism for requesting the translation for DPs into FAO languages posted on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110995>). The notification period for approved DPs is twice a year on defined dates. IPPC members have 45 days to review the approved DP and submit a formal objection, if any.

If no formal objection is received, the SC, on behalf of the CPM, adopts the DP. Diagnostic Protocols adopted through this process are noted by the CPM at its meeting and attached to the report of the meeting.

When a technical revision is required for an adopted DP, the SC can adopt the updates to adopted DPs via electronic means. The revised DPs are made publicly available as soon as the SC adopts them. Diagnostic Protocols revised through this process are noted by the CPM and attached to the report of the CPM meeting.

3.4.2 Step 8: Publication

The adopted ISPM is made publicly available and noted in the report of the CPM meeting. IPPC members may form a Language Review Group (LRG) and, following the CPM-agreed LRG process (see: <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110770>), may propose modifications to translations of adopted ISPMs to be noted at the following CPM meeting.

4. THE IPPC ONLINE COMMENT SYSTEM

4.1. Description of the IPPC Online Comment System

Although part of the standard setting process, the Online Comment System (OCS) of the IPPC standards is currently so important for effective contribution of IPPC members to standard setting that this handbook presents it in a dedicated, though short chapter. The OCS provides a web based approach that is easily accessed at <http://ocs.ippc.int/index.html>. The system that has been in use since 2012 enables contracting parties to analyse, share and submit comments on draft ISPM and specifications. It also allows the IPPC Secretariat to compile comments in an easy and efficient manner.

The OCS has 4 modules viz.

- i. IPPC Secretariat
- ii. Stakeholders (IPPC Members)
- iii. Steward / Lead
- iv. Standards Committee / Technical Panels.

The first module of the OCS is the IPPC Secretariat. It allows the Secretariat to manage the standard setting process effectively by serving as a platform for uploading documents. Comment period can be opened and closed easily and comments easily compiled especially by stewards. The platform can run reports on statistics among other tasks.

Stakeholder module comprises of IPPC Contact Points.

4.2 Roles and responsibilities under the OCS

- i. The Contact Point can draft, verify and submit official comments on documents, designate a Lead, invite Assistants and Reviewers, receive their comments, share comments in-country and with other Contact Points. It is only the Contact Points that can submit the official comments to the IPPC Secretariat
- ii. Leads have similar roles to Contact points (see (i) above) but CANNOT submit official comments to the IPPC Secretariat.
- iii. Assistants (one per document) can draft and verify comments on documents, submit them to Contact Points or Leads, invite Reviewers and compile in-country comments.

- iv. Reviewers can draft comments, submit them to Contact Points, Leads or Assistants and see in-country comments.

Within the IPPC Secretariat module, a Steward assigned (one per document) is created and invited by the Secretariat. A steward can:

- i. Invite Standards Committee / Technical Panel members or Assistant Stewards
- ii. Provide responses to comments
- iii. Share responses with Standards Committee / Technical Panel members or Assistant Steward
- iv. Submit responses to IPPC Secretariat.

The Standards committee reviews comments flagged by the Steward before final revision and submission.

4.3. Requirements for using the OCS

Requirements for using the OCS include

- i. Access to internet using a computer with Adobe FLASH 10.1 or newer; Internet Explorer 6.0 or newer; Mozilla Firefox; Safari or Google Chrome.
- ii. Obtaining user name and password to enable IPPC members to access the OCS.
- iii. Designating an Official IPPC Contact Point by IPPC members to specifically lead the standard setting work as he/she is the only person authorized by the OCS to submit comments.
- iv. Clarification of hierarchical roles and responsibilities with varying levels of authorization to upload and/or relay documents as described in 5.1 for the Leads, the Assistants and Reviews, with clarity on the extent to which specified functions can be delegated
- v. Training of the IPPC contact points, lead, assistants and reviewers on the usage of OCS by the IPPC Secretariat

With these requirements IPPC Contact Points are able to accept and modify member country comments, including those from Regional Workshops, as appropriate to their respective countries and submit these to the IPPC Secretariat.

5. GUIDELINES FOR EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION IN IPPC STANDARD SETTING PROCESS

5.1. Overview of participation in standard setting

Effective participation by IPPC members (contracting parties, NPPOs, RPPOs and other international organizations) requires both organizational and functional arrangements for requisite resources and planning. Quality participation in IPPC standard setting and contribution in meetings of the IPPC particularly the CPM and regional workshops presents scenario that inform issues addressed hereafter. As much as possible, the issues are presented against activities envisaged under the 4 stages of IPPC standing setting process and mirrored against possible actions that contracting parties may take as well as capacity requirements needed to effectively participate meaningfully in standard setting process and meetings of the CPM. Foremost is the requirement for clear understanding of the status of any country participating as an IPPC contracting party or not, relative to what their delegates can/cannot do at the meetings or workshops.

Only countries that are contracting parties to the IPPC can contribute effectively in the standard setting work because they have opportunities to participate through contributions using the system currently in place (the OCS) that gives exclusive rights to the IPPC Contact Points to submit comments on draft standards (See Chapter 4). Participation in standard setting process may require technical involvement of NPPOs in any or all of the following:

- i. Development and submission of topics for new standards and submission of these using the procedures outlined in Chapter of this Handbook
- ii. Providing comments on draft specification at stage 1 of standard setting process using only the systems and procedures recommended by the IPPC Secretariat for this purpose and within the set timeframes
- iii. Nominating qualified experts to serve in EWGs and EDGs at stage 2 whenever there is a call for experts to serve in the EWGs,TPs, and other technical areas that may be issued by the IPPC Secretariat from time to time
- iv. Reviewing draft ISPMs with the aim to identify technical and substantive issues that should be addressed by the standards, including feasibility of implementation, generating comments during member consultation period and submitting country comments using the OCS, taking care to ensure that the set timelines are observed.

- v. Further review of draft ISPMs during the SCCP and generating and submitting comments on substantial concerns about draft standards at stage 3 of standard setting process using the OCS.
- vi. Ensuring that country delegates to meetings of the CPM at which adoption of ISPMs takes place are aware of adoption of the current adoption requirements and are able to make useful contributions should any issue relating to adoption, including formal objection, be open for discussion during the CPM.
- vii. Overall, it takes interest, expertise, and good preparation to participate effectively in standard setting activities and meetings of the CPM. Such preparation should also provide for feedback to national stakeholders after on development in standard setting work and CPM meetings.

