



REPORT

STRATEGIC PLANNING GROUP (SPG) MEETING

**ROME, ITALY
24-26 OCTOBER 2022**

IPPC SECRETARIAT

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 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 (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

- [1] The Chairperson of the Strategic Planning Group (SPG), John GREIFER, and the IPPC Secretary, Osama EL-LISSY, welcomed all participants and opened the meeting. The meeting was the first SPG meeting to be held in person since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- [2] The participants introduced themselves.
- [3] The SPG chairperson clarified that the SPG provides strategic advice to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) but is not a decision-making body. He also emphasized that the viewpoints and contributions of all participants to the meeting were most welcome.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Adoption of the agenda

- [4] The SPG adopted the agenda (Appendix 1).

2.2 Election of a rapporteur

- [5] The SPG elected Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH (Australia) as rapporteur.

3. Administrative matters

- [6] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”) referred to the documents posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) (listed in Appendix 2) and explained that the participants list would be appended to the report (Appendix 3).

4. Governance and strategy

4.1 IPPC Secretariat proposed vision and future strategy

- [7] The IPPC secretary introduced the SPG to the proposed vision and future strategy for the secretariat. He explained that the aim was to optimize the IPPC secretariat, so that it was effective, focused, adaptable and innovative. To achieve this, an ambidextrous management approach was required, accommodating the ongoing core work as well as changes. He summarized some of the key achievements over the past year and then shared some ideas about future changes that were being explored by the secretariat. He explained that the secretariat had drawn up a set of core organizational values, considered the relative priorities of their various activities, and were reviewing their organizational structure, with the aim of having a flatter structure. The IPPC secretary explained that one of the challenges faced by the secretariat was that 70% of the secretariat personnel are contracted or engaged on a temporary basis, as either consultants or in-kind contributions, so there was an inherent instability. The IPPC secretary finished his presentation by reflecting on the communication and outreach activities of the secretariat, emphasizing the importance of proactive engagement. He encouraged the SPG participants to contact the secretariat with feedback and suggestions at any time.
- [8] The SPG chairperson thanked the IPPC secretary and invited comments.
- [9] The SPG expressed support for the secretariat in their planning for the future and highlighted the need to protect its FAO-allocated, regular-programme funding. The secretariat confirmed that it had not yet requested a specific level of funding from FAO for the next biennium.
- [10] The secretariat explained that the high proportion of temporary personnel resulted in a high turnover, with a consequential loss of knowledge and experience, and that a more stable staffing level would provide greater resilience and continuity in the face of changes.
- [11] The SPG:
- (1) *noted* the update from the IPPC secretary.

4.2 Proposal for restructure of CPM agenda

[12] Greg WOLFF (Canada) presented a proposal to restructure the CPM agenda around the objectives of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030.¹ The proposal had originally been considered by the SPG at its meeting in 2019, at which the SPG had welcomed the proposal.² However, the subsequent disruption to CPM meetings caused by the COVID pandemic had prevented the proposal from proceeding further. It was therefore being reintroduced, this time with an example CPM agenda.

[13] The SPG chairperson thanked Mr WOLFF for his presentation and invited comments.

[14] The proposed restructuring received support from the SPG, with the following suggestions made to improve it:

- To improve clarity, subitems should be included under the CPM agenda items on the Strategic Framework Development Agenda Items (SFDAIs) where appropriate, including a subitem on the IPPC ePhyto Solution under the SFDAI on “harmonization of electronic data exchange”.
- The reports from the three units of the secretariat should be shorter and better integrated with each other and should refer to the CPM agenda items on the SFDAI.

[15] The SPG:

- (2) *confirmed support* for future CPM agendas to be oriented around implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030, and for this to be communicated to the CPM Bureau in order that the agenda for CPM-17 (2023) be developed accordingly.

5. Discussion items from CPM focus groups

5.1 Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 development agenda items

[16] The Chairperson of the CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 Development Agenda Items, Peter THOMSON (New Zealand), gave an update on the work of the group.³ He referred to the overarching, integrated plan for implementation of the strategic framework that had been drafted by the group,⁴ and invited the SPG to provide feedback on the report, highlighting a series of issues and questions for specific consideration by the SPG.

[17] **Complexity–impact grid.** The focus group chairperson explained that each of the SFDAIs had been placed on a complexity–impact grid to convey the extent of the challenges faced to implement the SFDAI and the likely impact of the SFDAI. Responses from the SPG were mixed. One participant thought that it was useful as a visual representation but was surprised that climate change had been rated so low in terms of complexity. Others speculated that the grid did not have much value and may prompt more questions than it answers. Another participant cautioned that the grid could unintentionally convey the idea that some issues were more important than others and suggested that although it might have been helpful to progress the development of the implementation plan within the focus group, it should be omitted from the report.

