



REPORT

Rome, Italy
11-12 and 20 March

CPM Bureau

March, 2015



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation

CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting and update from the O-i-C	3
2.	Adoption of the agenda.....	3
3.	Review October 2014 Bureau and December 2014 Bureau reports	3
4.	Information on the organizational arrangements for CPM-10 (2015)	4
5.	Discussion of the CPM-10 (2015) Agenda and papers.....	4
5.1	Opening of the Session (Ag 1)	4
5.2	Election of the Rapporteur (Ag 3).....	4
5.3	CPM Chair report	4
5.4	Election of the Credential Committee (Ag 4)	4
5.6	Nominations of the Subsidiary Bodies (Bureau, SC, SBDS) (Ag 19)	5
5.7	Secretariat Report (Ag 16)	5
5.8	Governance (Ag 7).....	5
5.9	Standard setting (Ag 8)	6
5.10	Implementation (Ag 9).....	9
5.11	International Plant Protection Convention Financial Report, Budget and Resource mobilization (Ag10).....	10
5.12	Capacity development (Ag 11)	11
5.13	National Reporting Obligations (Ag 12).....	12
5.14	Communications (Ag 13).....	12
5.15	Liaison and Partnership and Cooperation of the IPPC with relevant organizations-possible response to progress (Ag 14).....	13
5.16	Recommendations (Ag 15).....	13
5.17	Dispute Settlement (Ag 16).....	14
5.18	Contracting Parties Reports of Successes and Challenges of Implementation (Ag 17) ..	15
5.19	Special Topics Session (Ag 18)	15
5.20	Any other business (Ag 20).....	15
6.	Issues arising from CPM-10 (2015) requiring Bureau actions	16
6.1	Bureau June 2015 Agenda.....	16
7.	Resource impact of CPM-10 (2015) decisions and prioritization	18
8.	Calendar of upcoming meetings	19
9.	Other business.....	19
10.	Close	19

APPENDICES

Appendix 1:	Agenda.....	20
Appendix 2:	Participants list	23
Appendix 3:	Action list	26

1. Opening of the meeting and update from the O-i-C

- [1] The O-i-C of the IPPC Secretariat opened the meeting and summarized some of the highlights of IPPC Secretariat work since the last Bureau meeting. He informed that the Secretariat had had meetings with possible donors (Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF), Switzerland and the European Union (EU) among others) regarding possible funding of Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) and the International Year of Plant Health (IYPH).
- [2] He also noted the positive outcomes from the IPPC photo contest “Pests without borders”, which had been achieved in spite of some bureaucratic issues encountered after the launch of the contest. Out of the photos, 30 have been selected to be printed for demonstration at the CPM Cocktail at which time the best will be selected (based on Facebook and in-person voting). One of the most important direct results from the contest is that the Italian National Geographic has decided to write an article on IPPC with photos from the contest.
- [3] Lastly, he thanked the IPPC Secretariat staff for all the work done to complete the CPM arrangements, especially in this period of change.
- [4] The Chairperson of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) welcomed the CPM Bureau (hereafter “Bureau”) members.
- [5] She took the occasion to commemorate the Bureau member, Mr Mohamed REFAAT RASMY (Egypt), who passed away on 30 January 2015. She also noted that the Bureau member from the Pacific, Mr Peter THOMSON, had resigned from his position.
- [6] She thanked the Secretariat for having processed the CPM papers in due time.

2. Adoption of the agenda

- [7] One Bureau member asked to discuss whether FAO has a procedure for legally recognizing regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) that have been created through the IPPC.
- [8] To answer this question, FAO Legal Officer was invited to the meeting. She explained that RPPOs are intergovernmental organizations (IGO) recognized by IPPC. To be recognized as an IGO, the agreement creating an RPPO needs to be ratified by its member countries, funding for the RPPO must come from the member countries; and the members must be representatives of the governments. Once these requirements have been fulfilled, the RPPO may be recognized as an IGO by FAO Legal Office (according to the FAO basic text). Additionally, it was noted that the CPM has procedures that relate to the recognition and revocation of RPPOs.
- [9] The Bureau adopted the Agenda (Appendix 1), and noted the Participants list (Appendix 2).
- [10] Mr John GREIFER (USA) was selected as Rapporteur.
- [11] For ease of future reference, a list of Action points is attached in Appendix 3.

3. Review October 2014 Bureau and December 2014 Bureau reports

- [12] The Bureau reviewed the report from their October 2014 meeting and the outcomes of their December 2014 teleconference¹.
- [13] A Bureau member recalled that the IPPC Financial Committee had decided to track and cost the activities proposed by CPM to inform the CPM appropriately in-session. It was suggested that this consultation be done during the Bureau morning meetings and that CPM be informed before decisions are made on any new activities.

¹ CPM Bureau reports are available at: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/governance/bureau>

4. Information on the organizational arrangements for CPM-10 (2015)

- [14] The Secretariat introduced the CPM schedule and the CPM documents. He noted that Mr David MASSEY will write the CPM report.
- [15] Should voting be necessary, this will be done electronically by a button thus saving considerable time.
- [16] He lastly noted that 120 contracting parties, 14 organizations and 305 persons had registered, and that quorum is 92 contracting parties.

5. Discussion of the CPM-10 (2015) Agenda and papers

- [17] The Bureau discussed the CPM-10 (2015) agenda² and papers³.
- [18] The FAO Legal Officer was invited to clarify use of terminology employed in CPM decisions, specifically when to use “approve”, “endorse” and “adopt”.
- [19] She explained that the main difference is in the ownership of the product. *Endorse* means to support someone else’s instrument, which remains the instrument of that person, i.e. ownership is not transferred. When a body *adopts* an instrument, the instrument becomes the ownership of that body. It is the term used for high level instruments. *Approve* is a middle ground, and may be used in lieu of *adopt* depending on the level of the instrument.
- [20] As examples, she noted that: Standards are adopted; TF Budgets are adopted or approved; programmes are adopted or approved; work plans are adopted or approved; TF financial report is noted (as done by others); procedures are adopted; recommendations are adopted; activities are endorsed.
- [21] The Bureau asked the Secretariat to add this information to the IPPC Procedure Manual for standard setting.

5.1 Opening of the Session (Ag 1)

- [22] It was confirmed that the following would make opening remarks: Ms Maria Helena SEMEDO, FAO Deputy Director-General, Coordinator Natural Resources, Mr Dong-Pil LEE, Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (MAFRA), Democratic Republic of Korea (via video) and Mr Ren WANG, Assistant Director-General, FAO Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department (AGD).

5.2 Election of the Rapporteur (Ag 3)

- [23] Two potential Rapporteurs for the CPM report had been identified. The Bureau agreed to elected Ms Olga LAVRENTJEVA (Estonia) because she has participated in several CPMs and because Mr Brian DOUBLE (Canada) was also an in-kind contribution with the Secretariat.

5.3 CPM Chair report

- [24] No comments.

5.4 Election of the Credential Committee (Ag 4)

- [25] The Chairperson noted that only one country had volunteered a member to the Credential Committee; Mr Tobias Olson (Sweden) for Europe. The Bureau members urged its members to solicit nominations from their regions.