All the above areas require provision of resources (human, ICT infrastructure and dedicated staff) and dedication of time by the NPPO managers to coordinate activities and establish frameworks that facilitate the work of IPPC contact points, including his/her engagement with national stakeholders in the review and provision of comments on draft standards. To accomplish these senior NPPO managers ought to:

- i. have staff responsibilities designed with clarity of purpose of work relating to roles in standard setting as provided under the OCS and
- ii. develop institutional operational plans designed in accordance to Article IV of the IPPC.

An arrangement that ensures adequate provisions are made for the performance of standard setting work and quality participation in CPM meetings must also provide for prior national consultations on draft ISPMs and agenda of CPM meetings.

5.2. Participation in developing topics for ISPMs

Knowledge within contracting parties of the requirements for initiating development of an ISPM or revising an existing ISPM i.e. knowledge that topics have to be submitted for consideration and prioritization as candidate ISPMs seemingly does not exist beyond the NPPO in most developing countries. Stakeholders and experts within most of these countries therefore may not appreciate that they can contribute to standards development in terms of topics or as members of EWGs and TPs.

Generally NPPOs in most developing countries of Africa do not actively engage in soliciting collaboration with other public or private sector organisations to

build partnerships for phytosanitary services work. They rarely seek support from other IPPC members in developing new topics or in discussing comments generated from the review of draft ISPMs. To enhance participation in standard setting, African contracting parties need to:

- i. develop capacity for technical contribution to standards development by engaging stakeholders within and out of NPPOs
- ii. design a framework for creating awareness of national experts about IPPC and its areas of work
- iii. design framework for developing stake-holder partnerships led by NPPOs in which relevant experts and interest groups can engage to contribute ideas and expertise needed for standard setting work
- iv. develop internal facilitative mechanisms, through their NPPOs, to interrogate the elements of work of technical panels, content of topics for draft standards, subjects to be addressed within the existing Technical Panels (TPs) viz. Technical Panel on Glossary (TPG), Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP), Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) and Technical Panel on Fruit Flies (TPFF).

5.2.1 Proposing development of new or revision of existing standards

The process developed by the IPPC to optimize the use of resources in standard setting work programme ensures that only sound topics are put forward for development into standards. To be able to enhance the chance of a proposed topic being rated as high priority, contracting parties should strive to have mechanisms that:

- i. Guarantee development of good standard specifications backed by sound literature review and well thought out justification(s) and submission within set time frames and using appropriate procedures
- ii. Provide for quality assurance on draft specifications for a proposed standard, literature review, and justification that the topic meets the CPM-approved criteria.
- iii. Provide/facilitate access of the IPPC contact points to basic ICT infrastructure and internet connectivity as essential requisites for effective participation in standard setting.
- iv. Solicit support from other members and/or regions for proposed standards to ensure that it is relevant beyond individual country levels and interests.

5.2.2 Developing good specifications when proposing a standard

To be able to contribute to standard setting at stage I, leadership of NPPOs and national stake-holders, particularly experts to be involved in developing a topic, need to have sound understanding of what is meant by the term “specification

for a standard.” A specification is essentially a document for building into an ISPM written in a way that gives concise direction to the Expert Drafting Groups (EDGs). A specification must describe the scope of the proposed ISPM and detail the tasks EDGs will need to undertake as well as expertise/skills needed to develop the proposed ISPM. The same requirements apply to the work expected of Technical Panels (TPs).

Contracting parties should develop work arrangement led by their NPPOs under which critical expert analysis of various existing and past specifications, in the latter case, those that led to successful advancement of a topic to an adopted ISPM, is used to train and build competency of experts to develop topics for new standards or propose revision of existing standards.

Specifications have criteria for justification and prioritization and support criteria. The former should include feasibility of implementation of the proposed ISPM at the global level such as ease of implementation, technical complexity, capacity of NPPOs to implement, relevance for more than one country/region and clear identification of the problems to be addressed through application of the standard. These can be supported by other considerations such as scientific, historical, technical information and experience. Support criteria include consideration in terms of practicality, economic, environmental and strategic considerations.

Contracting parties submitting a topic should give consideration to the following additional criteria:

- i. feasibility of developing the standard in a reasonable time frame – e.g. stage of development of the proposed standard (usage widely by NPPOs/RPPOs)
- ii. availability of the expertise needed to develop the proposed standard
- iii. estimated value of the plants/plant products/plan resources to be protected through implementation of the standard
- iv. 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
- v. estimated value of new trade opportunities provided by the approval of the proposed standard;
- vi. potential benefits in terms of pest control or quarantine activities;
- vii. potential to reduce the negative environmental consequences (if any) of application of certain phytosanitary measures such as fumigants
- viii. potential for management of non-indigenous species which are pests of plants (such as some invasive alien species)

- ix. contribution to the protection of the environment, through the protection of wild flora, and their habitats and ecosystems, and of agricultural biodiversity
- x. extent of support by contracting parties and other stakeholders
- xi. frequency of trade disruption
- xii. relevance and utility to developing countries
- xiii. coverage (application to a wide range of countries/pests/commodities);
- xiv. complementarity to 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)
- xv. foundation standards to address fundamental concepts (e.g. treatment efficacy, inspection methodology); expected standard longevity (e.g. future trade needs, suggested use of easily outdated technology or products)
- xvi. urgency of the need for the standard
- xvii. templates and the IPPC style guide (available from the IPPC Secretariat)

5.2.3. Following specification criteria

Specification criteria are important in guiding those proposing a topic for a standard to correctly define the scope and content of the proposed ISPM. The same criteria are used by SC to identify and issue a call for the right experts for drafting work. Specifications guide standards development and are useful in maintaining focus of work to ensure efficiency in the use of resources, including time, at all stages of standard development. The better the understanding of the criteria by country experts the more likely it is that they will submit sound topics and specifications for the standards they propose and correspondingly the higher the likelihood that the topic will advance to a draft ISPM.

It is essential that contracting parties proposing new standards strive to

- i. Have systems led by their NPPOs that ensure only high quality and technically sound topics that meet all criteria set for standards development work are submitted
- ii. Develop mechanisms that ensure expertise is sought beyond the confines of the capacity within their NPPOs, including private sector and professional organizations.