[18] **Sequencing and phasing of SFDAIs.** The focus group chairperson presented a table showing the proposed phasing of the SFDAIs. He commented that the SFDAIs on e-commerce, third-party entities and climate change may need a review phase, followed by a “scope and plan” phase, with CPM asked to approve a further block of work at the end of this phase. He also explained that all SFDAIs should have a “go/stop” phase for CPM decision after the “scope and plan” phase, even though this was not presented as such in the draft plan.

¹ 04_SPG_2022_Oct.

² SPG 2019, agenda item 6.2.

³ 07_SPG_2022_Oct.

⁴ 06_SPG_2022_Oct.

- [19] One participant suggested that there be an “Evaluation and report to CPM” step after the first phase of implementation of the SFDAIs on e-commerce, third-party entities and climate change, and that the CPM does not budget for further work in those areas until it has decided to proceed to a second phase of implementation. Another participant suggested that an evaluation step also be included for the SFDAI on pest outbreak alert and response systems (POARS), perhaps two years after the start of the delivery phase. The SPG noted that the evaluation should be pragmatic and straightforward.
- [20] The SPG recognized that there were still concerns in some regions about the authorization of third-party entities, despite the adoption of ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*). One participant suggested that these concerns may not be addressed by the guidance to be produced under the SFDAI on “developing guidance on the use of third-party entities” and that what was needed was dialogue. The focus group chairperson commented that this SFDAI was not just about helping countries adopt ISPM 45 but also about helping countries resolve issues if they have concerns. Another participant asked whether, in that case, this SFDAI needed another “scope and plan” phase in 2023, to consider any other guidance that may be needed in addition to the guide.
- [21] One participant informed the SPG that Euphresco, the European phytosanitary research network, was discussing expansion outside of Europe. The SPG noted that this may partially meet the objectives of the SFDAI on “global phytosanitary research coordination” and it would be useful to closely follow such developments, especially the potential of the IPPC community to link to rather than duplicate the established research coordination activity facilitated by Euphresco.
- [22] Regarding the SFDAI on “diagnostic laboratory networking”, the SPG noted that the needs of regions may differ, and that although this was not scheduled to start until 2025, some regions were very keen on the development of diagnostic support. The focus group chairperson explained that the reason that the SFDAIs on “global phytosanitary research coordination” and “diagnostic laboratory networking” were not scheduled to start until 2025 or 2026 was in response to concerns expressed by contracting parties about the demands on their time and therefore the impossibility of doing everything. The SPG noted that one of the regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) of the Americas was planning to establish a diagnostic network, but this was still at an early stage.
- [23] One participant supported the suggestion that focus groups would be needed for the SFDAIs on “global phytosanitary research coordination” and “diagnostic laboratory networking”, and highlighted the need for strong global representation on these focus groups to ensure that they were aware of all the relevant initiatives. The focus group chairperson commented that, before establishing those focus groups, it would be important to be clear about the purpose and scope of the focus groups and then to develop terms of reference for them. He suggested that the bureau could work with the secretariat to develop those, for consideration by the CPM.
- [24] One participant pointed out that a key strategic decision for the CPM will be prioritization of activities. The participant suggested that the sequencing of the eight SFDAIs be prioritized depending on whether the activity is already underway, whether the funds have already been identified, and whether a body already exists to lead the work. Following this approach, the participant suggested three categories: the first priorities would be the SFDAIs on electronic data exchange, commodity standards, third-party entities and climate change, because these were all well underway and already had a group leading the work; the second category would include the SFDAIs on POARS and e-commerce, because these require more work to develop strategic and operational objectives, identify funding and establish groups to lead the work; and the third category would include those SFDAIs that are entirely novel concepts, where no work has begun, and no funding is available, namely the SFDAIs on global research coordination and diagnostic laboratory networking. The participant suggested that this last category should come after the first two categories have been adequately progressed.
- [25] The focus group chairperson thanked everyone for their suggestions thus far and commented that milestones for each SFDAI were identified in the implementation plan.

