



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  
الأغذية والزراعة  
للأمم المتحدة

# COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

**Fifteenth Session**

**Virtual Meeting, 16, 18 March and 1 April 2021**

**Statements from the European Union and its 27 Member States**

**Various agenda items**

**Prepared by the European Union and its member states**

*The following are the statements that the European Union and its 27 Member States will present on the various agenda items of CPM-15 (2021):*

**Agenda item 8.1: Adoption of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030**

The EU and its 27 Member States are delighted to agree to the proposed IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030.

We are especially pleased that the Strategic Framework 2020-2030 includes considerable innovative approaches to identified future plant health challenges. We would also like to show our strong appreciation with the approach to link the IPPC Strategic Framework with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals and thus showing how plant health can help solve humankind's major current and future challenges.

The EU and its Member States would like to congratulate the IPPC Secretariat and the CPM and its subsidiary bodies for the excellent procedure on how this strategy was developed. Let us express our hope, Mr Chairman that SF 2020-2030 will be successfully implemented and will constitute a major milestone in the history of the IPPC and the global plant health community.

**Agenda item 8.2: Adoption of the revision of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure**

The EU and its 27 Member States are of the opinion that changing the IC Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure is not an urgent issue.

There is a need to have a more extended period to observe the Committee's work and a necessity to take into consideration the IC's recommendations regarding the issue before changing the TOR and the ROP.

**Agenda item 8.3: Report of the Strategic Planning Group – Adoption of the revision of the Strategic Planning Group Rules of Procedure**

The EU and its 27 Member States thank the USA for the original paper. We would fully agree that it is important to regularly screen the procedures and functions of CPM bodies to improve their work over time.

In the case of the SPG, however, we believe that the SPG has worked in an exemplary fashion over the last years, as we can see with the successful development of the Strategic Framework 2020-2030. For this reason, we do not see the need to change the Rules of Procedure of the SPG at this time and cannot agree to the proposed changes contained in document CPM 2021/06.

### **Agenda item 8.3: Report from Strategic Planning Group - Establishment of CPM Focus Group on Implementation plans for the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030**

The EU and its 27 Member States thank the IPPC Secretariat for the excellent paper. We fully agree with the proposal to establish a focus group on developing a detailed implementation plan for the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 Development Agenda. We agree with the proposed terms of reference in general, but have one observation.

We do not understand why the CPM-Bureau has to review the single nominations from each FAO region, RPPOs, Bureau, SC and IC. Once nominated, the CPM-Bureau endorses them without right to object to individual nominations.

We would like to change, therefore, paragraph 10 of the document to read:

*“10. Each region, the RPPOs, the CPM Bureau, SC and IC will submit one nomination, to be endorsed by the CPM Bureau.”*

In addition to the above, we believe that the third bullet point in the “Functions” (Section IV) of the ToR could benefit from a closer alignment with the agreed text of the SF 2020-2030. We would kindly suggest changing bullet point three to read:

*“ • provide practical guidance and advice to the IPPC community on key technical aspects related to the strategic objectives of the IPPC's Strategic Framework, which are such as trade facilitation, enhancing global food security and increasing sustainable agricultural productivity, and protecting forests and the environment from the impacts of plant pests, and facilitating safe trade, development and economic growth.”*

### **Agenda item 8.3: Report from Strategic Planning Group - Establishment of CPM Focus Group on Communications**

The EU and its 27 Member States thank the IPPC Secretariat for the excellent paper. We fully agree with the proposal to establish a focus group on developing a communication strategy and its purpose.

We could imagine though, some small adjustments to the functions of the focus group. We believe that the efforts to declare an International Day of Plant Health will be successful and that this day will be in the future the main annual communication event for the IPPC. We, therefore, believe that any IPPC communication strategy should include provisions on how to plan and implement future international days of plant health.

We would like to suggest, therefore, to add a new point to the functions of the Focus Group. This point would be inserted after point 3 and would read:

*“4) Elaborate and if appropriate propose procedures and processes on how to plan IPPC communication activities and their implementation for future international days of plant health.”*

### **Agenda item 8.3: Report from Strategic Planning Group - Establishment of CPM Focus Group on Climate change impacts on plant health**

The EU and its 27 Member States thank the IPPC Secretariat for the excellent paper. Climate action and tackling climate change is also at the heart of the European Green Deal and the EU Farm to Fork strategy – an ambitious package of measures for a healthier and more sustainable EU food system.

We fully agree with the proposal to establish a focus group on climate change impacts on plant health and its purpose. We could imagine though, some small adjustments to the ToRs, which could improve in particular the work with regard to point three of the purpose – enhancing the recognition of phytosanitary matters in the climate change debate.

We would like to suggest, therefore, to add to the proposed membership one or two experts on climate change designated by the IPCC.