5.2.4. Considerations to ease review and prioritization of topics by SC

Contracting parties ought to be aware right from the onset of considering to propose a topic for development into an ISPM that

- i. The technical details presented in the submission of a topic, including the specification and justification should enable easy review of the topic and its

rating as high priority by the SC in the list of topics recommended to the CPM for addition in the standard setting work programme.

- ii. Experts engaged to develop the topics have good knowledge of the criteria used for justification and prioritization of proposed topics and the IPPC Strategic Framework

5.3. Selecting/identifying experts for nomination to draft standards

Contracting parties, through their NPPOs, should make functional arrangements for timely selection and submission of their experts whenever the IPPC Secretariat issues a call for experts on proposed standards. This requires that NPPOs

- i. establish a roster of experts
- ii. maintain a network of such experts
- iii. nominate the relevant experts to serve in the working groups of the IPPC.

It is essential that the details in the call are critically evaluated so that all conditions set therein are fulfilled. An analysis of the call should ensure right experts are identified for specific requirements since skills and experiences must match the specific expertise required for the work at hand. Contracting parties should set merit based criteria for a system to nominate their experts (including individuals outside NPPOs and in private sector) to serve IPPC in standard setting work. The names of potential candidates should be submitted by the NPPO to the IPPC Secretariat in compliance with requirements specified in each call. When a contracting party submits names of its experts it should strive to seek support from other NPPOs to support the nominee. Countries submitting nominations should do so through IPPC contact points to the IPPC Secretariat.

All nominations should include:

- i. curriculum vitae (CV) of the nominees)
- ii. contact details
- iii. summary of expertise and
- iv. a signed statement of commitment to undertake the work of drafting the proposed standard.

Good working knowledge of English language and availability to participate in meetings that may be organized outside of the usual working hours and access to specific pieces of equipment and programs needed that may be needed for the work including for virtual meetings are some of the general requirements to consider in selection of experts.

In selecting experts to be nominated, countries must take into consideration the following:

- i. Participation in developing an ISPM takes a lot of time of experts
- ii. Senior management of the expert's institution have a good understanding of the level of commitment and involvement required
- iii. A statement of commitment is required as evidence of guarantee that the expert will be authorized to be fully available for the intended work.

5.3.1 Setting criteria and procedures for activity tracking

Contracting parties should maintain regular contact with the SC member from their regions as their representative in the standard setting activities as a way of ensuring that they

- i. Keep abreast of the progress in development of new standards
- ii. Respond to call for nomination of experts to serve in EWGs and TPs
- iii. Know position of their countries and region(s) on ISPMs and
- iv. Are adequately informed of other IPPC issues relating to standards development.

Contacting parties have opportunities to engage actively in standard setting process by nominating or supporting nomination of suitable experts from their regions to serve as members of SC. To make use of this opportunity, they should set clear criteria and procedures for identifying and selecting suitable experts for nomination to serve in EWG and TPs. This is an opportunity that many developing countries do not seem to use fully. To enhance their participation and improve the quality of contribution of their delegates at the CPM, the countries either directly or through the NPPO need to develop a system of communicating with the member of SC from their region(s) on the current standard setting activities besides making it a requirement that IPPC contact points also give updates to stakeholders on information posted on IPPC website about progress in developing new standards.

5.4 How to operate functional and effective member consultations

The period of member consultation on draft standards should be factored in the work plan of NPPO managers with the associated tasks is set as some of the criteria for evaluating performance of IPPC contact points. Member consultation period currently lasts 150 days running from July 1 to December 1 of each year. This gives contracting parties (and other IPPC members) ample time to review, comment and submit comments on draft ISPMs to the IPPC Secretariat.

To make use of this opportunity, contracting parties should ensure that mechanisms are put in place to facilitate

- i. online access by IPPC contact points to draft standards and associated background documents from the IPPC Secretariat
- ii. distributing documents about the standards to suitable experts for review
- iii. exhaustive review of the standards in a way that enables national stakeholders to make substantive and technical (not merely editorial) comments.

The mechanism should be facilitative of the process of compiling and submitting comments to the IPPC Secretariat by the Contact Point using the Online Comment System (OCS) on or before December 1 (See Chapter for more information on OCS).

Note: Only comments submitted by IPPC contact point are considered for incorporation or further revision of a standard.

5.4.1 How to generate comments on draft ISPMs

Expert review of draft ISPMs should enable contracting parties to generate technical and substantive comments. This requires collaborations and/or consultations with relevant experts within and out of the NPPOs, other institutions and even other countries as well as effective representation in IPPC Regional Workshops on draft ISPMs.

Contracting parties should review their systems with the aim to establish partnerships between NPPOs and other organizations that would contribute expertise needed to review draft standards and conduct in effective consultations needed to generate high quality comments. Contracting parties should also facilitate provision of the IPPC Contact points with technical resources to ease the process of accessing, generating and compiling/consolidating comments. Currently the IPPC Online Comment System (OCS) is the only method available for submitting comments on draft ISPMs to the IPPC Secretariat. Contracting countries should strive to build capacity for effective use of the system in the nearest time possible if they have to be able to participate fully in standard setting process especially during ember consultations.

The OCS allows only the IPPC Contact Point of each contracting party to collect stakeholder comments, compile these and submit them to IPPC Secretariat. The use of OCS provides for the nomination by the IPPC Contact Point for a Lead to whom the responsibility of collecting comments and/or assigning of responsibilities to persons for each specified draft standard to

serve as Assistants or Reviewers as appropriate (See Chapter 5). The system has the flexibility of enabling NPPOs to use expertise existing both within and outside of the organization in the area addressed by a specific draft ISPM to generate comments through invitation by the IPPC Contact Point, the Lead, and the Assistant to participate/contribute as Reviewers.

5.4.2 Regional Workshops on draft ISPMs

Regional Workshops on draft ISPMs have been conducted by the IPPC Secretariat in the past with the objective of building capacities within regions to effectively participate in standard setting with expected corresponding increase in the number of countries submitting substantive and technical comments on draft ISPMs. The workshops allow participant from countries within any region to learn the process of standard setting further by jointly discussing and preparing comments on draft ISPMs besides and discussing other IPPC issues. They are usually held every year between July and September in all the FAO regions except Europe and North America.