² CPM 2015/08 Rev.03

³ CPM 2015/CPR/01; [Link to IPP CPM page](#)

5.6 Nominations of the Subsidiary Bodies (Bureau, SC, SBDS) (Ag 19)

- [26] The Secretariat noted that an official nomination for the new South West Pacific region Bureau member had been received. However, no official Bureau member had been nominated from the Near East. Additionally, the CPM Vice-chair should be chosen.
- [27] The Secretariat also recalled that it was important that any regional arrangements for collection of nominations be communicated officially to the Secretariat through the FAO Regional Chair. Otherwise, the official procedure would be followed. This is especially important because the FAO Regional chairs rotate every six months and they must be informed of the rules. He further clarified that once the CPM initiates, the representative of the FAO Region present in at the CPM session, will be able to nominate or confirm nominations.
- [28] It was noted that nominations were missing for several regions for both the Standards Committee (SC) and the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement.
- [29] Lastly, it was recalled that long standing members of the SC would be leaving the SC after the May 2015 meeting and the Bureau agreed that it would be appropriate to recognize verbally their contribution to the IPPC.

5.7 Secretariat Report (Ag 16)

- [30] The Secretariat informed that the Annual Secretariat report had been prepared by the Communications expert recruited to enhance work on IPPC communications. The report had not been completed in time for translation, and would be presented only in English for this reason. Additionally, a paper presenting highlights of the Secretariat's work would be presented.

5.8 Governance (Ag 7)

IPPC Enhancement evaluation

- [31] The Bureau discussed the finalized Enhancement Evaluation and noted that a new Secretary has been selected, Mr Jingyuan XIA (People's Republic of China). While the Bureau did not have an opinion on the merits of the chosen candidate, they did express concern about the selection procedure because it had not been done in a transparent and inclusive manner.
- [32] Mr Matthew MONTAVON was invited to respond to questions and discuss implementation of the recommendations. The Bureau thanked the ADG's Office for the support throughout the process and the report which they found gave clear directions for the future of the Secretariat.
- [33] Mr MONTAVON explained that the FAO Management response had been prepared and submitted to the Deputy Director-General Knowledge for clearance, and he assumed it would not be cleared in time for the CPM. He suggested that an oral response to CPM be given in the meantime. The IPPC O-i-C would give this response on behalf of the AGD should the ADG not be available. The presentation of the evaluation (by the Lead for the evaluation) and the following FAO management response would take place on Monday afternoon. The CPM discussions on the evaluation would take place the following morning to allow for reflection and consultation among the CPs.
- [34] Mr MONTAVON furthermore clarified that the management response and the Bureau response would be separate documents.
- [35] As to the recommendations, he highlighted that the FAO management generally agreed with them, although the details necessary for implementation would need to be worked out.
- [36] He explained that two recommendations were suggested to be rejected:
- (1) Recommendation 6 because it was contrary to the current rules of the Organization; special staff rules should not be set up for a body within FAO, staff rules must be the same for the whole Organization.

(2) Recommendation 7 because ultimately the DG wishes to have the final decision on recruitment and selection of candidates, thus only informal consultations will be done.

[37] The Bureau queried how the recommendations will be implemented. Mr MONTAVON explained that the new IPPC Secretary would receive the necessary guidance to set up an implementation and staffing plan. Naturally, there may be HR and financial constraints to consider, but that part of his mandate would also be to seek more sustainable extra-budgetary funds.

[38] The Bureau asked whether the Bureau would be consulted on the implementation. Mr MONTAVON explained that the ADG, IPPC Secretary and the Secretariat would work together for solutions, and present these to the Bureau for comments.

[39] The Bureau felt it would be imperative that the new Secretary take on the implementation of the evaluation recommendations as one of his core mandates. To this effect, the Bureau would seek CPM consensus on the recommendations to ensure clear direction for the Secretary.

[40] The Bureau agreed that a regular meeting be set up with the ADG during the Bureau's June meeting with a standing agenda item to discuss the ongoing implementation of the recommendations and asked the Coordinator to arrange for this.

[41] The Secretariat noted that the Secretariat response had been shared with the ADG's office and that it would be shared with the Bureau for consideration in their June 2015 meeting.

[42] The Bureau agreed with the proposal in CPM 2015/INF/13 that comments on the Enhancement evaluation from contracting parties should be sent to the Bureau members by 15 May 2015. The Bureau will discuss the comments in their June 2015 meeting and finalize a proposal for CPM-11 (2016).

Summary of the Strategic Planning Group report

[43] As follow up on the Strategic Planning Group meeting, October 2014, papers had been prepared elaborating on "IPPC in 20 years" by various SPG members. The Secretariat hoped that these narratives would serve as a good foundation for CPM discussions. Additionally, these themes were intended to provide a narrative for an IPPC strategic framework to be developed for 2020-2029; and to feed into the preparations for the IYPH.

[44] The Chairperson noted that the SPG Chairperson, Peter THOMSON, would give an oral update to the CPM.

[45] The Bureau briefly discussed the Enhancement recommendation to abolish the SPG with which they disagreed, stressing the need for a strategic body that has the capacity to consider and analyze longer term issues, challenges and planning for CPM.

[46] It was clarified that until a decision has been made on the abolishment of the SPG, the SPG will continue to function.

[47] With the purpose of ensuring continuity, the Bureau agreed to ask Mr Peter THOMSON if he would be able to participate in this SPG meeting, and, in that case, if he would be available to be focal point for receiving the CPM member comments on the "20 years vision".

[48] The Bureau agreed that comments on the narratives on IPPC in 20 years would be due by 15 May 2014.

5.9 Standard setting (Ag 8)

Adoption of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures

[49] The Secretariat introduced agenda item 8.2, highlighting that formal objections had been received on two draft standards: *International movement of growing media in association with plants for planting* (2005-004) and *International movement of wood* (2006-029).

- [50] The Chairperson was disappointed about the formal objections and highlighted the need to consider the financial aspects of developing standards over many years only to receive formal objections.
- [51] The Secretariat noted that the standard setting procedure provides criteria to determine if the formal objection is technically justified, but that the two weeks at disposition before CPM is not enough for the full SC to decide. Therefore, the SC Chairperson in consultation with the CPM Chairperson had decided that the issues in the formal objections were so complex as not to be lifted during CPM. These draft standards would be returned to the SC for further discussion.
- [52] He further explained that the formal objection on the draft ISPM on the *International movement of wood* (2006-029) relates to a pivotal issue relevant to the future development of commodity standards, namely the content of a standard. The “concept of a standard” had been briefly discussed in the Bureau, SPG and the CDC and will be discussed again in the SC May 2014 meeting based on the input from these other bodies. However, considering the importance and ramifications of the issue, it may be appropriate that the CPM discusses the concept of a standard also. Lastly, it was noted that discussion is also relevant for the Framework for standards and implementation.
- [53] The Bureau agreed to discuss the subject “concept of a standard” in their June 2015 meeting and asked the Secretariat to consolidate input from the SC May 2015 and the CDC December 2014 and June 2015 meetings and forward this for the Bureau discussions.
- [54] The Secretariat recalled that four draft standards had been forward to the CPM for adoption by a vote: draft ISPM on *Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)* (2006-031); draft *Cold treatment on Bactrocera tryoni on Citrus sinensis* (2007-206E); draft *Cold treatment on Bactrocera tryoni on Citrus reticulata x C. sinensis* (2007-206F) and draft *Cold treatment on Bactrocera tryoni on Citrus limon* (2007-206G) (phytosanitary treatments as annexes to ISPM 28).
- [55] The Bureau agreed that adoption by consensus would still be preferable, and, after having consulted with some contracting parties that had previously formally objected to the cold treatments, it had been decided that adoption by consensus would be a viable option. The Chairperson would therefore suggest the CPM to adopt the treatments by consensus and should any contracting party object to this, the CPM will proceed with adoption by a vote, if a member proposes and CPM agrees to proceed on the basis of voting.
- [56] Regarding the draft ISPM on *Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*, one Bureau member noted the USA felt this standard was technically flawed and would have significant consequences for international trade with the USA should it be adopted. Additionally, the concepts of the draft had been substantially changed and he felt it was inappropriate that the draft was put forward for a vote without providing contracting parties the possibility to comment on this new draft. He felt that at least another round of consultation would have been necessary. Lastly, he noted that there was a need for a concept standard on host status because it is a cross cutting issue.
- [57] The Secretariat noted that the Standard setting procedure would be reviewed in the SC-7 May 2015 meeting and that the issues brought up in this meeting were already in the tasks to be considered. The Bureau invited Bureau members to forward comments on the review of the standard setting procedure to their SC regional members by 15 May 2015.
- [58] Another Bureau member noted that Uruguay had made a formal objection on this draft prior to CPM-9 (2014) but that it was not clear how their objection had been taken into consideration.
- [59] The Secretariat noted that SC members are responsible for communicating SC considerations to their regions, but a Bureau member felt that it may be more effective if the IPPC Secretariat would communicate directly with the CP that had proposed a formal objection to explain the changes and outcomes.
- [60] The Bureau agreed to propose that the CPM decide by consensus that the draft be returned to the SC. However, should any contracting party object to this proposal, the process may default to voting.

