

## 1. Opening of the session

- [1] The Director of the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division, Mr Jingyuan XIA, welcomed participants to the Fifteenth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), which was being held in virtual mode for the first time owing to the COVID-19 pandemic. He extended a particular welcome to Uzbekistan as the 184th contracting party to the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).
- [2] The CPM observed a one-minute silence to honour the former CPM Chairperson Mr Felipe CANALE and other members of the IPPC community who had been victims of the pandemic.
- [3] In her opening remarks, the FAO Deputy Director-General Ms Beth BECHDOL assured the CPM that the FAO remains fully committed in its support of the IPPC community and the mission it shares with FAO in protecting the world's plant resources while also contributing to safe trade and environmental protection. She highlighted some of the landmark achievements of the past two years and thanked Finland for spearheading the proclamation of the International Year of Plant Health (IYPH). Looking forward, the Deputy Director-General highlighted the importance of the new IPPC 2020–2030 Strategic Framework, but noted that it will require appropriate implementation plans to deliver it. She expressed appreciation for the role of the IPPC community in supporting Zambia as Champion of the proposal for an International Day of Plant Health and envisioned global implementation of the ePhyto (electronic phytosanitary certificate) Solution. Finally, she updated the CPM on the rigorous progress for the upcoming selection of a new IPPC Secretary.
- [4] Mr XIA thanked the Deputy Director-General and, on the occasion of his last CPM session, highlighted some of the main achievements during his tenure as IPPC Secretary. These included: the development and promotion of IPPC annual themes, IYPH and IPPC strategic frameworks; the adoption of 56 international standards; the delivery of 34 regional workshops; an enhanced IPPC ePhyto Solution; enhanced external collaboration; the issue of over 700 headline news; increased funding; and the reorganization of, and increase in, the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as the “Secretariat”).

## 2. Keynote address by the Finnish Minister of Agriculture and Forestry

- [5] The CPM Chairperson, Mr Francisco Javier TRUJILLO-ARRIAGA, welcomed participants and thanked Mr XIA and Ms BECHDOL for their encouraging words and continuous support. He congratulated all contracting parties, CPM observers, Mr Lucien KUAMÉ KONAN (the CPM Vice-Chairperson), his fellow CPM Bureau members, Mr Avetik NERSISYAN (IPPC Officer-in-Charge of daily matters) and the Secretariat on their work and thanked them for their support. He also expressed his sincere gratitude for the commitment, confidence, flexibility and support that contracting parties (CPs) had shown by endorsing the use of a virtual mode for this CPM session. The Chairperson then introduced the keynote speaker.
- [6] The keynote address was delivered by the Finnish Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, Mr Jari LEPPÄ, who reflected on the impact and legacy of the events of the past year for plant health. The Minister recalled the original proposal by Finland to celebrate the year 2020 as the IYPH, and the ambitious plans of Finland, the FAO and the IPPC community that followed. The aim had been to establish an understanding around the world that plant health is as important for the environment and livelihoods as human health is to the well-being of people. Two months into the year, however, the COVID-19 pandemic had struck, leading to the cancellation and postponements of physical events, and culminating in the cancellation of the flagship event – the first ever International Plant Health Conference.
- [7] The Minister acknowledged the enormous impact of the pandemic on IYPH activities and the resulting disappointment felt by event organizers, but noted that, in the wake of the pandemic, it would be easier to demonstrate to the public that plant-health epidemics can spread as fast as human-health epidemics, and

that prevention is far more economical than dealing with a full-blown, plant-health emergency. However, the Minister highlighted that we would not be able to prevent a future plant-health pandemic unless we also tackled climate change and environmental degradation. Emphasizing the role of strong international cooperation, he said that the world needed the cooperation, energy and knowledge of the IPPC community to find meaningful ways to prevent the spread of plant pests. He finished by expressing a dream that in 30 years' time the year 2020 would not only be remembered for the COVID-19 pandemic, but also as the beginning of a new international consciousness about One Health, including plant and environmental health.

### **3. Adoption of the agenda**

[8] The CPM added an update on the desert locust under agenda item 18 (Any other business), to raise awareness of the effects of this pest on food security.

[9] The CPM noted that the inclusion of plant health in the One Health approach, and in biosecurity and biosafety, was a matter for the SPG to examine, as there may not be enough information for it to be discussed at this CPM session.

[10] The CPM:

(1) *adopted* the Agenda with changes (Appendix XX) and noted the List of Documents (Appendix XX).

#### **3.1 European Union Statement of Competence**

[11] In response to a question from the European Union, the CPM Chairperson clarified that it was possible that an online polling system would be used during the session, but this would not constitute voting. In the event of a poll, time would be given to allow the European Union to hold internal consultations.

[12] The CPM:

(1) *noted* the Declaration of Competences and Voting Rights submitted by the European Union and its 27 member states.<sup>1</sup>

### **4. Election of the Rapporteur**

[13] The CPM:

(1) *elected* Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy) and Ms Raymonda JOHNSON (Sierra Leone) as Rapporteurs.

### **5. Report from the CPM Bureau on credentials**

[14] The CPM Chairperson informed the session that this year, in agreement with the FAO Legal Office, credentials submitted by contracting parties for their participation at CPM-15 (2021) had been reviewed by the CPM Bureau. He informed the session that 115 valid credentials had been received (plus three not valid), which was enough to constitute the quorum of a majority of CPM members.

[15] The CPM:

(1) *noted* the report from the CPM Bureau on credentials.

---

<sup>1</sup> CPM 2021/CRP/02

## 6. Report by the Chairperson of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures

[16] The CPM Chairperson presented his report.<sup>2</sup> As well as highlighting some of the key achievements of the last year and looking ahead to the challenges of the coming year, the report also outlined the governance position taken by the CPM Bureau following the cancellation of CPM-15 in 2020 owing to the COVID-19 pandemic. This included the Bureau taking various decisions on behalf of the CPM, to progress the annual IPPC work plan to the extent that was possible.

[17] The CPM noted that, in accordance with the *IPPC procedure manual*, reports that do not contain any decisions should be information papers (INFs) rather than DOCs.<sup>3</sup>

[18] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the report presented by the CPM Chairperson, including decisions taken by the CPM Bureau by virtual means throughout 2020;
- (2) *noted* that the CPM Bureau, on behalf of the CPM, established a CPM Focus Group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems;
- (3) *noted* that the CPM Bureau approved the Terms of Reference for a CPM Focus Group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems as presented in CPM 2021/13;
- (4) *noted* the composition of the CPM Focus Group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems as selected by the CPM Bureau.