Effectiveness of the workshops in enhancing participation in standard setting depends on the:

- i. the choice of nominees selected by contracting parties/NPPOs and
- ii. the ability to take up follow up actions such as consultation with the relevant stakeholder using appropriate channels thereafter

In planning for participation in the workshops, each country should recognize the impracticality of any one individual or organization having technical competency to make effective contribution in different standards and therefore prepare their participants adequately by engaging other national experts from within or outside the NPPO to review the draft standards, make technical and substantive comments and discuss these with the nominated nominee preferable in an inter-institutional seminar. The participant should make written consolidated comments as draft country comments for each of the draft ISPMs for presentation at the workshops and have adequate understanding to enable him/her to convincingly articulate the technical and/or scientific basis of each comment.

Ideally the IPPC contact points or their representatives (the Leads in the context of OCS, see Chapter 4) with responsibilities over standard setting should be the choices selected by countries to participate in the regional workshops. The following should be undertaken by participants in the regional workshops upon returning to their respective countries:

- i. Contacting the official IPPC Contact Point (if not the contact point) to let him/her know that the comments are available for review using the Online Comment System
- ii. Collaborating with institutional/national/regional experts to develop and finalize comments initiated during the workshops
- iii. Ensuring that the IPPC Contact Point submits the country comments to the IPPC Secretariat before the end of the member consultation period.

In the run up to the workshops, particularly where the participant nominated by a country is not the IPPC contact point, he/she should ensure that the participant has the username and password for the OCS and has working knowledge of the OCS.

All countries should

- i. Make it mandatory for all participants in the regional workshops to have authorisation for accessing the OCS (username and password) as well as preliminary country comments on draft ISPMs during the workshop
- ii. Strive to ensure that all nominees are sufficiently qualified and have read and understood the draft standards to be discussed at the workshops.

At the stage of submission of comments to IPPC Secretariat, it is essential that IPPC contact points make an input even where a country has no comments to submit on any standard, in which case a comment such as “We have no comment” would be sufficient.

In all countries, NPPOs are the lead organizations in the process of setting IPPC standards. The decision on which comments to submit on draft ISPMs rests with NPPOs which should therefore be officially tasked with the following as performance criteria:

- i. Facilitation of appropriate review of draft standards and generation of comments
- ii. Leading the collection and collation of comments by other stakeholders
- iii. Deciding which comments to submit to the IPPC Secretariat.

Countries should recognize that whereas some stakeholders may have their own views on a topic/or draft standard based on their situation and mandate, it is the NPPO that is expected to have a view and wide expertise on global phytosanitary situation. Systems should therefore be set where NPPOs take all viewpoints into consideration when making decisions on the final comments to submit. For accountability purposes, it may be necessary the NPPO gives a

feedback to all stakeholders on the comments it has submitted and a convincing technical justification on why, if any, it has left out some of the comments.

5.4.3. The next steps after IPPC Secretariat receives comments on draft standard

The IPPC Secretariat compiles comments received from contracting parties and other organizations, makes them publicly available and submits them to the Steward of each draft standard for consideration. Contracting parties should ensure that they submit their comments before the deadline set for member consultation. By having comments ready for submission by the IPPC Contact Point to the IPPC Secretariat in advance of the set deadlines, contracting parties have the guarantee that any difficulties that may arise in the process are addressed by IPPC Secretariat in good time.

The Steward of each standard reviews the comments, prepares responses, revises the draft ISPM and submits the draft to IPPC Secretariat. Responses of the Steward are reviewed by the SC/TP and if necessary the standard is revised by the SC-7/TP. At this stage countries can keep informed of all developments relating to standards by engaging with their SC member(s) and checking postings on the IPPC website.

5.4.4 Substantial concerns commenting period (SCCP)

The Substantial concerns Comment Period (SCCP) last 120 days from June 1 to September 30 each year. During this period IPPC members can review draft further and pick out any technical and substantive issues that would be of major concern should the standard be adopted. The SCCP is the final opportunity for any IPPC member to contribute to development of an ISPM before CPM meeting. Contracting parties should strive to dedicate as much expert analysis and review as possible to scrutinize a draft ISPM or a revision to an ISPM at this stage, taking cognizance of the fact that whatever objection they do not raise during the period will not be allowable for discussion at the CPM meeting. Any such concerns can be used to raise a formal objection (See 5.5) to adoption of the standard by the CPM.

Comments to be submitted during this period should be only those that focus on substantial concerns. The comments are submitted by the IPPC Contact Point using the OCS. At the end of the period, members of the SC review comments from their respective regions, identify the most important comments and give suggestions on how to address these before forwarding to the Steward of the draft ISPM. The Steward reviews the comments made

by contracting parties during the SCCP and prepares responses, revises the draft ISPM and submits both the responses to comments and the revised draft ISPM to IPPC Secretariat. Responses to contracting parties' substantial concern comments are also made available to the SC.

The comments and the responses of the Steward are reviewed and the draft ISPM revised further, if necessary. The SC then decides either to recommend the draft ISPM to the CPM for adoption or put it on hold or return it to the steward or EWG or submit it for another round of MC. If there is no major controversial issue, the draft ISPM is recommended for adoption and presented to the CPM

5.5. Adoption and publication of a standard

Following approval of a draft ISPM by the SC, the draft is put in the agenda for the next session of the CPM. The draft ISPM is posted on the IPP at least 6 weeks before CPM. At this stage a contracting party country can participate and change the course of developing a standard by submitting a formal objection as the only option for preventing adoption of a draft standard by CPM. A contracting party wishing to raise formal objection must send the objection through the official IPPC contact point. Contracting parties should therefore understand both the process and the substance that qualifies as a formal objection. The formal objection process consists of a contracting party submitting the objection to the IPPC Secretariat with technical justification and suggestions for improvement no later than 14 days before CPM.

All draft ISPMs presented to the CPM are subject to formal objections. A formal objection should be a technically supported objection to the adoption of the draft standard in its current form. The objection is sent to the IPPC Secretariat through the IPPC contact point. An objection with some technical discussion of the issue would be accepted as a formal objection.

Any contracting party that has a formal objection must submit the objection along with the technical justification and suggestions for improvement of the draft ISPM to the IPPC Secretariat at least 14 days prior to the CPM meeting. If no formal objection is received, the CPM adopts the ISPM without discussion but if a draft ISPM is objected through FO, it is returned to the SC. However, in exceptional circumstances, not including DPs and PTs, the CPM Chairperson may, in consultation with the SC Chair and the IPPC Secretariat, propose a discussion of the formal objection at the CPM meeting with the aim that the formal objection is lifted and the ISPM be adopted.

