



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



International  
Plant Protection  
Convention

## **DRAFT REPORT**

# **Sixteenth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures**

## **1. Opening of the session**

- [1] The Director of the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division, Jingyuan XIA, welcomed participants to the Sixteenth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), and extended a particular welcome to Osama EL-LISSY in his role as the new Secretary of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). Noting that this session was being held in virtual mode for the second time because of the COVID-19 pandemic, the director expressed his hope that the CPM would meet in person in 2023.
- [2] The FAO Deputy Director-General Beth BECHDOL also welcomed the new IPPC secretary and expressed her gratitude to the IPPC community and the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”) for their work during the year. She highlighted some of the achievements of the year, thanked donors for their contributions, and emphasized the importance of the “One Health” initiative and of aligning efforts in support of the new FAO Strategic Framework and the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030. She finished by looking forward to the first International Day of Plant Health (IDPH) and the first International Plant Health Conference later in the year, and the opportunity that these events presented for increasing the visibility of work on plant health.
- [3] The IPPC secretary thanked Ms BECHDOL for her support for plant-health work in FAO, Mr XIA for his leadership as IPPC secretary over the last seven years, the secretariat for their work during the transition to a new IPPC secretary, and all those who had contributed to IPPC bodies over the years. He looked ahead to some of the activities in 2022 and commented on the role of the secretariat in supporting the CPM in its collective mission to protect plants against pests, facilitate safe trade and hence, ultimately, feed the world.
- [4] Mr XIA added his thanks for the support of Ms BECHDOL, expressed his gratitude to the IPPC community and the secretariat over the duration of his time as secretary, and wished his successor well as secretary.

## **2. Keynote address by the CPM chairperson**

- [5] The CPM Chairperson, Lucien KOUAME KONAN, welcomed participants and thanked Ms BECHDOL and Mr XIA for their opening remarks and continuing support for IPPC work. He welcomed the new IPPC secretary and thanked the acting officer-in-charge for daily matters for his contributions and the secretariat for their support. He welcomed all contracting parties (CPs) and observers, and thanked them for endorsing this virtual session.

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

- [6] The CPM chairperson informed the session that the CPM Bureau had agreed that agenda item 8.8.6 of the provisional agenda be deferred and discussed after item 11.3.
- [7] The CPM:

- (1) *adopted* the agenda as modified (Appendix XX) and noted the list of documents (Appendix XX).

### **3.1 European Union statement of competence**

- [8] The CPM:

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

---

<sup>1</sup> CPM 2022/CRP/03.

#### **4. Election of the rapporteur**

[9] The CPM:

- (1) *elected* Raymonda JOHNSON (Sierra Leone) as rapporteur.

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

[10] The CPM chairperson informed the session that, in agreement with the FAO Legal Office and noting the content of Rule III of the General Rules of the Organization on “delegations and credentials” as well as the practice and criteria followed by the Organization with respect to the acceptance of credentials, the credentials submitted by CPs for their participation at CPM-16 (2022) had been assessed by the CPM Bureau. He informed the session that 114 valid credentials had been received (plus two non-valid submissions and one from a country that is not a CP), which was enough to constitute the quorum of a majority of CPM members.

[11] The CPM:

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

#### **6. Report from the CPM chairperson**

[12] The CPM chairperson presented his report, highlighting some of the key achievements and milestones of the last year.<sup>2</sup> These had included various activities to promote and close the International Year of Plant Health (IYPH), the finalization of several key standards, the management of eight capacity-development projects, the deployment of phytosanitary capacity evaluations (PCEs) in several countries, and the first steps towards operationalizing the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030. This work had involved around 37 different expert and focus groups, subsidiary bodies, panels, teams, governance committees, and ad hoc bodies, each requiring support from the secretariat and representation from contracting parties.

[13] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the report presented by the CPM chairperson.

#### **7. Report from the IPPC Secretariat**

[14] The IPPC secretary presented the 2021 annual report of the IPPC Secretariat,<sup>3</sup> highlighting important achievements in various areas of IPPC work.

[15] The CPM acknowledged with appreciation the work of the secretariat, particularly in relation to the transition to a virtual mode of operation for the continuation of the work of the CPM. Some CPs also called for FAO to increase the number of permanent staff positions in the secretariat.

[16] In various interventions from CPs during the meeting, CPs also took the opportunity to welcome and congratulate the new IPPC secretary on his new appointment.

[17] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the 2021 annual report presented by the IPPC Secretariat.

---

<sup>2</sup> CPM 2022/34.

<sup>3</sup> CPM 2022/37.

## 8. Governance and strategy

### 8.1 Report from the Strategic Planning Group

[18] The vice-chairperson of the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) presented the SPG's 2021 summary report,<sup>4</sup> which highlighted some of the strategically important issues addressed by the SPG at its meeting in October 2021. These included, among other issues, the progress of work of the CPM focus groups and discussions within FAO about One Health. He commented on the record number of participants at the SPG meeting and, looking ahead, emphasized the useful role of the SPG as a forum to discuss progress on the implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework and other matters of interest to the CPM. He finished by thanking the various focus groups and the secretariat for their contributions.

[19] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the summary of the 2021 meeting of the IPPC Strategy Planning Group.

### 8.2 CPM authorization for the CPM Bureau to operate on its behalf until CPM-17 (2023)

[20] The CPM chairperson presented a paper setting out proposals for the CPM Bureau to take reasonable decisions on behalf of the CPM until CPM-17 (2023), given the travel restrictions arising from the COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>5</sup> Under the proposals, decisions would be in line with decisions taken at CPM-16 (2022) but may have to extend beyond this because of the abbreviated scope of the CPM-16 agenda. The decisions would be communicated to contracting parties and if no objections were received within two weeks after the decision, the CPM Bureau would be entitled to proceed with the actions resulting from the decision.

[21] Some CPs proposed that the length of the "silent-consent period" be four weeks, as agreed for 2021–2022 by CPM-15 (2021), rather than two weeks. In addition, one CP suggested that the secretariat provide documents through formal channels in FAO languages for decisions on important and sensitive issues in order to support decision-making and widen the participation of CPs.

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

- (1) *advising* the 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 workplan and CPM agenda are addressed in an efficient and timely fashion, including ensuring that funding is directed to CPM-approved workplan 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; and
- (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 silent-consent procedure).

[23] The CPM also:

- (5) *requested* that, where possible, documents submitted for CPM concurrence through the silent-consent procedure are provided through formal FAO channels in FAO languages.

---

<sup>4</sup> CPM 2022/17.

<sup>5</sup> CPM 2022/19.

### 8.3 Framework for Standards and Implementation

[24] The secretariat presented the Framework for Standards and Implementation, which had been updated by the Standards Committee (SC) and Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC).<sup>6</sup> As a follow-up from the Strategic Planning Group (SPG), the secretariat had also started to develop a database on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) to show the framework content and to streamline the process for compiling and maintaining it.

[25] Some CPs thanked the secretariat for their work on the database and suggested that it could be enhanced by adding a tentative date by which standards and implementation resources would be concluded.

[26] The CPM:

- (1) *endorsed* the updated Framework for Standards and Implementation as presented in Annex 1 of CPM 2022/09;
- (2) *noted* the development of the database to show the content of the Framework for Standards and Implementation as presented in Annex 2 of CPM 2022/09;
- (3) *requested* that the secretariat reflect the content of Annex 1 of CPM 2022/09 and the CPM-16 (2022) decisions in the database and update and maintain the database as needed (i.e. after CPM and after publications are released); and
- (4) *requested* that the secretariat add to the database the date by which outputs are expected to be available.

### 8.4 IPPC dispute settlement procedures revision

[27] The secretariat presented revised procedures for settlement of disputes, which had been prepared by the FAO Legal Office.<sup>7</sup>

[28] The CPM considered some amendments to the wording of the revised procedures proposed by some CPs in CPM 2022/INF/19, and modifications to these as presented in CPM 2022/CRP/04. The CPM also considered an editorial suggestion to move sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 of the procedures into section 1 (Introduction) and to provide an infographic of the procedures.

[29] A few CPs suggested that the procedures be simplified to provide greater access to the IPPC dispute settlement process to contracting parties, including smaller countries, given the resources required to follow the World Trade Organization process.