- [26] **Funding and resources.** The focus group chairperson explained that the cost estimates had been based on the assumption that if activities were going to be done, they should be done properly and be funded adequately. The focus group had recognized, however, that the secretariat did not have the resources to deliver the plan at present, so extra resources would be needed. One of the suggestions made by the focus group had been to appoint a programme manager to coordinate the programme as a whole.
- [27] The proposal to appoint a programme manager was welcomed by SPG participants but with the recognition that this was a decision for the secretariat and would need to be funded.
- [28] One participant suggested that although the annexes containing the detailed costings did not need to be presented to the CPM, it was important to make it clear that activities should not proceed without resources. If funding is not secured, then the activities may need to be scaled back accordingly. Another participant emphasized the need for prioritization of activities if resources were insufficient for all.
- [29] The focus group chairperson clarified that the costings in the plan were indicative only and the formal budgets would be approved, and adjusted as necessary, by the CPM in the usual way.
- [30] One participant suggested that the staffing and non-staffing costs be distinguished in the annexes and asked what the baseline budget was to start each activity. The focus group chairperson explained that the focus group had considered preparing two budgets – one more ambitious and the other constrained – but had not found a way to do that and so had estimated what each activity realistically would cost.
- [31] **Monitoring and evaluation.** The focus group chairperson explained that the focus group had considered having some impact indicators, as well as monitoring milestones and budgets, but could not work out how to identify indicators in a meaningful way and so had excluded this. However, components such as compilation of a risk register that were normal parts of project management would be included.
- [32] The SPG recognized that national plant protection organization (NPPO) frameworks for monitoring and evaluation can become very detailed and costly. To avoid misconceptions about the content of the monitoring and evaluation in this case, one participant therefore suggested that it instead be referred to as “assessment” or “review” and that a small panel is established to review progress and determine whether anything has happened that would require a change of course.
- [33] The SPG recognized that the monitoring and evaluation reports, including practical and less costly project review options, should be part of the information presented to the CPM on the SFDAIs.
- [34] The focus group chairperson clarified that the focus group had not discussed in detail who would do the monitoring and evaluation, but he speculated that it would be a combination of an internal review by the relevant focus group and the secretariat. If there were a programme manager, that person could perhaps provide a template structure for it. The SPG chairperson commented on the need to keep the monitoring and evaluation practical and focused and that it is beneficial for the review to be independent of the people doing the work. One participant suggested that cross-cutting groups of perhaps four individuals could be established, tasked with conducting an independent evaluation of initiatives. Another participant pointed out that the two elements – monitoring, which was ongoing, and evaluation, which was periodic – may potentially be done by different people. The SPG also recognized that some self-monitoring could be done by those delivering the activities groups, for instance using IPPC Observatory surveys.
- [35] The focus group chairperson explained that the focus group had drafted a template for SFDAI reporting to facilitate CPM discussion in a more structured way.
- [36] **Review.** The focus group chairperson explained that the focus group had recommended that the implementation plans for each SFDAI be refreshed by the groups responsible for them every two years, before the start of each financial biennium, with a more substantial review of the implementation plan as a whole every five years (the first in 2025 for the CPM in 2026; then 2029 for the CPM in 2030).
- [37] The SPG supported this.

- [38] **Investment prospectus.** The focus group chairperson invited comments on the suggestion of the focus group to have an investment prospectus targeted at potential donors.
- [39] The SPG noted that the focus group would need to liaise with the CPM Focus Group on Communications to ensure that there was no duplication of effort or outputs between the two focus groups.
- [40] The SPG noted that there is a possibility that a donor would offer funding for a particular project out of sequence with the sequencing outlined in the implementation plan. The focus group chairperson acknowledged that this was a risk and suggested that if this were to arise it would need to be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- [41] **Overall implementation plan.** One participant suggested that the recommendations should be highlighted as a management summary, as some of them were implicit rather than explicit. Another suggested that a clear statement be included about what each SFDAl is expected to deliver. The focus group chairperson drew the attention of the SPG to the benefit statement for each SFDAl in the appendices but acknowledged that these could be tightened up and put in the main part of the report.
- [42] In terms of next steps, the focus group chairperson explained that the focus group would be checking some of the content with the secretariat, filling in gaps, seeking input from the RPPOs at the forthcoming virtual session of the Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPOs), and then submitting it to CPM-17 (2023) for approval.
- [43] The SPG:
- (3) *welcomed* the draft report from the CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 Development Agenda Items and *invited* the focus group to consider modifying it according to the suggestions made by the SPG in this meeting.

5.2 Climate change and phytosanitary issues action plan

- [44] The bureau representative for the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues, Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom), referred to the SPG paper for this agenda item, which gave an update on the activities of the group.⁵ He explained that the work of the group was well advanced and highlighted some of the groups' activities and plans on behalf of the focus group chairperson. He explained that there was currently no budget for the activities set out in the action plan of the FG, but the more complex activities would need a budget.
- [45] The SPG chairperson thanked the bureau representative for the update and invited comments.
- [46] One participant highlighted the role that RPPOs could play in this SFDAl, as they know the pest distributions and host ranges in their regions better than anyone.
- [47] Another participant informed the SPG that the theme of the recent annual meeting of the International Pest Risk Research Group was "Climate Change and Pest Risk Assessment" and that review articles arising from this would be published in a special issue of the *EPPO Bulletin* in 2023. The focus group chairperson asked if it would be possible for a member of the focus group to submit an article to this special issue and the representative from the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) offered to explore this possibility.
- [48] The secretariat confirmed that the published outputs from the focus group, such as the guide on climate-change impacts on plants pests, would follow the normal approval process established by the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC).
- [49] One participant welcomed the plans to establish a landing page for climate change on the IPP, noting how valuable this would be in conveying to the wider world what the issues are, what we have to do, and why climate change is important for plant health.

