



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Implementation and Capacity Development Meeting (Virtual Meeting N°9)

**Rome, Italy
16 December 2020**

IPPC Secretariat

Required citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2020. *Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (Virtual Meeting No 9), 16 December 2020*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2020



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original English edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

Third-party materials. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

Contents

1. Opening of the Meeting.....	4
2. Meeting Arrangements	4
2.1 Election of the Rapporteur	4
2.2 Adoption of the agenda	4
3. Administrative Matters	4
3.1 Documents list	4
3.1 Participants list.....	4
4. IC Sub-group: Sea Containers Task Force and Programme.....	4
4.1 Sea Containers Task Force update to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee.....	4
5. IC Team: National Reporting Obligations	7
5.1 Proposed terms of reference for the IC subgroup on NROs	7
6. IPPC Secretariat Work Plan 2021	9
6.1 2021 IFU work plan	9
7. IC Involvement in Explanatory Documents	11
7.1 Discussion on the IC's involvement with explanatory documents and the IC's future role	11
8. Any Other Business.....	13
8.1 Setting and changing priorities	13
8.2 IC leads	13
8.3 Invitation from the new IC Chairperson for one-to-one chats	14
9. Date and Arrangement of the Next Meeting	14
10. Evaluation of the Meeting Process	14
11. Close of the Meeting	14
Appendix 1	15
virtual meeting n° 09 agenda	15
Appendix 2.....	16
Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) Sub-group on NROs Proposed Terms of Reference	16

1. Opening of the Meeting

- [1] The IC Chairperson, Mr Dominique PELLETIER, welcomed all participants to the ninth virtual meeting of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC).
- [2] The Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU) lead, Mr Brent LARSON, briefed the IC on some recent and forthcoming changes to staffing in the IFU.

2. Meeting Arrangements

2.1 Election of the Rapporteur

- [3] Mr Nilesh Ami CHAND (Fiji) was elected as the Rapporteur to the meeting, with Mr Thorwald GEUZE (The Netherlands) as a back-up.

2.2 Adoption of the agenda

- [4] The IC agreed to consider three items under agenda item 8 (Any Other Business), regarding who can set or change priorities, selection of IC leads for priority 1 topics, and an invitation from the IC Chairperson to IC members for one-to-one chats. The agenda, as modified, was adopted and is attached to this report (Appendix 1).

3. Administrative Matters

3.1 Documents list

The List of documents was introduced as follows:

- Agenda (VM09_01_IC_2020_Dec)
- Sea Containers Task Force update to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (VM09_02_IC_2020_Dec)
- Proposed Terms of Reference for the IC Sub-group on NROs (VM09_03_IC_2020_Dec)
- 2021 IFU work plan (VM09_04_IC_2020_Dec)
- Discussion on the IC's involvement with explanatory documents (VM09_05_IC_2020_Dec)

3.1 Participants list

- [5] For IC virtual meetings, the participant list would no longer be annexed to the report but those IC members who could not attend the meeting will be listed. For the IC VM09 only Mr Lalith KUMARASINGHE (New Zealand) was absent.

4. IC Sub-group: Sea Containers Task Force and Programme

4.1 Sea Containers Task Force update to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee

The IC lead for this topic, Ms Stephanie BLOEM (The Regional Plant Protection Organizations representative (RPPOs)¹). She drew the attention of the IC to the following issues:

- **Extension of mandate** – In July, the Bureau had agreed that, because of the COVID-19 pandemic, the activities of the Sea Containers Task Force (SCTF) and their mandate would be extended until the end of 2021.
- **STCF deliverables** – The task force's overall remit is to supervise and direct the implementation of the Sea Containers Complementary Action Plan and provide recommendations to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) in 2022 via the IC. The STCF has had three face-to-face meetings, with the fourth being cancelled because of the pandemic. At the first meeting,

¹ VM09_02_IC_2020_Dec

the task force agreed to operationalize the Complementary Action Plan. At the third meeting, they reviewed their tasks:

- Measuring the impact of the Cargo Transport Units (CTU) Code had been hampered because there were insufficient data, despite the efforts of some national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) and industry to collect data.
- Work is continuing on increasing awareness of the risk of pest contamination of sea containers, not just by the IPPC Secretariat but also by other organizations. Future activities are planned at both regional and national level.
- Work on providing information on pest risk is pending, as is work on coordinating awareness-raising with contracting parties.
- **Pending deliverables** – Pending deliverables include continuing the sea container national surveys to get an idea of the extent of the danger posed by contamination of sea containers. Although it has not yet proved possible to collect sufficient data from industry, there is the possibility of data being gathered via the inspection programme of the International Maritime Organization (IMO). Additionally, work is also ongoing on two models from the World Customs Organization (WCO) that may help industry and NPPOs to collect data. One of these use of Authorized Economic Operators and the other is the WCO Data Models. Another pending deliverable is participation in the revision of CTU Code, which is going to be opened in 2021. There is some interest in adding text on contamination and cleanliness of sea containers to the Code. A workshop led by the North American Sea Container Initiative and the World Bank had been planned for 2020, aiming to bring together the big maritime organizations that move sea containers with small industries that receive containers and pack containers, to seek creative solutions. The workshop had been cancelled due to the pandemic, but it is hoped that it can take place in 2021.
- **Future activities** – The SCTF hope to meet next in January 2021 and will be discussing and finalizing 2021 work plan at that meeting.