## 7. Report by the IPPC Secretariat

[19] The IPPC Officer-in-Charge of daily matters presented the 2020 annual report of the IPPC Secretariat,<sup>4</sup> highlighting important achievements in ten areas of IPPC work: the CPM and subsidiary bodies, standard setting, implementation and capacity development, IPPC networks, the IPPC ePhyto Solution, IYPH, communication and advocacy, international cooperation, resource mobilization, and internal management.

[20] The CPM Chairperson clarified that financial and in-kind contributions were covered in the financial report under agenda item 12.

[21] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the 2020 annual report of the IPPC Secretariat.

## 8. Governance and strategy

### 8.1 Adoption of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030

[22] The Secretariat presented the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 to the CPM.<sup>5</sup> It had been revised to incorporate the adjustments agreed by CPM-14 (2019) and was now presented to the CPM for adoption.

[23] The IPPC Strategic Framework received broad support from CPs. Contracting parties commented on the benefits of identifying the links between the IPPC work programme and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, and the usefulness of the framework as a tool when promoting plant health activities. The need to have sufficient funding in place was emphasized, as was the importance of having an implementation plan for the Framework. The CPM noted that the development agenda and other parts of

---

<sup>2</sup> CPM 2021/13

<sup>3</sup> IPPC Procedure Manual: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/ippc-procedure-manual/> (section 2.7.3)

<sup>4</sup> CPM 2021/24

<sup>5</sup> CPM 2021/03

the Framework could be reviewed when necessary by the IPPC Strategic Planning Group (SPG) and the CPM Bureau, who could then seek agreement for proposed changes from the CPM.

[24] The CPM:

- (1) *adopted* the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030.

## **8.2 Adoption of the revision of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure**

[25] The Secretariat presented the paper on the proposed revisions to the Terms of Reference and the Rules of Procedure of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC).<sup>6</sup> These revisions were undertaken as advised by the FAO Legal Office to clarify several issues and were now being submitted for CPM adoption.

[26] The CPM noted the call from a few CPs and a regional plant protection organization (RPPO) to have more time to observe the work of the IC before changing its Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure.

[27] The CPM:

- (1) *deferred* consideration of the revision of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure to a future session of the CPM.

## **8.3 Report from the Strategic Planning Group**

[28] The Chairperson of the SPG, Mr Lucien KUAME KONAN, presented the 2020 summary report from the SPG,<sup>7</sup> which highlighted the main issues considered by the SPG at its meetings in 2020. The main focus of the group's discussion had been the implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 and the development agenda items identified therein. Areas that needed strengthening had been identified and it had been recognized that these needed to be supported by an adequate budget. The SPG had also reviewed its Rules of Procedure.

[29] The CPM considered the following four proposals arising from the SPG meetings, each being presented in a separate paper (the first by the United States of America and the others by the SPG Chairperson).

### ***Revision of the Strategic Planning Group Rules of Procedure***

[30] The SPG had drafted revised Rules of Procedure, with the aim of providing more focus on emerging strategic issues, rather than reviewing operational and administrative matters, and incorporating a mechanism for CPs to submit proposals for topics for discussion at SPG meetings.<sup>8</sup> The CPM was invited to adopt the revised Rules of Procedure.

[31] The views of CPs were mixed as to whether the proposed changes would serve to strengthen the role of the SPG or were not necessary at this time given the success of the SPG in recent years. Acknowledging the lack of consensus, the CPM Chairperson suggested that the SPG discuss the matter further.

### ***Establishment of CPM Focus Group on Implementation Plans for the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030***

[32] The SPG had recommended to the CPM Bureau that Terms of Reference be developed for a focus group, to be established by the CPM, to develop a clear plan for sequencing the implementation of the IPPC

---

<sup>6</sup> CPM 2021/09

<sup>7</sup> CPM 2021/19

<sup>8</sup> CPM 2021/06

Strategic Framework 2020–2030 development agenda items. The resulting Terms of Reference were presented to the CPM for consideration.<sup>9</sup>

- [33] A few CPs expressed their support for the establishment of the CPM focus group, one of which highlighted the importance of sequencing as it is better to focus upon a few items at a time and to do them well, rather than trying to do everything at once. The role of the IPPC Strategic Framework in strengthening the plant-health community was highlighted, and the Secretariat expressed appreciation to New Zealand and Finland for the preparing the draft Framework.
- [34] The CPM agreed to amend the proposed Terms of Reference of the focus group to change the nomination process so that the CPM Bureau *endorses* rather than *reviews* nominations and to change the section on Functions to align better with the wording in the IPPC Strategic Framework.<sup>10</sup>

#### ***Establishment of CPM Focus Group on Communications***

- [35] The SPG had endorsed a proposal to develop a new IPPC Communications Strategy, which would be aligned with the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030, and had recommended that the CPM establish a focus group on communications to be responsible for drafting and supporting the implementation of the new strategy.
- [36] The CPM considered this proposal, together with the corresponding draft Terms of Reference,<sup>11</sup> and agreed to amend the Terms of Reference to include an additional point to focus IPPC communication activities on the planning and implementation of future International Days of Plant Health.

#### ***Establishment of CPM Focus Group on Climate Change Impacts on Plant Health***

- [37] The SPG had recommended that the CPM establish a focus group on climate change impacts and plant health, which would be mandated to develop an IPPC action plan on climate change and to coordinate its implementation. The CPM considered this proposal, together with the corresponding draft Terms of Reference.<sup>12</sup>
- [38] There was broad support for the establishment of this focus group among CPs, but some also suggested amendments to the Terms of Reference or commented on possible changes to it. These included: amendments to the membership, in terms of having a broader range of skills, a regional nomination component, a clear process for selection of experts, and an open call for nominations including regional nomination; a possible additional function; and amendments to bring the Terms of References into greater alignment with those of the other focus groups being considered under this agenda item. The CPM acknowledged the need for representation from all regions of the world, and noted the concerns expressed that countries should not be asked to commit to cover the costs of participating in face-to-face meetings. Some CPs suggested that the focus group be opened up to other entities working on climate change.
- [39] Wider comments from CPs on the subject of climate included the suggestion for a group to be set up to debate the challenges posed by climate change, and the suggestion that an introductory webinar be held to present the findings of the study on the impact of climate change on plant health.
- [40] Interested CPs considered the suggested changes to the Terms of Reference in more detail outside of the session, and brought an amended version back to the CPM for consideration.<sup>13</sup> This took account of the

---

<sup>9</sup> CPM 2021/08

<sup>10</sup> CPM 2021/CRP/10

<sup>11</sup> CPM 2021/07

<sup>12</sup> CPM 2021/14

<sup>13</sup> CPM 2021/CRP/11\_REV1

need to base membership of the focus group on scientific expertise as well as regional representation, including experts on climate change related to pests.