⁵ 17_SPG_2022_Oct.

- [50] Referring to the plans to hold a webinar series on climate change, one participant requested that at least one of the webinars be held at a time that is suitable for the Southwest Pacific region, given that climate change is one of the priorities for the Southwest Pacific region.
- [51] The SPG noted the linkages with the work of the CPM Focus Group on Communications, including the need to liaise with other international organizations in relation to climate change. The SPG chairperson noted that two of the three outcomes identified in the focus group's action plan relate to communications and so have linkages to the communications strategy (see agenda item 5.7), but the other one relates to the provision of support to countries and perhaps this last aspect needed to be emphasized more.
- [52] The SPG:
- (4) *noted* the report from the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues.

5.3 Sustainable funding of the IPPC ePhyto Solution

- [53] The bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution, Peter THOMSON (New Zealand), gave an update on the activities of the group.⁶ He explained that the group had identified what elements should be within the potential scope of the funding model and those that should not, had estimated the costs of running the IPPC ePhyto Solution, and had developed a set of core principles to guide their thinking when developing funding options. The group had then considered options for each of three components to a sustainable funding mechanism: the scope of costs to include or exclude; how to apportion costs across users; and the need for the payment system to be efficient and effective.
- [54] **Guiding principles.** The SPG had no comments on the principles.
- [55] **Scope of costs to include or exclude.** The bureau representative explained that the focus group had drawn up two options for this component, Option 1 including all costs of running the system and Option 2 having an additional amount for basic-level capacity development and support to assist initial uptake by NPPOs (helping ten countries per year to get started) together with some communication activities.
- [56] The bureau representative clarified that the figures used for the ePhyto Solution in the draft implementation plan for the strategic framework related to Option 2. If the CPM decided to go for Option 1 instead, the figure would be adjusted in the implementation plan.
- [57] There was a mixed response from SPG participants as to whether Option 1 or Option 2 was preferred. One participant noted that Option 2 was more expensive but provided a more sustainable outcome so supported Option 2. Another favoured Option 1 and suggested that the extra activities in Option 2 could perhaps be funded from a general secretariat budget and not funded by ePhyto (electronic phytosanitary certificate) users. A further participant commented, however, that other activities should not be put at risk and hence supported Option 2, with a portion of the budget providing training and development. A fourth participant preferred Option 1, with users paying for the running costs of the system but capacity building paid for by voluntary contributions.
- [58] The bureau representative commented that these responses reflected the discussion within the focus group and concluded that it was best to present both options to the CPM.
- [59] **How to apportion costs across users.** The bureau representative explained that the focus group had devised four options: in Option 1, the costs of the ePhyto Solution would be shared according to the number of ePhytos sent and received through the ePhyto Hub the previous year (with exceptions for the least developed countries and countries with very low usage); in Option 2, there would be set voluntary fees depending on the level of economic development of a country, with the remainder of the costs (if any) being apportioned according to the previous year's usage or by increasing the fixed fee; in Option 3, FAO would cover all ePhyto costs of either of the two "scope" options above; in Option 4, donors would

⁶ 09_SPG_2022_Oct.

provide funds through the Multidonor Trust Fund and the remaining costs would be covered via Option 1 or Option 2.