- [61] Should voting become necessary, it would be done on Tuesday at the start of the afternoon session to allow for a full quorum.
- [62] Lastly, two draft standards would be adopted by consensus as no formal objections had been received prior to CPM-10 (2015): *Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management* (2005-010) as Annex 3 to ISPM 26; *Irradiation for Dysmicoccus neobrevipes, Planococcus lilacinus and Planococcus minor* (2012-011) as annex to ISPM 28.
- [63] The Bureau discussed how to appropriately recognize the efforts made in developing standards, and agreed that the stewards, technical panel members and leads be thanked by the CPM. The Secretariat would prepare a CRP containing all the names of individuals who had contributed; this would also be recorded in the report.
- [64] In this context, the Secretariat informed the Bureau that certificates of appreciation are being sent to any individual who has contributed to the development of a standard after its adoption.

Noting translation adjustments to ISPMs adopted at CPM-9 (2014)

- [65] The Secretariat confirmed that as of this year, the language review group (LRG) process would be charged at revision rate by FAO Translation-services. This was due to an assessment that the work carried out by the head translators was so significant and time consuming that to sustain this activity it would have to be at a cost. He explained that this meant a more formalized arrangement that was being recorded in a service level agreement and against which the IPPC Secretariat would be able to measure deliverables. He hoped that this would help FAO Translation responding within the deadlines set out in the process.

Proposed ink amendments to correct inconsistencies in the use of terms in adopted standards

- [66] The Secretariat explained that two papers were being presented as the ink amendments were (i) to correct internal inconsistencies in ISPM 5 and (ii) to correct inconsistencies of the term *phytosanitary status* across standards.

Revocation and replacement of old versions of standards

- [67] The Secretariat explained the proposal for a mechanism to revoke standards, noting that in the future only one version of a standard would be in force at any given time.

Framework for standards and implementation (update)

- [68] The Secretariat recalled that this agenda item had been added mainly to update the CPM on the outcomes of discussions from the Framework for standards meeting, Costa Rica, August 2014, and the SC November 2014 meeting. Some recommendations were being forwarded for CPM consideration, but the work on the Framework itself was ongoing. He noted that the Capacity Development Committee would discuss the Framework in their next meeting in June 2015 and forward their conclusions to the IPPC Secretariat.
- [69] The Coordinator had been designated by the SPG to collect comments from the IPPC subsidiary bodies to produce a full Framework for standards and implementation to be presented to the SPG 2015 meeting.

Topics for IPPC standards

- [70] Regarding the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, the Standards Officer noted that the SC had modified a number of subjects and their priorities, as per delegation, but that this was only for information.
- [71] A Bureau member noted that there would be a suggestion to delay the 2015 call for topics until the Framework for Standards and Implementation had been adopted. The Secretariat agreed with this especially in regards to phytosanitary treatments. He noted that there are currently more than 20 phytosanitary treatments on the work programme, plus five topics for requirements standards and therefore currently no Secretariat capacity to develop more PTs. By issuing a call for topics, CPs may be disappointed when their submissions are not considered in a timely manner.

5.10 Implementation (Ag 9)

- [72] Implementation Pilot Programme on surveillance (IPS) and the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) (update)
- [73] The Secretariat explained that a strategic work plan for IPS was proposed for CPM approval. He stressed the need for additional extra-budgetary resources to be mobilized in order to ensure that the IPS would have the desired effect and success. He also highlighted the need for guidance on how to move forward should there not be additional funds allocated.
- [74] The Standards Officer felt that the title of this program does not correctly reflect the realities for standard setting, he found it hard to see standard setting as a component of implementation. A Bureau member clarified that the standard setting section would relate to implementation by making every effort to take implementation issues into consideration in the development process.
- [75] The Capacity Development Officer informed the Bureau that the CDC had revised the draft pilot plan on Surveillance in its December 2014 meeting, providing comments to the draft, identifying all activities that are currently under the Capacity Development work plan approved by CPM that are related to it and revising the work plan to add any other significant activity that could be needed.
- [76] The Secretariat noted that it had prepared the proposed program based on discussions at CPM-9 (2014) and the 2014 SPG. In the absence of additional dedicated resources, however, the program would not be able to go forward.
- [77] Regarding the work plan, a Bureau member found it unclear which new activities are being foreseen under the programme versus those that are already being worked on and consequently what the financial implications would be.
- [78] The Bureau considered two scenarios for the work plan: (i) CPM approval of the broad work plan based on which the Secretariat can develop, in a coordinated manner, a more specific work plan for each area and other methods to develop specific work plans, e.g. based on IRSS information. (ii) The CPM does not approve the work plan but encourages the Secretariat to continue any currently ongoing implementation activities.
- [79] In this context, the Bureau asked the Secretariat to identify and compile surveillance and implementation activities within CD and IRSS and agreed to review this information at the Bureau meeting in June 2015.
- [80] The Chairperson clarified that the main point of the programme would be to ensure closer coordination between the different areas of the Secretariat and work done by contracting parties.
- [81] The Bureau discussed the role of explanatory documents in terms of helping countries implement the standards. The Bureau generally agreed that additional information besides the standards is needed for implementing the standards. Regarding explanatory documents, it was noted that they should all be reviewed, as is the case for any capacity development produced material, but regarding explanatory documents (under the remit of the SC) it was queried whether they are relevant today where capacity development produces manuals and other supporting documents.
- [82] The Bureau agreed that the implementation support (activities, material, other) would depend on the standard, and would therefore need to be assessed on a standard-by-standard basis by the whole of the Secretariat.
- [83] The Bureau generally did not feel it necessary for the CPM to approve a detailed work plan, but agreed that the CPM should be informed of the results of the current implementation activities.

ePhyto (update)

- [84] The Secretariat highlighted the efforts taken to prepare for the development of the ePhyto hub and information materials hereto related. He noted that the IPPC Secretariat would be submitting an STDF

proposal which could mobilize USD 1.2 million to develop the hub and developing some training materials. The proposal had been reviewed by two external consultants and both had been supportive. Additionally, the International Grain Trade Federation had expressed interest in the project and were considering matching the funds.