[41] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the summary of the 2020 meetings of the IPPC Strategy Planning Group;
- (2) *agreed* not to revise the Rules of Procedure for the IPPC Strategic Planning Group (SPG) at this time, and *noted* that the matter needed further consideration by the SPG;
- (3) *agreed* to establish a CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework's 2020–2030 Development Agenda Items, and *adopted* Terms of Reference for the group as modified in this meeting (Appendix XX);
- (4) *agreed* to establish a CPM Focus Group on Communications, and *adopted* Terms of Reference for the group as modified in this meeting (Appendix XX);
- (5) *agreed* to establish a CPM Focus Group on Climate Change Impacts on Plant Health, and *adopted* Terms of Reference for the group as modified in this meeting (Appendix XX).

#### **8.4 Endorsement of updated Framework for Standards and Implementation**

[42] The IPPC Officer-in-Charge of daily matters presented the Framework for Standards and Implementation, which had been updated, restructured and aligned with the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030, reviewed by the SC, IC and SPG, and was now being presented to the CPM for endorsement.<sup>14</sup>

[43] The CPM:

- (1) *endorsed* the revision of the Framework for Standards and Implementation as presented in the paper;
- (2) *requested* that the Secretariat update the content of the Framework for Standards and Implementation, including updates to reflect decisions made by CPM-15 (2021);
- (3) *agreed* that the most current version of the Framework for Standards and Implementation, updated by the Standards Committee, Implementation and Capacity Development Committee and Strategic Planning Group, will be maintained and fully accessible on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP).

### **9. Standard setting**

#### **9.1 Report from Standards Committee**

[44] The SC Chairperson presented the report of the SC's activities during 2019 and 2020.<sup>15</sup> He outlined the progress made with development of standards, the work done on the development and governance approach for commodity standards with a new technical panel formed, the discussions held on the reorganization of the pest risk analysis standards, and the webinar held on the authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions. He also pointed out that approximately 50 of the 100 topics on the SC work programme have progressed. The SC Chairperson highlighted the collaborative work with the IC in revising the Framework for Standards and Implementation. Finally, he thanked all those involved in the standard setting process, including the Technical Panels and especially the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine, whose disestablishment was to be considered under agenda item 9.3 of this CPM.

[45] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the report on the activities of the Standards Committee in 2019 and 2020.

---

<sup>14</sup> CPM 2021/11

<sup>15</sup> CPM 2021/17, CPM 2021/INF/17

## 9.2 Adoption of standards

- [46] The Secretariat introduced the papers for this agenda item, which presented the draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) proposed by the SC for adoption by the CPM, the diagnostic protocols (DPs) adopted by the SC on behalf of the CPM since the last session of the CPM, and activities related to translation of adopted standards.<sup>16</sup> The SC had requested that the CPM convey its appreciation to the experts of the drafting groups for their active contribution to the development of these standards.
- [47] The Secretariat informed the CPM that the deadline for objections specified in the Standard Setting Process was three weeks before CPM-15 (2021), namely 22 February 2021, but by that date no objections had been received.<sup>17</sup>
- [48] The CPM noted the need for capacity development to help CPs in developing countries implement standards such as the one on modified atmosphere treatments.
- [49] The CPM:
- (1) *adopted* the revision of ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) (2009-005) (Appendix XX) and revoked the previously adopted version;
  - (2) *adopted* ISPM 44 (*Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as phytosanitary measures*) (2014-006) (Appendix XX);
  - (3) *adopted* the 2018 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001) (Appendix XX) and revoked the previously adopted version;
  - (4) *noted* that the Standards Committee adopted on behalf of the CPM the following diagnostic protocol (DP) as an annex to ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*): DP 29 (*Bactrocera dorsalis*) (2006-026);
  - (5) *adopted* PT 33 (Irradiation treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis*) (2017-015) as Annex 33 to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) (Appendix XX);
  - (6) *adopted* PT 34 (Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica*) (2017-022A) as Annex 34 to ISPM 28 (Appendix XX);
  - (7) *adopted* PT 35 (Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica*) (2017-022B) as Annex 35 to ISPM 28 (Appendix XX);
  - (8) *adopted* PT 36 (Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Vitis vinifera*) (2017-023A) as Annex 36 to ISPM 28 (Appendix XX);
  - (9) *adopted* PT 37 (Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Vitis vinifera*) (2017-023B) as Annex 37 to ISPM 28 (Appendix XX);
  - (10) *adopted* PT 38 (Irradiation treatment for *Carposina sasakii*) (2017-026) as Annex 38 to ISPM 28 (Appendix XX);
  - (11) *adopted* PT 39 (Irradiation treatment for the genus *Anastrepha*) (2017-031) as Annex 39 to ISPM 28 (Appendix XX);
  - (12) *adopted* ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*) (2014-002) (Appendix XX);
  - (13) *thanked* the experts of the groups who drafted the adopted standards for their active contribution to the development of these standards (Appendix XX);
  - (14) *noted* that the following three ISPMs (including one diagnostic protocol (DP)) had been reviewed by the Arabic, Chinese, Russian and Spanish Language Review Groups and FAO Translation Services,

---

<sup>16</sup> CPM 2021/15 (including attachments 01–11)

<sup>17</sup> CPM 2021/INF/11

and that the IPPC Secretariat had incorporated the modifications accordingly and posted the new versions on the Adopted Standards page of the IPP to replace the previous versions:

- ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*),
  - ISPM 43 (*Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure*),
  - DP 2 (*Plum pox virus*);
- (15) *thanked* contracting parties and regional plant protection organizations involved in the Language Review Groups, as well as FAO Translation services, for their efforts and hard work to improve the language versions of ISPMs;
- (16) *acknowledged* the contributions of contracting parties, regional plant protection organizations, and organizations who hosted or helped organize standard setting meetings in 2019:
- Canada for hosting the Expert Working Group on Audit in the Phytosanitary Context (2015-014),
  - The Joint FAO/International Atomic Energy Agency Division for Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture for hosting the meeting of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments in Vienna, Austria,
  - Australia, the AgriBio-Centre for Agri Bioscience and La Torbe University for hosting the meeting of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols,
  - France, for providing in-kind staff support in 2019 for the Standard Setting Unit of the IPPC Secretariat;
- (17) *acknowledged* the contributions of the members of the Standards Committee who had left the committee in 2019 and 2020:
- Brazil, Mr Jesulindo Nery DE SOUZA JUNIOR,
  - Canada, Mr Rajesh RAMARATHNAM,
  - Iraq, Mr Abdulqader Khudhair ABBAS,
  - Kenya, Ms Esther KIMANI,
  - Lebanon, Mr Nicholas EID,
  - New Zealand, Mr Stephen BUTCHER,
  - Samoa, Mr Lupeomanu Pelenato FONOTI,
  - Sri Lanka, Ms Jayani Nimanthika WATHUKARAGE,
  - Syria, Ms Ouroba ALZITANIABOALBORGHOL;
- (18) *acknowledged* the contributions of the members of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments who left in 2019:
- FAO/IAEA Joint Division, Mr Andrew PARKER (member),
  - China, Yuejin WANG (member),
  - Egypt, Ms Shaza OMAR (Assistant Steward);
- (19) *acknowledged* the contribution of the following member of the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine who left in 2019:
- Poland, Mr Krzysztof SUPRUNIUK (member).