- [60] Some SPG participants pointed out that NPPOs need predictability about fees so that they can budget in advance. For this reason, Options 1 and 4 received no support from the SPG, as in Option 1 the NPPOs would not know the fee sufficiently well in advance and it could vary too much between years, and Option 4 was reliant on donations, which are inherently unpredictable. However, it was suggested that donations of funds to the ePhyto Solution should not be ruled out, as regardless of which option is chosen, donations should always be sought to fund development. The bureau representative commented that the aim was to move away from strong reliance on donors but that, with any of the scenarios, there would still be projects funded in countries by donor countries.
- [61] The SPG recognized that the chance of success of Option 3 was slim but that it was at least worth trying this route and that this could be done in parallel with another option (e.g. one of the other options being discussed, or working with the FAO Legal Office to establish a new trust fund for the ePhyto Solution funded by regular contributions and donations from stakeholders). The SPG noted that there may be scope for the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat also using the system and, if that were the case, FAO may be more willing to invest in the system and commit to it. The SPG noted the need to emphasize to decision makers that the ePhyto Solution is a tool for trade facilitation.
- [62] A clear consensus emerged in favour of Option 2, because it was simple, practical and predictable. One participant commented that another reason to favour this option is that, for some countries, it can be easier to secure funding if it is for an international treaty. To maximize the stability of the annual fees, one participant suggested that development costs be spread across years.
- [63] One participant favoured Option 2 to cover the maintenance of the ePhyto Solution, with the costs of human resources to be covered by the secretariat's regular budget, as this work would become core work for the secretariat.
- [64] Recognizing that the ePhyto Solution requires a certain amount of funding to run it, some SPG participants asked what would happen if a significant number of countries did not pay their fee in Option 1 or Option 2. Another participant suggested that a reserve could be established to cover shortfalls if countries could not pay because of extenuating circumstances.
- [65] To help the CPM decide on options, one participant suggested that it would be useful to include a breakdown of how many countries are in the various fee categories of Option 2, so that contracting parties could calculate the likely income from Option 2. It would also be useful to give an indication of how much each other option might generate, if possible.
- [66] Mindful of the discussion thus far, the bureau representative suggested that predictability could perhaps be added to the list of guiding principles and asked whether predictability was more important than equity. Participants noted that all countries trading through the ePhyto Solution benefit from more countries being in the system, which perhaps outweighs the equity issue, and that the cost of running the system does not vary with usage. They also recognized that equity is about economic equity, not just equity in terms of usage, with economic equity providing an equal right of access. One participant suggested that perhaps the "IPPC family" could follow the approach of the Pacific Plant Protection Organisation, where "no one is left behind".
- [67] **An efficient and effective payment system.** The bureau representative explained that the focus group had drafted two options: in Option 1, the ePhyto Solution was funded by FAO (i.e. Option 3 of the "scope" options); in Option 2, the usage of ePhytos and the level of voluntary contributions sought from NPPOs would be included in the CPM annual report, together with details of the Multidonor Trust Fund. He confirmed that it would not be possible, however, for a country to be excluded from the ePhyto Solution on grounds of non-payment.
- [68] One participant referred to the principle of transparency in the SPG paper, where it said that "all costs, cost components and usage information and data must be available to all participating NPPOs" and

suggested that the wording be amended to make it clear that it was referring to the level of usage of NPPOs not information that was trade-sensitive.

- [69] The SPG acknowledged that FAO could not issue invoices and that mandatory payments would require a change to the convention. They recognized, however, that if contributions were voluntary (e.g. in Option 2), some countries – perhaps a substantial proportion – would not pay them. Participants suggested that perhaps the word “voluntary” could be avoided and contracting parties could instead be issued with an “invitation to pay”, or the fees could be described as the “expected contribution”, or it could be presented as a subscription service. The bureau representative confirmed that the secretariat could not invoice for a subscription fee but could send a letter.
- [70] Some participants suggested that contributions could be added to the annual FAO fee that FAO members pay, but the bureau representative thought that was not possible because it would make it mandatory, which would require a change to the convention.
- [71] One participant asked whether the payment obligation could be incorporated within the ePhyto usage contract. The bureau representative confirmed, however, that users cannot be excluded from ePhyto on grounds of non-payment.
- [72] Recognizing that renegotiation of the convention to allow mandatory payments would be difficult and could take ten years, the bureau representative speculated that perhaps it would be more feasible to explore the development of a “supplementary agreement” as provided under Article 16 of the convention to address this specific funding issue. .
- [73] One participant commented that even if payments remain voluntary and some countries do not pay, some guaranteed income is better than nothing.
- [74] The SPG noted that, until the payment mechanism is in place, there would still be a need for donations to the Multidonor Trust Fund to keep the ePhyto Solution running, so it would be important to make an urgent plea at CPM-17 (2023) for donations to cover operational costs and to build a reserve.
- [75] The SPG:
- (5) *noted* the report from the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution;
 - (6) *invited* the focus group to develop the Apportion 2 option further.

