



REPORT

(Revised on 2015-11-09)

Rome, Italy
12 and 16 October

CPM Bureau

October, 2015



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation

CONTENTS

- 1. Opening of the meeting3
- 2. Adoption of the Agenda and Election of the Rapporteur3
- 3. Housekeeping3
- 4. Review of the Report of the last Meeting3
- 5. Preparations for SPG3
- 6. Briefing on Implementation Progress of Enhancement Evaluation.....4
- 7. IPPC Secretariat Work Plan and Budget for 2016.....5
- 8. International Year of Plant Health 20206
- 9. Post SPG Discussion6
- 10. Briefing from the Financial Committee.....7
- 11. Next meeting.....8
- 12. Other Business8
- 13. Close of Meeting10

APPENDICES

- Appendix 01 – Agenda.....11
- Appendix 02 – Participants list12

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The Chairperson of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), Ms Kyu-Ock YIM (Rep. of Korea), welcomed the Bureau members back to Rome and wished them a fruitful meeting.
- [2] The Secretary for the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), Mr Jingyuan XIA also welcomed the Bureau to Rome. He briefed to the Bureau about the renewal of the IPPC Secretariat, which aims in a general goal of “One IPPC” through two strategies (internal cohesion and external influence), implements three actions (reshaping the structure, regrouping the responsibilities and renewing the operational mechanisms), and brings about four outcomes (new structure, new mechanism, new performance and new image).
- [3] He explained his efforts to reach this goal, highlighting the Mid-year report from the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter “Secretariat”) and noting that this was a step towards enhancing transparency and visibility as it will be distributed to FAO offices and external organizations. He also informed the Bureau that the Secretariat is organizing scientific seminars, held at FAO HQ on a number of important issues such as the International Year of Plant Health, invasive alien species, and so forth.
- [4] He further explained that discussions on the restructuring of the Secretariat are ongoing with FAO Senior Management.
- [5] The Bureau applauded the efforts to increase communication between the Secretariat and the contracting parties through the Mid-year report, and internally through regular meetings, expressing their full support for the initiatives.

2. Adoption of the Agenda and Election of the Rapporteur

- [6] The Bureau adopted the Agenda (Appendix 1).
- [7] The Bureau elected Corné VAN ALPHEN as Rapporteur.

3. Housekeeping

- [8] The Secretariat introduced the Participants list asking that the Bureau members verify their contact details (Appendix 2).
- [9] The Bureau noted the local information¹.

4. Review of the Report of the last Meeting

- [10] The CPM Chairperson summarized the main outcomes from the June meeting. There were no comments to the report of the June 2015 meeting².

5. Preparations for SPG

- [11] The Secretary introduced the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) agenda³ noting that he had decided to direct this year’s SPG meeting towards planning for the next five years through which discussions would also provide longer term strategic direction. He felt it was important that the SPG would take a more direct role in providing guidance on the short-term planning and direction of the Secretariat. He suggested that the SPG should decide on five “Themes” -one for each year- that the Secretariat should focus on to increase visibility and raise awareness about the IPPC. He informed the Bureau that the Secretariat had prepared presentations for each main area of work (standard setting, implementation

¹ [Link to Local information](#)

² Bureau 2015-06 report is available at <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81307/>

³ 01_SPG_2015_Oct

facilitation, communication, etc.) providing a historical overview of main achievements, future challenges and what the Secretariat would wish for the area in 2020. Each presentation would be concluded with a number of questions to facilitate SPG discussions.

- [12] Several Bureau members were concerned about the proposal to change focus of the SPG from longer-term strategic discussions to short-term planning, feeling this was not in line with the mandate of the SPG. They feared that instead of focusing on feasible goals, the SPG would create a long wish list without identifying the means to achieve the goals. They also pointed out that the SPG participants had not prepared for short-term discussions. However, the Secretary explained that although short-termed, the SPG was still needed for strategic thinking to help the Secretariat to move in the right direction.
- [13] The Bureau discussed how to approach the discussions, highlighting that it would be important to clearly identify the desired achievements for the discussions to have the intended outcomes. The Bureau agreed that there should be break out groups in order for all the areas to be covered adequately, and for there to be tangible outcomes for the Secretariat to use. The break out groups would report to plenary for further discussions.
- [14] The Bureau also agreed that these discussions should feed into preparations for the next strategic framework where it would be important first of all to decide on the overall direction. The Bureau agreed to propose the SPG to set up a drafting group for the development of the strategic framework.
- [15] As to the five-year plans that would be prepared, the Bureau discussed whether they should be approved by the CPM but agreed that they should be decided only at Bureau level. CPM would be briefed through the report from the SPG Chairperson report.