[30] Noting that the transfer of the dispute settlement functions to the CPM Bureau was not intended as a permanent arrangement, the CPM recognized the need to consider how best to institutionalize this oversight function on a more permanent basis.

[31] The CPM:

- (1) *adopted* the revised IPPC Dispute Settlement Procedures, subject to the amendments proposed in CPM 2022/INF/19 and CPM 2022/CRP/04 and the inclusion of sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 in section 1 (Introduction) (the final version being as presented in Appendix XX);
- (2) *repealed* all prior IPPC Dispute Settlement Procedures relating to the IPPC, including the 1999 and 2001 Dispute Settlement Procedures and the 2006 Dispute Settlement Manual, these being superseded by the newly adopted IPPC Dispute Settlement Procedure;
- (3) *assigned* the role of the Dispute Settlement Oversight Body to the CPM Bureau; and
- (4) *requested* that the CPM Bureau:

---

<sup>6</sup> CPM 2022/09.

<sup>7</sup> CPM 2022/05.

- consider whether the newly adopted IPPC Dispute Settlement Procedures can be simplified and be more user-friendly (including an infographic of the procedures) to make the process more accessible to all contracting parties,
- consider how best to institutionalize the oversight function of the Dispute Settlement Oversight Body on a more permanent basis, and
- present its recommendations and options to CPM-17 (2023).

## 8.5 The IPPC Secretariat and One Health

[32] The secretariat presented a summary of discussions held at the SPG meeting in October 2021 on the extent of the involvement of plant health in the One Health approach.<sup>8</sup> The secretariat highlighted the links between this and the IPPC Strategic Framework development agenda item on pest outbreak alert and response systems and also the ongoing work related to antimicrobial resistance.

[33] There was a general consensus among CPs that the secretariat should continue to participate in FAO discussions on the One Health concept, but also a recognition by some CPs that there was, as yet, an incomplete collective understanding among CPs about how plant health is related to the One Health concept, what lies within the scope of the IPPC, and the benefits of greater IPPC involvement with the FAO One Health mission. A few CPs suggested that the SPG therefore devote some time to this issue in October 2022, and that CPs be encouraged to provide discussion papers for the SPG meeting. The CPM noted a project supported by the European Food Safety Authority to collect data on the use of antibiotics and the emergence of antimicrobial resistance in plant pathogenic bacteria.<sup>9</sup>

[34] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* that, as advised by the SPG, the secretariat will continue monitoring and participating in the FAO One Health discussions and reporting back to the SPG and CPM Bureau, while ensuring any work or commitments are strictly aligned with the secretariat's work and strategic priorities; and
- (2) *encouraged* contracting parties to submit discussion papers on One Health to the SPG for more discussion about the role of the IPPC secretariat in the One Health approach.

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

[35] The secretariat presented a paper on proposed revisions to the Terms of Reference and the Rules of Procedure of the IC, which were designed to achieve better alignment with those of the SC and to bring greater clarity.<sup>10</sup> Further to concerns raised by CPs at CPM-15 (2021), the revisions had been discussed by the SPG in October 2021, who had agreed that the representatives on the IC from the regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) and the SC should be considered as full IC members without the possibility of taking on the role of IC chairperson or vice-chairperson. The SPG had also recommended that the oversight of the IPPC dispute settlement procedure be removed from the IC Terms of Reference (see agenda item 8.4), but dispute avoidance be maintained within the IC mandate.

[36] The CPM chairperson acknowledged the call from one CP for the secretariat and CPM Bureau to continue to consider providing interpretation at IC meetings in order to allow the full participation of CPs, but commented that this would require some thought about how to manage this problem.

[37] The CPM:

- (1) *adopted* the revision of the IC Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure as presented in Appendix XX and *revoked* all previous versions.

---

<sup>8</sup> CPM 2022/13.

<sup>9</sup> CPM 2022/CRP/05.

<sup>10</sup> CPM 2022/04.

## 8.7 Recommendations and report from the Task Force on Topics from the IPPC 2021 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation

- [38] The acting chairperson of the Task Force on Topics (TFT) presented a report on the 2021 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation, including the TFT's recommendations for consideration by the CPM.<sup>11</sup> He reported that, for one of the submitted topics (*Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid* (2021-020)), it had proved difficult to reach a consensus on the best way forward and so the SC, with agreement from the IC, had proposed the establishment of a CPM focus group (see agenda item 9.3.3).
- [39] The CPM considered the recommendation to revise International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) No. 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*), with some CPs supporting the revision of ISPM 26 given the economic impact on fruit flies in many countries, but others questioning the usefulness of such a revision given that ISPM 26 had only recently been revised as part of the reorganization of fruit fly standards. The acting TFT chairperson recalled that the SC's intention, in recommending that the topic be progressed as a revision of ISPM 26, had been to allow information that was now out of date because of technological advancements to be transferred to implementation material, which could be kept up-to-date more easily.<sup>12</sup> Given the differing views expressed by CPs, a compromise was reached to include the topic but with priority 2 rather than priority 3.
- [40] With regard to topics that the TFT had not recommended, the submitting country for the topic proposal *Requirements for the use of testing laboratories* (2021-012) informed the CPM that it wished to continue to consider how to address the issues raised in the proposal, as it considered that a standard would be beneficial to CPs when laboratories are authorized under ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*).
- [41] The CPM:
- (1) *adopted* the recommended topics in response to the 2021 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation as presented in Table 1 of Appendix XX;
  - (2) *adopted* the recommended priorities for standards in response to the 2021 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation, subject to the change of priority from 3 to 2 for the topic *Revision of ISPM 26* (2021-010), as presented in Table 1 of Appendix XX;
  - (3) *requested* that the SC and the IC integrate the adopted topics into their respective lists of topics;
  - (4) *noted* the TFT's recommendations on SC subjects (for diagnostic protocols) outlined in Table 2 of Appendix XX;
  - (5) *encouraged* contracting parties, regional plant protection organizations and other interested parties to provide support to deliver high-priority topics.

## 8.8 CPM focus groups

### 8.8.1 Recommendations and report from the CPM Focus Group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems

- [42] The chairperson of the CPM Focus Group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems presented a report on the activities of the focus group.<sup>13</sup> The group had drawn up a set of recommendations for the CPM to consider regarding the development, implementation and maintenance of a global Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System (POARS) coordinated by the secretariat. These considerations included a proposal for a new CPM subsidiary body, the POARS Committee, but as this option was costly it was proposed that a steering group would first be set up to advance POARS activities.
- [43] The proposals from the focus group generated a lengthy discussion among CPs. Some CPs supported the establishment of an interim steering group, whereas others did not and commented on the budgetary

---

<sup>11</sup> CPM 2022/27.

<sup>12</sup> SC 2021-11 (focused meeting), agenda item 4.

<sup>13</sup> CPM 2022/36, CPM 2022/INF/22.

implications and potential overlap with existing initiatives. One alternative suggested was to use the same model as has been used by FAO for fall armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda*) and Fusarium banana wilt TR4 (caused by *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* Tropical Race 4) whereby technical working groups gather information and develop supporting materials for specific emerging pests. No CPs expressed support for a new subsidiary body and one commented on the need to first have stronger support and consensus on the role and focus of IPPC functions on pest response.

[44] With respect to the development of the global POARS itself, the CPM noted that any global system would need to be aligned with regional systems but that alternative options to the model proposed could include addressing the scope of POARS through FAO regions and RPPOs or trying a regional system before expanding to a global system. The need to secure sufficient funding was raised and concern was expressed that the proposals were moving too far, too fast. Given the synergies between the proposed POARS and national reporting obligations (NROs), some CPs also advocated the use of measures to incentivize CPs to meet their NROs and to report (in future) to the POARS.

[45] Given the range of views, 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 revisions to the recommendations for CPM decision and revisions to the draft terms of reference for the POARS steering group.<sup>14</sup> The latter included increasing the number of NPPO representatives and removing the international or regional research-institution representative so that the group comprised those most familiar with the topic. The Friends of the Chair recognized that the terms of reference were not finalized and that the CPM Bureau may wish to make further changes and submit them for CPM approval through the silent-consent process.