[6] The Secretariat added that the IPPC Secretariat and WCO Secretariat have a joint work plan and had recently met virtually with representatives of the WCO Secretariat. The Secretariat was informed that in current WCO discussions, there was a proposal from Turkey regarding the use of Authorized Economic Operators to collect relevant data on contamination of containers.

[7] The IC Chairperson thanked the IC Lead for SCTF for her presentation and invited comments and questions from the IC.

[8] **CPM paper on SCTF.** In response to a query from an IC member, the Secretariat confirmed that a paper on SCTF is planned for CPM-15 (2021), updated from the paper submitted for the cancelled CPM session in 2020.

[9] **SCTF work plan.** One IC member suggested that it would be a good idea to publish the SCTF work plan, so that contracting parties could see the planned activities. The Secretariat replied that the work plan would not be finalized in time for submission to CPM, but it would still be possible for the Secretariat to notify contracting parties when the work plan is posted on the IPP, once approved by the IC.

[10] **The problem of empty sea containers.** One IC member highlighted the importance of the work on sea containers for the Asia and Pacific region, not only from a food security perspective but also because of problems with sea containers as they may have residual infestations of pests such as the khapra beetle. The Australian NPPO is looking into how to address this, for instance by analysis of eDNA from empty sea containers rather than mandatory fumigation, and their regional representative will be updating the SCTF on progress to date.

[11] The IC lead commented that although the khapra beetle is absent from North America, there have been some interceptions in Mexico, not only from the cargo but also associated with the sea containers. The Mexican NPPO is now in contact with the Australian NPPO to learn from their experience, and the

Mexican NPPO intends to develop a short case-study article on this for publication on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP).

- [12] **Revision of the CTU Code.** In response to a question about how the IPPC community was going to influence the revision of the CTU Code, the IC lead said that she expected the IPPC Secretariat would play a key role in this. It was also noted that NPPOs may wish to liaise with their national representatives to the IMO to ensure their delegates were aware of the issue and to try to gain support for the proposed changes to include more cleanliness/ pest freedom information in the code.
- [13] **Workshop on sea containers.** Regarding the participants at the workshop organized by the North American Sea Container Initiative and the World Bank, the IC lead confirmed that the intention is to invite the various industries involved in the sea container pathway, with the aim of generating practical solutions. She expected that the IPPC Secretariat would be involved but informed the IC that a date had not yet been set.
- [14] **Problems with gathering data.** One IC member queried whether an extension of just one more year would make any difference, given the slow rate of data acquisition, and suggested that the key question is to find out the reason for the difficulties in gathering data. The IC lead agreed that another year might not make any difference if the problems with data continue, and confirmed that the critical issue is that the analysis would not be valid unless there were more data. She expected the SCTF would discuss the matter at their meeting in January.
- [15] Another IC member mentioned that lack of resources could be one of the reasons for the low participation in the sea container surveys, exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic. The IC lead agreed that the normal low response from NPPOs had been compounded by the “stay-at-home” orders for NPPO professionals but noted that the response to this type of survey is always low, so it is not a problem unique to this survey. She clarified that the idea behind the involvement of Authorized Economic Operators is to try and obtain data from people who are involved with inspections for non-phytosanitary purposes (bombs, drugs, human smuggling, etc.) but who could also possibly look at issues that are of concern to the phytosanitary community. She emphasized, however, that this was all still under negotiation – it was not a “done deal” yet.
- [16] The IFU lead commented that the survey of contracting parties had had about 60 responses, which was about one third of all contracting parties and so was not a bad response rate. Getting NPPOs to conduct national surveys, however, is another matter, with much less success in terms of participation. He suggested that the expense of such surveys is probably one reason, and that it involves having people out in the field, which is difficult because of COVID-19. Looking forward, he noted that the Secretariat has had a good relationship with both WCO and the International Maritime Organization over many years, but what is perhaps missing is collaboration at a national level. He suggested, therefore, that the SCTF could perhaps develop a one-page document on what NPPOs need to do in relation to gaining support for these efforts from their national IMO and WCO. NPPOs would then better understand who they needed to liaise with and be able to better inform their counterparts in customs and shipping what actions were needed by them when attending IMO and WCO meetings. This would also help the Secretariat when making interventions in these international meetings by encouraging country representatives to support the intervention. The IC lead welcomed this suggestion.
- [17] One IC member commented that containers are travelling all over the world, so it may be assumed that certain generalizations can be made, based on the experiences of individual countries. An example was given of one country whose port authority had done a survey and found that over 50% of containers had a problem with contamination to some extent. They were therefore taking sea container cleanliness far more seriously. So, rather than waiting for more data, the IC and SCTF, should perhaps start to make some decisions about how to communicate the risks of pest contamination associated with the movement of sea containers.
- [18] The IC:
- (1) *noted* the update from the Sea Containers Task Force.

