



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Focus Group on Communication

Thirteenth Virtual Meeting
2 November 2022

IPPC Secretariat

Required citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2022. *Report of the meeting of the Focus Group on Communication, 2 November 2022*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2022



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original English edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

Third-party materials. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (<http://www.fao.org/publications>) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the meeting	4
2. Meeting arrangements	4
2.1 Election of the rapporteur.....	4
2.2 Adoption of the agenda	4
3. Administrative matters	4
3.1 Document list	4
3.2 Participant list.....	4
4. Feedback from CPM Bureau and SPG	4
5. Discussion and finalization of survey questions.....	6
6. Consultation timeline.....	7
7. Any other business.....	8
8. Date and arrangement of the next meeting	8
9. Close of the meeting	8
Appendix 1: Agenda.....	9
Appendix 2: Document list.....	10
Appendix 3: Participant list.....	11

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The IPPC Secretariat (secretariat) opened the meeting and welcomed all participants.
- [2] The chairperson thanked the secretariat for its work in preparing the draft IPPC Communication Strategy and the papers for submission to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) Bureau and to the Strategic Planning Group (SPG). The chairperson said that the feedback received was very positive.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Election of the rapporteur

- [3] Members of the Focus Group on Communication (FG-COM) elected Katy LEE as rapporteur of the meeting.

2.2 Adoption of the agenda

- [4] FG-COM members adopted the agenda as presented in Appendix 1 to the present report.

3. Administrative matters

3.1 Document list

- [5] FG-COM members took note of the documents on the document list as presented in Appendix 2.

3.2 Participant list

- [6] The secretariat introduced the participant list (Appendix 3).

4. Feedback from CPM Bureau and SPG

- [7] Members thanked the secretariat for its work to summarize the feedback received from the CPM Bureau and the SPG on the draft communication strategy.
- [8] It was noted that the strategy was received with positive interest and a number of useful comments were made to refine the document before it was sent out for consultation. No major changes were suggested, which was encouraging. The CPM Bureau and SPG had thanked FG-COM and the secretariat for their work to prepare the communication strategy.
- [9] A number of comments were received on the importance of expounding IPPC engagement with industry. It would be important to further emphasize the economic importance of plant health. That message would be particularly important to the One Health community to ensure that plant health was included on the One Health agenda. The scope of industry stakeholders should be broadened to include forestry and greenhouse producers.
- [10] A comment was made that the communications strategy should align with the work of other IPPC focus groups and strategies, the IPPC Partnership Strategy in particular.
- [11] A comment was made that academia and research institutions should be included in stakeholders to inform. The communication strategy needed to appeal to the next generation of plant health professionals.
- [12] It was noted that the terminology used in the communication strategy should be consistent with the Glossary of phytosanitary terms, particularly for the use of the term “pests”.
- [13] Netherlands commented during the SPG meeting that the communication strategy needed to relay to stakeholders the urgency of climate change and the impact of climate change on food availability.
- [14] Argentina commented during the SPG meeting that a two-way mechanism should be developed between national and regional plant protection organizations (NPPOs, RPPOs) and FAO and the IPPC Secretariat

that would allow NPPOs and RPPOs to feedback on their ideas and experiences in implementing communication strategies.

