

THE FOLLOWING ARE THE STATEMENTS
 THAT THE EUROPEAN UNION AND ITS 27 MEMBER STATES WILL PRESENT
 ON THE REFERRED TO AGENDA ITEMS OF CPM-16 (2022)

Agenda item 8.2: CPM authorization for the CPM Bureau to operate on its behalf until CPM-17 2023 (document CPM 2022/19)

The EU and its Member States would like to thank the CPM Bureau for their active and sustained leadership over the past 12 months. We support to continue the same approach as applied during the past biennium. In CPM-paper 2022/19 a “silence consent period” of two weeks is proposed, even though in CPM-15 an increase to a four-week period was endorsed. The EU and its Member States would like to stick to the CPM decision of the last year and continue this four-week “silence consent period” during the coming year.

Agenda item 8.4: IPPC Dispute Settlement Procedures revision (document CPM 2022/INF/19 – Statement from COSAVE)

In reaction to the proposals from COSAVE under point 8.4 of the Agenda (Revision of the IPPC Dispute Settlement Procedures), which are available in the document CPM 2022/INF/19, the EU and its Member States would like to communicate the following:

1. In relation to the proposal on point 5.5.4.2:

as a compromise suggestion, we would like to propose the following wording of the point:

“Experts may be nominated by contracting parties, and the Regional Plant Protection Organizations. If agreed by the disputing contracting parties, ~~and~~ other organizations invited by the IPPC Secretariat may invite also other organizations to provide nominees.”³⁸

We suggest retaining the possibility for the nomination of other organizations’ experts, because we think that such expertise may be needed/appropriate for certain disputes, or the aspects thereof.

2. We support all the other drafting suggestions proposed by COSAVE.
-

Agenda item 8.8.3: Update from the CPM Focus group: Climate Change and Phytosanitary issues (document CPM 2022/14)

The EU and its Member States thank the Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues for their valuable input provided in a very short time frame. We would also like to underline that climate change has an impact on both plant health and environment in its broad sense, and that it could create important synergies in the ongoing discussions on the One Health concept. The EU has recognized also as part of its Green Deal policy the fact that analysing the impact of climate change when conducting pest risk analysis can help to protect plant health, biodiversity and food security.

To that end, and in line with the actions proposed by the Focus Group, the EU assigned EFSA to take on board/incorporate a pilot “climate change scenario” while conducting quantitative pest risk assessments.

A One Health approach to climate change adaptation may significantly contribute to food security with emphasis on plant source foods, plant health, and steps towards regional and global integrated syndromic surveillance and response systems. The cost (economic, social, environmental, etc.) of outbreaks of emerging pests may be much lower if they are detected early. *Therefore*, integrated surveillance of pests is a promising avenue to reduce plant health effects of climate change.

While we agree on the proposed core action areas, key activities, tentative delivery dates and priority levels of the 2022-25 Action Plan as outlined in Appendix 1 of the CPM document, and on prioritizing the activities specified in paragraph 4 of the paper, we would like to suggest the following:

1. To add to the prioritized activities also the cooperation and exchange of information on climate change and plant health matters with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and other international and regional organisations (e.g., International Pest Research Group, Centre for Agriculture and Bioscience International (CABI));
 2. To consider adding the global level seminar/webinar on the impacts of climate change on plant health to the programme of the forthcoming first International Plant Health Conference in London in September this year.
-

Agenda item 8.8.6: Proposed establishment and draft TOR CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers (document CPM 2022/31)

The EU and its Member States are not in agreement with the establishment of a Focus Group. We think there are many Focus Groups already and we worry that the Secretariat might not be able to give all the different Focus Groups enough support. We would like to propose that we await the outcomes of the International workshop and let CPM-17 decide on the best way forward and whether a Focus Group is the best instrument to finalise the worldwide discussion on the issue of Sea Containers.

However, if CPM-16 decides to establish a Focus Group, we would like to provide the following suggestions to further improve the TOR of the Focus Group:

- We propose to limit the mandate of the Focus Group to 3 years.
- We suggest to have representatives from NPPO's or RPPO's from all regions, because this is a global issue that concerns all regions.
- We furthermore propose to delete the last bullet under "Criteria for experts..." because invasive species are not entirely within the scope of the IPPC.
- Last but not least, we propose to put the FG, if it were to be established, under the supervision of the CPM Bureau.

Agenda item 9.2: Draft ISPM: Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures (documents CPM 2022/INF/16 – Statement from Japan)

The EU and its Member States agree to consider that the concern expressed by Japan may be caused by the paragraph "*Effectiveness of the measures is evaluated based on criteria developed and revised as necessary by the TPCS. Evaluation of the effectiveness may be based on:*" which perhaps it not clear enough and could lead to a misunderstanding.

The criteria for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the phytosanitary measures are already listed in the standard, by providing the different elements to be taken into account, and is no pretended to be further developed by the TPCS and this can be confirmed by looking at the Terms of reference of the TPCS where no reference to the development of these criteria is made.

Consequently, perhaps, it is necessary for the CPM-16 to consider whether a technical update to clarify the text is deemed necessary and, in the case of a positive answer, to follow the ink amendment process for CPM-17 in order to carry it out in the adopted standard.