5. IC Team: National Reporting Obligations

5.1 Proposed terms of reference for the IC subgroup on NROs

- [19] To provide some background to this agenda item, the Secretariat gave a presentation about national reporting obligations (NROs) activities during 2020 and the work plan for the coming year.
- [20] Two virtual NRO workshops had been held in October 2020, one for the Caribbean and the other for Africa, both of which had attracted more participants than the face-to-face workshops in the previous year. Contracting parties continued being encouraged to access the e-learning course on NROs which had been posted on the IPP in September 2019, with a certificate awarded to those who complete it. Turnover in IPP contact points during the year had been relatively high, with 45 changes for IPP contact points and nine changes in IPP editors. Two issues of the NROs newsletter *NROs update* had been published and a new resource – the Pest Reports Bulletin webpage of the IPP – had been created, which comprises monthly summaries of pest reports. The latest pest reports can also be viewed in the What's new part of the IPP homepage, by clicking on the Pest reports tab. The recent prompt reporting of wheat blast disease in Zambia and fall armyworm in Jordan had served as good examples to FAO colleagues of how efficient the pest reporting system can be.
- [21] The NROs work plan for 2021 is as follows:
- Governance:
 - Secretariat to prepare paper on 2019–2020 NROs activities as part of IC report to CPM-15 (2021)
 - prepare an annual report of 2020 activities to submit to the IC team
 - prepare an annual work plan for June 2021 to May 2022 and submit to the IC team
 - establish an IC subgroup for NROs, and revise and adjust the NROs programme and NROs work plan (2014–2023) with the support of the IC NROs team.
 - Direct assistance to contracting parties:
 - ongoing registration of IPPC contact points and IPP editors
 - ongoing assistance to IPPC contact points and IPP editors in national reporting
 - NROs capacity development:
 - prepare and distribute three NRO newsletter issues
 - organize one virtual training workshop (host region yet to be determined)
 - maintain IPP website, IPP reporting tools, and Pest Report Bulletin
 - ongoing distribution and delivery of NROs e-learning course.
- [22] The Secretariat also provided a brief update on the CPM Focus Group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems, noting the link between the work of this group and the work on NROs. The terms of reference for the group include some activities related to NROs:
- Identify and review existing material and experiences on the topic.
 - Discuss and agree on the components necessary for an efficient and effective programme to strengthen pest outbreak and alert systems, considering the pre-requisite for an effective global alert system is an effective NPPO system, including timely detection and diagnosis of new pests.
 - Review how CPs could meet their NROs in a timely manner and recommend changes to contribute to strengthen a pest outbreak alert system.
- [23] The group has now been established and will meet virtually from January to July 2021. It is composed of regional representatives, an IC representative, a Standards Committee representative, a Bureau representative and representatives from relevant international organizations. The Secretariat commented that the outcomes from the group in terms of lessons from existing systems should usefully feed into the IC discussions on NROs.