[46] The CPM:

- (1) *thanked* the members of the CPM Focus Group on POARS for their work over the year of the focus group's mandate;
- (2) *agreed*, as an interim measure, to establish a POARS Steering Group to work on establishing a POARS capability;
- (3) *agreed* to the POARS Steering Group Terms of Reference in Appendix XX being revised to reflect the discussions of the CPM and submitted to the CPM Bureau for approval, and *requested* that the secretariat open a call for experts once the bureau has given its approval;
- (4) *requested* that the Finance Committee consider how to allocate an appropriate level of resources to continue the work on POARS during 2022;
- (5) *encouraged* CPs to contribute extra-budgetary resources to help fund the POARS workplan; and
- (6) *invited* the SC to invite the Technical Panel for the Glossary to consider the term “emerging pest” for inclusion in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) and the suggestion made by the POARS focus group for this definition.

#### **8.8.2 Update from the CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030**

[47] The chairperson of the CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 Development Agenda Items referred the CPM to a paper giving an update from the focus group.<sup>15</sup> He explained that good progress had been made, but that it had been a very challenging task and would take a few more months to complete. It was anticipated that a draft of the overarching implementation plan would be presented to the CPM Bureau and SPG in late 2022, with a view to proposing it to CPM-17 (2023) for approval. He noted, however, that – as is the case for all plans – the implementation plan would need to be reviewed and adjusted subsequently as time progressed.

---

<sup>14</sup> CPM 2022/CRP/07.

<sup>15</sup> CPM 2022/35.



[48] Some CPs expressed their support for the continuation of the work of the focus group, with a few also highlighting the need for a realistic plan for funding and for resource mobilization among donors. One suggestion was to include both an optimal plan and a minimal plan, to allow for the uncertainty in funding.

[49] In response to a query, the CPM chairperson and the focus group chairperson clarified that the membership of the focus group had been selected from a call for experts, based on the criteria in the terms of reference, but not all regions had submitted a nomination.

[50] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the report from the CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030;
- (2) *noted* the issues raised in the report for the CPM and the secretariat to consider;
- (3) *agreed* that the focus group should continue to operate until the overarching and integrated implementation plan has been developed and approved by the CPM, and that this is anticipated to be at CPM-17 (2023).

### **8.8.3 Update from the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues**

[51] The chairperson of the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues presented an update from the focus group.<sup>16</sup>

[52] The action plan received broad support from CPs and Japan informed the CPM of its intention to provide an in-kind contribution towards the secretariat’s work on climate change.

[53] Some CPs suggested that the cooperation and exchange of information on climate change and plant-health matters with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and other international and regional organisations should be added to the prioritized activities in the action plan. They also suggested that the CPM consider adding a global seminar or webinar on the impacts of climate change on plant health to the programme of the first International Plant Health Conference London in September this year.

[54] The CPM noted a suggestion that the Bureau Finance Committee review the funds available for this activity at its June meeting and report back to CPM-17 (2023).

[55] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues;
- (2) *welcomed* the offer from Japan to provide an in-kind contribution to support the secretariat’s work on climate change;
- (3) *approved* the 2022–2025 action plan for the implementation of the development agenda item “Assessment and Management of Climate Change Impacts on Plant Health”; and
- (4) *requested* that the CPM Bureau review the funds available for delivery of the action plan.

### **8.8.4 Update from the CPM Focus Group on Communications**

[56] The chairperson of the CPM Focus Group on Communications presented a paper giving an update from the focus group, which outlined the progress made to date towards developing a new IPPC Communications Strategy for the rest of the decade.<sup>17</sup> The group had agreed on four high-level, strategic-communication objectives and had identified the levels of influence and interest of different audiences and stakeholders. However, given the short space of time since the focus group’s first meeting in September 2021, the group had concluded that a one-year extension would be required to allow the necessary input and feedback in order to ensure a robust communications strategy. The focus group

---

<sup>16</sup> CPM 2022/14.

<sup>17</sup> CPM 2022/39.

would also be taking part in the process of establishing the IPPC annual themes, together with the secretariat and in collaboration with all parties involved.

[57] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the report of the CPM Focus Group on Communications;
- (2) *encouraged* national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) and RPPOs to contribute to the IPPC Communication Strategy through the focus group members in their region;
- (3) *encouraged* the North America region to nominate a person to join the CPM Focus Group on Communications; and
- (4) *agreed* to postpone the adoption of the IPPC Communication Strategy to CPM-17 (2023).

#### **8.8.5 Update from the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution**

[58] The CPM agreed to consider this item under agenda item 14, because of time constraints.

#### **8.8.6 Proposed establishment and draft terms of reference for a CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers**

[59] This item was considered under agenda item 11.3.

## **9. Standard setting**

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

[60] The SC chairperson presented the report of the SC's activities during 2021.<sup>18</sup> He informed the CPM that progress had been made on more than 50 of the 100 topics on the SC work programme. In addition to this, the SC had rationalized the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and reviewed new topics submitted as part of the 2021 Call for Topics. He referred the CPM to the paper for this agenda item for further details of matters considered by the SC during the year. The SC chairperson commented on the importance of the continued collaboration between the SC and the IC and thanked all those involved in the standard setting process, including Brazil for providing in-kind staff support. He also gave special thanks to the Standard Setting Unit of the secretariat and concluded by hoping for a return to face-to-face meetings, to engender a more productive working environment for the SC.

[61] The CPM expressed its gratitude and appreciation to the SC chairperson, who would shortly be finishing his term of office, for his excellent leadership of the SC.

[62] Some CPs suggested that at least one face-to-face SC meeting be held during 2022, with the same applying to all strategic meetings, such as those of the CPM Bureau and the IC.

[63] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the report on the activities of the SC in 2021.

### **9.2 Adoption of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures**

[64] The secretariat introduced the papers for this agenda item, which presented the draft 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>19</sup> The summary paper also highlighted the need for a coordinator for the Language Review Group for French.

[65] The secretariat informed the CPM that the deadline for objections specified in the Standard Setting Procedure was three weeks before CPM-16 (2022), namely 17 March 2022, but by that date no

---

<sup>18</sup> CPM 2022/30.

<sup>19</sup> CPM 2022/24 (including attachments 01–09).

objections had been received.<sup>20</sup> The secretariat explained that, according to the procedure, the CPM should therefore adopt the standards without discussion. The secretariat informed the CPM, however, that a statement on two of the draft ISPMs had been received from one CP for consideration by the CPM.<sup>21</sup>

[66] The CP in question explained its concerns. One was that the necessary differences in requirements between audits conducted by a national plant protection organization (NPPO) in its own territory and audits in an exporting country were not reflected in the draft ISPM on *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2015-014) and it would be better if these two sets of requirements were described separately. The second related to the draft ISPM on *Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures* (2019-008), which the CP thought did not make clear whether and how the criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of measures would be shared with the CPM for its review and approval. The CP suggested that after the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) has developed the draft criteria, the criteria should be shared with the CPM and perhaps added to the standard as a supplement or annex with a cross-reference in the core text of the standard.

[67] The CPM noted the concern expressed by the CP regarding the draft audit standard and acknowledged that the relevant subsidiary bodies would consider a possible future review of the standard. The CP confirmed that its statement did not represent an objection and that, given these assurances, it would agree to adoption of the draft audit standard without any change.

[68] For the draft standard on commodity-specific standards, some CPs expressed the view that it was not intended that the TPCS further develop the criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of measures, as the criteria were already in the draft ISPM and this task was not included in the specification for the TPCS. They suggested that the CPM consider whether a technical update to clarify the text was deemed necessary and, if so, this could be applied as an ink amendment after adoption. The CP that had submitted the statement agreed with these comments and also confirmed that its statement did not represent an objection. The CPM noted the concern expressed by this CP and agreed that an amendment of the standard would be considered by CPM-17 (2023) if a technical update was deemed necessary.

[69] The CPM:

- (1) adopted ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) (2019-008) (Appendix XX);
- (2) adopted ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*) (2015-014) (Appendix XX);
- (3) adopted the focused revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011) (Appendix XX) and *revoked* the previously adopted version;
- (4) adopted the 2019 and 2020 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001) (Appendix XX) and *revoked* the previously adopted version;
- (5) adopted PT 40 (Irradiation treatment for Tortricidae on fruits) (2017-011) as Annex 40 to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) (Appendix XX);
- (6) adopted PT 41 (Cold treatment for *Bactrocera zonata* on *Citrus sinensis*) (2017-013) as Annex 41 to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) (Appendix XX);
- (7) adopted PT 42 (Irradiation treatment for *Zeugodacus tau*) (2017-025) as Annex 42 to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) (Appendix XX);
- (8) adopted PT 43 (Irradiation treatment for *Sternochetus frigidus*) (2017-036) as Annex 43 to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) (Appendix XX);
- (9) adopted PT 44 (Vapour heat-modified atmosphere treatment for *Cydia pomonella* and *Grapholita molesta* on *Malus pumila* and *Prunus persica*) (2017-037 and 2017-038) as Annex 44 to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) (Appendix XX);

---

<sup>20</sup> CPM 2022/INF/15.