6. Briefing on Implementation Progress of Enhancement Evaluation

- [16] The IPPC Secretary gave a PowerPoint presentation of the steps taken to implement the Enhancement Evaluation highlighting that he strongly believed in taking a top down approach to the restructuring of the Secretariat. He highlighted his intentions to remove the Coordinator role and to establish two technical units: the Standard Setting Unit (SSU) and the Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU) each headed by a Unit manager that would report to the Secretary, which would lead also the Governance and Management Unit. The Secretary clarified that the approval of the new structure will be requested formally from FAO Senior management but that indication of their agreement had already been given and some changes were already being implemented accordingly.
- [17] He demonstrated the current structure of the Secretariat highlighting the temporary nature of most staff contracts and the imbalance in type of staff funding between the units, followed by the future desired structure which showed an increase in regular programme staff mirrored by the same number of trust fund staff. He stressed that while FAO Senior management was very positive towards the proposals, the current staffing situation at FAO is extremely difficult and it is unlikely that the Secretariat will be allowed to create new regular programme positions. In this context, the Secretary highlighted the need for all contracting parties to take stock of the situation and provide the necessary financial support to the Secretariat to sustain the activities and human resources.
- [18] He informed the Bureau that he had given this presentation also to Senior Management of the FAO including directors of HR and Legal Office. The outcomes from the meeting were considered confidential and they were not included in this report.
- [19] The Bureau appreciated the progress on the implementation of the recommendations, strongly supported the proposed structure and in particular the creation of a P5 position as this position was considered key for having two identically influential units. The Bureau queried a few details regarding the areas of responsibility of the units and suggested that a “plan b” be set up in terms of implementing the new structure in the situation where the new positions would not be agreed to.

[20] The Bureau also briefly discussed concerns raised by a contracting party on the implementation of recommendations from previous evaluations of the Secretariat. The contracting party had suggested the SPG discuss these concerns. However, the Bureau felt that the concerns had already been taken into consideration during the June 2015 Bureau discussions on the Evaluation. Additionally, the Bureau did not assume that previous evaluations would necessarily continue to have validity, but would rather be superseded by the more recent evaluation, and agreed that, in any case, it would be up to the Secretary to decide on which recommendations from previous evaluations to implement at this point.

7. IPPC Secretariat Work Plan and Budget for 2016

[21] The IPPC Coordinator introduced the Secretariat's work plan and budget which was a consolidated effort to demonstrate the next year's planned activities and budget⁴. The suggestion to create this stemmed from the Enhancement Evaluation and had been requested by the CPM Bureau.

[22] The work plan and budget was divided into three pillars to reflect the new proposed structure of the Secretariat: Governance and Management, SSU and IFU. The plan and budget, he explained, did not reflect the current staffing situation of the Secretariat but what was being proposed in the new structure. He highlighted that the plan and budget were the result of months of negotiations and planning and that the guiding principle had been to ensure that the budget allocations between the three units would be almost equal.

[23] He highlighted that there was no budget deficit on the regular programme allocation, but that the TF budget had a 112% deficit because the budget was based on this year's expenses.

[24] The Bureau expressed their appreciation of the work done by the Secretariat and discussed the work plan and budget. The following points were raised.

[25] Results and achievements. The Bureau suggested that the "major activities" should include the primary deliveries so that return on investment would be clear. It should be clearer what would be the major outcomes and achievements because, as presented, the work plan seemed to be a budget only. The Bureau felt it would be useful to understand what the core functions of Secretariat staff are and what will be achieved through these functions. In this context, the Bureau discussed the level of detail needed in the plan and budget, and agreed that it was not needed to increase particularly the details but that focus should be on the results, and advised the Secretariat to include expected outcomes and results by the three main pillars in the Secretariat Work plan and Budget for 2016. The Bureau also considered that these deliverables should be linked both to the core activities and the annual theme (see Section 5.1 and 9).