- [15] The IPPC Secretary reiterated during the SPG meeting the need to ensure that the communication strategy addressed the right audiences with the right messages via the right channels.
- [16] A variety of views were expressed, but it was generally felt that the Online Comment System (OCS) was perhaps not the most effective tool for a consultation process on the communication strategy; it was a lengthy process and time was limited, and it was likely to elicit granular comments when high-level feedback was needed instead.
- [17] The possibility of using a survey was discussed, although they often had low response rates, and countries reported a degree of “survey fatigue”. To counter that, a number of suggestions were made, including a webinar to pique interest or a short video presentation with survey questions posed throughout. A webinar or video would work to raise awareness of the communication strategy.
- [18] The secretariat noted that the role of FG-COM was to develop the communication strategy; implementation would be the purview of the secretariat, who would assess requirements and resources needed for implementation. Given the secretariat’s finite resources, there was a question as to whether a new focus group would be convened to guide implementation of the communication strategy, or if a less resource-intensive mechanism would be used.
- [19] One member said it would be beneficial to propose one, or a number, of financing strategies to the Seventeenth Session of the CPM (CPM-17, 2023).
- [20] The IPPC Secretary recognized during the SPG meeting the work of FG-COM to support the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH) and its work in partnership with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) to support the International Plant Health Conference (IPHC).
- [21] One member noted that a number of other CPM focus groups included communication and awareness-raising activities. It would be important to ensure that these complemented and aligned with each other and did not compete for resources. The communication experts in the Integration and Support Team (IST) should ensure cross-coordination.
- [22] Netherlands suggested during the SPG meeting that FAO play a more prominent role as a stakeholder and in sending a message on how the IPPC contributes to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). That would also provide a strong basis for contribution of resources to the IPPC.
- [23] The IPPC Secretary further said that some resources already existed for communications. Proposals on a funding model were, however, not clear.
- [24] NAPPO suggested leveraging events and meetings as a means of raising awareness of the communication strategy.
- [25] A number of questions were posed at SPG, which could be useful to inform the consultation process and frame the survey questions.
- [26] The secretariat had incorporated the received feedback into the draft communication strategy available on the MS Teams site for FG-COM members’ consideration.
- [27] As regards metrics to assess outcomes, one member said that the first year of the strategy would set a baseline, and it may be more useful to consider milestones rather than indicators.
- [28] One member said that it would be important for the secretariat to consider the need for continuity of staff resources to be able to deliver implementation of the communication strategy. A number of members supported the idea.

- [29] One member said that joint planning of communication initiatives among RPPOs, NPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat should be strengthened. One possibility was to create a community of practice of NPPOs and RPPOs that wanted to be involved, although the member noted that that would have staffing considerations.
- [30] As regards the effort to strengthen the IPPC engagement with industry in the communication strategy, one member said it would be useful to know what part of the strategy should be revised and how much text should be added, as the topic was broad and much could be said.
- [31] One member, noting the feedback on how and if industry should engage with NPPOs, said that there were already good, effective examples of partnerships between industry and NPPOs and RPPOs, which could be highlighted in the strategy.
- [32] One member said that the term “industry” was very broad; it may be beneficial to consider the term more strategically and address specifically those groups that engaged directly with IPPC work. Other industry groups would fall under the categories of inform and advocate. The IPPC partnership strategy could serve as a basis for that, although endorsement of the document was still pending. A number of members agreed to align the communication strategy with the partnership strategy where possible.
- [33] One member said that FG-COM should align its messaging on climate change to the work being developed by the Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues (FG-CCPI) to raise awareness of the impact of climate change on plant health to the broader climate change community. The chairperson said it would also be important to align with the communication needs of other IPPC focus groups as well.
- [34] A number of participants noted the importance of including One Health in the communication strategy and highlighting how plant health contributes to One Health.
- [35] A number of participants noted that currently the role of communication at the IPPC was more functional, developing products to support different units, and less strategic. Specific mention of communication outcomes and goals may provide an impetus for the secretariat to think more strategically about communication.
- [36] As regards short-, medium- and long-term outcomes, a member said that one measure of success would be to redesign the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) to facilitate better access and use of materials being produced, another would be the development of an editorial calendar to plan communications campaigns in an organized way, and another would be to ensure that social media accounts were robustly used to communicate information and engage with current and potential followers. The Strategic Framework 2020–2030 also contained a number of key result areas that could serve as outcomes for the communication strategy.

5. Discussion and finalization of survey questions

- [37] One member said that it would be important to have clarity on the survey’s objectives; was the aim to rewrite the strategy or to ensure that the strategy met people’s needs and expectations? A number of members agreed that the aim of the survey was to “take the temperature” of the extant document and not seek detailed comments or revisions.
- [38] On the issue of survey fatigue, a number of members supported the idea of producing a short one- to two-minute video, which would help to engage the community and elicit responses. A short, very succinct survey should also help with survey response rates.
- [39] A number of members said that the survey would give all parties the opportunity to provide their feedback and avoid unexpected critiques of the communication strategy at CPM-17 (2023). One member said that a short survey would also give external stakeholders that did not have many opportunities to engage directly in IPPC work, the chance to provide their point of view.