- [24] The Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for the presentation. He noted that the close link between the outbreak alert and response system and NROs means that no matter how sophisticated the alert and response system is, if the NPPOs do not report, the system is pointless. This is part of the IC's rationale for considering the establishment of an IC subgroup on NROs – to strengthen pest reporting.
- [25] The IC then considered the proposed terms of reference for the IC subgroup on national reporting obligations (NROs)², commenting on the following issues.
- [26] **Linkage with alert and response system, and programme planning.** The IC lead for NROs, Ms Olga LAVRENTJEVA (Estonia), emphasized the link between the alert system and NROs, and therefore the need to ensure that this is reflected in the terms of reference for the IC Sub-group on NROs. This was noted by the IC. She also highlighted that this subgroup would have a fairly extensive list of activities in terms of what needs to be done to raise awareness about NROs, but the programme of activities should be agreed before any surveys or training is undertaken.
- [27] **Membership of the IC Sub-group.** The IC lead for NROs queried whether the lack of any IC members on the IC Sub-group was intentional. The Secretariat clarified that the IC lead would automatically be part of the IC Sub-group, so does not need to be listed as a member of it, but that the group could include one or more other IC members. The IC therefore amended the draft terms of reference to include one IC member, noting that this would be in addition to the IC lead. The Secretariat recalled that three IC members are currently on the IC team for NROs, in addition to the IC lead: Mr Ahmed M. Abdellah ABDELMOTTALEB (Egypt), Mr Nilesh Ami CHAND (Fiji) and Ms Magda GONZALEZ ARROYO (Costa Rica).
- [28] The Secretariat confirmed that the “experts representing entities having national reporting obligation systems” would be members of the IC Sub-group rather than invited experts.
- [29] **Progress report.** The Chairperson asked about the timing of the progress report referred to in the terms of reference under the section on Tasks. The IC noted that although the general terms of reference for IC Sub-groups stipulate that subgroups report annually, there is an additional reporting need for the IC Sub-group on NROs because it would be taking over a ten-year plan that CPM had agreed for NROs (2014–2023) – which no other IC Sub-group has – and so it would be necessary to review progress partway through this ten-year period. The IC agreed that the draft terms of reference did not need amending.
- [30] **IC Sub-group or team?** The IC agreed that it would be better to establish a dedicated IC Sub-group rather than just keeping with an IC team and agreed to the terms of reference as modified in this meeting. The IFU lead suggested that, in the interim, before the IC Sub-group is established, the team could make a start on some of the tasks from the terms of reference, simultaneously with the work of the Focus Group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems. The team could, for example, start to review progress with the ten-year plan. This would mean that the work would not stop for a year.
- [31] The IFU lead confirmed that, although the NROs programme had been a collective responsibility to date, going forward it would be led by IFU, with one staff member as the Secretariat lead. He also confirmed the process for establishing the subgroup: the draft terms of reference will be submitted for country consultation in 2021, the IC lead will then review the comments, the revised terms of reference will then be considered for approval by the IC and, if approved, the Secretariat would open a call for experts.
- [32] The IC:
- (1) *agreed* to establish an IC Sub-group on national reporting obligations, and *approved* the terms of reference as modified in this meeting (Appendix 2) to be submitted for country consultation

² VM09_03_IC_2020_Dec

- (2) *agreed* that the IC team on national reporting obligations will continue to work in parallel with the CPM Focus Group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems until the IC Sub-group on NROs is established.

6. IPPC Secretariat Work Plan 2021

6.1 2021 IFU work plan

- [33] The IFU lead presented the 2021 work plan³. He explained that the IFU tries to focus on global initiatives as a first priority, and then regional and national initiatives if they have global impact. In terms of overall strategies, the unit also aims to continue building a strong, quality-oriented team, strengthen cooperation with stakeholders in order to maximize resources, and plan its work according to allocated resources, mobilizing other resources as needed. He then outlined the main activities and outputs planned for 2021 as described in the work plan, with the following additional comments.
- [34] The work on e-commerce and on the pest outbreak and response systems is supported by Canada and the European Union, respectively, and funding has recently been received from the Republic of Korea which will allow the surveillance guide to be finished. Some staff time is also being funded through the FAO China South–South Cooperation project.
- [35] With reference to IFU support of the IC, the list of IC leads will be circulated to IC members.
- [36] There will be a Call for topics on 2021 which will require more work for the IFU to manage the Call, review the submissions and organize the Task Force on Topics.
- [37] The IFU communication plan includes the various publications to be worked on as well as the approximately ten webinars planned for 2021. Work on ICD web-based information will include continuation of the new phytosanitary system's component pages on the IPP: this will be funded through residual funding left over from 2020 and the pages should be completed by the end of April. Four publications are in progress: the pest status Guide is almost finished but is waiting adoption of the ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*); the revision of the surveillance Guide had been pending funds but will now hopefully be published in the first quarter of 2021; and working groups have been established for the guide on ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) and the e-commerce Guide. Four sets of e-learning are planned: the first two, on pest risk analysis and export certification, for 2021 and the second set, on surveillance and inspection, in 2022.
- [38] Work will continue on the seven projects currently being managed by IFU. The China South–South Cooperation project currently funds two initiatives. The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) project targets African countries and funds, among other things, the development of e-learning material and some legal studies. There are three European Union projects: one funding the work on the ISPM 15 Guide, one funding the work on pest outbreak alert and response systems and the final funding work on IRSS. Funding from Japan has provided one staff member of staff the last three years, and a new project will fund a staff member for the next three years. The Beyond Compliance project funded by the Standards and Trade Development Facility is being implemented by the IFU with support from Imperial College London and aims to provide a tool that can be used to improve market access using systems approaches. Finally, the IFU provides backstopping for several FAO projects, which is unpredictable.
- [39] Work on the IRSS has been managed as a project up to now, but the IFU is trying to move to it being managed as a system instead. However, this project ends in December 2020 and until more funds are secured, the priority topics will not get implemented and the IRSS will go into maintenance mode.
- [40] Work on phytosanitary capacity evaluations (PCEs) continues. The IFU is trying to finalize the PCE policy and procedures for PCEs in 2021, so that there is a very clear, transparent way of how PCEs are delivered. Five PCEs are to be conducted in 2021, funded from multiple sources and projects (e.g., the