<sup>21</sup> CPM 2022/INF/16.

- (10) *noted* that the SC adopted on behalf of the CPM the following DPs as annexes to ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*):
- DP 30 (*Striga* spp.) (2008-009),
  - DP 31 ('*Candidatus Liberibacter*' spp. on *Citrus* spp.) (2004-010);
- (11) *thanked* the experts of the groups who drafted the adopted standards for their active contribution to the development of these standards (Appendix XX);
- (12) *requested* that the SC consider the possible changes to ISPM 46 proposed at this meeting and advise CPM-17 (2023) accordingly;
- (13) *noted* that the following eleven ISPMs (including seven phytosanitary treatments (PTs)) had been reviewed by the Arabic, Chinese, Russian and Spanish Language Review Groups and FAO Translation services, 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 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*),
  - ISPM 44 (*Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as phytosanitary measures*),
  - ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*),
  - annexes to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*):
    - PT 33 (Irradiation treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis*),
    - PT 34 (Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica*),
    - PT 35 (Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica*),
    - PT 36 (Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Vitis vinifera*),
    - PT 37 (Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Vitis vinifera*),
    - PT 38 (Irradiation treatment for *Carposina sasakii*),
    - PT 39 (Irradiation treatment for the genus *Anastrepha*);
- (14) *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, including annexes;
- (15) *acknowledged* the contributions of the members of the SC who had left the committee in 2021:
- Estonia, Olga LAVRENTJEVA,
  - France, Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC,
  - Guinea-Bissau, Luis Antonio TAVARES,
  - Nigeria, Moses Adegboyega ADEWUMI,
  - Sudan, Abdelmoneem Ismaeel ADRA ABDETAM;
- (16) *acknowledged* the contributions of the members of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments who had left the panel in 2021:
- Australia, Matthew SMYTH (member),
  - United States of America, Andrea BEAM (member);
- (17) *acknowledged* the contributions of the following member of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols who had left the panel in 2021:
- Australia, Brendan RODONI (member); and

(18) *acknowledged* the contributions of the members of the Technical Panel for the Glossary who had left the panel in 2021:

- China, Hong NING (member for the Chinese language),
- European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization, Andrei ORLINSKI (member for the Russian language),
- Estonia, Olga LAVRENTJEVA (Steward and member for the Russian language).

[70] The secretariat presented a paper on proposed ink amendments to adopted ISPMs arising from consistency reviews.<sup>22</sup> Only one such ink amendment had been proposed and the SC had agreed to it.

[71] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the ink amendment to the definition of the Glossary (ISPM 5) term “area of low pest prevalence” (as presented in Attachment 01 of CPM 2022/18 in English) to avoid redundancy in the term definition;
- (2) *noted* that the ink amendment will be implemented into the language versions of the standard concerned as resources permit; and
- (3) *agreed* that, once the secretariat has applied the ink amendment, the previous versions of ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) are replaced by the newly implemented versions.

### **9.3 Standards Committee recommendations to the CPM**

#### **9.3.1 Adoption of the List of topics for IPPC standards**

[72] The SC chairperson presented a paper on changes to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.<sup>23</sup> This listed the modifications to subjects (Glossary terms, DPs and PTs for consideration by the relevant technical panels) that had been made by the SC and proposed the removal of seven topics.

[73] Some CPs suggested that the topic *Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade* (2006-010) be retained in the list of topics, as it was no longer lacking scientific data following the publication of a relevant scientific paper in January 2022.

[74] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the adjustments made by the SC to the list of subjects in the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (as presented in Part II of CPM 2022/22);
- (2) *agreed* to retain the topic *Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade* (revision of ISPM 15) (2006-010);
- (3) *agreed* to remove the following topics from the *List of topics for IPPC standards*:
  - *Efficacy of measures* (2001-001),
  - *Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages* (2008-004),
  - *International movement of cut flowers and foliage* (2008-005),
  - *International movement of grain* (2008-007),
  - *International movement of wood products and handicrafts made from wood* (2008-008),
  - *Supplement Guidance on the concept of probability of transfer to a suitable host and establishment as used in a pest risk analysis for quarantine pests* to ISPM 11 (2015-010);and
- (4) *adopted* the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, with the above adjustments.

---

<sup>22</sup> CPM 2022/18.

<sup>23</sup> CPM 2022/22.

### **9.3.2 Adjustments to the standard setting process to facilitate the development of phytosanitary treatments**

- [75] The secretariat presented a paper proposing adjustments to the standard setting process to facilitate the development of phytosanitary treatments.<sup>24</sup> These adjustments would allow the SC to recommend draft PTs for adoption by the CPM after the first consultation if no significant or major technical comments were made during the consultation, rather than all draft PTs being submitted for a second consultation. The paper identified the proposed changes to the Standard Setting Procedure and the criteria that the SC would use when deciding whether a second consultation was needed.
- [76] Some CPs proposed a modification to the proposed adjustments to clarify that the SC decides for each PT whether a second consultation is needed.<sup>25</sup> The CPM agreed to these amendments.
- [77] One CP suggested that draft PTs for which there are major disagreements and disputed technical parameters are submitted to two rounds of consultation, with verification tests organized when necessary to ensure the scientific nature of the standards. The CP also suggested that a mechanism be established to review PTs and regularly evaluate their application and effectiveness, and that a fast track be established for the approval of ISPM topics to ensure that existing standards can be revised to take account of new technologies where needed.
- [78] Another CP emphasized the importance of transparency in decision-making and suggested that the responses to first consultation comments be published, together with the detailed reasoning for the SC's decisions about whether comments were significant. The secretariat clarified that the responses to consultation comments for all draft DPs and PTs were posted on the IPP (unlike the responses for draft ISPMs, which were reported in SC meeting reports).
- [79] The CPM:
- (1) *adopted* the modified Standard Setting Procedure recommended by the SC, as amended in this meeting (Appendix XX); and
  - (2) *invited* the SC to consider the suggestions made at this meeting.

### **9.3.3 Discussions on the topic Food and other humanitarian aid in a phytosanitary context and a proposal for the establishment of a CPM focus group**

- [80] The secretariat presented a paper from the SC outlining the discussions within the TFT, SC and IC on the topic "Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid" (2021-020), which had been submitted in response to the 2021 Call for Topics.<sup>26</sup> Recognizing that the topic was challenging to address as a standard because of the extensive scope of regulated articles to be covered by it, the TFT, SC and IC had considered alternative options but had not been able to reach a consensus. The SC, with the support of the IC, had therefore proposed that a CPM focus group be established to address the barriers to development of the topic as a standard and determine a possible way forward.
- [81] The proposal to establish a focus group received broad support from CPs, with some CPs also expressing support for the future development of a standard.
- [82] Some CPs suggested that, for consistency with the scope of the IPPC, the term "risk" be changed to "pest risk" in the Purpose section of the terms of reference.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> CPM 2022/21.

<sup>25</sup> CPM 2022/CRP/04.

<sup>26</sup> CPM 2022/23.

<sup>27</sup> CPM 2022/CRP/04.

[83] Some CPs commented on the participants of the focus group, suggesting that the membership be expanded to include representatives from developing countries and that food-aid professionals be invited as invited experts.

[84] A few CPs suggested that, given the wide support for a standard already expressed by CPs and RPPOs, the focus group should concentrate on establishing the principles and other aspects that a standard should contain, rather than re-analysing the strategic value and benefits of developing a standard, and proposed revisions to the draft terms of reference to this effect, with also a reduction in the focus group's mandate to one year.<sup>28</sup> Another CP suggested that the focus group should also analyse the feasibility of implementing a standard, including the potential impediments and challenges for CPs when trying to comply with one, and that consideration should be given to the focus group having at least one face-to-face meeting.