- [40] One member noted that using scaled answers in the survey would allow the results to be quantified, making quick analysis and straightforward presentation of the results possible.
- [41] The secretariat confirmed that a mechanism was in place to distribute the survey and possible video presentation to all NPPOs and RPPOs.
- [42] On the issue of a possible webinar workshop, one member said that the registration process could be used to collect survey responses in an immediate way. One member said that the number and kind of attendees for a possible workshop would need to be considered, as a large number of attendees would lead to more passive engagement, and would be difficult to facilitate. Another member said that it may be difficult to analyse workshop responses and decide how to address and incorporate them into the strategy. Given the intended aims of the consultation, FG-COM members expressed their support for the video presentation option over a workshop.
- [43] The chairperson said that students were an important community to engage, as they represented the future of plant health professionals. Organizing webinars during the implementation phase of the communication strategy could help foster student and public engagement with plant health topics and the work of the IPPC.
- [44] A number of participants said that it would be important to exercise a level of care when summarizing reports, as survey responses were not necessarily considered official country positions. The survey should ask the respondent to provide their title, designation and organization name to better contextualize their responses. It would also be important for the survey to include language on data protection.
- [45] The chairperson said that two key questions for the survey would be whether the correct objectives and priorities had been identified, and if anything was missing from the strategy. One member said that it would be important to include a question about the value proposition, a question on the approach to channels and a question on whether the messaging captured the responder's concerns, with a single open-ended question at the end of the survey for responders to provide additional thoughts.
- [46] One member said that it would be important to include a paragraph explaining why the survey responses were valuable and what they would be used for.
- [47] A number of members said that it would be beneficial to include a summary of the communication strategy so that responders did not need to reread the entire document to respond to survey questions. One member said that the video presentation would be an opportunity to provide an overview of the communication strategy.
- [48] On the question of languages, one member said that a subtitled video may be easier for respondents who did not have English as their first language to understand. One member said that NAPPO had offered to provide Spanish-language translation. The secretariat said that translation resources were available at the IPPC, but clarification would be needed on the possibility of using them for a focus group survey. The secretariat noted that translation would also be needed for survey responses.
- [49] The CPM Focus Group on Communication:
- (1) *Asked* the secretariat to draft the survey questions intersessionally and distribute them to group members for comment;
 - (2) *Asked* the secretariat to prepare an outline of the content of the video presentation;
 - (3) *Asked* the secretariat to prepare an executive summary of the communication strategy.

6. Consultation timeline

- [50] The vice-chairperson said that respondents should be given approximately two weeks to complete the survey. That would likely mean that comments would be consolidated and summarized in early

December 2022, with an FG-COM meeting in mid-December to discuss thereon. The secretariat noted that the final draft communication strategy and paper for CPM-17 needed to be submitted for translation and distribution by end January 2023. A number of participants supported the proposed timeline, noting that it was ambitious but serviceable.

[51] The secretariat said that the production of the video and the compilation of external stakeholder contacts were not accounted for in the present timeline, and may add a few days to the plan.

[52] One member said that it would be beneficial to have a few people external to FG-COM test the survey before sending it out to ensure that the information was clearly presented and understandable.

7. Any other business

[53] The group discussed the possibility of rotating the timing of future meetings to better accommodate members in various time zones. With the distribution of group members, and given that FG-COM would only meet a few more times, it was decided to maintain the current timing. The chairperson said that if any group member had a concern about meeting timing, they should contact the secretariat to discuss a solution.

8. Date and arrangement of the next meeting

[54] FG-COM members agreed to hold the forthcoming virtual meeting on 14 December 2022 at 10:00 to 13:00 CET.

9. Close of the meeting

[55] The Chairperson thanked the participants for their contributions and the secretariat closed the meeting.