³ VM09_04_IC_2020_Dec

World Bank for the PCE in Nepal, COMESA for Sierra Leone, and the China project for Cambodia and Sri Lanka, and FAO for Belarus). Four PCEs are also been implemented by accredited PCE facilitators in the Caribbean, financed by the FAO regional office. The revision of the phytosanitary legislation will also be undertaken in Fiji and Mongolia. The IFU will also explore opportunities to conduct additional PCEs. In 2021, most PCEs will be conducted in virtual mode. Finally, the IFU would like to modernize the PCE tool, but this is currently unfunded so for now the IFU will try to explore how to fix the problems with it.

- [41] Regarding training, the China project funds One Road training in China and field demos in Cambodia and Sri Lanka.
- [42] The *IPPC procedure manual for implementation and capacity development*⁴ is updated annually, so that the most recently agreed IC related procedures can be included making them easier to find. The IFU is currently working on revising the procedure for the development of guides and training materials, which will be presented to the IC.
- [43] Dispute settlement is an activity that the Secretariat is obliged to deliver under the Convention text itself, with the Secretariat providing assistance upon request. The CPM adopted procedures need to be revised, but there is currently no funding for this so the IFU is trying to mobilize the needed resources.
- [44] Since the work plan was circulated to IC members, it has been confirmed that the IPPC regional workshops and the TC-RPPOs will now be coordinated by the IPPC Integration and Support Team (IST) rather than the IFU. However, staff from the IFU, will still be involved in delivering IPPC regional workshops.
- [45] External cooperation will be maintained and developed with various organizations as described in the work plan, but also with the International Maritime Organization (which had been accidentally omitted from the list).
- [46] The IC Chair thanked the IFU lead and invited questions from the IC.
- [47] **IPPC regional workshops.** In response to a query from an IC member, the IFU lead clarified that the whole Secretariat is involved in the preparation of material for the workshops and the delivery of them; it is just the logistics and coordination that is now to be done by IST, so there should not be any difference from an IC perspective. Each regional workshop will continue to establish an Organizing Committee, which will oversee the delivery of each workshop. The TC-RPPOs representative noted the need to inform the TC-RPPOs that the transfer is happening.
- [48] **Phytosanitary capacity evaluations.** One IC member asked whether the virtual PCEs would deliver the same objectives as face-to-face PCEs at the national level. If it can be done virtually then maybe more PCEs can be conducted. The Secretariat responded that this is not currently known. Delivering the PCEs in virtual mode only eliminates some travel costs but does not eliminate the cost because a PCE facilitator. The IFU is trying to deliver one virtual PCE in Sri Lanka, but it is difficult to deliver PCEs at the moment because countries are struggling with coping with the pandemic. The Secretariat added that early indications suggest that a PCE in virtual mode demands more discipline for people to make the time, compared with setting aside a week for focused meetings where it's easier for people to focus on the task at hand, so the success of a PCE delivered virtually is likely to depend on the country and the willingness of participants to work virtually (including stakeholders – exporters, farmers, etc. – not just NPPOs).
- [49] The Secretariat confirmed that the total cost of a face-to-face PCE is around USD 80 000 to 100 000 including legal revision, and the total cost of a virtual PCE is estimated to be around USD 30 000 without legal revision. The main cost for a PCE relates to the costs of the people conducting it: recruiting the experts, the facilitator to oversee them, and the national counterparts if needed. Together with some

⁴ IPPC procedure manual for implementation and capacity development: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/86954/>

other overheads this amounts to around USD 30 000 for the phytosanitary part of the PCE. On top of that is the same amount again for revising the legislation (both national and international lawyers are needed, as well as support from FAO lawyers), plus 20 000 to 30 000 for travel and subsistence.

[50] **Implementation Review and Support System.** The IC Chairperson queried what “going into maintenance mode” meant, given that there are some priority 1 topics. The IFU lead clarified that these topics will not go ahead without funding. The Secretariat are exploring some options at the moment to secure funding, but one of the problems is that to attract funding people need to see the IRSS and know what it is. So that is one of the challenges for the IC Sub-group on IRSS.

[51] **Approval of the work plan.** The Secretariat clarified that the work plan is determined by FAO and the projects being funded, so no decision from the IC is required.

The IC:

(1) *noted* the IFU work plan for 2021.