- [85] He also thanked Argentina for having provided in-kind IT specific technical support through Mr Walter ALESSANDRINI because of the enormous job he did in moving this project forward.
- [86] The Secretariat presented a cost estimate from the FAO Information Technology Division (CIO) for the high level development and subsequent support. The development proposal amounted to USD 400 000 and the annual support cost to USD 50 000, with a proposed development timeframe of one year. He noted, however, that he had also had a meeting with the UN ICC which would seem to be the most opportune place to host the hub. The UN ICC would choose the developers and maintain the system. The Chairperson noted that the UN ICC has very good reputation which would help countries be encouraged to use the system.
- [87] The Secretariat furthermore confirmed that the hub would only transfer the data, not store it. Therefore, the data would not be retrievable for any purpose.
- [88] Lastly, FAO Legal Office had confirmed that it would be possible to ask for voluntary contributions from the countries using the hub; those using it more would pay a higher fee.
- [89] The Bureau confirmed that it seemed that most CPs fully support the project, the only worry some may have still relate to the information technology available in the countries.
- [90] The Chairperson confirmed that the International ePhyto Symposium in Korea was scheduled for 9-13 November 2015; noting that there would be resources to fund developing countries' participation to the symposium. The ePhyto steering group will be in charge of the arrangements.
- [91] One Bureau member noted that the EU will suggest that the Steering group focuses on the development and the bureau take over any financial considerations.
- [92] The Bureau agreed that Mr Diego QUIROGA would take the role as Bureau representative on the ePhyto steering committee, replacing Peter Thomson who had previously served in this role.

5.11 International Plant Protection Convention Financial Report, Budget and Resource mobilization (Ag10)

Financial report

- [93] The Secretariat noted that the FAO regular programme allotment for 2014 had been fully spent. He explained details on the current spending and the future budget. As to the IPPC Trust fund he stressed the need for mobilizing additional resources because spending was done at a faster rate than the funds were replenished. The current level of activities cannot be kept unless additional resources are mobilized. This year the multi-donor trust fund has received USD 50 000 from New Zealand and USD 137 000 from South Africa.
- [94] With reference to Figure 5 of CPM 2015/27, a Bureau member queried how the spending per strategic objectives was measured. He noted that spending on some objectives was quite low.
- [95] The Secretariat explained that this figure clarifies how many activities (translated in costs) were executed according to the budget which is planned according to the strategic objectives.
- [96] The CD officer expressed concern about the conclusions of the Enhancement study on the financial aspects related to capacity development, referring to conclusions in the report stating that this trust fund has currently no funds available and that the IPPC Secretariat was poor at raising funds. She mentioned that in the FAO database the umbrella trust fund for capacity development does not have funds because funds are linked to specific project activities which are carried out through baby budgets and this trust fund was the best funded in the IPPC

[97] A Bureau member asked whether the possible STDF project funds for ePhyto had been added to the overview of the Multi-donor trust fund. It was clarified that this was not the case, and that only confirmed funding and allocations are added to the figures for the Multi-donor trust fund. Additionally, should the STDF funds come, they would be added to the capacity development fund.

Resource mobilization

[98] The Secretariat mentioned highlights from the paper on resource mobilization, specifically in regards to the proposal to encourage the use of a contribution agreement to ensure sustained financial support to the IPPC Secretariat.

[99] Some Bureau members felt that formalizing voluntary contributions was too premature. The Secretariat stressed the need for new resource mobilization actions to ensure the existence of the IPPC. He noted that the OIE and CODEX both receive many millions to support their activities, but that there is clearly no understanding world wide of the importance of plant health that translates into a similar funding for IPPC related activities.

[100] The Bureau felt that a CPM discussion on the financial future of the Secretariat would be necessary. If the contracting parties wish the IPPC activities to continue, more funding is necessary and the CPs need to understand this. The Bureau suggested that this be highlighted in the Secretariat report to the CPM. The Secretariat noted in this context that it also needs to be clearly explained to the CPM that trust funds cannot pay the salaries of the Secretariat staff, unless the staff works on the specific project funded by the trust fund.

[101] The Bureau agreed that all proposals to the CPM should have a section on financial implications.

5.12 Capacity development (Ag 11)

CDC evaluation, what are the next steps?

[102] The Secretariat noted that the CPM should decide on the way forward for the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) because it had become clear that the lead of the CDC review had difficulties in completing the assignment.

[103] The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Enhancement evaluation team had wished to use the CDC evaluation and the Secretariat felt that the fact it had not been ready perhaps was a reason for the poor and incorrect views of the Enhancement evaluation' team about capacity development activities. The Capacity Development Officer recommended that it be considered that the CPM recognizes the efforts of the CDC members who carry out very important and sustained work for the benefit of IPPC contracting parties.

[104] As to the future of the CDC, while the Secretariat strongly supported retaining the CDC because of the value of the work carried out, it was noted that the Enhancement evaluation suggested there be formed one body to encompass all areas of implementation. These issues will be considered by the Bureau together with due evaluation of CDC structure and activities.

[105] The Bureau expressed their disappointment for the review not having been completed as planned.

[106] The Bureau members noted that their regions would suggest extending the current mandate of the CDC for one year and support that a consultant produce an evaluation report for consideration at the Bureau meeting in June 2015. This would allow for the Bureau to discuss the issue while also considering CP comments on the Enhancement evaluation. Following, the Bureau would report to CPM-11 (2016).

[107] Regarding the legal status of CDC the FAO Legal Officer confirmed that the CPM can only establish subsidiary bodies. Hence the CDC would be a subsidiary body. However, she noted that the establishment of subsidiary bodies is only a formality since what the body refers to is in its ToRs and Rules of procedure. In particular, item 3 of Rule IX of the CPM Rules of Procedure gives options on

the selection procedures for members of Subsidiary bodies. She further clarified that if the Rules of a body are silent on an issue, the CPM rules will apply.

Capacity Development pre-CPM training session, CPM-10 side sessions and CPM-10 Market Places

- [108] The Capacity Development Officer went through the schedule of training and side sessions, and explained the set-up of the market places where two-three experts will present a specific issue followed by discussions. She noted that the training and side sessions would be informally translated by the Capacity Development staff when necessary.
- [109] The Bureau thanked the Secretariat for arranging the sessions; they are useful, relevant and well carried out.
- [110] The Secretariat took the opportunity to update the Bureau on various other capacity development issues. Firstly, the Central-African project, to which the Secretariat had contributed across all areas, was a candidate for the Edouard Saouma Award. This is a strong and positive indication of the countries appreciation of the project. Secondly, the Secretariat wished to request that all Regional Workshops be co-sponsored with the organizers because of budgetary constraints. Peru has offered to host the Regional Workshop in Latin America, this is a significant development in the organization of Regional Workshops.
- [111] One Bureau member informed that the funding for the African Regional Workshop often is allocated so late that it is difficult to organize the workshop appropriately; the dates and venue of the Regional Workshops for Africa in 2014 were decided so late that many countries could not attend. He noted that there would be efforts made to improve on this and also on communicating with the Secretariat.

5.13 National Reporting Obligations (Ag 12)

- [112] The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the CPM was invited to review and following adopt the proposed NRO programme and procedures. He also noted that to help ensure quality reporting information, the IPPC Secretariat would do basic quality checks, based on “the NRO Quality Control guidelines”, to the information uploaded by the contracting parties.
- [113] The Bureau suggested that a budget, including human resource needs, for the programme be prepared for the Bureau and CPM, with clear indication of what will be done this year.
- [114] The Secretariat explained that there had not been intention to detail the budget at this point; this would be done for the work plan to be approved by CPM-11 in 2016. The programme as presented was only an overall view of the activities, recognizing that some of the activities would overlap with other areas (Capacity Development and Implementation). The complexity of the detailed overlap between programs was part of the reason why the work plan will be sent for member consultation.
- [115] The Bureau agreed with this proposal, but found that the programme should then only be “endorsed” not approved or adopted. This way the ongoing activities are supported, but there is no official approval of any new activities, although the Bureau acknowledged that NROs remain essential for the IPPC.
- [116] The CPM-11 (2016) would approve the work plan and budget for NRO.