[26] Worst case scenario. As to a plan for the situation where the Multi-donor trust fund would not be replenished and hence the deficit would remain, the Bureau suggested that a line be added under each pillar to clarify which expected outcomes would not be achieved.

[27] Other trust funds. The Bureau queried the resources provided for capacity development projects outside of the Multi-donor trust fund, such as from the STDF and the EU. The coordinator explained that these funds had not been included in the plan and budget because it is funding that is competed for, allocated for a specific purpose only, and has a "volatile" or insecure nature. Several Bureau members felt it would be beneficial to have a full picture of the funding and outcomes, and hence to include these other TFs. The Bureau also suggested it be clearer in the plan and budget that core funding is needed for staff to mobilize resources.

[28] Process and further steps. The Bureau asked the Secretariat to make the necessary adjustments as advised in this meeting for approval by the Bureau in their December 2015 meeting. The Bureau also suggested that the Secretariat's Annual Report should contain information on what was proposed in the work plan and budget, and what was achieved.

⁴ 03_Bureau_2015_Oct

- [29] Implementation Facilitation. One Bureau member was concerned that the implementation of standards did not have a higher budget allocation. He stressed that many African countries have no capacity to implement the standards, and he argued that the Secretariat should focus more on building capacities for implementation instead of developing new standards.
- [30] The Coordinator expressed the appreciation for the comment and highlighted that the 2016 budget reflected the conscious effort to increase emphasis on implementation. Previous budgets had almost no allocation for implementation. Additionally, the CPM Chairperson recalled that IPPC cannot help the individual CPs directly, but only facilitate implementation because this is ultimately the obligation of all individual CPs. She suggested that the first priority should be for the country to identify the needs at a national level and lobby the appropriate ministers and FAO.

8. International Year of Plant Health 2020

- [31] Mr Ralf LOPIAN introduced the papers related to the ongoing activities to establish an International Year of Plant Health (IYPH)⁵. He summarized the SPG discussions on the IYPH specifically on the scope or definition of “plant health” and the main objective of the IYPH⁶.
- [32] The Bureau discussed the proposed definition of “plant health”. Some Bureau members felt that word choices such as “normative and legislative approaches”, which had been included to link plant health to the IPPC, would not be easily understandable by all. They acknowledged the intention of trying to purvey the international and national level efforts that are made through the IPPC and national governments, but pointed out that by mentioning these types of cooperation, others would be excluded (e.g. research). The Bureau did not agree on a specific proposal for terms, but asked that Mr Lopian discuss with a public affairs specialist to find appropriate terminology. The Bureau agreed to discuss the definition and scope of “plant health” at their December meeting.
- [33] The Bureau suggested that a preliminary time line for the proposal of the IYPH be added to the paper so that it would be clear how things would proceed. Mr Lopian explained that the document would be modified for presentation to CPM-11 (2016) and the Bureau suggested that the specific outputs for the IYPH should be discussed by the CPM to obtain the largest possible ownership.
- [34] As to the structure of the IYPH Steering Group, the Bureau agreed with the SPG recommendations.

9. Post SPG Discussion

- [35] The Bureau went over the SPG discussions and recommendations to the Bureau, and considered other issues of relevance for their next meeting and the CPM-11 (2016).
- [36] Ministerial participation at CPM-11 (2016). The Bureau agreed to invite the Ministers of Agriculture from Australia or China to participate via video.
- [37] Core Themes for IPPC in next five-years. The Bureau considered that the yearly Themes could be used as topics for discussion by CPM in plenary. Regarding the allocation of the Themes to the specific years, the Bureau shifted them around to accommodate for capacity building in 2019, as this is already a core business of the Secretariat and would not require many additional resources, which would need to be directed towards IYPH. The Secretary made some textual adjustments to the titles of the Themes: Plant health and food security for 2016, Plant health and trade facilitation for 2017, Plant health and environmental protection for 2018, Plant health and capacity building for 2019, and the International Year of Plant Health in 2020. The Secretary suggested to change “Global symposium on ePhyto” to “The Second IPPC Global Symposium on ePhyto” (as one has been held in Brazil already) to create a logic sequence for historic purposes. The Bureau agreed and suggested that the Symposium be advertised globally through press releases. Regarding the selection procedure of the countries for the pilot hub, the Bureau agreed with the plan proposed in the SPG and would await recommendations