For a draft ISPM that had been previously included on the agenda of the CPM and subjected to a formal objection, the SC may decide to forward the draft ISPM to the CPM for a vote with no option for a formal objection.

6. GUIDELINES ON ELEMENTS OF GOOD PRACTICE IN CONTRIBUTING TO IPPC STANDARD SETTING

6.1 Other IPPC activities

Effective participation by contracting parties in the IPPC standard setting work is closely tied to participation through appropriate delegates in other activities that IPPC Secretariat run regularly in various developing countries as well as meetings of the CPM. These activities enable contracting parties, through their delegates, to have good understanding of the general scope of IPPC work in other areas such as capacity development and information exchange thereby empowering NPPOs with competency to design good practices in phytosanitary work. These notwithstanding, good understanding the following areas is essential for ensuring good practice in implementation of the IPPC and its work including standard setting:

- i. contracting party obligations under the convention
- ii. the roles and responsibilities of the NPPO and RPPOs
- iii. intended purposes of phytosanitary measures
- iv. the requisite provisions for functional national phytosanitary systems e.g. the need to dedicate/assign staff & other resources for regular activities relating to IPPC work

National Plant Protection Organizations should design function based strategic plans that enable review of resource requirements needed for use of the OCS and liaison with the IPPC Secretariat in some of its requirements such as username & password and then identify suitable persons with levels of responsibilities desired of the IPPC Contact Point / the Lead, the Assistants and the Reviewer(s) as necessary. This may require adoption of organizational structures at national and/or regional levels adapted to assigning responsibilities and providing certain basic resources for communication between NPPOs and other national organizations and NPPOs of other countries in a to exchange information necessary for enhancing participation in standard setting process at national and regional levels.

6.2 How to enhance participation in IPPC Standard setting process

Countries have many opportunities to participate in the Standard Setting Process of the IPPC. The first of these is to become a contracting party to the Convention.

IPPC contracting parties can improve their participation in IPPC standard setting process by

- i. Setting regularly monitoring mechanism for calls posted issued by IPPC Secretariat and responding to these as appropriate. The calls may be for ISPM topics, experts to serve in EWG and/or TP and or other services for which the Secretariat may need experts. Responses to such calls. This should be set up as a specific job function within each NPPO.
- ii. Nominating experts to serve in EWGs or TPs. Contracting parties should ensure that their NPPOs establish rosters of national experts and that there are transparent and merit-based guidelines on criteria for nominating experts to be submitted to IPPC Secretariat when the need arises
- iii. Contracting parties should design NPPO-led system of stakeholder engagement partnership building for expert review of draft ISPMs and quality assurance system for processing comments during member consultation
- iv. Contracting parties should set up the requisite infrastructure and facilitate training on skills needed for operating the OCS by the IPPC Contact Point.
- v. Contracting parties should design preparatory system for technical consultations to develop common understanding and national position on items covered in the CPM agenda, with a feedback mechanism for delegates to inform national stakeholders on the developments at CPM meetings.

6.2.1 Arrangements for effective participation

Among the organizational arrangements for effective participation of contracting parties in the IPPC standard setting is the need to:

- i. design a functional stakeholder network e.g. roster of internal (within NPPO) and external experts in broad areas of plant protection
- ii. design partnership arrangement to enable engagement of national experts in standard setting work
- iii. establish a system for knowing IPPC standard setting activities and their timeframes (e.g. comment periods) by tracking postings on the IPP
- iv. plan for relevant participation in regional workshops on draft ISPMs (where applicable) – letting the CP, the Lead or Assistant with roles in OCS represent the NPPO and
- v. have a structured mechanism for making follow-up actions on activities undertaken at the regional workshops with the delegate of your country to ensure that generation of comments is advanced to consolidation and submission through the IPPC OCS within the set periods

Effective participation in setting IPPC standards is closely tied to consistent participation by a contracting party in other activities of the IPPC particularly

meetings of the CPM. This may require specific organizational arrangement at national and/or regional levels relating to assignments of responsibilities, provisions of certain basic resources and information exchange / communication with other non NPPO staff and with other NPPOs in a region. Some of the elements of these are outlined below:

- i. Dedication of human resources at the national level, preferably by the NPPO and within the regular work of the IPPC contact point, to regularly keep track of new postings on the IPP (an information resource to which frequent reference should be a must for NPPO managers). This enables NPPOs to keep abreast of development in the IPPC Standard Setting Work Programme. Being a web based resource; IPP has the advantage of enabling users prompt access to information and making timely enquiries on specific issues relating to standard setting work. However, contracting parties should recognize that this can only be done through the IPPC Official contact Point
- ii. Expertise needed to contribute effectively to standard setting work may often be found only outside the NPPO. NPPO managers need to take cognisance of this and establish a network of stakeholders and to the best of their ability, a forum for national engagement relevant experts whose contribution may be needed in the suggestion of topics for new standards, review of draft standards to generate substantive and technical comments
- iii. Set-up of infrastructure to enable IPPC Official Contact Point and/or the Lead, the Assistant and Reviewers use of the OCS and clarification of their respective roles and required resources to their managers/superiors. This should come with a corresponding training by the IPPC Secretariat on the OCS
- iv. Observance of timeframes set for submissions of comments – both during the member consultation and the substantial concerns. The responsibility over this should be provided as criteria for assessing work performance of the IPPC Official Contact Point and/or an appropriate staff with coordination of standard setting work as one of the responsibilities
- v. Participation in Regional Workshops on draft ISPMs by appropriate delegate(s) – the IPPC Contact Point/Lead, the Assistant and/or Reviewer with commitment to advance the work initiated at the workshop further into country comments for ultimate submission by the Contact Point. Eligibility of each country to participate in the workshops should be based on evidence of prior review and commenting on draft ISPMs or specifications. Each delegate, if not the IPPC Contact Point should have the authorisation from the Contact Point to Access the OCS and have the current username and password for their respective countries.

- vi. Further stakeholder review during the SCCP and submission of substantial concerns. The submitted comments during member consultation and substantial concerns should be discussed with the relevant stakeholders as may be appropriate. These must be presented and further clarified to the country delegate to the CPM
- vii. Information sharing on matters relating to the draft standards with other NPPOs in a region or even beyond to help secure a common position and plan interventions as appropriate during CPM meetings.