5.14 Communications (Ag 13)

- [117] The Secretariat summarized some of the communication efforts being undertaken by the IPPC Secretariat, for instance the newsletter, the redesign of the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP – www.ippc.int) and the proposal for an International Year of Plant Health (IYPH).
- [118] Within the Secretariat, an editorial team on communication has been set up with one member from each core area. This facilitates the coordination of daily communication efforts. However, it was also noted that this requires significant staff time. The Secretariat highlighted that there was a need to

increase the communication competences within the Secretariat. To this effect, the Secretariat had contacted the FAO Office of communication but found that it was very difficult to liaise with them, as they would basically block most suggestions.

[119] As regards the work plan, some Bureau members felt that was too superficial; they had assumed that the plan had been more detailed at this point.

[120] The Bureau discussed the way forward based on the fact that the Secretariat does not currently have the necessary capacity to produce appropriate communication material. The Bureau suggested that this be communicated clearly to the CPM. The Bureau agreed that with the current limitations, the Secretariat should focus on a well-functioning and functional website. Regarding the steering committee for the IYPH, the Bureau also suggested that this group could be used for communication activities across the core themes. The Bureau suggested that the Secretariat identify AGD resources that may help develop communication products. The Bureau also noted that it would be appropriate to use also external press releases. Lastly, the Bureau agreed to discuss in detail the organization of communication activities in the Bureau June 2015 meeting.

[121] As to other communication efforts, the Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Secretariat has worked with units of SO4 to have an information booth during the next Council session to inform FAO members on IPPC activities. The Bureau thought this was an interesting point and agreed the IPPC Secretariat prepare an informative paper on the IPPC work and liaison activities under SO4.

[122] Regarding the IYPH, the Secretariat noted that Mr Ralf LOPIAN would be recruited as a consultant to drive this work, but that contracting parties would need to be the driving force in proposing the initiative. The Bureau asked the Secretariat to provide support to countries who wish to support the initiative with practical advice on how to contact authorities, FAO, etc.

5.15 Liaison and Partnership and Cooperation of the IPPC with relevant organizations- possible response to progress (Ag 14)

[123] The Secretariat noted that WTO-SPS and CBD would give oral presentations, whereas STDF, IAEA and IICA would present papers only. The Bureau asked the Secretariat to inform the organizations giving presentations to limit them to 10 minutes.

[124] He also noted that a possible Memorandum of Understanding with the World Customs Organization (WCO) is being considered, which would help the Secretariat to be informed about any relevant activities undertaken by the WCO. (See also discussions under 6.)

[125] One Bureau member queried whether the EU request to consider a partnership with the International Organization for Biological Control had been fulfilled. The Secretariat explained that little action had been taken on this.

TC-RPPO

[126] The Secretariat briefly summarized the main issues linked to the TC-RPPO meeting in 2014.

5.16 Recommendations (Ag 15)

[127] Possible criteria for the CPM recommendations

[128] The Secretariat noted that comments on the proposed change to the criteria for CPM recommendations had been received from Argentina. The Bureau generally agreed with the Argentinean proposal, but suggested that “brief guidance” would be specified to clarify that the text should be short, not that the guidance would be in effect for a brief period. Also, “different organisms from the NPPO” would be changed to clarify that “other units outside of the NPPO” was meant.

[129] One Bureau member noted that the USA would likely propose a special topic session for CPM-11 (2016), with engagement from IMO, on sea containers, for CPs to gain understanding of this complex issue. The session would gather IMO experts explaining its standards for containers, industry, pest risk

experts and regulators and discuss the need and ways forward to reduce the introduction and spread of pests from sea containers. He felt that CPs need more information more about this pathway and the IMO activities before it can become a priority for them and before making a final decision on the production of an ISPM.

[130] In this context, the Standard Setting Officer explained the difficulties in proceeding with the development of the draft standard on the *International Movement of sea containers* (2008-001) because there are mixed ideas in the SC about going forward with the draft and because it does not seem to be a priority for CPs (no country has offered to host the EWG, and only few of the previous experts are available). In light of this, the CPM should decide whether to change the priority of this topic, as it currently has the highest priority on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.

[131] The Capacity Development Officer congratulated the Bureau for the proposal on a special topics session on this topic and welcomed the idea to provide more information through a side session (or marketplace), intended to help IPPC contracting parties to take informed decisions at the CPM plenary on this particular issue. She also mentioned the need to have a participatory, but well established methodology for the session since the open discussion performed in plenary some years ago on sea containers had not produced the expected results.

Proposed CPM recommendations for adoption

[132] A proposal for CPM to adopt a CPM recommendation on Sea Containers had been submitted by a number of countries and comments had been received from the EU, New Zealand and Canada. The IPPC Secretariat had following modified the recommendation, and the EU submitted comments to change it before adoption.

[133] Additionally, the EU had submitted a proposal for the development of a CPM recommendation on the importance of pest diagnosis. Contemporaneously, the EU had prepared an actual draft recommendation which would be distributed as a CRP. The Bureau discussed the appropriateness of presenting a draft before the CPM had agreed to develop a recommendation, but the Bureau member explained that this was to provide as much information possible for the CPM to make an informed decision.

[134] The Bureau suggested that the EU would remain lead on the development of the recommendation, if the CPM agreed to it, and that the EU should seek input from other CPs. The final draft should be submitted to the Bureau by 15 May 2015, after which point it would be submitted for member consultation.

5.17 Dispute Settlement (Ag 16)

[135] The Secretariat noted that a second call for experts for the Dispute settlement panel for the dispute between South Africa and EU had been issued, because there had not enough experts thought to be fully neutral in the first call. The second call would end on 30 March 2015.

[136] During CPM the Secretariat has set up a meeting between the parties of the dispute, where agreement to the sequence of the actions to be taken will be sought, as this is a key procedural issue at the moment. Following, the Secretariat explained, the SBDS procedures will be rewritten for CPM adoption so that the sequence of actions are clear for future disputes (the substance should remain the same).

[137] The Secretariat noted that considerable staff time had gone towards handling the dispute and working on dispute avoidance with other FAO divisions. In this context, the Bureau thanked Japan for the in-kind contribution for a six months full-time staff to work on dispute settlement.

[138] One Bureau member noted that several African countries looked with anticipation for the results of this first dispute settlement case that had been put in front of the IPPC; specifically querying what would happen should the dispute not be settled.

[139] One Bureau member suggested that WTO rulings be analyzed and reformulated in layman language and used to inform CPs of specific measures that were ruled inappropriate. The purpose would be to encourage dispute avoidance. The Secretariat had considered developing case stories, but noted that countries may interpret the rulings differently.

5.18 Contracting Parties Reports of Successes and Challenges of Implementation (Ag 17)

[140] The Bureau discussed the proposal for an International ISPM 15 workshop⁴. The proposal was based on the positive outcomes from the workshop on ISPM 15 in Beijing, China, in 2014, which was organized and hosted by two RPPOs. The proposal stated that it would be opportune to duplicate this sort of effort because the workshop would discuss global issues and get RPPOs more involved in IPPC related activities; and ultimately improve the implementation of standards. The RPPOs would be invited to discuss this proposal in the RPPO meeting taking place in the margins of CPM.

