CPM Recommendations

1. 1. At CPM-8 the IPPC Coordinator introduced a paper presenting two proposed CPM Recommendations and reminded members that over a period of several years (2008–2009), the CPM had discussed the need for a category of decisions that are not ISPMs but would serve as lasting reference material and benefit from a higher profile than being published only within the text of a CPM report.
2. 2. He also reminded members that CPM-4 (2009) had agreed on a process for submitting proposed Recommendations and clarified that this was the first time it was being used because existing Recommendations had been allocated to this category retroactively.
3. 3. The Coordinator noted that the IRSS conducted two desk studies that were presented to CPM during the Scientific Session. This resulted in a fruitful discussion but CPM had not had time to act on the issues presented.
4. 4. The Coordinator emphasized that these Recommendations were being introduced to encourage ways forward and continue the momentum from 2012.
5. 5. At CPM-8 there were members who supported immediate adoption and others who sought additional consultation before moving forward having noted that Recommendations have a high profile.

 **The CPM asked the Secretariat to:**

* (1) Invite members to provide comments on both Recommendations by 30 May 2013;
* (2) Referred the Recommendations to the Bureau for consideration;
* (3) Decided that the SPG should discuss the Recommendations at its meeting in October 2013;
* (4) Invited the Secretariat to present the revised Recommendations at CPM - 9.
1. 6. The Secretariat made the recommendations available for a period of 30 days following CPM-8 for contracting parties to provide additional comments. After the period the Secretariat received comments from only 4 contracting parties and the EC.
2. 7. The comments received at CPM-8 and after the 30 day consultation were incorporated and submitted to review by the Bureau.
3. 8. Following the steps outlined by CPM the two recommendations are presented to the SPG for discussion.

Recommendation on the IPPC coverage of Aquatic Plants

Background

1. The IPPC, having the purpose of “securing common and effective action to prevent the spread and introduction of pests of plants and plant products”, does not distinguish between terrestrial and aquatic plants and does not specifically refer to aquatic plants. Furthermore, as clarified by the CPM on several occasions, the IPPC deals with the protection of plants whether cultivated, managed or wild.
2. Aquatic plants may, as other plants, be infested by pests, pathways for pests or themselves be pests to other plants.
3. “Aquatic plants,” are mentioned in several International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) as plants that should be protected under the IPPC framework. CPM-1 (2006) noted the IPPC Secretariat’s liaison with other international organizations to clarify the mandate of the IPPC with respect to invasive aquatic plants. The IPPC Business Plan 2007 - 2011, adopted at CPM-2 (2007), identified marine and other aquatic plants as an emerging issue to be considered, and it was stated that ISPMs should be developed or modified to take aquatic invasive plants into account.
4. At CPM-5 (2010) a scientific session on aquatic plants was held, outlining the pest risks to and from aquatic plants. CPM members agreed that in principle aquatic plants were covered under the scope of the IPPC.
5. At CPM-6 (2011) it was agreed that the issue of aquatic plants (including the question on *algae*) under the IPPC should be further considered by the Bureau and SPTA. The CPM agreed that the issue of aquatic plants within the IPPC should be further considered by the Bureau and SPTA and the conclusions be reported back to the CPM (CPM-6, Report, Para 193).
6. Accordingly, a “Scoping study on aquatic plants and their significance to the IPPC” was conducted under the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) project and presented at the IPPC Symposium at CPM-7 (2012).
7. This recommendation synthesizes these discussions, taking into account the findings from a study conducted through the implementation review and support system (IRSS), and concludes with a set of recommended actions for contracting parties (including NPPOs), RPPOs and the Secretariat.
8. ***Addressed to:*** Contracting parties, National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs), Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs), and the IPPC Secretariat
9. ***Recommendation:***
10. The CPM *confirms*, that aquatic plants should be protected and invasive aquatic plants considered as potential pests under the IPPC framework.
11. Therefore, the CPM *encourages* the following commitments be recognized:

***Contracting Parties or RPPOs***

* Contracting parties are encouraged to ensure that aquatic plants are included in pest risk analysis processes.
* Contracting parties are encouraged to ensure that relevant government agencies, importers, exporters, shipping service companies and/or agencies (for ship ballasts and tanks) and other stakeholders are aware of the pest risks related to the import and movement of aquatic plants.
* Contracting parties are encouraged to prevent the spread of known regulated aquatic plants as pests in the ornamental and other trade sectors, using appropriate phytosanitary measures, with support from other national organizations positioned to enforce such measures.
* Contracting parties are encouraged to ensure that aquatic plants, as potential pests and pathways, become subject to, or included in, pest risk analysis whenever relevant, in particular in cases where aquatic plants are intentionally imported for intended uses as plants for planting, e.g. in aquaculture or other aquatic habitats.
* Contracting parties are encouraged to ensure that, in accordance with the outcome of a pest risk analysis, aquatic plants as pathways or pests become subject to official control and that adequate phytosanitary measures such as phytosanitary import requirements, surveillance, eradication, containment etc. are established.
* RPPOs are encouraged to coordinate regional cooperative efforts on pest risk analysis for aquatic plants as pathways or pests.
* RPPOs are encouraged to coordinate communication among NPPOs and other stakeholders to strengthen regional approaches to managing risk and identifying appropriate management options for aquatic plants as pathways or pests.

***The IPPC Secretariat:***

* is encouraged to develop guidance on pest risk analysis addressing the introduction and spread of aquatic species into new areas.
* is encouraged to include aquatic plants in future capacity development activities on pest risk analysis, establishment of phytosanitary regulation, and the development of pest management plans etc.
* is encouraged to continue liaising with relevant international organizations (CBD in particular) and other partners to strengthen the coordination and cooperation on the protection of aquatic plants as well as the prevention of the introduction and spread of aquatic plants as pathways or pests.

Recommendation(s) superseded by the above: None.

RECOMMENDATION ON INTERNET TRADE (E-COMMERCE) IN PLANTS AND OTHER REGULATED ARTICLES

Background

1. Sale of plants and plant products ordered through the internet (e-commerce) has increased significantly in the years since the IPPC and most ISPMs were adopted. E-commerce is fueling an increasing volume of traded commodities. In many cases online traders of plants and plant products do not take into account a customer’s location before agreeing to a sale and shipping their purchases to them. This lack of knowledge of a customer’s location can lead to consignments of regulated articles being imported into a country without the phytosanitary certificates which may be required by the NPPO of that country.
2. A number of studies, including an IRSS study on internet trade presented at CPM 7 (2011), have shown that regulated articles ordered over the internet are routinely not accompanied by appropriate phytosanitary certificates during import. Similar concerns have also been identified with other forms of distance selling, such as mail order companies who trade via advertisements in newspapers and magazines.
3. In order for the global plant protection framework to keep pace with this increasingly important trade, NPPOs, RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat should collaborate with other stakeholders to monitor internet trade and to ensure that goods ordered in this way are incorporated into relevant phytosanitary regulations on the basis of risk analysis. This requires improvements in collaboration, monitoring and enforcement across the pathways known for transporting those goods, particularly postal and express delivery services.
4. ***Addressed to*:** Contracting parties, National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs), Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs), and the IPPC Secretariat
5. ***Recommendation*:**
6. This recommendation applies to a variety of products ordered through e-commerce. It includes plants for planting, other articles such as plants for consumption, soils, propagation media, and living organisms in a wide range of taxa that are known or have the potential to be plant pests and are sold to and exchanged by hobbyists, collectors, researchers etc. Many of these articles may be sold in a variety of product configurations that may incorporate or be infused with plants for planting though the product itself may not be recognized immediately to contain them (e.g. articles of clothing, footwear, packaging, greeting cards, paper products, home accessories, novelty products etc.).

**To respond to this developing situation, the CPM recommends the following:**

* NPPOs and RPPOs are encouraged to develop mechanisms for identifying e-commerce traders based within their countries and regions.
* NPPOs and RPPOs are encouraged to establish mechanisms to identify products of concern that may be purchased via e-commerce, with a focus on potential high-risk pathways such as plants
* for planting, soils and propagation media, living organisms etc. and to explore options for implementing appropriate phytosanitary regulations based on risk assessment.
* NPPOs of countries in which e-commerce traders are based are encouraged to promote to traders compliance with the phytosanitary requirements of importing countries.
* NPPOs and RPPOs are encouraged to ensure that adequate information on phytosanitary import requirements and the risks posed by bypassing them is communicated to e-commerce traders and their customers
* NPPOs and RPPOs are encouraged to strengthen coordination with postal and express courier services to ensure that relevant information of the phytosanitary risks and phytosanitary measures are conveyed to e-commerce traders.
* NPPOs, RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat are encouraged to raise awareness of the risks of bypassing phytosanitary regulations.
* NPPOs, RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat are encouraged to investigate the risks posed by all forms of distance selling and if necessary to include these purchasing methods in their risk management activities.

***Recommendation(s) superseded by the above:*** None.