Agenda item 9.3: Adoption of the List of topics for IPPC Standards (document CPM 2022/22)

The EU and its Member States acknowledge and appreciate the work undertaken by the SC for the rationalisation of the List of topics, and support all the proposed deletions except one.

The Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (as an annex to ISPM 15), is no longer lacking scientific data after the publication in January 2022 of the scientific paper “Elucidating the efficacy of phytosanitary measures for invasive alien species moving in wood packaging material” by Michael D. Ormsby. Therefore, there is now a good basis to re-initiate the review of the process for testing new treatments for ISPM 15, which in a later phase can open the possibilities for approval of more phytosanitary treatments for wood packaging material. As a consequence, we propose to keep the revision of treatment criteria of ISPM 15 in the List of topics.

Agenda item 9.3: Adjustments to the Standard Setting Process to facilitate the development of phytosanitary treatments (document CPM 2022/21)

The EU and its Member States can agree with the streamlining of the standard setting process for phytosanitary treatments. However, we noted in the proposed text to adjust the standard setting procedure some inconsistency between paragraphs 17 and 21. Following paragraph 17, draft Phytosanitary Treatments will not undergo a second consultation unless decided otherwise by the Standards Committee. On the other hand, paragraph 21 reflects well the spirit of the CPM document, namely that the Standards Committee has to decide for each phytosanitary treatment upon the need of a second consultation, depending on whether significant or major technical comments were made during the first consultation. In order to create more clarity, it is proposed to align paragraph 17 better in this sense. Therefore, the EU proposes to amend paragraph 17 as following:

“Draft ISPMs other than draft DPs and draft PTs are submitted to two consultation periods; ~~except for d~~Draft DPs and draft PTs which are submitted to one consultation period unless decided otherwise by the SC. Draft PTs are submitted to one or two consultation periods depending on the decision of the SC.”

Agenda item 9.3: Standards Committee recommendations to the CPM - Discussions on the topic “Food and other humanitarian aid in phytosanitary context” and a proposal for the establishment of a CPM Focus Group (document CPM 2022/23)

The EU and its Member States thank for the effort made in addressing this topic, and support the establishment of a CPM Focus Group to discuss the issue and find a solution that meets the needs of Contracting Parties. For consistency with the scope of the IPPC, the EU and its Member States consider that “risk” should be replaced with “pest risk” in the last sentence of paragraph 6 of the draft Terms of Reference for the Focus Group:

« (...) to address the *pest* risk associated with the provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid (...) ».

Agenda item 10.1: CPM Recommendations – Adoption of CPM Recommendation on ‘contaminating pests’ (documents CPM 2022/06 and CPM 2022/06_01)

The EU and its Member States welcome the draft recommendation and thank Australia and the IPPC Secretariat for having considered our comments and for having accepted most of them.

We do, however, have two more comments on the draft text:

- The first one is a substantive one and is related to the newly included point (f) of the Recommendation. In the interest of consistency with the other parts of the Recommendation, we suggest using also in this part the term ‘contaminating pests’. The text should be then reworded as follows:

*“(f) establish appropriate regulatory tools to enable NPPOs to manage the pest risk associated with regulated and unregulated articles being imported and exported that may harbour ~~plant or environmental~~ **contaminating** pests regulated by the importing country;”*

- The second one is technical and is related to the chapeau of the Recommendation. In the last sentence there, we suggest to add also the RPPOs. The paragraph would then read:

*“The Commission therefore encourages contracting parties to take the necessary actions, based on sufficient scientific evidence, to minimize the introduction and spread of contaminating pests via both regulated and unregulated articles and other pathways. The Commission encourages contracting parties **and RPPOs** to:”*

Agenda item 11.2: National Reporting Obligations (document CPM 2022/12)

The EU and its Member States appreciate the National Reporting Obligation activities. Taking into account available funding for 2022, we would like to ask for clarification whether the revision of the National Reporting Obligations guide (2021-026) should be added to the Implementation and Capacity Development List of Topics and assigned as priority level of 1.

Agenda item 11.3: Sea Containers Task Force (document CPM 2022/33)

The EU and its Member States would like to thank the SCTF for its report and the recommendation. Also, we would like to acknowledge the amount of work and time that the members of the SCTF have devoted to this subject.

Generally, we can support the recommendations provided in the report, but we would like to make the following remarks:

We do agree with organising an international workshop. However, regarding the Focus Group, we propose to await the outcome of the International Workshop before we can decide which kind of instrument is best suited to follow up and to finalise the worldwide discussion on Sea Containers. However, if CPM decides to establish a Focus Group, we propose to limit its mandate to 3 years to keep the pressure on the progress of this subject. Also, we would like to propose to put the Focus Group, if it were to be established, under the supervision of the CPM Bureau.

With regard to retaining the CPM recommendation, we believe this is a good solution for the interim. If the outcome of the Focus Group renders the recommendation superfluous, it can be withdrawn. We therefore propose not to take a decision on the permanent retention of the recommendation now but to await the outcome of the Focus Group.