5.4 Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid

- [76] The bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and other Humanitarian Aid, Lucien KOUAMÉ KONAN (Africa), gave an update on the activities of the group.⁷ He explained that the call for experts had been extended twice because of insufficient nominations and that the group had met for the first time, in virtual mode, on 12 October. A further virtual meeting was planned for December and a face-to face meeting tentatively scheduled for February 2023 in Fiji.
- [77] The SPG chairperson thanked the bureau representative for the update and invited comments.
- [78] The secretariat confirmed that they had reached out repeatedly to the World Food Programme, inviting them to participate in the focus group, and had been promised a response. The secretariat would, however, keep trying. One participant raised the possibility of contracting parties asking their permanent representatives to help with approaches to the World Food Programme, but the SPG chairperson advised that countries should contact the secretariat in the first instance to avoid any conflict with the outreach already being undertaken by the secretariat.
- [79] One participant noted that although the focus group is tasked with determining whether the best way forward is the development of a standard or another option, countries that are recipients of aid are still

⁷ 13_SPG_2022_Oct.

very vocal about the need for a standard. The participant suggested that perhaps there may be many documents that are needed to support this work, one of which may be a standard.

[80] The SPG:

(7) *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and other Humanitarian Aid.

5.5 Sea containers

[81] The bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers, Greg WOLFF (Canada), gave an update on the activities of the focus group and explained that he would also include an update on the sea containers workshop (agenda item 5.6) in the same update.⁸ He emphasized the immensity of the challenge faced by the IPPC community in addressing the pest risk posed by sea containers and the need to ensure that, whatever solution is introduced by the IPPC community, it has a minimum impact on sea container logistics. Otherwise, there was a risk to both global supply chains and the reputation of the IPPC community. He also highlighted the short timescale for the focus group to accomplish its tasks, as papers would need to be ready by December 2023 for submission to the CPM in 2024.

[82] The bureau representative highlighted some of the outcomes of the *International workshop on reducing the introduction of pests through the sea container pathway* that had been held in London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in September. As a result of being able to meet in person, more progress had been achieved in two days than over the past three years. The most significant advancement that had emerged was the identification of a potential “systematic” approach. After the workshop, many comments had been received saying that the level of risk presented by sea containers (empty or packed) was not clear. The bureau representative therefore highlighted the need to draw together data so that a case could be made for why IPPC actions or measures are needed to address the pest risks associated with the sea container pathway.

[83] The bureau representative explained that a focus group meeting was scheduled for 27 and 28 October, at which the focus group would be drafting a revision to the CPM recommendation on *Sea containers* (R-06). The focus group was also planning to hold another workshop in June or July 2023, hosted by Australia, following a call for this at the workshop in London. This workshop would be a key step towards the decisions to be made at CPM-18 (2024) about IPPC guidance, as it would allow the focus group’s ideas to be tested out with industry to see where the concerns and impediments remain, thereby building confidence in a chosen solution. The bureau representative explained that Canada may fund this workshop.

[84] The SPG chairperson thanked the bureau representative for the update and invited comments, noting the potentially fruitful direction being taken by the focus group to elaborate on a so-called “systematic” approach or general framework that would combine measures taken by NPPOs and industry together.

[85] The SPG thanked the organizing committee and NPPOs who had organized the London workshop and acknowledged the importance of this kind of public–private partnership. Participants were supportive of the proposal to hold a second workshop.

[86] One participant expressed support for the proposal to gather data that already exists and perhaps publish this, but also noted the need to continue to gather data. Another participant expressed surprise about the comments on lack of data, as their NPPO had conducted sea container surveys and had had more than enough evidence to introduce measures. The member suggested that countries that are concerned should be encouraged to do surveys of sea containers and analyse and share the results. The SPG noted that it was just as important to have evidence of a lack of risk as it was to have evidence of a risk. They also noted, however, that many NPPOs lack the ability to intervene with containers.

⁸ 20_SPG_2022_Oct.

[87] The SPG:

- (8) *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers;
- (9) *noted* the prospective components of the emerging systematic approach identified at the 2022 sea containers workshop;
- (10) *noted* that the focus group will prepare a draft revision of the existing CPM recommendation of *Sea containers* (R-06);
- (11) *noted* the concerns raised by several NPPOs about the lack of risk-based data relating to sea containers, *agreed* to arrange where possible to provide any related information that may be available to the focus group, and *recommended* to CPM-17 (2023) that all contracting parties be encouraged to do likewise;
- (12) *noted* that the IPPC Secretariat will engage with contacts at the World Organisation for Animal Health and the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat to determine what concerns, plans or work may exist in relation to sea containers in the context of animal health or food safety, and that leads from one or both organizations may be invited to observe certain focus group meetings;
- (13) *noted* and *supported* the intention to hold a second workshop on sea containers in mid-2023 and that NPPOs and RPPOs should plan to send participants as appropriate.

5.6 Discussion on international workshop on sea containers

[88] This item was considered under agenda item 5.6.