[50] The Secretariat presented the paper on proposed ink amendments to adopted ISPMs, arising from consistency reviews,<sup>18</sup> and also highlighted that the ink amendments to phytosanitary treatments on

---

<sup>18</sup> CPM 2021/22



irradiation described in the paper would also be applied to the two irradiation treatments adopted at this CPM as annexes to ISPM 28.<sup>19</sup>

[51] The CPM noted the suggestion that, in future, changes of a technical nature that change the substance or content of a standard, such as the removal of the disclaimer from the irradiation treatments, should be considered to be technical revisions and not be submitted as ink amendments, and that ink amendments should be reserved for changes that improve the consistency of terminology.

[52] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the ink amendments to the following adopted annexes to ISPM 28 (Appendix XX, attached to the English version only):
  - PT 1 (Irradiation treatment for *Anastrepha ludens*),
  - PT 2 (Irradiation treatment for *Anastrepha obliqua*),
  - PT 3 (Irradiation treatment for *Anastrepha serpentina*),
  - PT 4 (Irradiation treatment for *Bactrocera jarvisi*),
  - PT 5 (Irradiation treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni*),
  - PT 7 (Irradiation treatment for fruit flies of the family Tephritidae (generic)),
  - PT 14 (Irradiation treatment for *Ceratitis capitata*),
  - PT 33 (Irradiation treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis*),
  - PT 39 (Irradiation treatment for the genus *Anastrepha*);
- (2) *noted* the ink amendments to the use of “commodity class” to ensure a consistent use across adopted ISPMs (Appendix XX, attached to the English version only);
- (3) *noted* that the ink amendments will be implemented into the language versions of the standards concerned as resources permit;
- (4) *agreed* that, once the Secretariat has applied the ink amendments, the previous versions of the standards will be replaced by the newly implemented versions;
- (5) *noted* the comments made at this meeting regarding what constitute an ink amendment.

### 9.3 Standards Committee recommendations to the CPM

[53] The SC Chairperson presented the SC’s recommendations to the CPM from 2019 and 2020.<sup>20</sup> These included updates to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*<sup>21</sup>, including topics added by the CPM Bureau on behalf of the CPM, and a proposal to disestablish the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine because none of the current topics on its work programme are anticipated to move forward in the coming years and the panel had not met since September 2017.

[54] The CPM noted that the disestablishment of the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine would not hinder progress on topics related to forestry, as work on individual topics could still proceed via expert working groups or the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments.

[55] The CPM:

- (1) *adopted* the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, with the adjustments outlined in CPM 2021/18;

---

<sup>19</sup> CPM 2021/INF/12

<sup>20</sup> CPM 2021/18

<sup>21</sup> *List of topics for IPPC standards*: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards/list>

- (2) *disestablished* the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ);
- (3) *thanked* the members of the TPFQ for their contributions over the years (Appendix XX).

## 10. CPM recommendations

[56] The Secretariat presented the paper outlining the development of draft CPM Recommendations since CPM-14 (2019).<sup>22</sup> A CPM Recommendation is an adopted text by the Commission on important issues related to plant health, either to promote action on a specific phytosanitary issue or to address a more generalized issue.<sup>23</sup>

### 10.1 Adoption of draft CPM Recommendation on “food aid”

[57] The draft CPM Recommendation on *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation* (2018-026) had been submitted to two rounds of consultation and had been revised accordingly. This had included removing the appendices because it had been suggested that these would go beyond the scope of the IPPC. It was proposed that the appendices be submitted as contributed resources on the IPP instead, following the usual contributed resources process. Further to these changes, the CPM Bureau had recommended the draft CPM Recommendation to CPM-15 (2021) for adoption.<sup>24</sup>

[58] Some CPs expressed support for adoption of the draft CPM Recommendation, noting the particular importance of the Recommendation for countries that are vulnerable to natural disasters. A few of these also expressed disappointment about the removal of the appendices. One RPPO informed the CPM of its intention to submit a proposal for an ISPM on the provision of food and humanitarian aid during the 2021 Call for Topics, including the information contained in the appendices removed from the CPM Recommendation, as it felt there is a need for more detailed guidance. A few CPs lent their support to the idea of developing a standard, with one also intending to submit a proposal for a topic.

[59] The CPM:

- (1) *adopted* CPM Recommendation R-09 (*Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation*) (2018-026) (Appendix XX).

### 10.2 Approval for first consultation of CPM Recommendation on “contaminating pests”

[60] The draft CPM Recommendation on *Facilitating safe trade by reducing the incidence of contaminating pests associated with traded goods* (2019-002) had been developed through an international workshop and virtual drafting group,<sup>25</sup> and the SPG had subsequently recommended it to CPM-15 (2021) for approval for first consultation.

[61] The CPM noted the support of CPs for this proposal.

[62] The CPM:

- (1) *agreed* to submit to consultation the draft CPM Recommendation on *Facilitating safe trade by reducing the incidence of contaminating pests associated with traded goods* (2019-002), contained in CPM 2021/16\_02, between 1 July and 30 September 2021 using the Online Comment System, with a view to presenting a final version for adoption at CPM-16 (2022).

---

<sup>22</sup> CPM 2021/16

<sup>23</sup> CPM Recommendations: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/cpm/cpm-recommendations-1/cpm-recommendations/>

<sup>24</sup> CPM 2021/16\_01

<sup>25</sup> CPM 2021/16\_02

### 10.3 Inclusion of any other topics submitted by contracting parties in the CPM work programme

- [63] The Secretariat informed the CPM that the only proposal received thus far was the proposal to revise CPM Recommendation R-06 (*Sea containers*), which was to be considered under agenda item 11.3.
- [64] No other proposals for new CPM recommendations were made.