[85] Given the various suggestions about the draft terms of reference, the CPM chairperson proposed that interested CPs participate in a Friends of the Chair meeting to discuss these further. This took place outside of the session and resulted in a set of consolidated amendments for the CPM to consider, including changes to the membership and purpose of the focus group.<sup>29</sup> The secretariat confirmed that this focus group, like all others, would be under the remit of the CPM Bureau unless the CPM agreed otherwise.

[86] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* that several regions and individual NPPOs have supported the need for a standard on the safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid, as demonstrated through the submission of this topic to the 2021 Call for Topics;
- (2) *agreed* to establish a CPM Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and other Humanitarian Aid to discuss the issues and determine a way forward for this topic to be developed as a standard or another option that meets the needs of contracting parties;
- (3) *approved* the Terms of Reference for the CPM Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and other Humanitarian Aid as modified in this meeting (Appendix XX); and
- (4) *requested* that the secretariat open a call for focus group members.

## 10. CPM recommendations

[87] The secretariat presented a paper outlining the development of draft CPM recommendations in the work programme.<sup>30</sup>

### 10.1 Adoption of draft CPM Recommendation on *Reduction of the incidence of contaminating pests associated with regulated and unregulated articles to protect plant resources and facilitate safe trade (2019-002)*

[88] Since CPM-15 (2021), the draft CPM Recommendation on *Reduction of the incidence of contaminating pests associated with regulated and unregulated articles to protect plant resources and facilitate safe trade (2019-002)* had been submitted to consultation and had been revised accordingly. Further to these changes, the CPM Bureau had recommended the draft CPM Recommendation to CPM-16 (2022) for adoption.<sup>31</sup>

[89] Some CPs suggested that “plant or environmental pests” be changed to “contaminating pests” in recommendation (f), for consistency with the other parts of the CPM Recommendation, and that the

---

<sup>28</sup> CPM 2022/INF/20.

<sup>29</sup> CPM 2022/CRP/08.

<sup>30</sup> CPM 2022/06.

<sup>31</sup> CPM 2022/06\_01.

introductory stem to the recommendations be amended to refer to RPPOs being encouraged as well as CPs.<sup>32</sup> The CPM agreed.

[90] The CPM:

- (1) *adopted* CPM Recommendation R-10 (*Reduction of the incidence of contaminating pests associated with regulated and unregulated articles to protect plant resources and facilitate safe trade*) (2019-002) as modified in this meeting (Appendix XX).

## **10.2 Inclusion of any other topics submitted by contracting parties into the CPM work programme**

[91] No proposals for new CPM recommendations were made.

## **11. Implementation and capacity development**

### **11.1 Report from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee**

[92] The IC chairperson presented the IC's report for 2021.<sup>33</sup> He explained how the work of the IC had continued despite the continuing challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic and highlighted the work of the three IC subgroups and the eight IC teams. He finished by recognizing the dedication of the secretariat's Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU), but also signalled his concern about a continued reliance on project contracts for staffing within the unit, observing that retaining staff for a long period is a vital component of the success of an organization.

[93] The CPM recognized the need to increase the awareness and use of IPPC implementation materials, and noted a call to publish all materials in all FAO languages to avoid discrimination. The secretariat informed the CPM of the efforts already being made to address the latter issue and assured CPs of their intention to continue pursuing this.

[94] Some CPs called upon the secretariat to continue to provide adequate support for the IC's work and to encourage CPs, RPPOs and other institutions to provide resources for implementation and capacity development activities.

[95] The secretariat thanked donors for financial and in-kind support.

[96] The CPM:

- (1) *thanked* the following experts:
  - for their contributions to the *Pest status guide*:
    - Guadalupe MONTES (Argentina)
    - Wendy ODGERS (Australia)
    - Nelson LAVILLE (Dominica)
    - Ebenezer ABOAGYE (Ghana)
    - Dominic EYRE (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)
  - for their contributions to the *Surveillance guide*:
    - Chris DALE (Australia)
    - Ruth AREVALO MACIAS (Chile)
    - Pablo CORTESE (Argentina)
    - Hernan ZETINA (Belize)
    - Robert FAVRIN (Canada)

---

<sup>32</sup> CPM 2022/CRP/04.

<sup>33</sup> CPM 2022/11.



Magda GONZÁLEZ ARROYO (Costa Rica)

George MOMANYI (Kenya)

Ringolds ARNITIS (Latvia)

Paul STEVENS (New Zealand)

Leroy WHILBY (United States of America)

- for their contributions to the fall armyworm prevention guide (*Prevention, preparedness and response guidelines for Spodoptera frugiperda*):

Chris DALE (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization)

Tek TAY (Australia)

Mekki CHOUBANI (Near East Plant Protection Organization)

Viliami (Pila) KAMI (Pacific Plant Protection Organization)

Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy)

Valerio LUCCHESI (European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization)

Roger DAY (CABI)

Alison WATSON (Grow Asia);

- (2) *noted* the work of the IC and the outcomes of the meetings in 2021;
- (3) *noted* the activities of the IC Subgroup on the IRSS;
- (4) *noted* the current status of the IC Subgroup on Dispute Avoidance and Settlement;
- (5) *noted* the activities of the IC Subgroup Sea Containers Task Force;
- (6) *noted* the activities of the IC Team on National Reporting Obligations;
- (7) *noted* the activities of the IC Team on e-Commerce;
- (8) *noted* the activities of the IC Team on Framework for Standards & Implementation;
- (9) *noted* the activities of the IC Team on Guides and Training Materials;
- (10) *noted* the guides and training materials that were published in 2021;
- (11) *noted* the progress on the development of guides and training materials;
- (12) *agreed* to add the following topics to the *List of implementation and capacity development topics*:
  - the guide to *Performing audits in the phytosanitary context* (2021-009) (agreed under agenda item 8.7),
  - the revision of the guide to *National reporting obligations* (2021-026) (agreed under agenda item 11.2);
- (13) *agreed* to delete the following topics from the *List of implementation and capacity development topics*:
  - *Strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems*, programme (2017-051) (see agenda item 8.8.1),
  - *Dispute settlement*, revision of procedure (1999-005) (see CPM 2022/05),
  - *Modernization of PCE tool* (2017-052) (see agenda item 11.4),
  - *Sea containers*, programme (2016-016) (see agenda item 11.3),
  - *Plant health surveillance* (2015-015), contributed resource,
  - *Designing plant quarantine laboratories* (2018-013), contributed resource,
  - *Management of plants and plant products carried by entry passengers*, awareness materials (2018-017),
  - *Pest diagnostics* (2016-015),
  - *Pest status*, guide (2017-048),
  - *Surveillance*, revised guide (2017-049),

- *Fall armyworm prevention, guide (2020-010)*;
- (14) *noted* the status of the development of the various implementation and capacity development topics;
- (15) *noted* the priority levels assigned to the implementation and capacity development topics;
- (16) *noted* the activities undertaken towards advancing the PCE Strategy 2020–2030;
- (17) *noted* the work of the IC Team on Fusarium TR4;
- (18) *noted* the work of the IC Team on Projects;
- (19) *noted* the work of the IC Team on Web-based resources; and
- (20) *thanked* Olga LAVRENTJEVA (Estonia), the former IC chairperson, for her work and important contributions to the work of the IC.

## 11.2 National reporting obligations

[97] The secretariat presented a summary of the 2021 activities on NROs and the workplan for 2022, including work to oversee NROs activities, provide direct assistance to CPs, and develop the NROs capacity of CPs.<sup>34</sup> The secretariat informed the CPM, however, that the extent to which the workplan could be delivered was dependent on funding being available. The secretariat thanked a CP for providing an in-kind staff contribution to work partly on NROs.

[98] Some CPs commented on the success of a recent pre-CPM regional workshop and asked whether such type of initiatives could be repeated. The secretariat clarified that they were open to any suggestions about activities that CPs may suggest.

[99] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the summary of the NROs 2021 activities;
- (2) *noted* the summary of the NROs 2022 workplan;
- (3) *added* the revision of the *Guide to national reporting obligations (2021-026)* to the *List of implementation and capacity development topics* and *noted* that the IC would assign a priority level of 1;
- (4) *noted* the IC’s decision to allow IPPC contact points to delete any of their NROs documents on their country page on the IPP, and that while the record would no longer be visible on the country page on the IPP, the data would be archived and be made available only to the generator of the record upon request; and
- (5) *noted* that although NROs activities were unfunded, a contracting party had provided an in-kind staff contribution to work partly on advancing the NROs 2022 workplan.