⁵ 04_Bureau_2015_Oct; 05_Bureau_2015_Oct

⁶ 06_Bureau_2015_Oct

from the ePhyto steering group. The Bureau agreed that OIE and CODEX should be invited to join the steering group as observers.

- [38] IPPC 2020-2030 Strategy. The Bureau agreed that the preliminary drafting group to draft the IPPC 2020-2030 Strategy outline would consist of Mr Ralf LOPIAN (Finland), Ms Beatriz MELCHO (Uruguay) and Mr Peter THOMSON (New Zealand). The preliminary drafting group would draft the IPPC Strategy Outline for consideration by the Bureau.
- [39] Enhancement evaluation and CDC review. The Bureau considered whether to set up a plan to address any concerns from CPs on the implementation of recommendations from previous evaluations. The Bureau felt that this was not necessary because the 2007 evaluation had a different scope and would no longer be relevant. As to the CDC review, some Bureau members felt that it would be better to delay the reporting back on the CDC review to the CPM, until the structure of the secretariat had been fully agreed upon. However, the Bureau agreed to provide a status update to the CPM for information.
- [40] Framework for Standards and Implementation. The Bureau agreed with the SPG recommendation that the Framework for Standards and Implementation (outcome from the second working group) should be presented to the CPM. The Bureau fully acknowledged the usefulness of a full Framework for the Secretariat to integrate better and for CPs to get an overview of the work of the Secretariat.
- [41] To address the concerns raised by the CD Officer on behalf of the CDC, the Bureau invited the CDC and SC Chairpersons to meet and discuss the usefulness of the Framework in its current form, and to suggest any adjustments before CPM-11 (2016) discussion. They should also consider whether the CPM should be recommended to endorse or adopt the Framework including the implications on needs for flexibility. The Bureau felt that the two committees should be empowered and have the authority of the Framework and the mechanism for updating it (not the SPG as is currently in the process).
- [42] In this context, the CPM Chairperson reported on an informal meeting held in the margins of the SPG meeting between the SC Chairperson and the CDC representative (Mr Sam BISHOP) to discuss the possibility of having a combined call for topics for standards and implementation tools. The participants at that meeting agreed that this would be in the interest of all and agreed that the proposal will be presented to the Standards Committee and the CDC for discussion.
- [43] The Bureau applauded this effort for enhanced cooperation and collaboration and strongly encouraged that the CDC and SC Chairperson would meet and discuss regularly possibly during CPM and SPG meetings. The Bureau also agreed that the Chairpersons should be invited to the Friday Bureau meetings after the SPG meeting. Lastly, Bureau suggested that the Secretariat consider planning the SC and CDC meetings back-to-back or at the same time because this too would allow for integration of activities.
- [44] SPG meeting evaluation. The Bureau stressed the need for the agenda to be discussed and decided at the Bureau June meeting, that CPs should be encouraged and allowed to submit topics and papers for discussion at the meeting, that discussion papers must to be made available well in advance and that the meeting room should be such as to facilitate discussions.

10. Briefing from the Financial Committee

- [45] The Financial Committee (FC) Chairperson briefed the Bureau on the key outcomes from the FC meeting held on the morning of 12 October 2015, referring to the report for details⁷.
- [46] He noted that there are currently five key positions that will be abolished with a negative impact on certain activities due to the lack of contributions to the Multi-donor trust fund. The FC felt that the direction taken by the Secretariat was good but that also developing countries should be targeted. The

⁷ The report of the FC meeting will be available publicly at <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/bureau/ippc-financial-committee-fc/>

target is to obtain USD 0.5 million to fund the contracts after June 2016. Alternatively, the lapsed salary from the retiring positions could be used to fund the positions for some months.