## 11. Implementation and capacity development

### 11.1 Report from Implementation and Capacity Development Committee

- [65] The Chairperson of the IC presented the IC's report for 2019 and 2020.<sup>26</sup> He summarized the matters considered by the IC during this period, including work related to the global plant health surveillance programme, the Sea Containers Task Force (SCTF), e-commerce, national reporting obligations, the dispute avoidance and settlement programme, the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS), guides and training materials, monitoring and evaluation, and phytosanitary capacity evaluation (PCE). Finally, he thanked the IC members who had left the committee, welcomed the new members, and thanked the former Chairperson Ms Olga LAVRENTJEVA and the Secretariat.
- [66] Contracting parties commented on various aspects of implementation and capacity development activities. These included the need to provide sufficient Secretariat support for IC work; the need to encourage CPs, RPPOs and other institutions to provide resources; and the benefits of shifting the IRSS from a project-driven activity to a system, driven by the IPPC community. The value of PCEs was highlighted, while recognizing that PCE needs to be promoted and updated and the PCE tool (software) needs to be modernized.
- [67] The CPM:
- (1) *thanked* the following Implementation and Capacity Development Committee members who ended their term in 2020 for their work and important contributions to the work of this committee:
    - Ms Sally JENNINGS (New Zealand),
    - Mr Mamoun ALBAKRI (Jordan),
    - Mr Dilli Ram SHARMA (Nepal),
    - Mr Yuji KITAHARA (Japan),
    - Mr Ngatoko NGATOKO (Cook Islands),
    - Mr Philip KARONJO NJOROGI (Kenya);
  - (2) *thanked* the experts who had contributed to the *Guide for establishing and maintaining pest free areas* and the *IPPC guide to pest risk communication* (Appendix XX);
  - (3) *noted* the activities undertaken to advance the e-Commerce Programme;
  - (4) *noted* the activities undertaken to advance the National Reporting Obligations programme;
  - (5) *noted* that the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee, based on a SPG recommendation, had agreed to put the work on dispute avoidance and settlement on hold until the end of the IYPH;
  - (6) *noted* the request from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee for the CPM to consider allocating funds to the revision of the CPM-approved IPPC dispute settlement procedures to ensure their clarity and consistency;

---

<sup>26</sup> CPM 2021/26, CPM 2021/INF/18

- (7) *noted* the activities undertaken to advance the work under the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS);
- (8) *noted* the intention of the IPPC Secretariat to move the IRSS from a project driven activity to a System for the IPPC Community with a long-term work plan that will be funded by multiple donors;
- (9) *acknowledged* that the following three projects were reviewed by the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee and *noted* that they are aligned with the IPPC strategic objectives, have strategic value and a competitive advantage:
  - The phytosanitary component of a FAO project “Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) Trade Facilitation Project” (2019-2023) (GCP /INT/387/COM),
  - The EU project “Support the IPPC Strategic Framework: Commodity and pathways standards, Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems and e-Phyto” (2020-2022) (GCP/GLO/040/EC),
  - The EU project “Supporting the implementation of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)” (2020-2022) (GCP/GLO/040/EC);
- (10) *agreed* that the phytosanitary capacity evaluation (PCE) is a useful tool to help evaluate and develop national phytosanitary capacities;
- (11) *noted* the PCEs conducted by several contracting parties and the achievements of contracting parties where PCE was conducted;
- (12) *noted* the Implementation and Capacity Development activities (2019 and 2020) presented by the IC Chairperson in the IC report to the CPM.

## 11.2 Adoption of the list of implementation and capacity development topics

[68] The Secretariat presented the paper outlining the proposed adjustments to the *List of implementation and capacity development topics*.<sup>27</sup> The list had been reviewed by the IC based on priorities and potential linkages between implementation and capacity development topics and other ongoing work. As a result of the review, the IC had recommended that 13 topics be deleted because they can be merged with other topics or are no longer needed or relevant, and that six topics be removed because they have been completed. The IC had also proposed seven new topics. In addition, the IC had changed the priorities of four topics.

[69] The suggestion was made that, when presenting the table of the list of topics in the future, the addition of three columns should be considered: one briefly describing the main deliverables of each topic, one giving the projected timeframe and one giving the source of funding.

[70] The CPM noted the confirmation from the Republic of Korea that it would be providing funding for some implementation and capacity development activities.

[71] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the changes to the priority level of four topics made by the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee, as detailed in Appendix XX;
- (2) *agreed* to adjust the *List of implementation and capacity development topics* to delete thirteen topics, remove six topics and add seven topics, as detailed in Appendix XX;
- (3) *adopted* the *List of implementation and capacity development topics* as detailed in Appendix XX.

## 11.3 Update from the Sea Containers Task Force

[72] The Secretariat presented the paper outlining the work of the SCTF during 2019 and 2020.<sup>28</sup> This highlighted the difficulties in gathering data on sea container cleanliness and the various activities

---

<sup>27</sup> CPM 2021/29

<sup>28</sup> CPM 2021/27

undertaken by the SCTF to raise awareness of the pest risks associated with the movement of sea containers. Among the issues put forward for consideration by CPM-15 (2021) was the suggestion that CPM Recommendation R-06 (*Sea containers*) be revised to reflect the work done by the SCTF.

[73] Contracting parties commented on the importance of sea container cleanliness, acknowledging that it is a complicated and challenging issue and recognizing that there was still a need for further international cooperation. The CPM noted that there had been limitations to gathering data; however, useful conclusions may still be drawn, given that sea containers travel all over the world.

[74] Regarding the work of the SCTF in the remaining months until their mandate elapses at the end of 2021, the CPM considered various suggestions made by CPs. These included a suggestion that the SCTF address some core strategic questions and consider the possibility of an international workshop or special session in late 2022. It was agreed that after the report and recommendations of the SCTF were presented to CPM-16 (2022), the CPM would then consider how to move forward on this topic including: the establishment of a CPM focus group to drive the delivery of the agreed approach, the revision of CPM Recommendation R-06, or resuming the development of a draft ISPM on sea container cleanliness.

[75] The CPM Chairperson suggested that interested CPs participate in a Friends of the Chair meeting, which took place outside of the session and resulted in agreement to revised decisions that were presented to the CPM to consider.<sup>29</sup> The CPM considered these and agreed to them.

[76] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the outcome of the Friends of the Chair meeting;
- (2) *communicated* to contracting parties the value of carrying out sea container surveys and, in so doing, making use of the IPPC Guidelines on Sea Container Surveys for national plant protection organizations<sup>30</sup> and encouraging the submission of any related information to the Secretariat once any survey is executed;
- (3) *noted* the executive summary of the “Questionnaire on Monitoring of Sea Container Cleanliness” (Appendix XX);
- (4) *noted* the work of the Secretariat and the Sea Container Task Force (SCTF) in encouraging the inclusion of sea container cleanliness among the criteria for the International Maritime Organization’s (IMO’s) inspection programmes for cargo transport units;
- (5) *noted* that contracting parties may contact their IMO national contact points to support the inclusion of sea container cleanliness among the criteria for the IMO’s inspection programmes for cargo transport units;
- (6) *requested* that the Secretariat and SCTF continue to explore the potential use of the Authorized Economic Operators framework to incorporate phytosanitary criteria and the inclusion of additional fields in the World Customs Organization Data Model to track container cleanliness;
- (7) *noted* the Secretariat’s and SCTF’s arrangements to update the IMO/International Labour Organization/United Nations Economic Commission for Europe’s Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units (CTU Code) and the potential co-sponsoring of the CTU Code by the FAO;
- (8) *encouraged* contracting parties to use CPM Recommendation R-06 (*Sea containers*);
- (9) *encouraged* contracting parties to use the IPPC guidance document *Sea container supply chains and cleanliness: An IPPC best practice guidance on measures to minimize pest contamination*<sup>31</sup>;