6.2.2. Co-ordination Mechanisms

Mechanisms of coordination of national and regional phytosanitary functions are essential for enhancing participation of African countries in IPPC activities and can be part of good practices that already exist in certain countries and/or regions of the world. These comprise of national and regional consultations on matters relating to standard setting and other IPPC activities prior to CPM meetings or regional workshops on draft ISPMs. Consultations on standards or agenda for CPM meetings at the institutional (NPPO), the national and regional levels need to be encouraged to ensure contribution of ideas from all relevant stakeholders (including private sector and interest groups). Only individuals and organizations directly related to the agenda topic should be involved in such consultations.

Where participation in any meeting is by delegation, the selected delegates should have full powers of representation and authority to make decisions. Where face to face meetings are not possible due to resource constraints, a well-structured mechanism such as teleconferences, Skype calls or video conferencing should be designed and agreed by all concerned stakeholders, with clarity of roles and responsibilities over actions assigned as in face to face meetings.

6.2.3 National Consultations

Issues covered in standard setting work and items in the agenda of meetings of the CPM require stakeholder consultation at policy as well as technical expert levels. At both levels it is essential that public and private sector stakeholders are involved. NPPOs should, of necessity, develop workable partnerships that enable the consultations to be participative and informed by developments in phytosanitary field in the global arena and implications in national interests. With such partnerships, advance distribution of documents relating to proposed standards, and the justifications presented by the proposers of the standards enable exhaustive exploration of implications of the standards in both technical

and economic terms and has the potential to provoke in-depth research into the issues and generations of substantive and technical comments.

An element of national consultations is the conducting of stakeholder meetings, preferably coordinated by the NPPO, in which the major interest groups and experts participate to analyse national needs and generate coherent national issues needed to define a national position on draft standards. Distribution of documents on draft standards and planning of stakeholder meetings should therefore be timed against the time frames set by the IPPC Secretariat for member consultation. Likewise, the planning should give clear channels for communicating comments and the person to receive the comments. Ideally, comments should be sent to the IPPC Contact point. It is in the interest of the contracting parties that consultations are conducted and/or tracked at the highest technical level with clear accountability on the progress with the head of the NPPO.

6.3 Regional Consultations

Contracting parties that are known to participate effectively in standard setting and other IPPC work and meetings are members of RPPOs that have mechanisms for coordinating consultations to consider the developments and progress in development of standards and matters to be addressed during CPM sessions. The RPPOs hold such consultations well in advance of the CPM meetings and submit written concerns / positions of their regions to IPPC Secretariat prior to CPM meetings. These RPPOs coordinate consultations that lead to regional positions on substantive and technical issues about items to be addressed by the standards and/or CPM. Through this process most national positions are re-enforced by support from other countries thereby strengthening the likelihood for successful influence on the CPM decision. This is a good practice that IAPSC should endeavour to adopt. The approach will help in avoiding the current scenario where attempts to get positions of African countries, including nominating experts to serve in various IPPC committees and EWGs, are consolidated during the week of the CPM.

6.4 Feedback mechanisms and action planning

In the case of regional consultations and international meetings (including attendance of meetings of SC and CPM), the other good practice is to ensure that national debriefing sessions are held immediately after. The debriefing session should include the public and private sector interest groups and other stakeholders who have previously participated in the same stream of consultation meetings at the national or institutional levels. The delegate(s)

to the meeting should be aware of the requirement to debrief stakeholders prior to accepting to participate in the regional consultations or CPM meetings and should give a thorough issue by issue presentation of the outcome of the meeting and should be able to explain the reasons why the meeting took the bearing that led to the specific outcome(s). The debriefing should result in a proposed action plan in which there is provision for sustaining communication on next steps and feedback to stakeholders by the head of the NPPO.

7. DO REGIONAL ECONOMIC COMMUNITIES HAVE A ROLE IN THE IN STANDARDS SETTING ACTIVITIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION (IPPC)?

7.1 Regional Economic Communities in Africa

The developments in global phytosanitary arena have run concurrently with the emergence of Regional Economic Communities (RECs). The RECs are essentially “economic and political” agreements. The RECs in Africa include, inter alia, Community of Sahel-Saharan States (CEN-SAD); East African Community (EAC); Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS); Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA); Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS); Intergovernmental Authority for Development (IGAD); Southern African Development Community (SADC); Union du Maghreb Arabe (UMA); West African Monetary Union (UEMOA).

The RECs do not have binding relationships within the IPPC through membership. The majority of members of these RECs do not have structured framework for effective participation in the activities of the convention and are poor at coordinating implementation of IPPC and ISPMs, two issues that may create policy and operational complications in the entire phytosanitary domain in Africa. This complication is already encountered in two areas viz.

- i. the tendency within the RECs to mix standardization, quality assurance, metrology and testing (SQMT) falling within the mandates of the Bureaux of Standards with phytosanitary issues falling within the mandates of NPPOs, and
- ii. the assumption that the framework for implementation of the SQMT measures addresses the gaps arising from inadequacy of national systems to implement justified phytosanitary measures based on objectively determined and science based risk assessments.

Chapter I of this handbook presents the global framework upon which implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs is based. In this framework, contracting parties, NPPOs and RPPOs are clearly named as the members of the Convention with roles and responsibilities clearly spelt out (see Articles IV and IX of the convention). What is expected of countries upon becoming contracting parties to the IPPC, presented in Article I of the convention, considers countries as sovereign entities that willingly enter the agreement by becoming contracting

parties. There is no provision in the IPPC for contracting parties to cede their obligations to the RECs or, in the converse, for RECs to take over contracting party obligations upon the latter becoming members of any of the RECs. This does not mean that RECs, as economic and trade agreements, do not have a role in the global phytosanitary arena. On the contrary it puts on the RECs the responsibility for coordination of member states and supporting the development of their phytosanitary capacities towards realization of improved phytosanitary compliance as a primary requirement for trade in plants and plant products.

Note that the IPPC also provides, in article XVIII, that contracting parties should encourage any non-contracting parties to apply phytosanitary measures consistent with the provisions of the convention and any of its standards. This forms the point at which RECs should come into action in their endeavour to promote trade among member states and between member states and other countries. The RECs of Africa should strive to engagement in phytosanitary issues by empowering member states to have coordinated approach to handling trade related issues arising from activities of the WTO committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (WTO-SPS Committee) and working with the IAPSC to ensure that member countries have correct understanding of their roles as contracting parties to the IPPC and make relevant preparations for participation in IPPC activities.