Appendix 1: Agenda

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES FOCUS GROUP ON COMMUNICATION VIRTUAL MEETING

2 November 2022

Agenda Item		Document No.	Presenter
1.	Opening of the meeting	–	Lihong ZHU <i>Chairperson</i>
2.	Meeting arrangements		
2.1	Election of the rapporteur	–	Lihong ZHU
2.2	Adoption of the agenda	01_FGCOMM_Agenda_20220211	
3.	Administrative matters		Mutya FRIO <i>IPPC Secretariat</i>
3.1	Document list	02_FGCOMM_Doclist_20220211	Mutya FRIO
3.2	Participant list	03_FGCOMM_ParticipantsList_20220211	
4.	Feedback from CPM Bureau and SPG	04_FGCOMM_Comments_Bureau_SPG_20220211 05_FGCOMM_IPPC_Communications_Strategy_20220211	Lihong ZHU
5.	Discussion and finalization of survey questions	–	Lihong ZHU
6.	Consultation timeline	06_FGCOMM_Comms_Timeline_20220211	James STAPLETON <i>Vice-Chairperson</i>
7.	Any other business		Mutya FRIO
8.	Date and arrangement of the next meeting		Mutya FRIO
9.	Closing of the meeting		Lihong ZHU

Appendix 2: Document list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE
01_FGCOMM_Agenda_20220211	2.2	Agenda
02_FGCOMM_Doclist_20220211	3.1	Document List
03_FGCOMM_ParticipantsList_20220211	3.2	Participant list
04_FGCOMM_Comments_Bureau_SPG_20220211	4.	Comments by the CPM bureau and SPG on the IPPC Communications Strategy 2022–2030
05_FGCOMM_IPPC_Communications_Strategy_20220211	4.	International Plant Protection Convention Communications Strategy 2022–2030
05_FGCOMM_Comms_Timeline_20220211	6.	Timeline
CPM FG COMMUNICATIONS PAGE ON THE IPP		
Link to meeting documents: CPM Focus Group on Communications - International Plant Protection Convention (ippc.int)		

Appendix 3: Participant list

Representation	Name, role, organization	Email address	Presence (Yes/No)
Australia	Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH Chief Plant Protection Officer, Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment, Canberra, Australia	Gabrielle.Vivian-Smith@agriculture.gov.au	Y
Consortium of International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)	James STAPLETON Head of Communications & Public Awareness, Consortium of International Agricultural Research Centers- (CGIAR) Lima, Peru	J.Stapleton@cgiar.org	Y
Egypt	Islam Farahat ABOELELA Supervisor of Pest Risk Analysis, FAO International Consultant Central Administration of Plant Quarantine, Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation	Islam.gene@gmail.com	N
FAO	Denise MARTINEZ-BRETO Information and Communication Officer, Office for Corporate Communications, Food and Agriculture Organization	Denise.Martinez@fao.org	Y
International Grain Trade Coalition (IGTC)	Katy LEE Director, Agricultural Dialogues International Limited Cheshire, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Secretariat International Grain Trade Coalition (IGTC) Geneva, Switzerland	katy@agriculturedialogues.org	Y
Malawi	Hector MALAIDZA Communications Officer, Technology Dissemination- Agriculture Research Officer, Department of Agriculture Research Services	hectormalaidza@yahoo.co.uk	Y
North America	Ifi CHAFY Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA)		Y
Near East and North Africa	Mekki CHOUIBANI Executive Director Near East Plant Protection Organization (NEPPO)	hq.neppo@gmail.com, m.chouibani@neppo.org	Y
New Zealand	Lihong ZHU Portfolio Manager for IPPC, New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries	Lihong.Zhu@mpi.govt.nz	Y
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Lucy CARSON-TAYLOR Plant Health Engagement Manager, UK APHA/ Defra	Lucy.Carson-Taylor@apha.gov.uk	Y
Zambia	Martin SIAZEMO Senior Plant Health Inspector and Head of Communications,	martinkabemba@yahoo.com	Y

	Ministry of Agriculture Plant Quarantine and Phytosanitary Service		
CPM Bureau Asia	Fuxiang WANG Deputy Director General, National Agriculture Technical Extension and Service centre (NATESC) Ministry of Agriculture Room 630, Building No. Mai Zi Dian Street Chao Yang District, Beijing 100125 China Ph.: (+86) 10 59194548 Fax.: (+86) 10 59194517 Mob.: (+86) 1013701330221	wangfuxiang@agri.gov.cn	Y

IPPC Secretariat	Mutya FRIO	Mutya.Frio@fao.org	Y
IPPC Secretariat	Zdravka DIMITROVA	Zdravka.Dimitrova@fao.org	Y
IPPC Secretariat	Natsumi YAMADA	Natsumi.Yamada@fao.org	Y
IPPC Secretariat	Maki IIZUKA	Maki.iizuka@fao.org	Y