7. IC Involvement in Explanatory Documents

7.1 Discussion on the IC’s involvement with explanatory documents and the IC’s future role

[52] The IFU lead presented the paper on explanatory documents⁵. He started by giving some background to explanatory documents, which had started in 2001 to provide additional guidance to complement that in ISPMs, given that ISPMs contain the bare minimum. He used the example of the explanatory document on ISPM 15 which at the time, there was no IC or equivalent to develop guides, so the approach taken was that an expert writes the document, the SC is invited to provide comments (which the author is not obliged to take on board but usually does), and the document is published under the author’s name. However, now there is a committee (the IC) and a procedure for developing guides, which raises the question of whether these explanatory documents are still needed.

[53] The IFU lead explained that, in addition, this agenda item had been prompted by a recent request from the SC, asking the Secretariat to forward a draft explanatory document on ISPM 16 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: concept and application*) to the IC for their review and comment. The IFU have subsequently confirmed, however, that review by the IC is not part of the process agreed by the CPM for explanatory documents. The IFU lead also commented that, once the ISPM 15 guide is published, perhaps the IC could suggest to the SC that the corresponding explanatory document is not needed anymore. He suggested that explanatory documents could be “retired” once the corresponding guide is published.

[54] Finally, the IFU lead noted that the explanatory document on ISPM 5 (the Annotated Glossary) is different to the other explanatory documents, as it is produced by a technical panel of the SC (the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG)), updated every three years, and provides a historical record of the Glossary. He suggested that it should simply be called the Annotated Glossary and not an explanatory document.

[55] The IC Chairperson thanked the IFU lead for his presentation.

[56] **Questions and clarifications.** The IC Chairperson asked what the difference is between explanatory documents and guides in terms of look and feel. The IFU lead confirmed that explanatory documents are not formally reviewed or edited but are just processed and formatted by the Secretariat. Regarding the mechanism for review once published, the Secretariat clarified that the process for explanatory documents does not include a mechanism for post-publication review or a mechanism for removing explanatory documents if they become out-of-date or obsolete. The IFU lead recalled that the explanatory document on ISPM 15 had been revised a couple of times – because the author decided to do it to align with revisions of the related ISPM – but could not recall what the mechanism had been.

⁵ VM09_05_IC_2020_Dec

One IC member asked about the uptake of explanatory documents by contracting parties but not data is available on their use.

[57] **General comments and ideas.** The IC discussed the various issues concerning explanatory documents. Comments made included the following:

- Explanatory documents are useful for contracting parties
- Explanatory documents are a good source of information when developing IPPC implementation material. For example, the working group drafting the IPPC guide to ISPM 15 is likely to make heavy use of the explanatory document on ISPM 15.
- Once explanatory documents are superseded by an IPPC guide covering the same subject matter, the explanatory document would have little use so could (or should) be retired.
- In explanatory documents, it is not clear that the document is the opinion of the author and not a legal interpretation of the ISPM, and that it cannot be interpreted as a decision of the CPM.
- It could be possible to still have both guides and explanatory documents. Explanatory documents in the future could be re-purposed to be a summary that provides a link between each standard and the corresponding implementation material on the IPP. Alternatively, explanatory documents could be restricted to concepts where there is not sufficient justification to develop a guide; for instance, if contracting parties seek an explanation or interpretation of a concept on a particular term or phrase, it may merit an explanatory document but not a full guide (but there would need to be strict criteria on what merits an explanatory document). However, the IFU lead reminded the IC that this is exactly the function intended for the Component Pages that are currently being worked on.

[58] **The next steps.** The IC acknowledged that explanatory documents are a tool for the SC, so it is up to the SC whether to have explanatory documents or not. The IC noted, however, that several explanatory documents relate to both standard setting and implementation, so the question about their future is of relevance to the IC as well as the SC. The IC could, therefore, share their ideas with the SC and invite the SC to consider whether to discontinue or to maintain explanatory documents and, if maintaining, to look at the procedure for explanatory documents when they are replaced by other material. In terms of individual explanatory documents, the IC could potentially play a role, jointly with the SC, in those explanatory documents that relate to implementation, although not in those that do not (e.g. those concerning interpretation of a term or interpretation of the requirements in a standard). The IC acknowledged that the Annotated Glossary is different to the other explanatory documents and goes through its own process of review (being published every three years but reviewed annually by the TPG), so would need to be treated differently to the other explanatory documents.

[59] The IC agreed that the IC representative on the SC, the SC representative on the IC, and Mr Artur SHAMILOV from the Secretariat would liaise with each other to consider further the various ideas about explanatory documents, taking into account the points made at this meeting, and report back to the IC.