---

<sup>29</sup> CPM 2021/CRP/12\_REV01

<sup>30</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87069/>

<sup>31</sup> <http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/ca7963en>

- (10) *noted* the IPPC leaflet *Reducing the spread of invasive pests by sea containers*<sup>32</sup>;
- (11) *confirmed* the following key objectives for the SCTF to pursue during the remainder of its mandate (which extends to the end of December 2021) and which are to be reported on at CPM-16 in 2022 on behalf of the SCTF. In this regard, under the direction of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee, *the SCTF is asked, as feasible in the remaining time available, to:*
- consider and prepare responses to the core strategic questions laid out in CPM 2021/INF/13, “Update from the Sea Containers Task Force – Proposal for a Path Forward for the Sea Container Task Force”. The SCTF may also review additional sources of information of potential value in this regard, such as information gathered by the earlier IPPC working group that developed the recommendation on contaminating pests;
  - outline potential core aspects that the SCTF would consider important for inclusion in (a) a potential revision of CPM Recommendation No. 6 on Sea Containers, and (b) a potential ISPM on sea containers, recognizing that the CPM has yet to determine whether to proceed with further development of either approach;
  - consider and communicate viewpoints on the potential value of an international workshop (or open-ended technical consultation) that could be held in late 2022, subject to CPM-16 approval, to be arranged by a CPM focus group as described below, which would allow for: (a) the discussion of the SCTF’s final report and any related recommendations; (b) exchange of relevant lessons learned, views, experiences and recommendations; and (c) identification of critical elements which should be considered in conjunction with any future related activities or development of related IPPC guidance. The outcomes of the workshop would be expected to be presented to CPM-17 in 2023;
  - develop any other considerations, recommendations or options that CPM-16 may wish to take into account during related decision-taking in 2022;
  - develop a draft Terms of Reference for a prospective CPM focus group that would be charged with arranging a possible 2022 workshop or consultation or any other tasks which CPM-16 (2022) decides upon and assembling related information or recommendations for subsequent communication to CPM-17 (2023). The draft Terms of Reference for this focus group would be presented to the Strategic Planning Group in 2021 for review and subsequently presented to CPM-16 (2022) for consideration and decision on holding the workshop or consultation.

## **12. Financial report and budget**

### **12.1 IPPC Secretariat financial report (2019 and 2020)**

- [77] The IPPC Secretariat presented its financial reports, detailing the resources available from FAO’s regular-programme budget, extra-budgetary and in-kind (non-financial) sources.<sup>33</sup> As the CPM had not been able to convene in 2020, two reports were presented: one for 2019 and the other for 2020. The year 2019 had been a record year for the Secretariat in terms of finances. In 2020, only four CPs had contributed to the IPPC Multi-Donor Trust Fund, but this reduction in contributions had been offset by an increase in regular-programme funding from FAO and by the reduction in travel expenses as a result of the pandemic. In both 2019 and 2020, in-kind contributions had totalled approximately USD 1 million.
- [78] While welcoming the increase in FAO regular-programme funding, some CPs asked the Secretariat to confirm that this increased level of funding would continue and voiced concerns that the funding was still not sufficient (see also agenda item 12.2).

---

<sup>32</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/88564/>

<sup>33</sup> CPM 2021/23

[79] The CPM noted a suggestion that the funds saved for contingencies should be increased, given the recent reduction in contributions and the current uncertain times.

[80] The CPM welcomed the confirmation from the Republic of Korea that its contribution to the Multi-Donor Trust Fund would be the same in 2021 as in 2020 and that it would support the IPPC regional workshop for Asia in 2021.

[81] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the Financial Report of the IPPC Secretariat for 2019;
- (2) *adopted* the financial report for 2019 of the IPPC Multi-Donor Trust Fund (Special Trust Fund of the IPPC) as presented in CPM 2021/23;
- (3) *noted* the Financial Report for 2020 of the IPPC Secretariat;
- (4) *adopted* the Financial Report for 2020 of the IPPC Multi-Donor Trust Fund (Special Trust Fund of the IPPC) as presented in CPM 2021/23;
- (5) *authorized* the CPM Bureau to allocate USD 650 000 of the IPPC Multi-Donor Trust Fund (Special Trust Fund of the IPPC) un-earmarked funds in 2021 to fund CPM priorities from the CPM-15 session and Secretariat's priority needs to support its operations;
- (6) *encouraged* contracting parties to contribute to the IPPC Multi-Donor Trust Fund (Special Trust Fund of the IPPC) and IPPC Projects, preferably on an ongoing basis;
- (7) *thanked* contracting parties that had contributed to the IPPC Secretariat's programme of work in 2019 and 2020.

## 12.2 2021 IPPC Secretariat work plan and budget

[82] The IPPC Secretariat presented the work plan and budget of the IPPC Secretariat for 2021.<sup>34</sup> The work plan and budget are aligned with the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 and the five-year investment plan, and takes into account all core activities of the Secretariat.

[83] As in the previous agenda item, some CPs called for FAO to maintain the increased level of funding on a regular basis, and asked the Secretariat to seek this assurance from FAO.

[84] Other suggestions made by CPs were to: prioritize activities on issues that are important to plant health, such as pest outbreak alert and response systems; use savings from reduced travel to support activities, such as SC meetings or IC projects that are lacking funds; and provide special assistance to the ePhyto programme.

[85] The CPM:

- (1) *approved* the 2021 IPPC Secretariat work plan and budget.
- (2) *expressed* its appreciation to FAO for the increase in regular-programme funding in 2021 and *requested* that the CPM Chairperson writes to thank FAO.

