



联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations

Organisation des Nations
Unies pour l'alimentation
et l'agriculture

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная организация
Объединенных Наций

Organización de las
Naciones Unidas para la
Alimentación y la Agricultura

منظمة
الغذية والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Twelfth Session

Incheon, Republic of Korea , 5-11 April 2017

EU written statements on various agenda items

Agenda items 8.3; 8.5; 8.7; 8.10 and 9.5

Prepared by the European Union and its 28 member states

English only

This document is printed in limited numbers to minimize the environmental impact of FAO's processes and contribute to climate neutrality. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and to avoid asking for additional copies. Most FAO meeting documents are available on the Internet at www.fao.org

CPM-12 (2017)
STATEMENTS FROM THE EUROPEAN UNION
AND ITS 28 MEMBER STATES
REGARDING THE FOLLOWING CPM AGENDA ITEMS

- **8.3 Sustainable funding**
- **8.5 Strategic partnerships**
- **8.7 Ink amendments for CPM recommendations**
- **8.10 Proposal for a new implementation oversight body**
- **9.5 Adjustment to the language review process**

8.3 Sustainable funding (Document CPM 2017/26)

The EU and its 28 Member States thank the CPM-Bureau, the Financial Committee and the SPG for their deliberations and proposals on the matter. At CPM-10 and CPM-11 the EU and its Member States made identical statements on the matter of sustainable funding. These statements contained a reference that "*We strongly believe that a possible contribution agreement based on voluntary contributions would need very careful preparation. We suggest this would-be part of the preparation of the IYPH so a proposal could be considered for a possible adoption by the CPM in that year*".

We think, that decision point 1 in paragraph 20 which states that the CPM "*Endorse in principle the use of a Voluntary Assessed Contribution Agreement*" could be understood as an agreement that a Voluntary Assessed Contribution Agreement is already accepted without any details developed for it. This is not acceptable for us. We would like to propose therefore to reword decision point 1 and to combine it with decision point 2 of paragraph 20 that it reads:

- 1) *Request* the CPM Bureau and its Financial Committee, as well as the SPG, to develop detailed provisions for the use of a "Voluntary Assessed Contribution Agreement" (VACA) system and a "Pay-As-You-Go" system as the fundamental components of a proposal for sustainable funding to be made at CPM-15 in 2020.

The original decision point 3 should stay as it is and be renumbered as 2.

In addition, we think that the encouragement of contracting parties to commit extra-budgetary resources consistent with the suggested amounts in attachment 2 is not appropriate. We should not align the extra-budgetary commitments of contracting parties to the amounts in a payment schedule which has not been adopted by the CPM. We propose that the relevant decision point is shortened and that it reads:

- 3) *Encourage* contracting parties in the interim period to commit extra-budgetary resources to the IPPC.

EU AND ITS 28 MEMBER STATES POSITION FOR CPM12**8.5 Strategic partnership (Document CPM 2017/37)**

The EU and its 28 Member States welcome and fully support the proposal for improving the collaboration between the IPPC and stakeholders. We also agree to the proposal to organize a stakeholder conference in 2020. Nevertheless, we do have a few observations and suggestions on the proposal:

The paper is very much industry oriented. We would like to stress that stakeholders are not just industry or their representatives, but also environmental groups and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) of different orientation. For this reason, it is our firm belief that the proposed Stakeholder Advisory Group should also contain other stakeholders than just industry representatives.

Furthermore, we think that the CPM as the initiator of the initiative to establish a Stakeholder Advisory Group must specify which expectations it has from the group. We should not just establish a Stakeholder Advisory Group for the sake of establishing such a group but we should attribute precise tasks for and expectations from the workings of the Stakeholder Advisory Group. This would be especially needed when considering the composition of the Stakeholder Advisory Group.

Finally, we consider that it would be important that the Stakeholder Advisory Group be officially connected to the CPM, but not as one of its subsidiary bodies.

In conclusion, we believe that draft ToR and RoP of the Stakeholder Advisory Group should be developed by the CPM-Bureau and the SPG, with stakeholders' involvement. The ToR and RoP of the Stakeholder Advisory Group could be agreed in the year 2020 at CPM-15 and the envisaged stakeholder conference. Thank you for this very important proposal.

EU AND ITS 28 MEMBER STATES POSITION FOR CPM12

8.7 Ink amendments for CPM recommendations (Document CPM 2017/15 Rev_1)

The EU and its 28 Member States would like to thank the IPPC Secretariat for the revision of the CPM recommendations and for intending to post the updated CPM Recommendations in all languages on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP). We welcome the increased visibility and transparency around CPM Recommendations.

The EU also supports the proposed criteria for CPM Recommendations in Attachment 3 of the CPM paper 2017/15 Rev 1 and would like to propose the following editorial changes to read:

Proposed Criteria for CPM Recommendations

1. The following are the main criteria to be considered when reviewing proposed topics for CPM Recommendations:

- In all cases, the proposed topic should address issues that fit within the legal framework of the Convention, its International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs), or strategic goals.
- And as much as possible, the proposed topic should:
 - address important issues related to plant health, either to promote action on a specific phytosanitary issue or to address a more generalized issue;
 - be relevant to the needs of the contracting parties, or at least a majority of the parties;
 - cover issues or actions that contracting parties or national or regional plant protection organizations have some influence, authority or competence to address;
 - offer “guidance” that is not possible or appropriate to offer, at the moment, in the form of a standard **or**
 - provide practical guidance and support for improving the implementation of **the Convention**, a specific ISPM or set of ISPMs.

EU AND ITS 28 MEMBER STATES POSITION FOR CPM12

8.10 Proposal for a new implementation oversight body (Document CPM 2017/08)

The EU and its 28 Member States welcome the establishment of the new IPPC subsidiary body, the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) under the proposed Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure.

We support the IPPC Secretariat proposal for the CPM to agree that the NROAG, TRG and SBDS be dissolved at the same time as the IC is established and that the functions and procedures of these committees to be transferred to the IC. Therefore, we believe that NROAG functions should be mentioned in the scope of the terms of reference the IC.

There are more points that we would like to mention, that relates to the scope of the IC. With the aim of clarity, we propose to redraft the paper CPM 2017/08 Appendix 1, point 2 bullet points 4 and 5 and incorporate the bullet point related with NROAG functions. We therefore suggest that the text of above mentioned bullet points in the ‘Scope of the IPPC Implementation and Capacity Development Committee’ be changed to read:

- Monitors and evaluate the efficacy and impact of implementation activities and reports on progress which indicates the state of plant protection in the world.
- Oversees dispute avoidance and settlement processes.
- Oversees national reporting obligation processes.

Also, we would like to support the initiative to have close cooperation between Standards Committee and the IC members to link standard setting and implementation activities together. Therefore, we would like to encourage the SC and the CDC (further the IC) to set as a priority the development of criteria for the joint IC/SC call for topics and issues.

EU AND ITS 28 MEMBER STATES POSITION FOR CPM12

9.5 Adjustment to the language review process (Document CPM 2017/23)

The EU and its 28 Member States welcome the modified LRG process which will allow saving significant resources.

For a better transparency, we suggest the following change in document CPM 2017/23:

- page 3, point 6: add a part to the last sentence: “If consensus cannot be achieved, the FAO Translation service will make the final decision and provide explanations in writing, and the IPPC Secretariat will make them available to contracting parties.”