[60] **Explanatory document on ISPM 16.** The Secretariat clarified that although the usual practice in the past had been that one author would develop an explanatory document, this had not been the case for the explanatory document on ISPM 16, which had been drafted by the TPG. The IC agreed that, until such time that the SC and IC had considered the general issue of explanatory documents, it was best to simply follow the process already established for explanatory documents, without IC involvement as they are not part of the process.

[61] The IC:

- (1) *agreed* that Mr Ahmed M. Abdellah ABDELMOTTALEB (Egypt), Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE (Chile) and Mr Artur SHAMILOV (IPPC Secretariat) would consider ideas about explanatory documents, taking into account the points made at this meeting, and would report back to the IC

- (2) *thanked* the SC for their invitation to comment on the draft *Explanatory document on ISPM 16*, but *proposed* that the current process for explanatory documents as agreed by CPM be followed, which does not include the involvement of the IC.

8. Any Other Business

8.1 Setting and changing priorities

- [62] The IFU lead raised an issue about how the priorities for ICD topics are set and reviewed. Giving a recent example, the e-learning projects had been assigned priority 1 by the IC because funding was immediately available for it, but this had been decided by the IC not the CPM. When a Call for topics is done, these are reviewed by the Task Force on Topics, who then submit topics to CPM for adoption. However, the formal process agreed by CPM relates to standard setting; there is no CPM-approved process for ICD topics, just a process that the Secretariat has developed with IC approval for transparency. This raises the question of whether, if the IC thinks it needs to change a priority, it should just do that and keep the CPM informed, so that the CPM would note the priorities rather than approving them.
- [63] The IC Chairperson commented that if IC approved the priorities, this would give the IC more flexibility to set and change priorities depending on funding and opportunities and allow this to be done more frequently than once a year at the CPM session.
- [64] The Secretariat commented that if the IC were to be able to adjust priorities, that it would be easier to adjust the work if funding became available. The Secretariat commented on the need to be transparent and clear, but to have flexibility.
- [65] One IC member queried why there is a problem with the IC setting and changing priorities if the IC does not have to go to the CPM for approval. The Secretariat clarified that there is a procedure in the *IPPC procedure manual for implementation and capacity development* and this includes going to CPM for approval, but the Secretariat has not been able to find any decision or opinion by the CPM saying that CPM should decide the priorities for IC topics, so had brought the matter to the IC to ask whether the IC approved procedure should be modified to give the IC more flexibility. The IC member agreed with the need for flexibility and recalled that the terms of reference for the IC do not say that the IC has to go to the CPM regarding priorities; the IC member commented, however, that the IC would need to be transparent so that the CPM always knows what the IC topics are and their priorities.
- [66] The IC:
- (1) *requested* the IPPC Secretariat to consider these issues and to modify the procedure for the development of Guides and training materials and present this modified procedure back to the IC.

8.2 IC leads

- [67] The IC Chairperson highlighted that there were still three priority 1 topics that need some work in 2021, but for which there is currently not an IC lead:
- Surveillance and reporting obligations, e-Learning course (2020-012)
 - Inspection and diagnostics, e-Learning course (2020-011)
 - Development and implementation of regulations and legislation to manage phytosanitary risks on regulated articles for NPPOs, Guide (2018-008).
- [68] The IFU lead confirmed that an Outline for the last of these topics (2018-008) would need to be submitted to IC and approved for consultation, in time for it to go to consultation in July 2021.
- [69] The IC:
- (1) agreed that Mr Chris DALE (Australia) be the IC lead for Surveillance and reporting obligations, e-Learning course (2020-012)

- (2) agreed that Mr Thorwald GEUZE (The Netherlands) be the IC lead for Inspection and diagnostics, e-Learning course (2020-011)
- (3) agreed that Mr Chris DALE (Australia) be the IC lead for Development and implementation of regulations and legislation to manage phytosanitary risks on regulated articles for NPPOs, Guide (2018-008).

8.3 Invitation from the new IC Chairperson for one-to-one chats

The IC Chairperson referred to the recent email he had sent to IC members, in which he had extended an open invitation for one-to-one chats with him. He clarified that the main purpose was simply to get to know each other in the absence of face-to-face meetings, although he is also happy to talk about IC issues. The invitation applied to all IC members, not just the new ones, but there was no obligation to take it up.

9. Date and Arrangement of the Next Meeting

- [70] The next virtual IC meeting (IC VM10) will be held on 20 January 2021 at 08:00 Rome time (CEST).

10. Evaluation of the Meeting Process

- [71] The Secretariat informed the IC that a link to a survey would be shared via email to evaluate the meeting.

11. Close of the Meeting

- [72] The IC Chairperson thanked everyone, wished everyone well for the holiday season, and closed the meeting.