---

<sup>34</sup> CPM 2021/25

## 13. ePhyto

### 13.1 Long-term financial sustainability

- [86] The Secretariat presented the paper on how to financially sustain the IPPC ePhyto Solution.<sup>35</sup> The CPM was invited to consider which of the seven potential options set out in the paper should be explored in greater detail.
- [87] One additional option was suggested: to embed ePhyto into a supplementary agreement under Article XVI of the IPPC.
- [88] The CPM noted the need to consider some basic fundamentals, including fee exemptions for countries that have a low usage of ePhytos or were least developed, payments being based on the value of export rather than import (if basing payments on volume of ePhytos), and that the funding should support the ePhyto Solution but not be used as a funding stream for other IPPC activities. The CPM noted that, regardless of the mechanism that is finally agreed by the CPM, it does not need to be a permanent arrangement but could be reviewed in, say, five years' time.
- [89] Some CPs expressed support for the establishment of a small working group to consider some of the options in greater detail, and were willing to take part in the group: Australia, Chile, Egypt, the European Union, Finland, Ghana, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The CPM Chairperson suggested that, rather than CPM-15 (2021) restricting the set of options, the working group could be charged with selecting which options to explore in greater depth.
- [90] The CPM deferred further discussion and came back to it later in the meeting. In the intervening time, the Secretariat and the IPPC Finance Committee had confirmed that sufficient funds for ePhyto were in place for 2021 and 2022. The CPM therefore considered a proposal for a CPM focus group to be established to develop a two-phase funding solution. The first phase of this would be an interim solution, which might rely upon a coalition of parties willing to provide funding or be a multi-pledge solution. This would give more time for a more permanent solution (e.g. a supplementary agreement or a charging scheme) to be developed as the second phase. The interim phase would last until the long-term solution could be implemented.
- [91] The CPM considered the membership of the proposed focus group. The CPM noted the need for a balanced representation from all FAO regions while avoiding an over-sized group. Several suggestions were made by CPs about the number and composition of the focus group membership, but the CPM noted that no decision on this was needed at this meeting. The CPM noted the suggestion that the group should include people with administrative and funding experience.
- [92] The United States of America offered to continue funding ePhyto until this long-term scheme could be implemented, and the European Union offered to look into how it could contribute. New Zealand added that it would participate in the coalition looking into transitional funding for ePhyto.
- [93] The CPM:
- (1) *agreed* to pursue a two-phase funding solution for the IPPC ePhyto Solution, with the first phase relying on funding from interested contracting parties and the second phase providing long-term financial sustainability;
  - (2) *requested* that the Secretariat take the lead in drafting Terms of Reference for a CPM focus group, including its composition, and *agreed* that the membership would include at least one representative from each region;

---

<sup>35</sup> CPM 2021/31



- (3) *agreed* that the focus group be tasked with preparing a decision document on the funding solution for the second phase, for presentation at the CPM session in 2023.

## **14. IPPC communication**

### **14.1 Update on IPPC communications**

- [94] The Secretariat presented the paper, summarizing the communication and advocacy activities undertaken by the Secretariat in 2019 and 2020, and presenting a communication and advocacy action plan for 2021.<sup>36</sup> Activities had included publications, headline news, revision of the IPP, an upgrade to the Online Comment System, social media, media outreach, promotion of the annual theme for 2019 “Plant Health and Capacity Development”, and the various initiatives taken to promote the IYPH in 2020.
- [95] The CPM thanked the Secretariat for their ongoing work and recalled the decision taken earlier in the meeting in relation to the CPM Focus Group on Communications (agenda item 8.3) that the International Day of Plant Health should be the focus of the IPPC communications strategy.
- [96] The Secretariat clarified that there was no firm timeline for the migration of the IPP to the FAO domain, because the latter was in the process of being restructured, but it would not happen in 2021.
- [97] The CPM:
- (1) *noted* the report of communication and advocacy activities carried out by the IPPC Secretariat in 2019 and 2020;
  - (2) *noted* the IPPC Secretariat’s communication and advocacy action plan for 2021;
  - (3) *agreed* to develop a new IPPC Communications Strategy 2022–2030 under the auspices of the CPM Focus Group on Communications;
  - (4) *encouraged* contracting parties to continuously report on national level activities, which may be advertised via the IPPC Secretariat’s communication channels.

### **14.2 Update on International Year of Plant Health**

- [98] The Secretariat, together with the Chairperson of the IYPH International Steering Committee, Mr Ralf LOPIAN, presented the paper.<sup>37</sup> This outlined the IYPH activities during 2020, the changes that had been necessary in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, and plans for 2021 and beyond, including the proposed rescheduling of the First International Plant Health Conference, which had been postponed and then cancelled because of COVID-19.
- [99] Several CPs thanked and congratulated the IYPH International Steering Committee, its Chairperson Mr Ralf LOPIAN and the Secretariat for their commitment towards and achievements during the IYPH.
- [100] The CPM:
- (1) *noted* the report on the International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) 2020;
  - (2) *noted* the remaining IYPH 2020 activities to be undertaken in 2021;
  - (3) *agreed* that the First International Plant Health Conference be organized as an IPPC event for the week of 12 May 2022;
  - (4) *mandated* the IYPH 2020 Technical Advisory Body to function as the IPPC preparatory body for the planning and organization of the First International Plant Health Conference and the webinars leading to it;

---

<sup>36</sup> CPM 2021/20

<sup>37</sup> CPM 2021/04

- (5) *called* upon IPPC contracting parties to volunteer for hosting the First International Plant Health Conference in 2022;
- (6) *thanked* and *congratulated* the IYPH International Steering Committee, Mr Ralf LOPIAN (Chairperson of the committee), and the Secretariat for their efforts in delivering the IYPH, despite the challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic.

### **14.3 Update on proposal for an International Day of Plant Health**

[101] The Secretariat presented the paper, which provided an update on progress towards the observance by the United Nations system of an “International Day of Plant Health”.<sup>38</sup>

[102] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the update on the process to establish the observance by the United Nations system of an “International Day of Plant Health” on 12 May every year;
- (2) *thanked* Zambia for its continuing efforts and support in establishing an International Day of Plant Health as well as the governments expressing support for such a proposal;
- (3) *encouraged* the IPPC contracting parties to support the proposal to establish the observance by the United Nations system of an “International Day of Plant Health” on 12 May every year by considering pledges to support the implementation of the occurrence and liaising with their counterparts in the FAO Conference and at the United Nations General Assembly to facilitate their final endorsement.

## **15. External cooperation**

### **15.1 Update on international cooperation**

[103] The Secretariat presented the report, outlining its main cooperative activities in 2019 and 2020 with external international organizations and RPPOs.<sup>39</sup>

[104] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the report on the international cooperation of the IPPC Secretariat in 2019 and 2020.

### **15.2 Written reports from international organizations**

[105] The following international organizations provided written reports:<sup>40</sup>

- Biological Weapons Convention;
- Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- Europe-Africa-Caribbean-Pacific Liaison Committee (COLEACP);
- Global Alliance for Trade Facilitation;
- International Organization for Standardization (ISO);
- International Pest Risk Research Group;
- Joint FAO/International Atomic Energy Agency Programme of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture;

---

<sup>38</sup> CPM 2021/05

<sup>39</sup> CPM 2021/28

<sup>40</sup> CPM 2021/INF/01, CPM 2021/INF/02, CPM 2021/INF/03, CPM 2021/INF/04, CPM 2021/INF/05, CPM 2021/INF/06, CPM 2021/INF/07, CPM 2021/INF/08, CPM 2021/INF/09, CPM 2021/INF/10, CPM 2021/INF/22, CPM 2021/INF/23, CPM 2021/CRP/04

- Ozone Secretariat for the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer;
- Phytosanitary Measures Research Group;
- Standards and Trade Development Facility;
- World Customs Organization;
- World Trade Organization (WTO).