[141] The Capacity Development Officer cautioned that this CPM section was not intended to present work proposals to CPM and this particular case presented a possible future RPPO related activity. The analysis of any proposal of this type should be made at the TC meeting or presented for consideration of the TC preparatory meeting taking place during CPM-10. She also mentioned that work proposals ideally should be presented with more advance notice and in the proper items of the agenda.

[142] The Bureau member proposing this also clarified that the intention was to share information, the workshop was not intended as purely standard setting or capacity development activity. Rather, the Bureau member stressed the need to leverage resources outside of the IPPC, particularly from RPPOs, to support the IPPC goals and implementation, and that the exchange of experiences, practices and implementation by NPPOs and industry that can lead to enhanced implementation and effect of ISPM 15.

[143] The Bureau discussed whether it was appropriate to propose the second recommendation on developing recommendations on improvements to ISPM 15. Some felt it was inappropriate because the standard is not under revision. Others that any recommendation on improvements to standards, similar to “customer” feedback on a “product”, was valuable at any time. The Secretariat noted that the Standard Setting team keeps a file with suggestions for improvements in standards that are forwarded to the expert working group when the standard is being revised. The Bureau agreed that any recommendations or other future work on ISPM 15 should come from CPs through the normal procedures.

5.19 Special Topics Session (Ag 18)

[144] The Capacity Development Officer explained the special topics sessions. She noted that she felt the special topics presentations should be profiled on the IPP

[145] It was clarified that a number of FAO divisions had been invited to the side and special topics sessions to improve cooperation between IPPC and FAO.

5.20 Any other business (Ag 20)

[146] The Secretariat informed the Bureau of the arrangements for the Thursday cocktail which would take place in a hotel in Trastevere. The photo contest would be concluded at this occasion.

[147] The Secretariat noted that an EU paper on strategic issues on diagnostics would be circulated as a CRP. A Bureau member queried if the paper would be relevant should the CPM agree to develop a recommendation. It was explained that the content of the document could help in the development of the recommendation.

⁴ CPM 2015/INF/10

POST CPM-10 (2015) SESSION

6. Issues arising from CPM-10 (2015) requiring Bureau actions

[148] The Bureau discussed issues arising from CPM-10.

6.1 Bureau June 2015 Agenda

[149] The Bureau discussed items for their June agenda and assigned priorities (indicated in parentheses). It was recalled that the Bureau June meeting would also decide on the agendas for the SPG and the CPM-11.

Enhancement evaluation (1)

[150] The Bureau will review comments and input received from members, RPPOs and the Secretariat to the Enhancement report at its June 2015 meeting. The Bureau will then engage with the new IPPC Secretary with the aim at providing input to the FAO Management response to the evaluation recommendations for implementation. The Bureau agreed to focus their briefing of the new IPPC Secretary on the major strategic issues for the IPPC (IPPC in 20 years) and on the main activities IPPC is going to focus on (IYPH). The Bureau felt it was fundamental that the new Secretary be fully aware of the links between these topics and the Enhancement evaluation recommendations; and his role in helping the IPPC to gain momentum in the future.

[151] The Bureau would formulate a proposal for a plan for implementing the recommendations, to be presented to the SPG in October 2015 for review, and following endorsement by CPM-11 (2016).

[152] Lastly, the Bureau will initiate more immediate actions regarding those recommendations which are considered operationally and economically feasible by the Bureau and inform SPG 2015 on those actions.

[153] The Bureau also agreed that, when reviewing the Enhancement evaluation, specific areas of Article XIV “freedoms” should be suggested (e.g. that the IPP may remain as a website separate from FAO.org – see also discussions under “Communication and the International Year of Plant Health”).

Communication and International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) (2)

[154] The Bureau will review the detailed Communication work plan, which should also include activities related to the IYPH, to be submitted to the SPG 2015. The Secretariat noted in this context that there may be a chance to enhance collaboration with the FAO Official communication division and that the Secretariat would set up a small communication unit consisting of in-kind contributions (as proposed by the Bureau in June 2014).

[155] The Bureau welcomed a suggestion that the EU make a key note speech on emerging pest risks at the Milan EXPO; and develop a video on IPPC related issues (to be ready by 14 July).

[156] The Bureau and the Financial Committee shall also form a small IYPH steering committee to continue with detailed planning of an IYPH and present a detailed work-programme for the planning of the IYPH 2020 to CPM-11 (2016). Mr Ralf Lopian will provide a planning proposal for the Bureau to review, including a list of possible donors. The Bureau assigned Mr Ralf Lopian to be the official contact for the IYPH.

[157] The Secretariat had been informed by FAO Senior management that the URL of the IPP would need to be changed as the IPP website would be hosted under www.fao.org (and not separately as now). The Bureau strongly opposed this, highlighting that the IPP is central to the implementation of the IPPC and its standards; it is key for the awareness of contracting parties, and; that it would be very inconvenient should the FAO not ensure that all links be migrated smoothly.

[158] The Bureau suggested that a joint meeting with the other Article XIV bodies be set up to build a common voice and clarify the costs of such a migration.

[159] Regarding the IPPC in 20 years, the Secretariat would receive comments from CPs on the narratives on IPPC in 20 years for further discussion by the SPG 2015. The Bureau would discuss the comments in relation to the SPG agenda. The Bureau agreed that based on the comments, the narratives should be revised to have a consistent format and address the topics in a similar manner. This would be done by the in-kind contribution from Canada.

[160] Lastly, the Bureau agreed that they would discuss strategically which entities the IPPC Secretariat should meet with to mobilize resources.

Pilot on implementation (3)

[161] In reference to the decision that the Bureau would provide oversight on the progress of activities under the approved “*Strategic work plan for the implementation programme on surveillance*” and invite comments for possible adjustments for the Secretariat to report to CPM-11 (2016), the Bureau agreed that the detailed work plan should be reviewed in the June meeting (noting that this would not be for the CPM to approve).

[162] The Secretariat clarified that the detailed work plan will be drafted by a group of two-three experts operating electronically.

ePhyto (4)

[163] The Bureau will consider how to further develop administrative and legal aspects of the ePhyto hub (based on a draft prepared by the Secretariat), a management structure for the hub, and a cost recovery system for the use of the hub, and report to the CPM-11 (2016).

[164] Mr Nico Horn, Chairperson of the Steering group, would be invited via teleconference to update the Bureau on the progress by the Steering group during the June meeting.

[165] It was noted that the Global ePhyto symposium scheduled for November 2015 to be held in Rep. of Korea could serve as a focal point to understand all the satellite needs for the hub to be implemented. The Bureau discussed whether there would be a possibility to develop a test hub for the Symposium, because this could facilitate additional funding. However, this would depend on when (and if) funding is provided for the development.

Formalized partnerships (5)

[166] The Bureau agreed to discuss possible formalized partnerships through Memorandums of Understanding (MoU) with specific organizations such as WCO or WTO-SPS. It was noted that it would be necessary to clarify common points of interest and also identify the actual entities to discuss a potential MoU with (it is not currently clear). Several concerns were expressed as to the implications and possible consequences for the IPPC.. The Bureau asked the Secretariat to invite the IPPC contact point of the WCO to participate in parts of the Bureau June meeting for the Bureau to be adequately informed about the potential MoU.