## 11.3 Sea Containers Task Force

[100] The CPM also considered agenda item 8.8.6 under this agenda item.

[101] The chairperson of the Sea Containers Task Force (SCTF) presented a paper outlining the work and outcome of the SCTF, which had completed its mandate and produced its final report.<sup>35</sup> He highlighted the complex logistics of sea-container movements; emphasized that, to be effective, phytosanitary measures (such as a standard) must not negatively impact these movements; and explained that although it is possible to reduce pest risk, it would not be possible to eliminate it. He informed the CPM that although the SCTF had not reached clear conclusions, it had drawn up recommendations on how to progress to reach key decisions, including a proposal for a global workshop to be organized in 2022 with representatives of all stakeholders and a proposal for a focus group to be established. The SCTF chairperson explained that it was advisable for the focus group to be established before the workshop,

---

<sup>34</sup> CPM 2022/12.

<sup>35</sup> CPM 2022/33; SCTF final report: [https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2022/02/Draft\\_SCTF\\_final\\_report\\_21\\_Dec\\_2021\\_Combined\\_EDITED\\_Clean.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2022/02/Draft_SCTF_final_report_21_Dec_2021_Combined_EDITED_Clean.pdf)

to maximize the participation of focus group members in the workshop. The draft terms of reference for the focus group were provided in the paper for agenda item 8.8.6.<sup>36</sup>

[102] In the interests of time-keeping, the CPM Chairperson suggested that interested CPs participate in a Friends of the Chair meeting to discuss the STCF's recommendations. This took place outside of the session and concluded that the establishment of the focus group should not be delayed and the call for members of the focus group should commence immediately after CPM-16 (2022). The Friends of the Chair also agreed on some amendments to the draft terms of reference for the focus group, based on some amendments proposed by one CP before CPM,<sup>37</sup> but with further revision.<sup>38</sup> The revised terms of reference set the focus group's duration as two years, limited the group's membership to CPs and related officials but with members from all seven FAO regions, and allowed for invited experts to participate as needed. The terms of reference also set the focus group the task of revising the existing CPM Recommendation on *Sea containers* (R-06). Recognizing that industry involvement was essential, the Friends of the Chair also suggested that the CPM consider establishing an industry advisory body through the silent-consent process. The SCTF chairperson also recalled that one point made in the Friends of the Chair meeting was that the CPM needed to be open to industry-led solutions that could be applied in combination with IPPC-specific guidance.

[103] The CPM:

- (1) *noted and approved* the SCTF report;<sup>39</sup>
- (2) *thanked* SCTF members for their work over the five years of the task force's mandate;
- (3) *agreed* with the following SCTF recommendations to CPM-16 (2022):
  - to establish a CPM Sea Container Focus Group (see decision point 7 of this agenda item).
  - to organize a global workshop in 2022 (see Annex 3 of the SCTF final report), provided resources are available, to discuss the outcomes of the SCTF with representatives of all stakeholders involved and to discuss the best way forward. The SCTF further recommended that additional elements be collected for inclusion in the programme of the proposed international workshop.
  - that CPM decisions on guidance and/or other next steps should be deferred until after the 2022 workshop. Such decisions should be based on further analysis of the workshop discussions by the new CPM Sea Container Focus Group, if established. The SCTF expects that this will result in the best-informed decisions being taken.
  - that any guidance on sea containers developed under the auspices of the IPPC Secretariat should include in its scope both empty and packed sea containers, as both types move internationally and both types may be contaminated. When developing guidance, the capacity of NPPOs and all other entities that may be impacted by such guidance should be carefully considered.
  - that the CPM Recommendation on *Sea containers* (R-06), originally adopted in 2017, should be retained and revised, either as an interim approach prior to the development of an ISPM, or as a final approach.
  - to remain alert to advances in modern technology, which may be made rapidly, and to opportunities to apply advanced technological approaches, including new detection methods and artificial intelligence, that may exist in the near or mid-term future.
- (4) *agreed* that the CPM Bureau would have oversight of work of the Focus Group on Sea Containers;

---

<sup>36</sup> CPM 2022/31.

<sup>37</sup> CPM 2022/INF/21.

<sup>38</sup> CPM/CRP/09.

<sup>39</sup> Sea Containers Task Force report (posted on the IPP in English only): [www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/capacity-development-committee/ic-sub-group/ic-sub-group-sea-container-task-force-sctf/sctf-final-report](http://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/capacity-development-committee/ic-sub-group/ic-sub-group-sea-container-task-force-sctf/sctf-final-report)

- (5) *noted* the following SCTF recommendations to contracting parties and their NPPOs:
- Contracting parties are encouraged to collect data to better define the pest risk and to help measure the uptake of the Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units (CTU) Code. Contracting parties are also encouraged to establish/execute sea container surveys according to the IPPC Guidelines on Sea Container Surveys for NPPOs and to submit the survey results to the IPPC Secretariat.
  - Contracting parties are encouraged to contact their national customs counterparts with the aim to explore what ongoing activities and experience are available at national level so that a consolidated approach could be proposed on the ways for potential collaboration between the World Customs Organization and the IPPC Secretariat on this topic.
  - Contracting parties should engage with their national contact points for the International Maritime Organization to support the inclusion of sea container cleanliness among criteria in the International Maritime Organization inspection programmes for CTU.
  - Collaboration and coordination between all border agencies should be undertaken to avoid duplicative and redundant activities, including inspections, compliance and enforcement systems. Border management activities should be risk-based and driven by data. This is in line with the World Trade Organization Trade Facilitation Agreement.
  - Contracting parties are encouraged to conduct a national feasibility study with their national customs counterparts, in order to identify the way forward on how the World Customs Organization Data Model could be used for exchanging information on the cleanliness status of sea containers.
  - Contracting parties are called on to provide input during the process of revising the CTU Code.
- (6) *noted* the following SCTF recommendations to all stakeholders:
- Raising awareness should continue and effective communication will be essential. All players within the chain of custody should be engaged so that the reason and the purpose of the approach applied can be easily understood. Large-scale importers should be engaged in discussions. The most significant challenge for future dissemination programmes will be ensuring that the advice and material developed reaches the many small- and medium-sized entities throughout the containerized supply chain, including those that are responsible for the packing and unpacking of sea containers.
  - The entire text of the CTU Code could be reviewed to make responsibilities and relevant actions clearer and better described along the CTU chain of custody. The language of the proposed amendments should take into account the status of the revised CTU Code: mandatory versus voluntary. This should result in a version of the CTU Code that could be used as an independent document for the management of pest risks. The SCTF recommends that the IPPC Secretariat submits comments and recommendations to this revision.
  - Phasing out of containers with wooden floors and replacing them with either composite containers or steel-floor containers is expected to reduce the risk of contamination and facilitate effective cleaning, and should be explored further.
  - Industry organizations represented on the SCTF recognized the role their respective memberships could play in helping reduce the risk of pest contamination of sea containers. As the work of the SCTF drew to a close, a number of ideas and proposals were identified by each of the organizations, and it is understood that joint discussions to assess and develop these are expected to take place after the Final Report of the SCTF is submitted. These various ideas addressed the roles and responsibilities of different parties in the supply chain, the extent to which container cleanliness could be “verified”, and methods for raising awareness of the risks of contamination and the means of reducing them. The SCTF encourages the organizations concerned to keep the CPM informed of developments.
- (7) *agreed* to establish a CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers and *approved* the terms of reference for it as modified in this meeting (Appendix XX);

- (8) *requested* that the secretariat open a call for focus group members;
- (9) *agreed* to establish an industry advisory body on sea containers and have its chairperson as a member of the focus group; and
- (10) *requested* that the secretariat draft terms of reference for the industry advisory body for consideration by the CPM Bureau and subsequent approval by CPs through the silent-consent process.

#### **11.4 Phytosanitary capacity evaluations**

[104] The secretariat presented a paper on PCE activities in 2021,<sup>40</sup> including the development of a procedure for certifying PCE facilitators, the production of a confidentiality agreement for PCE observers, plans for a desk study, and discussions about the IC Team on PCEs becoming an IC subgroup.