Their role of RECs in driving phytosanitary agenda for their member countries should be to support

- i. the coordination of efforts of member states to become contracting parties to the IPPC and
- ii. the development of capacity of member states to participate actively in activities of the Convention.

Considering that the RECs are largely designed to address inter alia creation of free trade areas, customs union, single markets, economic and monetary union, expecting member countries that have not set up functional policies, legislations and organizational infrastructure for phytosanitary coordination to gain comparative advantage in trade in plant and plant products necessitates that the RECs dedicate resources to support member countries in building basic phytosanitary capacities through liaisons with the international organizations and other agencies that work in technical cooperation programmes for phytosanitary capacity development.

7.2 What roles should RECs play?

For the development of national phytosanitary capacities of member countries the REC in Africa should strive to:

1. Provide for SPS desk with at least professional staff with phytosanitary expertise (at least one with expertise in phytosanitary issues and the rest in animal health and food safety) outside the domain of SQMT with regional mandates comprising, inter alia, of coordination of preparations of member countries for participation in IPPC activities, including
 - a. harmonized approach to standards implementation and identification of phytosanitary measures whose implementation by member states is not consistent with the IPPC
 - b. identification of priority technical phytosanitary issues that should be developed into new IPPC standards
 - c. improving implementation of IPPC and priority ISPMs for their regions
 - d. coordinate preparation of member countries for participation in IPPC and WTO-SPS activities
2. Encourage member countries to conduct systems evaluation based on the use of Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) tool to identify common gaps and support member countries in prioritizing their needs for improving capacity to protect national plant resources and adopt procedures and practices needed to enhance market access for plants and plant products
3. Support member countries in developing strategies for
 - a. increased liaison with the IPPC Secretariat for expert advise on how to build national phytosanitary capacity, including capacity to contribute to standard setting process and participate in standard setting, among other IPPC activities
 - b. seeking technical assistance to support the design and development of strategies needed for enhancing compliance with priority phytosanitary issues by the relevant national institutions (those already affecting plant biosecurity and access of products to international markets
 - c. Provide liaison between member countries and the IAPSC by ensuring that the work of the latter is rationalized with the provisions and work programme of the IPPC and
 - d. Support IAPSC in getting the collaboration and cooperation of member countries to enable it focus its activities in the delivery of its mandate, functions, roles and responsibilities within the framework provided in Article IX of the IPPC.
4. Develop a work programme in which support to phytosanitary services of member countries is embedded as coordination of preparation of member country delegates for participation in IPPC activities such as meetings of

the CPM, standards committee, Capacity Development Committee and the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement. In such an arrangement, the Secretariat of each REC should work with IAPSC to support each country in having clear designation of an NPPO with the roles and responsibilities matched with those in Article IV of the IPPC and develop Strategic Plans for delivery of Phytosanitary Services and NPPO management.

5. Harmonization of phytosanitary measures among member countries as part of efforts towards realization of elimination of hindrances to advancing political and economic interests by coming up with realistic plans for sustainable implementation of the internationally agreed SPS measures.

8. CHECKLIST FOR SPECIFIC COUNTRY REQUIREMENTS FOR EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION IN IPPC STANDARD SETTING PROCESS

A check-list of country requirements informed by the contemporary standard setting work of the IPPC can provide step by step guidance for the action of African contracting parties and IAPSC in participating in IPPC standard setting work programme. Such checklist should enable African countries (both contracting parties and non-contracting parties to the IPPC as well as the RECs in Africa to put in place systems that are aligned to expectations in the global phytosanitary domain and enhance their contribution to the IPPC work programme and benefit from the opportunities that arise for [participation in various activities of IPPC Secretariat and IPPC partners.

The issues itemized below help in assessing the ability of your country to participate in IPPC standard setting work programme:

1. Is your country a contracting party to the IPPC? If so then you have a right to participate in all activities of the IPPC including contribution in the meetings of the CPM and voting in its decisions, should this be necessary; serving as member or expert in various committees of the IPPC and submitting topics as proposed standards.
If not, you can only participate as in IPPC activities as an observer!
If you are not sure of the status of your country check the IPPC website or enquire from the IPPC Secretariat.
2. If your country is a contracting party to the IPPC, do you have a description of a designated National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) with roles and responsibilities similar to those outlined in section ...of this handbook? If so but not sure how to participate in the activities of the IPPC, consult the manager of your NPPO for advice.
If not, then your country has not honoured one of the key obligations under the IPPC. Efforts should be made, in need be, after consultation with the IPPC Secretariat and national laws to have a clear designation and description of the NPPO of your country.
3. Does your country have an officially designated IPPC contact point (person) within an institution e.g. NPPO?
If so then you are able to make contributions to the current IPPC standard setting process that uses the Online Comment System (OCS).
If not then you cannot make contribution to standard setting by submitting

your country proposed topics for standards or comments on draft standards and draft standards specifications.

4. Does the official IPPC have access to ICT infrastructure for internet access and using email as well as document processing?

If yes, you should be actively engaged in generation of comments on draft standards and submission of these to the IPPC Secretariat through the OCS. If, in spite of this, your country is not actively involved in standard setting work contact IPPC Secretariat for clarification on what you should do in order to be an active participant in standard setting work

If not then a critical resource for participation in standard setting is missing. The relevant government department or NPPO should procure and avail these to the Official IPPC contact point.

5. Does the IPPC Official contact point have a username and password for the OCS?

If so, is the contact point making use of these to facilitate participation of your country in standard setting work? Check with him/her.

If not, then the contact point should contact IPPC Secretariat to be assigned a username and password for OCS. With the username and password you are able to set up work arrangement for reviewing draft standards and submitting comments through the OCS

9. EPILOGUE

All countries should know what they can/cannot do under the IPPC, including the terms for participation and contribution in meetings of the Convention as contracting or non-contracting parties. The information to offer guidance on this can be obtained from the IPPC Procedure Manual and/or its Rules of Procedure of Subsidiary Bodies and Committees of IPPC. For contracting parties, understanding the obligations associated with membership to IPPC is necessary for guiding national policy and operational frameworks for phytosanitary work programmes under which plant health services are offered, particularly those aspects that deal with international movement of plants and plant products and other articles that may be regulated in certain countries because of pest risks.