Appendix 1**VIRTUAL MEETING N° 09 AGENDA***(Updated 2020-12-02)***COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES****IMPLEMENTATION AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (IC)****Start:** 2020-12-16 at 22:00 (Rome)

	Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
1.	Opening of the Meeting		
1.1	Opening by the IFU Team lead and welcome by the IC Chairperson		LARSON PELLETIER
2.	Meeting Arrangements		
2.1	Election of the Rapporteur		PELLETIER
2.2	Adoption of the Agenda	VM09_01_IC_2020_Dec	PELLETIER
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1	Documents list	Link	KOUMBA
3.2	Participants list	Link	KOUMBA
4.	IC Sub-group :SCTF and Programme		
4.1	Sea Containers Task Force update to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee	VM09_02_IC_2020_Dec	SHAMILOV
5.	IC Team: NROs		
5.1	Proposed Terms of Reference for the IC Sub-group on NROs	VM09_03_IC_2020_Dec	YANG
6	IPPC Secretariat work plan 2021		
6.1	2021 IFU work plan	VM09_04_IC_2020_Dec	LARSON
7.	IC involvement in Explanatory document		
7.1	Discussion on the IC's involvement with explanatory documents and the IC's future role	VM09_05_IC_2020_Dec	LARSON
8.	Any other business		PELLETIER/ LARSON
9.	Date and arrangement of the Next Meeting		LARSON
10.	Evaluation of the meeting process		CZERWIEN
11.	Close of the Meeting		PELLETIER / LARSON

Appendix 2

NATIONAL REPORTING OBLIGATIONS IMPLEMENTATION AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (IC) SUB- GROUP ON NROS PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Purpose

[73] The IC Sub-group on National Reporting Obligations (NROs) will:

- Support the IPPC Secretariat to facilitate and provide guidance to Contracting Parties (CPs) to help them meet their National Reporting Obligations, based on the IPPC and help them implement related ISPMs.
- Support the IPPC Secretariat to raise awareness in CPs, including their National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs), to meet and understand their NROs.
- Support the IPPC Secretariat to build and develop national or regional capacity to address activities that support NROs, e.g., surveillance, pest identification, and pest risk analysis (PRA).
- Support the IPPC Secretariat to update the NRO Programme to cover 2014 to 2023.
- Monitor and evaluate the work undertaken under the NROs Programme and prepare reports for the IC for review and approval.
- Develop an annual work plan for the IC Sub-group on NRO.

2. Duration

[74] The IC Sub-group on NROs will operate until May 2023 and may be extended upon agreement by the IC.

3. Membership

[75] The members should have extensive working knowledge of the IPPC, its objectives, its reporting obligations, as well as a good knowledge of ISPMs, especially those related to NROs.

[76] Members may be drawn from contracting parties, RPPOs and international organizations as follows:

- Up to three representatives of contracting parties
- One representative from the CPM Bureau (Optional)
- [One Lead and another representative from IC](#)
- One representative of the SC
- Up to three representatives from the RPPOs
- At least two experts representing entities having national reporting obligations systems such as the CBD, FAO, OIE, UNEP, CABI, World Health Organization, etc.

4. Tasks

[77] The IC Sub-group on NROs will work with the IPPC Secretariat to:

- (1) Analyse the NRO legal obligations of CPs, RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat.
- (2) Review of the existing IPPC NROs programme and work plan, including:
 - a. Complete the mid-term review of the NROs Programme (2014-2023) and NROs work plan (2014-2023); identify the progress of each item and task in the NROs Programme and work plan.

- b. Carry out analysis of the benefits and challenges of implementing the NROs Programme and work plan during the past five years.
 - c. Prepare and submit a progress report of the NROs programme (2014-2023) and work plan (2014-2023) to the IC.
- (3) Revise and adjust the IPPC NROs Programme and work plan including setting priorities and developing a stepwise approach with timeframes and submit them to the for IC.
- (4) Facilitate CPs to meet their obligations by:
 - a. determining the added value the IPPC Secretariat services could provide in addition to those already being developed for reporting.
 - b. advising the most appropriate way for CPs to consistently meet their national reporting obligations;
 - c. advising the most appropriate way of strengthening the role of RPPOs in ensuring contracting parties meet their national reporting obligations;
 - d. determining synergies with other programmes and activities (for example, collaborate with the FAO Intelligence and Coordination Unit of the Food Chain Crisis Management Framework (FCC-ICU), IPPC Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems, Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations, etc.).
- 5. [Contribute to the establishment of Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System](#)

5. Reporting

[78] The IC Sub-group on NROs reports to the IC annually and if necessary, upon request.

6. Rules of Procedure

[79] The IC Sub-groups Rules of Procedure will apply to the IC Sub-group on NROs.

7. Amendments

[80] Amendments to these Terms of Reference, if required, shall be approved by the IC.