5.7 Communications strategy

[89] Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH (Australia), a member of the CPM Focus Group on Communications, gave an update on behalf of the focus group chairperson.⁹ She outlined the contents of the draft IPPC communications strategy for 2020–2030, which had been prepared by the focus group with support from the secretariat. The draft strategy was aligned with the objectives of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 and detailed the objectives of the strategy, the potential audiences and stakeholders for IPPC communications, the key messages to convey, the channels to use, the management of the strategy, and how its impacts would be measured. Following the bureau and SPG meetings, the focus group planned to conduct further consultation to gather input on the “big picture” from RPPOs, NPPOs and other relevant organizations, probably via a simple survey of two or three questions. The draft communications strategy would then be presented to CPM-17 (2023) for approval.

[90] The SPG chairperson thanked Ms VIVIAN-SMITH for her update and invited comments.

[91] **Suggested amendments to the strategy.** The draft communications strategy was well received by SPG participants. The following suggestions were made by participants to improve the text even further.

- The reference to farmers as being one group of stakeholders to inform should be widened (perhaps by referring to “producers” instead of “farmers”) so that it did not exclude other categories of producers such as foresters or greenhouse producers.
- The stakeholders to inform should also include academia and research institutions (recognizing, however, that this will vary between regions).
- The potential role of FAO among stakeholders should be included.
- The role of NPPOs in engaging with other stakeholders should be recognized, as they are experienced in two-way communications with stakeholders.
- In the key messages, more emphasis should be placed on the value of plant production to the health of the economy.
- In the key messages, the *urgency* of the need to protect plant health in the face of climate change, because of the influence of climate change on plant production and hence food security, should

⁹ 11_SPG_2022_Oct.

be emphasized. This could be combined with the key message on the United Nations sustainable development goals.

- The list of events through which the IPPC community can leverage communications and advocacy should be expanded to include meeting of researchers.
- For consistency with IPPC terminology, the phrase “pests and diseases” should perhaps be replaced with “pests”, with a footnote to explain that the term “pests” includes diseases (as in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*)).

[92] **Communication plans across SFDAIs and beyond CPM-17 (2023).** The SPG noted the need to ensure coordination between the communication elements of individual SFDAIs and the overarching communications strategy. Ms VIVIAN-SMITH also raised the question of whether there is a role for a focus group after the communications strategy has been adopted, to work with the secretariat to oversee implementation, given that the current focus group’s mandate ends upon adoption of the strategy.

[93] The secretariat confirmed that the communications professionals within the secretariat were all now being brought together into one team (the Integration and Support Team), which should help ensure that communication plans are aligned.

[94] **Consultation mechanism.** The SPG considered the relative merits of a simple survey or the Online Comment System for consultation. They recognized the danger of “survey fatigue” but also that the Online Comment System is designed for detailed comments on text, rather than gathering feedback on general questions, and could generate an overwhelming number of comments and create ambiguity. For this reason, there was a general consensus that the Online Comment System was not appropriate in this case. Other suggestions from participants were to use an online survey tool, hold a webinar with a presentation and then structured questions, or create a prerecorded presentation with a link to a simple online survey.

[95] The SPG:

- (14) *noted* the report from the CPM Focus Group on Communications and the draft IPPC Communications Strategy 2022–2030; and
- (15) *suggested* that the focus group consider a webinar or prerecorded presentation with a link to an online survey as alternative options for consultation on the draft IPPC Communications Strategy.

6. Other emerging strategic topics

6.1 Follow up discussion on “One Health and antimicrobial resistance issues”

[96] The SPG considered three papers for this agenda item.

Discussion paper from the United States of America

[97] Ibrahim SHAQIR (United States of America) presented the discussion paper from the United States of America, which was aimed at more clearly defining the role of the IPPC community with respect to One Health.¹⁰ The paper outlined some opportunities for the IPPC community and knowledge gaps and concluded that IPPC involvement with One Health should be based on existing CPM initiatives and programmes, but that it was important to share these with the One Health community in a way that conveys their contribution to the One Health agenda.

[98] The SPG chairperson thanked Mr SHAQIR for his presentation and invited comments. There were no comments.

¹⁰ 05_SPG_2022_Oct.