- [47] He noted that the concept of sponsorship of standards came up again and that the TC-RPPO will be prompt to consider the issue in this year's meeting where the Secretary will bring it up to make the RPPOs to start thinking about it. Another cost saving option the FC considered was shortening the CPM session every second year or propose this with a cost tag to the CPM for all CPs to discuss this.
- [48] He also informed the Bureau that the Secretariat had formed a Task Force on Resource Mobilization.
- [49] For the FC meeting in March or June 2016, the FC will invite the EC to participate. It was outlined that the current working arrangements of the FC allow major donor representatives to be members of the FC as a confidence building measure. The Bureau felt this would be a good opportunity to build confidence in donors and create stronger links between the IPPC and potential and existing donors and therefore fully supported that a major donor such as the EC be invited to the FC meeting on 1 April 2016. The Bureau asked the Secretariat to take initiative to invite the appropriate EC representative.
- [50] He lastly mentioned some of the main functions and activities of the FC in the coming years and that one of these would be to review the FC working arrangements. Originally the FC working arrangements included provisions that they are to be reviewed by the SPG in 2015. SPG, however, had agreed that the FC working arrangements be reviewed by the FC itself and adopted by the CPM-Bureau. The Bureau noted this and asked that the FC report to the Bureau on their recommendations.
- [51] The Bureau will review the FC working arrangement in the June Bureau meeting 2016 as SPG agreed.

11. Next meeting

- [52] The Bureau will next convene virtually on 1 December 2015 (12:00h GMT+2). The Bureau's next face-to-face meeting will be in Rome from 29 to 31 March 2016, in combination with the Eleventh CPM Session (4-8 April 2016).
- [53] The Bureau members briefed each other on their attendance in various IPPC related meetings in the coming months. It was agreed that the CPM Chairperson will give a presentation of IYPH at the NAPPO Council 2015 meeting and that Mr Diego QUIROGA will give the same presentation (that he will have translated into Spanish) at the COSAVE Steering Group 2015 meeting.

12. Other Business

- [54] The Assistant Director-General for the Agriculture and Consumer Department (ADG AG), Mr Ren WANG, participated in the Bureau meeting to discuss any FAO issues of relevance to the IPPC and in specific the implementation of the Enhancement Evaluation. The Bureau briefed him on recent developments, including the ePhyto pilot project and the intention of the Republic of Korea to host CPM-12 (2017).
- [55] Mr WANG provided a brief overview of the current situation within FAO and reflected on today the 70th Anniversary of FAO and World Food Day which was being celebrated at the Milan Expo. He noted that 2016 will be marked by the "UN urban agenda", to be launched by UN Habitat and that, aligned with this, the "green week" which will be held in Berlin in January 2015 will expose the theme "food for urbanized cities". The "urban agenda" will be the leading theme of the coming year. Furthermore, FAO will be working to align the FAO strategic objections (SOs) further with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In addition, for FAO, the organizational cross-cutting priorities will be climate change, nutrition and statistics.
- [56] The Bureau queried under which priority he found IPPC would fit. Mr WANG explained that while the IPPC may not directly fit one of these priorities, the normative work of FAO can be considered "the bread and butter" of the organization and as such plays a fundamental role in the future work of FAO.