[105] The CPM recognized how PCE can help countries to improve their phytosanitary systems, including their legal frameworks, and suggested that PCE be implemented in additional countries. Some CPs, however, called for changes to be made to the PCE tool to allow flexibility and greater access so that more CPs could benefit from it, and had provided their detailed suggestions in written interventions before the meeting.<sup>41</sup>

[106] The CPM recognized the need to ensure that the forthcoming desk study would be independent, impartial and allow all CPs to provide input.

[107] Some CPs suggested that the training course for PCE facilitators should not start until after the desk study has been completed, so that it can accommodate the findings of the study.

[108] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the Procedure for a PCE Facilitator Certification agreed upon by the IC;
- (2) *noted* that work will begin to develop a PCE facilitators training course (2017-052);
- (3) *noted* the confidentiality agreement for representatives from international organizations and donors participating in the IPPC PCE process as observers;
- (4) *noted* that a desk study on PCE will be undertaken to help identify ways to improve PCE (modules, platform, process, accessibility, lite version);
- (5) *noted* that some of the activities identified in the PCE Strategy 2020–2030 have been implemented and that this strategy will be updated once the results of the desk study to improve PCE has been completed;
- (6) *noted* that the IC is considering establishing an IC Subgroup on PCE, which would replace the existing IC team; and
- (7) *agreed* that the management of PCE should be more intrinsically embedded in the secretariat’s activities and consideration should be given to allocating regular-programme funds to the management and improvement of PCE.

#### **11.5 Implementation Review and Support System**

[109] The secretariat presented a paper summarizing the preferred options for transitioning the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) from being funded by single donors through several projects into a more sustainable system.<sup>42</sup> The proposed changes included changing the name of the system to “IPPC Observatory”, narrowing its scope and allocating baseline funding.

---

<sup>40</sup> CPM 2022/20.

<sup>41</sup> CPM 2022/CRP/01, CPM 2022/CRP/02.

<sup>42</sup> CPM 2022/26.

[110] Some CPs, while supporting the proposals, suggested that monitoring of the implementation of the CPM, ISPMs and CPM Recommendations be part of every second three-year workplan, rather than every 3–5 years.

[111] The CPM considered the proposal to allocate annual baseline funding for the observatory (to cover the fixed costs, including costs for a full-time post, consumables and supplies, and amounting to USD 185 000 per year) from regular-programme funds. The CPM acknowledged, however, the current underfunding of some secretariat activities and therefore recognized the need to ensure that the funding for the observatory could be sourced without compromising other secretariat activities.

[112] The CPM recognized that the management structure for the observatory was a matter for decision by the secretariat, rather than the CPM.

[113] The CPM:

- (1) *approved* the change of the name of the “Implementation Review and Support System” (IRSS) to “IPPC Observatory” and *requested* that the IC rename the IC subgroup accordingly;
- (2) *agreed* to narrow the scope of the IPPC Observatory by releasing the “support function”, which means that this system will be limited to providing recommendations on ways to address implementation issues identified;
- (3) *requested* that the Finance Committee, with support from the secretariat, consider allocating USD 185 000 per year from the secretariat’s regular programme as baseline funding to cover the fixed costs of the IPPC Observatory (with additional funding to cover studies and surveys to be mobilized from other sources such as the Multidonor Trust Fund, projects and in-kind contributions), with the condition that such funding should not compromise other secretariat activities;
- (4) *requested* that the secretariat consider the management structure of the IPPC Observatory and that the IC and the secretariat, subject to the allocation of baseline funding, take the necessary actions to enable the effective operationalization of the observatory;
- (5) *agreed* that the IPPC Observatory would contribute to monitoring the achievements of the objectives outlined in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030;
- (6) *approved* the following five guiding principles for the IPPC Observatory: 1) transparency, 2) impartiality and independence, 3) usefulness, 4) driven by a workplan and based on set terms of reference and 5) continuous improvement based on feedback;
- (7) *agreed* that the IPPC Observatory would have a three-year workplan and a three-year communication plan approved by the IC and updated annually as necessary;
- (8) *agreed* that monitoring, evaluation and learning is a part of the IPPC Observatory;
- (9) *requested* that the IPPC Observatory improve the design of surveys and set up an efficient periodic mechanism (in every second three-year workplan) to monitor the implementation of the CPM, ISPMs and CPM Recommendations; and
- (10) *encouraged* contracting parties to contribute to the funding of the IPPC Observatory.

## 11.6 Projects managed by the IPPC Secretariat

[114] The secretariat presented a paper on the eight projects managed by the IFU in 2021, each being in line with the strategic objectives of the IPPC.<sup>43</sup>

[115] Some CPs expressed their appreciation for the work of the secretariat in developing the table on the IPP listing the implementation and capacity development topics, in response to a suggestion made at CPM-15 (2021).

---

<sup>43</sup> CPM 2022/07.

[116] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the transparency and compliance with IC procedures for projects managed by the IFU;
- (2) *noted* the synergies with the IC, and the resulting efficiency, when IFU manage implementation and capacity development projects in order to deliver global outputs following IC procedures;
- (3) *noted* the efforts to create synergies between the *List of implementation and capacity development topics*, all under the guidance of the IC, and the outputs of the implementation and capacity development projects with which the IFU is involved;
- (4) *noted* that the deliverables from implementation and capacity development projects are listed in the IFU annual workplan; and
- (5) *noted* that the staff involved in the delivery of projects are presented in the IFU staff list.<sup>44</sup>

## 12. Financial report and budget

### 12.1 IPPC Secretariat financial report 2021

[117] The secretariat presented its financial report, detailing the resources available in 2021 from FAO's regular-programme budget, extra-budgetary and in-kind (non-financial) sources.<sup>45</sup> The secretariat explained that the contributions to the IPPC Multidonor Trust Fund had been 15 percent lower than in 2020 but the reduction had been offset by lower expenditure on travel (as a result of the pandemic) and the virtual mode of CPM-15 (2021). In December 2019, the FAO Council had decided to increase the regular-programme funding to the secretariat, but the secretariat's programme of work was constantly expanding and so the secretariat encouraged CPs to continue to contribute and thanked those who had contributed in 2021.

[118] The CPM welcomed the confirmation from the Republic of Korea that it would be contributing USD 160 000 to the Multidonor Trust Fund and would specify the use to which this should be put following consultation with the secretariat.

[119] The CPM also welcomed the confirmation from Canada that it would be providing CAD 190 000 to the Multidonor Trust Fund towards three projects: CAD 100 000 to support the sea containers workshop in 2022, CAD 40 000 towards the IRSS studies on risk-based border management and e-commerce, and CAD 50 000 towards the IPPC workshop on sustainable funding for the ePhyto (Electronic Phytosanitary Certificate) Solution.

[120] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the financial report of the IPPC Secretariat for 2021;
- (2) *adopted* the financial report for 2021 of the IPPC Multidonor Trust Fund (Special Trust Fund of the IPPC) as presented in CPM 2022/40;
- (3) *encouraged* contracting parties to contribute to the IPPC Multidonor Trust Fund (Special Trust Fund of the IPPC) and IPPC Projects, preferably on an ongoing basis; and
- (4) *thanked* contracting parties that had contributed to the secretariat's programme of work in 2021.

### 12.2 2021 IPPC Secretariat workplan and budget

[121] The secretariat presented the workplan and budget of the secretariat for 2022.<sup>46</sup> This incorporated the increase in regular-programme funding from FAO, which would remain for the 2022–2023 biennium, and the lower amount of travel because of the pandemic. The secretariat explained that the workplan and budget were linked with the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 and incorporated all parts of the secretariat and all types of funding.

---

<sup>44</sup> IFU staff list: [www.ippc.int/en/publications/85686](http://www.ippc.int/en/publications/85686)

<sup>45</sup> CPM 2022/40.

<sup>46</sup> CPM 2022/28.

[122] Some CPs suggested that the CPM, in its conclusions of this meeting, express its appreciation for the FAO increased contribution in 2021–2022 from the FAO regular programme and call on the FAO to maintain this increased level of contribution on a permanent basis.

[123] The CPM:

- (1) *approved* the 2022 IPPC Secretariat workplan and budget; and
- (2) *expressed* its appreciation to FAO for its enhanced contribution to the IPPC secretariat and *called upon* FAO to make this funding level permanent.