We would also like to suggest to add one bullet point to the functions of the Focus Group. This bullet point would read:

*“ • Cooperate and exchange information on climate change and plant health matters with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.”*

We also miss a focus on forestry in the skill sets described under “*Membership*”. We would therefore like to suggest that in the “*Membership*” paragraph the skill “*agricultural entomology*” is amended to read “*agricultural and silvicultural entomology*”.

With regard to the process of selecting the members of the Focus Group, the EU and its 27 Member States miss the regional nomination component. We find it important that a CPM Focus Group consists of regionally nominated experts. For that reason, we would like to propose that paragraph 11 under section E “*process*” is changed to read:

*“11. The member selection for the Focus Group shall be carried out according to the following guidelines:*

- *Each region shall nominate two experts from different disciplines to fit some of the skill sets described under “Membership”.*
- *The CPM-Bureau shall select one nominee from each FAO region as the regional representative in the focus group, aiming to cover as many scientific disciplines as possible.*
- *The CPM-Bureau will select three “expert members” for the focus group from the remaining pool of seven nominees in order to cover scientific disciplines not or poorly covered by the seven regional representatives.”*

### **Agenda item 9.2: Adoption of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures – Ink amendments to adopted International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs)**

The EU and its 27 Member States agree to note the ink amendments to the use of “commodity class” in adopted ISPMs, as a consequence to the proposed deletion of the term and definition from the Glossary.

We also agree with the removal of the disclaimer from the irradiation treatments for Tephritid fruit flies. However, we note that these changes modify the substance of the standards and are not intended to solve a consistency terminological issue. Therefore, they cannot be considered to be ink amendments. Indeed, according to Section 3.7.1 of the IPPC procedure manual for standard setting:

*“Ink amendments are proposed as a result of consistency reviews by the TPG (consistency of specific terms in adopted ISPMs) or an EWG (necessary consequential changes identified during the drafting or revision of a standard).*

*The process for ink amendments was developed by the TPG and reviewed by the SC and FAO Legal Office, who advised that consistency changes could be regarded as “ink amendments”, as long as “consistency” is interpreted strictly so that no changes in the content of standards arise, and agreed that the recommended process was appropriate.*

*CPM-04 (2009) agreed with the proviso that it is limited to consistency issues and not substantive or stylistic issues, to the use of the following process for achieving consistency in the terminology of ISPMs: (...).”*

Therefore, the EU and its Member states agree to note the proposed amendments to irradiation treatments for Tephritid fruit flies, but request that in the future such technical or substantive changes to adopted standards be not presented to the CPM for noting as ink amendments, this process being reserved for achieving consistency in the terminology of ISPMs only.

### **Agenda item 11.1: Report from Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)**

The EU and its 27 Member States appreciate the IC's work and acknowledge the IPPC Secretariat support to the IC. We welcome the progress in its work programme's communication, and we acknowledge the separate paper for the SCTF. We encourage the IC and the IPPC Secretariat to promote the outcome of actions broadly to a range of stakeholders and beneficiaries.

The EU would like to welcome Mr Dominique Pelletier as a new Chair of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee and wish him all success in his work. We would like to express gratitude to Ms Olga Lavrentjeva, former chair of the IC, for her significant input into Implementation and Capacity building. The EU would like to request the IPPC Secretariat to continue providing sufficient support to the IC work and encourage contracting parties, RPPOs and other institutions to provide resources for implementation and capacity development activities.

### **Agenda Item 11.2: Adoption of the List of Implementation and Capacity Development Topics**

The EU and its 27 Member States would like to thank the Secretariat for this insightful document and thank the IC for the work done. We agree with all the proposed changes in the List of Topics.

The table in the Annex would give a more complete overview of the activities of the IC if three columns were added to the list: one briefly stating the main deliverables of each topic, one stating the projected timeframe and one stating the source of funding. We request the Secretariat and the IC to incorporate these columns in the next versions of this document and to present it at each following CPM.

### **Agenda Item 12.2: IPPC Secretariat Work Plan and Budget for 2021**

The EU and its 27 Member States would like to thank the CPM Bureau, the Financial Committee and the IPPC Secretariat for this detailed and comprehensive budget proposal and work-plan. We find the document to be of high quality and therefore are happy to accept it.

Furthermore, we would like to use the opportunity and suggest that the CPM, in its conclusions of this meeting, *appreciates* the FAO increased contribution in 2020-2021 from the FAO Regular programme, and *calls* on the FAO to keep this increased contribution on a permanent basis.

### **Agenda Item 13.1: Long-term financial sustainability - ePhyto**

The EU and its 27 Member States thank the IPPC Secretariat for putting the important issue of a sustainable funding mechanism for ePhyto Solution on the agenda of the CPM. Since the beginning of the ePhyto project, the EU and its Member States have belonged to the supporters of the project in both policy and financial terms. The EU is currently contributing 350.000 € to the operation of the system for the period mid 2020-mid 2023.