Participation in IPPC standard setting process is premised on the understanding of the purpose of phytosanitary measures in the contemporary global scenario and the objectives of the IPPC. Good knowledge of the Convention is fundamental to making informed decisions on contributions that a contracting part can make at meetings of IPPC and standard setting work programme.

All contracting parties should strive to understand fully the standard setting process, particularly its resource requirements, and design national frameworks for effective participation in the process. Such framework should take cognizance of the fact that expertise needed for effective contribution in standard setting process could be abundant in countries, regardless of its development status, but most likely situated outside the operational and functional domain of NPPOs. It is imperative that phytosanitary capacity (individuals, institutions and organizations with expertise in various fields of plant protection and international trade policy and law) may need to be re-tooled to look at their expertise in the context of IPPC or WTO-SPS Agreement to be able to make contributions of the quality and applications relevant to phytosanitary work. NPPOs should strive towards accomplishing this through developing rosters of experts and establishing partnerships for maximizing the use of phytosanitary capacity existing in their countries.

All IPPC members have opportunities to participate in standard setting process of the IPPC but have to dedicate staff and other resources in understanding the standard setting processes and its requirements needed to facilitate

organizational / functional arrangements that enable correct engagement of appropriate individuals and organizations at national and regional levels.

Finally, countries need to ask “why they chose to become contracting parties to IPPC and what is in it for them” in order to appreciate the social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits of protecting plant resources, both cultivated and wild, from pests – particularly through phytosanitary measures.

10. BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. <https://www.ippc.int/sites/default/files/mediakit/IPPCOverviewBrochure2012-03-en.pdf>
2. https://www.ippc.int/sites/default/files/documents/20130606/1329129099_ippc_2011-12-01_reformatted_2013060615%3A12--103.03%20KB.pdf for IPPC
3. IICA. Handbook of Good Practices for Participation in Meetings of the International Plant Protection Convention
4. ISPM5:2007 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms). Rome. IPPC. FAO
5. <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ippc-online-comment-system>
6. IPPC. 1997. The International Plant Protection Convention. New Revised Text. Rome, FAO
7. WTO. 1994. The Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures. Geneva, World Trade Organization.
8. Food and Agriculture Organization, PCE Tool.

ANNEX I

List of ISPMs adopted as at July 2013

1. ISPM 1:2006 Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade (originally adopted in 1993, revised in 2006)
2. ISPM 2:2007 Framework for pest risk analysis (originally adopted in 1995, revised in 2007)
3. ISPM 3:2005 Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms (originally adopted in 1996, revised in 2005)
4. ISPM 4:1995 Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas
5. ISPM 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms (updated as needed) - Supplement 1 (2012) - Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests - Supplement 2 (2003) - Guidelines on the understanding of potential economic importance and related terms including reference to environmental considerations - Appendix 1 (2009) - Terminology of the Convention on Biological Diversity in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms
6. ISPM 6:1997 Guidelines for surveillance
7. ISPM 7:2011 Phytosanitary certification system (originally adopted in 1997, revised in 2011)
8. ISPM 8:1998 Determination of pest status in an area
9. ISPM 9: 1998 Guidelines for pest eradication programmes
10. ISPM 10: 1999 Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites
11. ISPM 11:2013 Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests (originally adopted in 2001, revised in 2004 and 2013)
12. ISPM 12:2011 Phytosanitary certificates (originally adopted in 2001, revised in 2011)
13. ISPM 13:2001 Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action
14. ISPM 14:2002 The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management
15. ISPM 15:2009 Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade (originally adopted in 2002, revised in 2009, Annex 1 and 2 revised in 2013)
16. ISPM 16:2002 Regulated non-quarantine pests: Concept and application
17. ISPM 17:2002 Pest reporting
18. ISPM 18:2003 Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure
19. ISPM 19:2003 Guidelines on lists of regulated pests

20. ISPM 20:2004 Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system
21. ISPM 21:2004 Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests
22. ISPM 22:2005 Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence
23. ISPM 23:2005 Guidelines for inspection
24. ISPM 24:2005 Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures
25. ISPM 25:2006 Consignments in transit
26. ISPM 26:2006 Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)
27. ISPM 27:2006 Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests
 - a. DP 1:2010. Diagnostic protocol for Thrips palmi Karny
 - b. DP 2:2012. Diagnostic protocol for Plum pox virus
 - c. DP 3:2012. Diagnostic protocol for Trogoderma granarium Everts
28. ISPM 28:2007 Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests
 - a. PT 1:2009. Irradiation treatment for Anastrepha ludens
 - b. PT 2:2009. Irradiation treatment for Anastrepha obliqua
 - c. PT 3:2009. Irradiation treatment for Anastrepha serpentina
 - d. PT 4:2009. Irradiation treatment for Bactrocera jarvisi
 - e. PT 5:2009. Irradiation treatment for Bactrocera tryoni
 - f. PT 6:2009. Irradiation treatment for Cydia pomonella
 - g. PT 7:2009. Irradiation treatment for fruit flies of the family Tephritidae (generic)
 - h. PT 8:2009. Irradiation treatment for Rhagoletis pomonella
 - i. PT 9:2010. Irradiation treatment for Conotrachelus nenuphar
 - j. PT 10:2010. Irradiation treatment for Grapholita molesta
 - k. PT 11:2010. Irradiation treatment for Grapholita molesta under hypoxia
 - l. PT 12:2011. Irradiation Treatment for Cylas formicarius elegantulus
 - m. PT 13:2011. Irradiation Treatment for Euscepes postfasciatus
 - n. PT 14:2011. Irradiation Treatment for Ceratitis capitata
29. ISPM 29:2007 Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence
30. ISPM 30:2008 Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (Tephritidae)
31. ISPM 31:2008 Methodologies for sampling of consignments
32. ISPM 32:2009 Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk
33. ISPM 33:2010 Pest free potato (*Solanum* spp.) micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade
34. ISPM 34:2010 Design and operation of post-entry quarantine stations for plants
35. ISPM 35:2012 Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)
36. ISPM 36:2012 Integrated measures for plants for planting



African Union – Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources
(AU-IBAR)

Kenindia Business Park
Museum Hill, Westlands Road
PO Box 30786
00100 Nairobi

Kenya

Tel: +254 (20) 3674 000

Fax: +254 (20) 3674 341 / 3674 342

Email: ibar.office@au-ibar.org

Website: www.au-ibar.org