### 13. Update on emerging-pest activities

[124] The secretariat presented a paper on the IPPC activities carried out in 2021 in relation to emerging pests.<sup>47</sup> These included activities to help address two pests or diseases of primary concern for the IPPC community: fall armyworm and Fusarium banana wilt TR4.

[125] The CPM acknowledged the work on these two emerging pests and commended the secretariat for creating an IC Team on Fusarium banana wilt TR4. Contracting parties noted, however, that other pests may also merit attention as emerging pests. Suggestions made by CPs included ‘*Candidatus Liberibacter asiaticus*’, *Spodoptera exempta*, and the causative agent of potato purple top disease. The secretariat suggested that CPs submit these comments to the new POARS Steering Group, once it has been established, and the CPM Bureau and Finance Committee could then consider the suggestions received when planning the work on specific emerging pests.

[126] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the current IPPC Secretariat activities on emerging pests;
- (2) *invited* CPs and RPPOs to submit suggestions to the POARS Steering Group (once established: see agenda item 8.8.1) on other pests to be considered for inclusion in IPPC Secretariat activities on emerging pests;
- (3) *agreed* to promote the use of the global materials for prevention, preparedness and response for fall armyworm and Fusarium banana wilt TR4 developed under the auspices of the IPPC Secretariat; and
- (4) *agreed* to encourage contracting parties, NPPOs, RPPOs and stakeholders to participate actively in webinars, workshops and activities related to emerging pests.

### 14. Update on ePhyto activities

[127] The CPM also considered agenda item 8.8.5 under this item.

[128] The secretariat presented a paper on ePhyto activities, together with a verbal update.<sup>48</sup> The secretariat showed a map of those countries that were registered with the ePhyto Solution, those that were testing it, and those that were exchanging ePhytos. The secretariat informed the CPM that interest in, and usage of, the ePhyto Solution was increasing, with the number of ePhytos exchanged now being more than two million and close to a thousand people participating in the webinars on ePhyto organized by the secretariat. Progress was being made on translating the ePhyto Solution into FAO languages, and very soon there would be an Arabic version of the Generic ePhyto National System.

[129] With respect to the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution, the secretariat explained that, following a call for experts, the CPM Bureau had selected eight members, although no nominations had been received from three of the seven FAO regions: Africa, Near East, and Latin America and the Caribbean. The group’s first meeting will be on 27 April 2022.

---

<sup>47</sup> CPM 2022/10.

<sup>48</sup> CPM 2022/32.



[130] A few CPs shared their experience of the ePhyto Solution, commenting on how it can reduce the incidence of fraudulent phytosanitary certificates, save time, and facilitate data management and hence decision-making, and how particularly beneficial it has been during the COVID-19 pandemic. The CPM acknowledged, however, that some countries can experience difficulties because of inadequate infrastructure (e.g. poor internet connectivity or lack of computers at border points).

[131] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the results of the 2021 ePhyto Solution work programme;
- (2) *encouraged* all contracting parties intending to do so to register for and on-board the ePhyto Solution;
- (3) *urged* all contracting parties currently doing so to continue to provide support to the IPPC ePhyto Solution through the Multidonor Trust Fund;
- (4) *encouraged* all contracting parties to support the efforts of the Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for ePhyto; and
- (5) *noted* the update about the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution.

## 15. International Year of Plant Health legacies

### 15.1 Update on the first International Plant Health Conference

[132] The secretariat presented a paper giving an update on the first International Plant Health Conference.<sup>49</sup> This confirmed that, following the postponement of the conference because of the COVID-19 pandemic and the withdrawal of Finland as the host country, the conference had been rescheduled and would now be held in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on 21–23 September 2022, with FAO as a co-host. It had not proved possible to implement the decision by CPM-15 (2021) to give oversight of the conference to the Technical Advisory Board (TAB) of the IDPH in 2022, because of the late adoption of the IDPH itself and the consequential postponement of the establishment of the IDPH TAB by one year. This situation had also forced the two events – the conference and the IDPH – to take place at two different times during 2022 (May and September).

[133] The CPM discussed the opportunity to keep the oversight of the International Plant Health Conference with the IDPH TAB, once established in 2023, and agreed to continue holding the two events separately to maximize participation and outreach.

[134] The United Kingdom looked forward to welcoming CPM colleagues to London for the conference in September.

[135] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the paper on the first International Plant Health Conference;
- (2) *thanked* the United Kingdom for hosting the first International Plant Health Conference and Finland, Ireland, the Republic of Korea and the European Union for providing financial support for the event;
- (3) *agreed* that the Technical Advisory Board of the IDPH (once established in 2023: see agenda item 15.2) should have oversight of the International Plant Health Conference in future, and that the conference and the IDPH should be kept separate;
- (4) *agreed* that the IPPC Secretariat and the United Kingdom continue planning for the International Plant Health Conference in September 2022 through an *ad hoc* Organising Committee, ensuring broad participation and inclusion for the IPPC community; and
- (5) *encouraged* IPPC contracting parties to support the International Plant Health Conference.

---

<sup>49</sup> CPM 2022/15.

## 15.2 Update on the International Day of Plant Health

[136] The secretariat presented a paper on the IDPH, together with a verbal update.<sup>50</sup> The secretariat informed the CPM that, on 29 March 2022, the United Nations General Assembly had adopted a resolution proclaiming 12 May as the IDPH. The first IDPH would take place in virtual mode and a draft concept note for this event had been annexed to the paper. The paper also referred to the suggestion of the International Steering Committee of the IYPH that the former IYPH Technical Advisory Board be transformed into the IDPH Technical Advisory Board.

[137] The CPM thanked Zambia for tabling the proposal at the United Nations for the establishment of the IDPH and Zambia, in turn, thanked everyone who had supported this initiative.

[138] The CPM recognized the value of there being some degree of harmonization between CPs and regions in how they celebrate the IDPH, for instance by having a common theme, so that they can celebrate it effectively.

[139] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the update on the IDPH; and
- (2) *agreed* to delay the establishment of the Technical Advisory Board of the IDPH by one year (to CPM-17 (2023)).

## 16. External cooperation

### 16.1 Update on international cooperation

[140] The secretariat presented a report highlighting the main cooperative activities with international organizations, research and academic organizations, and RPPOs in 2021.<sup>51</sup>

[141] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the report on the 2021 international cooperation activities.

### 16.2 Written reports from international organizations

[142] The following international organizations provided written reports:<sup>52</sup>

- Biological Weapons Convention;
- CAB International (CABI);
- Europe-Africa-Caribbean-Pacific Liaison Committee (COLEACP);
- European Food Safety Authority;
- International Forestry Quarantine Research Group;
- International Olive Council;
- Joint FAO/International Atomic Energy Agency Centre of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture;
- Ozone Secretariat for the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer;
- Phytosanitary Measures Research Group;
- Standards and Trade Development Facility;
- Postal Security Group of the Universal Postal Union;

---

<sup>50</sup> CPM 2022/16.

<sup>51</sup> CPM 2022/29.

<sup>52</sup> CPM 2022/INF/03, CPM 2022/INF/04, CPM 2022/INF/05, CPM 2022/INF/06, CPM 2022/INF/07, CPM 2022/INF/08, CPM 2022/INF/09, CPM 2022/INF/10, CPM 2022/INF/11, CPM 2022/INF/13, CPM 2022/INF/14, CPM 2022/INF/18.

- World Trade Organization.

[143] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the written reports from international organizations and *thanked* them for their contributions to plant health.

## **17. IPPC network activities**

### **17.1 Report on technical cooperation among regional plant protection organizations**

[144] [TO BE ADDED LATER]

### **17.2 Update on the 2021 IPPC regional workshops**

[145] The secretariat presented a paper on the 2021 IPPC regional workshops.<sup>53</sup> The workshops had been held between August and September 2021 in virtual mode, but had attracted a record number of participants. Challenges that emerged during the workshops included insufficient financial support for the interpretation of presentations in some regions, low levels of comments received during the consultation period, and the need for more training on the use of the Online Commenting System.

[146] The CPM:

- (1) *noted* the update on the 2021 IPPC regional workshops.

## **18. Membership and potential replacements for the CPM Bureau, the Standards Committee and the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee**

[147] [TO BE ADDED LATER]

## **19. Any other business**

[148] [TO BE ADDED LATER]

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

[149] [TO BE ADDED LATER]

---

<sup>53</sup> CPM 2022/03.