[167] The Bureau will also review the work plan with the CBD (currently, comments are awaited from the CBD). In this respect, the Secretariat noted that the Bureau may wish to consider strategically how to access GEF funds. . It was also noted that contracting parties should be made more aware of the funds available at country level. The Bureau agreed to have a CPM-11 (2016) training and awareness raising side-session on “Project funding”, where GEF and other funding institutions would be invited to participate.

CDC Review (6)

[168] To facilitate the conclusion of the CDC review, the Bureau asked Ralf Lopian (member of the review group) to write the CDC review report for discussion in the June meeting. This would allow for the SPG to have a holistic discussion on some of the recommendations of the Enhancement evaluation and

the CDC review. The Bureau will then present the outcomes of the discussions to CPM-11 (2016) for a decision on the future of the Committee.

Criteria for CPM recommendations (7)

[169] Comments on the criteria for CPM recommendation would be solicited by 15 May 2015. The Bureau agreed to ask the EU to redraft the criteria based on the comments and following have a general discussion on the Bureau's position. It was noted that should any redrafting be needed by the Bureau directly, this should be done after session. The draft criteria would then be reviewed again in the Bureau October 2015 Meeting.

CPM recommendation on pest diagnostics (8)

[170] Comments on the proposed CPM recommendation would be solicited by 15 May 2015 and the Bureau's role would principally be to review that the process had been followed correctly.

Bureau membership (9)

[171] The Bureau will review the current procedures and rules for Bureau nominations.

Side-sessions for CPM-11 (2016) (10)

[172] The Bureau briefly considered some proposals of side-sessions and special topics sessions for next year's CPM session (sea containers and project funding) The Secretariat informed that the list of possible options suggested by the TC RPPOs and the CDC was going to be presented in the June Bureau meeting, as usual.

[173] It was agreed that the Secretariat would provide the necessary guidance for Eurasian Economic Union to request observer status should they wish to request to hold a side-session. Some concern was expressed about opening up for side-sessions from one regional economic group.

NRO programme

[174] The Bureau decided to discuss issues related to the NRO programme in their October meeting.

Concept of a commodity standard

[175] The Bureau discussed the composition of the Concept of a Commodity Standard Group, as requested by CPM in the Terms of references for the group. The Bureau agreed that the group should consist only of few current or previous SC members, and that there should be representation from both developing and developed countries.

[176] The Bureau agreed on the following participants: Codex, Ms Beatriz Melcho, Mr John Hedley, Mr Jens Unger, Mr Richard Zinc, the SC Chairperson, Mr Francisco Gutierrez and Ms Magda Gonzales. Additionally, one expert from industry would be invited to parts of the meeting. The Bureau considered that it may be beneficial to submit the draft document to member consultation to get in depth understanding of the concerns from all stakeholders.

7. Resource impact of CPM-10 (2015) decisions and prioritization

[177] The Secretariat asked that the Bureau consider changing the criteria for receiving financial support to participation in IPPC meetings, because it was felt that the World Bank tables for classification of countries do not reflect the actual financial situation of countries and do not consider the problems faced to participate in IPPC activities. The Bureau felt that it was important to have transparent criteria, and did not agree to consider to any change.

[178] The Bureau agreed to review the list of the resources needed for CPM-10 (2015) proposed activities in June.

8. Calendar of upcoming meetings

[179] The Bureau was informed of upcoming meetings; all dates for IPPC Secretariat-led meetings are available on the IPP calendar⁵.

[180] The Bureau will tentatively convene in FAO HQ from 16 (pm) to 19 June 2015, and on 12 October (pm) and 16 October 2015. The SPG is scheduled for 13-15 October 2105.

[181] Regarding Bureau participation in other IPPC meetings, Mr John Greifer confirmed his availability to participate in the SC-7+ group meeting to review the standard setting process (13-15 May 2015). Mr Diego Quiroga would attend the ePhyto steering group meeting in Rome beginning on on 25 May 2015.

[182] The areas of liaison were assigned following change in the Bureau membership.

Mr John GREIFER - Communications, SBDS, FC	Mr Diego Quiroga – ePhyto, Implementation
Mr Lucien Konan KOUAME - NRO	Ms Kyu-Ock YIM - Enhancement Study
Ms Lois Ransom - SC	Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN - CDC

[183] The Bureau members confirmed that they would try to attend the meetings within their areas of responsibility.

9. Other business

[184] No other business.

10. Close

[185] The CPM Chairperson thanked the Bureau members and the IPPC Secretariat for the fruitful meeting, and a well run and successful CPM session.

⁵ <https://www.ippc.int/en/year/calendar/>

Appendix 1: Agenda

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER	DOCUMENT NO.
1. Opening of the meeting and update from the O-i-C	Fedchock	
2. Adoption of the agenda	Yim	01_ Bur_2015_Mar_Agenda
3. Review October 2014 Bureau and December 2014 Bureau reports	Yim	https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/governance/bureau
4. Information on the organizational arrangements for CPM-10 (2015) -Schedule (timing of vote- Tuesday PM start, Thursday AM discussion on enhancement study?) - Thursday evening cocktail	Fedchock	Schedule distributed at meeting Handout- Friday 16:00 last version
5. Discussion of the CPM-10 (2015) Agenda and papers -Marta Pardo from FAO Legal office will join us on Thursday 14:00, so will make a parking lot of legal issues to discuss. Updates of DOC / INF / CRP Cut-off date 4 March 2015 for DOC and INF papers Documents list : CPM 2015/CRP/01 (as of 2015-03-10)	All Larson	Agenda: CPM 2015/08 Rev.03 CPM-10 documents - Link to IPP CPM page CRP 01 – will be e-mailed to Bureau
<i>Review of papers and discussions identification of potential difficulties and Strategy for presentations and clarity on decision.</i> Specific issues identified below:		CPM 2015/
CPM report -Meeting with Report writer David Massey	Fedchock	
Opening of the Session (Ag 1) -arrangements -Mr. LEE Dong-pil, Minster, Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (MAFRA) will give opening remarks via video.	Fedchock	<i>Ms Maria Helena Semedo, DDG giving opening speech</i>
Adoption of the Agenda (Ag 2) -other business items need to be added EU point re diagnostics?	Fedchock	01,08 INF 14
Election of the Rapporteur (Ag 3) - Proposed: o Mr Brain Double (Canada) o Ms Olga Lavrentjeva (Estonia)	Fedchock	
CPM Chair report (Ag 5)	Yim	INF 05, 06
Election of the Credential Committee (Ag 4) - Mr Tobias Olson (Sweden) for Europe	Fedchock	
Nominations of the Subsidiary Bodies (Bureau, SC, SBDS) (Ag 19) -communicating regional arrangements needs to be officially via FAO regional chair -recognition of long term members leaving	Larson	13, 30
Secretariat Report (Ag 16) - 2014 IPPC Secretariat Annual Report	Fedchock	INF 01 Report Annual 2014