[106] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the written reports from international organizations.

## **16. IPPC network activities**

### **16.1 Updates on technical cooperation among regional plant protection organizations**

[107] Mr Jean Gérard MEZUI M'ELLA (Inter-African Phytosanitary Council) and Ms Juliet GOLDSMITH (Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency) presented the reports of the 31st and 32nd meetings of the Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPOs) held in Nigeria in October 2019 and in virtual mode between December 2020 and February 2021, respectively.<sup>41</sup> One special highlight of the 32nd meeting had been to receive a request from the Economic Community of West African States for recognition as an RPPO under Article IX of the IPPC. This would be considered further at the 33rd meeting of the TC-RPPOs, which would be held in virtual mode in October and November 2021.

[108] Some CPs suggested that consideration be given to an enhanced involvement of the plant-health community in the One Health approach. This could start with the Secretariat having discussions with key international players in One Health and joint external evaluation, such as FAO, the World Health Organization, the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) and the United Nations Environment Programme, and the inclusion of the topic in the SPG agenda.

[109] The CPM also acknowledged the role of plant health in biosecurity, biosafety and environmental protection.

[110] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the reports from the 31st and 32nd meetings of the Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations;
- (2) *requested* that the agenda of the next Strategic Planning Group include consideration of the extent of involvement of the plant health community in the One Health approach, and the role of plant health in biosecurity, biosafety and environmental protection.

## **17. Confirmation of membership and potential replacements for CPM subsidiary bodies**

[111] The CPM Chairperson invited the CPM to confirm the membership and potential replacements for the CPM Bureau (including election of a new CPM Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson) and the SC. The Secretariat also clarified that, because of the COVID-19 pandemic and the postponement of CPM-15 originally scheduled for 2020, the CPM Bureau had extended the terms of those members whose terms would have expired in 2020, for one additional year to ensure continuity of the work. The Secretariat provided the CPM with lists of the nominations.<sup>42</sup>

[112] A representative from the FAO Legal Office clarified that, under Rule II of the CPM Rules of Procedure, members of the CPM Bureau serve for a term of two years and are eligible for re-election for another two

<sup>41</sup> CPM 2021/10, CPM 2021/33, CPM 2021/INF/19, CPM 2021/INF/20

<sup>42</sup> CPM 2021/21, CPM 2021/30, CPM 2021/CRP/07

consecutive terms.<sup>43</sup> In exceptional circumstances, an FAO region may submit a request to the CPM for an exception to allow a member to serve an additional term or terms.

[113] The Secretariat recalled that the new members of the SC have their terms starting after the SC-7. Thus, the Secretariat encouraged new members of the SC to register as observers for the May 2021 meeting, to ensure a smooth handover.

[114] The Secretariat invited the CPM to note the membership and potential replacements for the IC,<sup>44</sup> and clarified that memberships of the IC had been extended from May 2020 to November 2020 because of the COVID-19 pandemic.

[115] Following the election process, several CPs congratulated Mr Lucien KOUAME KONAN (Africa) on his election as Chairperson of the CPM Bureau and Mr John GREIFER (North America) for his election as the Vice-Chairperson.

[116] The CPM:

- (1) *elected* Mr Lucien KOUAME KONAN (Africa) as the Chairperson for the CPM Bureau;
- (2) *elected* Mr John GREIFER (North America) as the Vice-Chairperson for the CPM Bureau;
- (3) *elected* members for the CPM Bureau from FAO regions not represented by the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson (Appendix XX);
- (4) *elected* replacements for members of the CPM Bureau (Appendix XX);
- (5) *noted* the current membership of the Standards Committee and the potential replacements for the Standards Committee (Appendix XX);
- (6) *confirmed* new members and potential replacements for the Standards Committee, and the order in which potential replacements will be called upon for each region (Appendix XX);
- (7) *noted* the membership, alternative and replacement members for the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (Appendix XX).

## 18. Any other business

[117] [TO BE ADDED LATER]

## 19. CPM authorization for the CPM Bureau to operate on its behalf during 2021

[118] The CPM Chairperson presented the paper, setting out proposals for the CPM Bureau to operate on the CPM's behalf during times of emergencies or crises, such as the current COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>45</sup> The paper made it clear that decisions such as adopting ISPMs or CPM Recommendations would still remain under the exclusive authority of the CPM. A two-week period between a CPM Bureau decision and the action being taken was proposed, after which the CPM Bureau would be entitled to proceed with the actions if no objections had been voiced.

[119] Some CPs expressed their support for the proposals in the paper, thanking the CPM Bureau for their strong, active and sustained leadership over the past 12 months. A few CPs suggested that the "silence consent period" be increased from two to four weeks, to allow internal consultation.

---

<sup>43</sup> CPM Rules of Procedure: Rule II, <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/cpm/cpm-rules-of-procedure/#rule2>; Annex I, Rules of Procedure for the CPM Bureau, <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/cpm/cpm-rules-of-procedure/#annex1>

<sup>44</sup> CPM 2021/32

<sup>45</sup> CPM 2021/12

[120] The CPM noted the need for the CPM Bureau to keep CPs informed, through their contact points, on matters dealt with by the Bureau on behalf of the CPM.

[121] The CPM *endorsed* and *supported* the CPM Bureau in:

- (1) *advising* the IPPC Secretariat on administrative and operational matters necessary to continue advancing the CPM-approved initiatives being carried out by the various IPPC staff, committees, focus groups and working groups;
- (2) *addressing* and making any other operational related decision necessary to ensure the IPPC work plan and CPM agenda are addressed in an efficient and timely fashion, including ensuring that funding is directed to CPM-approved work plan activities, as well as resolving any administrative or procedural issues that may hinder or impede CPM-agreed work activities from progressing;
- (3) *providing* advice and direction to subsidiary bodies to enable them to progress their work;
- (4) *seeking* CPM concurrence electronically on decisions or issues that the Chairperson of the CPM Bureau may consider sufficiently important or sensitive to require CPM awareness and engagement (using a four-week silence consent procedure).

## **20. Date and venue of the next session**

[122] The Sixteenth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-16) is tentatively scheduled for 4 to 8 April 2022, pending confirmation from FAO. It is hoped that the session will be convened in person, but that will depend on the situation with the pandemic.