- [57] He further noted that the FAO Director-General (DG) is implementing structural changes to respond to the future needs in relation to implementation of the SDGs. This includes continued decentralization to enhance the capacity of delivery and a mobility scheme that allows for professional staff to transfer to field or HQ positions alike. He noted that the Secretariat, being an Art. XVI body, is not affected by this scheme. One challenge that must be tackled is to decentralize without losing the scientific and technical critical mass at HQ. He also explained that with zero growth, some vacancies are not being filled to allow for the regional and sub-regional offices to be staffed. To the question from a Bureau member on how FAO ensures that the regional and sub-regional staff is able to have a strong impact, he stressed that it will take time to build the capacities of the staff but that there will be expectations of high performance from their side.
- [58] As part of the change, the DG had decided that the Management of the FAO SOs should have more dedicated focus. The five SO managers would previously also cover director positions, but are now exclusively working on their individual SO programme officers. Administratively, they respond to the ADG of the Technical Cooperation Department and have teams consisting of professional and general service staff. Each SO is expected to deliver one-two regional initiatives (e.g. on rice or water).
- [59] The ADG noted that challenges within FAO remain and that we are in a moment of transition which will request not only structural but also cultural changes. Staff will be affected, in one way or the other. FAO has a zero growth in budget but ever increasing demands. For IPPC this translates into one challenge, which also stems from the Evaluation recommendations, namely that the potential of the Secretariat staff should be unlocked.
- [60] Lastly, he explained, FAO is presenting a plan to FAO Council in December for organizational adaptation so many more changes may come in the next year.
- [61] As to the implementation of the recommendations of the Evaluation, the ADG expressed his appreciation for the fact that the Bureau had endorsed FAO Senior management's response. He explained that the proposals for the structural changes within the Secretariat had been discussed with Office for Strategy, Planning and Resources Management, the Legal Office and the Human Resources Office. So far, the proposal had been received positively. However, he stressed that there would be no increase in core funding or the number of positions, hence there may be a change in grades of existing positions but the Secretariat will not see an increase in the number of regular programme positions. He concluded by noting that the proposal will need the approval of the DG.
- [62] In this context, he highlighted the need to focus on resource mobilization and that immediate, targeted and strong actions were needed.
- [63] The Bureau thanked the ADG for the briefing and for confirmation that current funding levels were likely to remain such in the future, and invited him to report on the implementation to CPM-11 (2016).
- [64] The Bureau emphasized their support to the Secretary and his attempts to renew the Secretariat and strongly encouraged the ADG to advocate for the recruitment of the P5 for SSU as this role will be essential to ensure the two pillars of the Secretariat will have equal weight.
- [65] The Bureau informed the ADG of the intention of the IYPH in 2020 and asked his advice in terms of collaboration and coordination within FAO, highlighting the desire to retain the responsibility for the IYPH within the Secretariat. Mr WANG suggested that close cooperation should be sought with AGP, including EMPRESS.
- [66] On a general note, he noted that he hoped that also the Bureau and CPM will be open and ready to adapt to the changing situation and reform and seek increased collaboration with other FAO divisions, such as AGP and AGE.

13. Close of Meeting

- [67] The CPM Chairperson thanked the Bureau members for their contributions and the Secretariat for their support and closed the meeting.

Appendix 01 – Agenda

Agenda item	Document No	Presenter
12 October 2015, Monday (14-17h) – Room B640		
1. Opening		YIM/XIA
		XIA
2. Adoption of the agenda and election of the rapporteur	01_Bureau_2015_Oct	YIM
3. Housekeeping		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants list • Local information 	02_Bureau_2015_Oct Link to Local information	NOWELL
4. Review of the Report of the last meeting	Link to the report	YIM
5. Preparations for SPG	01_SPG_2015_Oct	NOWELL
6. Briefing on Implementation Progress of Enhancement Evaluation		XIA
16 October 2015, Friday (09.30-17h) – Room D440		
7. IPPC Secretariat Work plan and Budget for 2016	03_Bureau_2015_Oct	XIA/BENOVIC
8. International Year of Plant Health 2020	04_Bureau_2015_Oct 05_Bureau_2015_Oct 06_Bureau_2015_Oct	LOPIAN
9. Post SPG discussion		FEDCHOCK
10. Briefing from the Financial Committee Chair		GREIFER
11. Next meeting		YIM
12. Other Business Remarks from Mr. Ren Wang, Assistant Director-General of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department of FAO		YIM
13. Close of the meeting		

Appendix 02 – Participants list

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed ⁸	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
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	Mr 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 (0)	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	1st term / 2 years (2)	2017

⁸ 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 ⁵	Term expires
✓	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 7207677	john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov	3rd term / 2 years (0)	2015
✓	Pacific Member	Ms Lois RANSOM Assistant Secretary, Plant Import Operations GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Ph.: (+61) 262723241	Lois.ransom@agriculture.gov.au	3rd term / 3 years (0)	2017

Others

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Jingyuan XIA Secretary	Jingyuan.Xia@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Craig FEDCHOCK Coordinator	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	Ms Eva Moller Report writer	Eva.Moller@fao.org	N/A	N/A