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER	DOCUMENT NO.
Governance (Ag 7) - IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation - update - Summary of the Strategic Planning Group report - Highlights of the SPG October 2014 Meeting	Fedchock	16, 21, 24, INF 03,13
Standard setting (Ag 8) - Adoption of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures Adoption via vote: Timing of vote -Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) -PT:2007-206E: Cold treatment on Bactrocera tryoni on Citrus sinensis -PT:2007-206F: Cold treatment on Bactrocera tryoni on Citrus reticulata x C. sinensis -PT:2007:206G: Cold treatment on Bactrocera tryoni on Citrus limon Adoption by consensus: -International movement of growing media in association with plants for planting -International movement of wood -Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management -PT:2012:011: Irradiation for Dymicoccus neobrevipes, Planococcus lilacinus and Planococcus minor Formal objection on ISPMs: - International movement of wood - growing media Framework- next steps input from other CPM bodies and then to SPG	Larson	18 06 and annexes 07, 09, 11, 05, 19, 10 INF 15
Implementation (Ag 9) - Implementation Programme - ePhyto – update FAO CIO's proposal to implement	Sosa Fedchock	12,23 & 26 INF 17
International Plant Protection Convention Financial Report, Budget and Resource mobilization (Ag10) - Financial report - Resource mobilization	Benovic Fedchock	03, 27
Capacity development (Ag 11) -CDC evaluation, what are the next steps?? - Capacity Development pre-CPM training session, CPM-10 side sessions and CPM-10 Market Places	Fedchock Peralta	25 INF04, 17
National Reporting Obligations (Ag 12)	Nowell	22
Communications (Ag 13)	Fedchock	04,14

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER	DOCUMENT NO.
Liaison and Partnership and Cooperation of the IPPC with relevant organizations-possible response to progress (Ag 14) Floor given to: WTO-SPS, CBD Written reports from: STDF, IAEA, IICA Considerations of memorandum of cooperation being consider with WTO/SPS/TFA and WCO	Larson Fedchock	17,20 INF 07, 09 INF 11,12
Recommendations (Ag 15) - Possible criteria for the CPM recommendations (15.1)	Fedchock	02,15, 28 INF 16, 17
Dispute Settlement (Ag 16)	Nowell	29
Contracting Parties Reports of Successes and Challenges of Implementation (Ag 17) -APPC ePhyto -Canada ISPM 15	Fedchock	INF 02 INF 08 INF 10
Special Topics Session (Ag 18)	Fedchock	INF 06
Any other business (Ag 20) -European paper on diagnostics	Fedchock	
POST CPM-10 (2015) SESSION		
Friday 20 March (9:00 -13:00)		
1. Issues arising from CPM10 requiring Bureau actions		
2. Resource impact of CPM-10 (2015) decisions and prioritization	Yim	
3. Calendar of upcoming meetings	Fedchock	
4. Items to be added to the June 2015 Agenda -opening remarks by new Secretary -reconsider partner-liaison-cooperation policy -enhancement evaluation -CPM 11 planning -CPM 11 agenda items -SPG planning and agenda	Fedchock	
5. Other business	Yim	
6. Close	Yim	
	Yim	

Appendix 2: Participants list

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates attendance at this meetings first part; a + indicate attendance in the second part of the meeting (post-CPM).

(Updated 2015-03-31)

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed ⁶	Term expires
✓ +	Africa Member	M Lucien KOUAME KONAN Inspecteur Direction de la Protection des Végétaux, du Contrôle et de la Qualité Ministère de l'Agriculture B.P. V7 Abidjan, COTE D'IVOIRE Phone: (+225) 07 903754 Fax: (+225) 20 212032	l.kouame@yahoo.fr ;	2 nd term / 2 years (2)	2016
✓ +	Asia Member <i>Chairperson</i>	Ms Kyu-Ock YIM Senior Researcher Export Management Division Department of Plant Quarantine Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs 178 Anyang-ro Manan-gu Anyang city, Gyunggi-do REPUBLIC OF KOREA Phone: (+82) 31 4207665 Fax: (+82) 31 4207605	koyim@korea.kr ;	CPM-8 (2013) 3 rd term / 2 years (0)	2016
✓ +	Europe Member	Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN Coordinating Policy Officer Phytosanitary Affairs Plant Supply Chain and Food Quality Department Ministry of Economic Affairs P.O. Box 20401 2500 EK - The Hague THE NETHERLANDS Phone: (+31) 618 596867	c.a.m.vanalphen@minez.nl ;	1st term / 2 years (0)	2016

⁶ The numbers in parenthesis refers to FAO travel funding assistance. (0) No funding; (1) Airfare funding; (2) Airfare and DSA funding.

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed ⁶	Term expires
✓ +	Latin America and Caribbean Member	Sr Diego QUIROGA Director Nacional de Protección Vegetal Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria (SENASA) Av Paseo Colón, 315 - 4 Piso Buenos Aires, ARGENTINA Phone: (+54) 11 4121 5176 Fax: (+54) 11 4121 5179	dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar ;	1st term / 2 years	2016
+	Near East Member	Mr Khidir Gibriel MUSA EDRES Director General Plant Protection Directorate P.O.Box 14 Khartoum North SUDAN Ph.: (+249) 912138939	khidirgme@outlook.com ; khidirgme@gmail.com ;	Replacement term/ 2 years	2017
✓ +	North America Member	Mr John GREIFER Assistant Deputy Administrator Plant Protection and Quarantine Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Department of Agriculture 1400 Independence Ave., South Building Washington DC 20250 USA Phone: (+1) 202 7997159	john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov v;	3rd term / 2 years (0)	2016
+	Pacific Member <i>Vice chairperson</i>	Ms Lois RANSOM GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Ph.: (+61) 262723241	Lois.ransom@agriculture.gov.au ;	Replacement term/ 2 years	2017

Others (IPPC Secretariat staff attended parts of both Bureau sessions, therefore attendance below does not indicate full presence in the meeting)

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Members hip Confirmed	Term expires
✓ +	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Craig FEDCHOCK O-i-C	Craig.Fedchock@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓ +	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Ana Peralta Capacity Development Officer	Ana.Peralta@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓ +	IPPC Secretariat	Mr David Nowell National Reporting Obligations Officer	Dave.Nowell@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓ +	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Brent LARSON Standards Officer	Brent.Larson@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓ +	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Orlando SOSA IRSS Officer	Orlando.Sosa@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓ +	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Marko BENOVIC Finance	Marko.Benovic@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓ +	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Eva Moller Report writer	Eva.Moller@fao.org	N/A	N/A

Appendix 3: Action list

Action	Ref.	Responsible	Deadline
Add guidance on “adoption”, “endorsement” and “approval” to the IPPC procedure manual for standard setting	[19-21]	Secretariat (Standard Setting Office)	2015-08-30
Set up regular meetings between the AG-ADG and the Bureau during the June Bureau meetings to discuss ongoing implementation of the recommendations of the Enhancement evaluation	[43]	Secretariat (Coordinator)	2015-04-10
Invite Mr Peter Thomson to the SPG 2015 meeting	[51]	Secretariat (Coordinator)	2015-04-10
Consolidate input on “concept of a standards” from SC May 2015 and CDC June meeting and forward to the Bureau for discussions	[58]	Secretariat (Standard Setting Officer)	2015-09-15
Identify surveillance and implementation activities within CD and IRSS and forward this information to the Bureau June meeting	[87]	Secretariat (CD Officer; IRSS Officer)	2015-05-15
Explore if there are communication resources available within AGD to help IPPC Secretariat	[133]	Secretariat (Coordinator)	???
Prepare an informative paper on the IPPC work and liaison activities under SO4	[134]	Secretariat	???
Set up a support mechanism to countries who wish to support the initiative [IYPH] with practical advice on how to contact authorities, FAO, etc.	[134]	Secretariat; Mr Ralf LOPIAN	???
Prepare document on administrative and legal aspects of the ePhyto hub for the Bureau June 2015	[179]	Secretariat (Coordinator)	2015-05-15
Invite Mr Nico HORN to teleconference with the Bureau June 2015	[180]	Secretariat (Coordinator)	2015-05-15
Write CDC review report and forward to the Bureau June 2015	[186]	Mr Ralf LOPIAN	2015-05-15