We are of the opinion, that the core challenge rests in finding a truly sustainable format of the funding mechanism, which would ensure a reliable, predictable and sustainable long-term arrangement. To achieve that, we need not only to look into the technicalities of a possible funding mechanism (pay-per-use, monthly/annual fees, etc.), but also, and even more importantly, into the underlying basis for such a mechanism. And we believe that there is a possible option, which is not included in the paper, and which we would like to propose.

The option we want to suggest is to make a use of the provisions of Article XVI of the Convention, whereby:

*“The contracting parties may, for the purpose of meeting special problems of plant protection which need particular attention or action, enter into supplementary agreements. Such agreements may be applicable to specific regions, to specific pests, to specific plants and plant products, to specific IPPC International Plant Protection Convention methods of international transportation of plants and plant products, or otherwise supplement the provisions of this Convention.”*

We do believe that embedding the ePhyto funding mechanism into a supplementary agreement is the only possibility to establish a sufficiently robust and binding arrangement. As for the

technical details of such an arrangement, we prefer elements that are included in options 3 and 2 of the paper, i.e. annual or monthly contributions, or in option 1, i.e. fixed charge for a PC, or a combination thereof.

We strongly recommend including the option of a supplementary agreement on the ePhyto Solution funding mechanism amongst the short-listed proposals that will be further reviewed in detail by a small working group as suggested by the paper. We do agree with the establishment of this small working group and we are willing to take part in its deliberations.

#### **Agenda item 14.2 – International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) 2020**

The EU and its 27 Member States thank the IPPC Secretariat and the chair of the IYPH 2020 International Steering Committee for the detailed paper. It has been one of the most unfortunate calamities that our high hopes for a vibrant and diverse celebration of plant health has been curtailed by a global pandemic of epic proportions. Yet, despite these adverse incidents we note with pleasure that still a number of activities could be undertaken and a considerable portion of the IYPH 2020 programme and activities were successfully shifted to virtual platforms and channels. Although some programme components suffered, such as inexplicably the IYPH advocates programme, an impressive amount of work has been undertaken and for that we would like to express our most sincere thanks to the IPPC and IYPH Secretariats and the IYPH 2020 International Steering Committee! We are looking forward for the conclusion of the outstanding IYPH 2020 programme activities.

We understand the reasons for the cancellation of the International Plant Health Conference in Helsinki, but at the same time, we regret it deeply. For the EU and its Member States, the conference was the flagship event of the IYPH and an example how the IPPC can in the future organize regular conferences on plant health. We fully agree with the suggestions by the International Steering Committee to organize a new International Plant Health Conference in the week of the International Day of Plant Health in 2022 and the notion that the Technical Advisory Body for the IYPH should be mandated to plan the conference and the webinars leading to it.

Mr Chair, Ladies and Gentlemen, the International Year of Plant Health comes to an end and 6 years of planning and organizing are getting concluded very soon. We believe that the success of the IYPH, despite all the barriers, has been due to the creativity and diligence of the all the plant health professionals, NPPOs, RPPOs and other organizations carrying out activities, informing about plant health and making plant health a mainstream subject. We would very much like to congratulate everybody involved for a job well done, with a special mention to Mr. Ralf Lopian, for his outstanding contribution to building a vision that has become a reality worldwide!

#### **Agenda item 14.3: Proposal for an International Day of Plant Health**

The EU and its 27 Member States thank the IPPC Secretariat for the paper. We would like to thank Zambia for this initiative and all its efforts to make it happen. The EU and its member states have supported the issue in COAG and in the FAO Council last December, and will do so in the future.

### **Agenda item 16.1: IPPC Network Activities**

The EU and its 27 Member States would like to express our appreciation for the report of the 32nd Technical Consultation of RPPOs. We welcome in particular the discussion on the strategic issue of the One Health approach and the role of plant health in it.

For many years, there have been thoughts that plant health should be an integral part of “One Health”, because of its substantial role in securing food and feed security, biodiversity and consequentially environmental health.

In this context, the EU and its 27 Member States would like to state, that it is our believe that the extent of the involvement of plant health in One Health Approach should be subject to further assessment.

In order to allow the CPM to make an informed decision on this issue, we would like to suggest that the IPPC Secretariat starts international cooperation with the World Health Organization, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE), with the aim of investigating and describing areas of mutual interest in this matter. It is advisable to explore the possibilities of cooperation between the tripartite (WHO, FAO, OIE) and UNEP on the one hand and the IPPC on the other hand.

### **Agenda item 19: CPM authorization for the CPM Bureau to operate on its behalf during 2021 - Role of the CPM Bureau and IPPC Secretariat during times of emergencies or crises**

The EU and its 27 Member States would like to thank the CPM Bureau and the IPPC Secretariat for rising to this challenge during this unprecedented period. We thus endorse and support the CPM Bureau to continue making operational, strategic and programming decisions on CPM’s behalf.

Nevertheless, it is also being recommended that the silence consent procedure period is extended from 2 to 4 weeks, to ensure sufficient time for the Contracting Parties to react to any such important and/or sensitive decisions, if necessary.