Discussion paper from the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization

- [99] Nico HORN (EPPO) presented the discussion paper from EPPO, which was intended as a contribution to the discussion rather than as a comprehensive analysis.¹¹ This provided two examples of issues for which plant health has a pivotal role to play in the One Health approach – antimicrobial resistance (AMR) and food security – and highlighted the low level of awareness and implementation of One Health among the plant-health community and the low profile of plant health in the wider international One Health debate. The paper made six recommendations on how to address these gaps.
- [100] The SPG chairperson thanked the Mr HORN and invited comments.
- [101] A few participants supported the view that, given resource constraints, it was better to show how existing IPPC activities could contribute to the One Health agenda rather than trying to establish a One Health programme within the IPPC work programme. One participant suggested that a CPM recommendation could be developed, providing recommendations on how NPPOs can present what they do in terms of One Health, although later in the agenda item another participant suggested that it was too early to do this given the gaps in knowledge about AMR. Another suggestion that emerged was a short (two- to three-page) document listing the activities that the IPPC community currently do that support the One Health agenda. One participant suggested that a section be included in the IPPC communications strategy on how the protection of plant health contributes to the One Health agenda. Another pointed out that the IPPC work on sea containers was a good example of how the IPPC community might be leading the way in areas that also affect animal health.
- [102] Given the concerns over antimicrobial resistance among some governments, one participant suggested that IPPC discussions on AMR should perhaps be decoupled from those on One Health. The participant also suggested that the focus shift from antibacterial to antifungal resistance. The SPG noted that it was important to identify what data already existed on AMR or were in the process of being collected, identify the gaps, and determine who would conduct the research to fill those gaps. A key objective for this baseline analysis is to better understand the nature and scope presented by AMR-associated risks in the phytosanitary context.
- [103] A few participants commented on the need for plant health to be more explicitly recognized in the One Health concept, the definition for which referred to the health of people, animals and ecosystems. One participant point out that, with the current definition, there was a risk that the IPPC strategic framework would be diminished if efforts were made to align it too closely with the One Health agenda. Later in the agenda item, the SPG noted that the concept of plant health in the IPPC context is narrower than that in the One Health discussions and so it was important to make it clear that the IPPC community could only address those aspects of plant health that fall within the scope of the IPPC.
- [104] One participant noted that it was important to have greater clarity on the linkages between plant health and the other components of One Health, as there were only a few pest taxa that crossed over from plants to animals or humans, or vice versa. Later in the agenda item, the secretariat provided the example of aflatoxins as a common area of concern in plant health, animal health and food safety, and the SPG chairperson recalled the examples given in the paper from the United States of America.

Update from the IPPC Secretariat

- [105] The secretariat gave an update on activities related to One Health and AMR,¹² explaining that, as noted by CPM-16 (2022), the secretariat had changed to a passive involvement with such activities, following concerns from contracting parties about resources. The secretariat's paper highlighted the new definition of One Health (“an integrated, unifying approach that aims to sustainably balance and optimize the health of people, animals and ecosystems”) and outlined some of the latest developments both within FAO and globally.

¹¹ 12_SPG_2022_Oct.

¹² 14_SPG_2022_Oct.

[106] The SPG chairperson thanked the secretariat for the update and invited comments. There were no comments.

General discussion

[107] The SPG considered their possible points of consensus, and the following points were suggested (in no particular order):

- The definition of One Health is problematic, but it also presents an opportunity for engagement on how plant health fits into One Health.
- The plant-health community is not yet well prepared to engage with One Health yet and so there is perhaps a need to equip the secretariat to engage more meaningfully.
- A short (two- to three-page) discussion paper or think-piece could be prepared for the CPM, outlining how the various IPPC activities contribute to the One Health agenda.
- There is a need for more research on AMR and plant health.
- There is not a need to establish a specific programme in One Health within the IPPC work programme.
- It is too early to develop a CPM recommendation on One Health, as we need to understand AMR and plant health better before we develop a recommendation.
- The secretariat should continue attending the FAO meetings on One Health in a passive role.

[108] One participant informed the SPG that the second edition of the *Handbook of plant biosecurity* was in preparation and would include an article about the role of plant health in One Health.

[109] The SPG chairperson speculated on the potential value of holding a webinar or side session at the CPM about One Health but acknowledged that CPM-17 (2023) might be too early for this.

[110] The secretariat commented on the fine balance that was needed when attending the FAO One Health meetings, to ensure that the secretariat was aware of developments but did not contribute too much. The secretariat added that further guidance on this may be needed after CPM-17 (2023).

[111] The SPG:

- (16) *noted* the latest global developments on One Health, in particular the new definition of One Health, the new quadripartite arrangement between FAO, the World Health Organization, the World Organisation for Animal Health and the United Nations Environment Programme, and the establishment of the One Health High Level Expert Panel;
- (17) *noted* the latest One Health developments at the FAO, in particular the One Health Programme Priority Area outcomes, and the establishment of the FAO One Health Technical Working Group;
- (18) *noted* that the quadripartite partnership is expected to approach the IPPC secretariat for further involvement on One Health;
- (19) *recommended* that the secretariat prepare a short paper for CPM-17 (2023), drawing upon the papers and discussion from this SPG meeting, to highlight the important contribution that plant health can make in achieving the One Health agenda and to indicate possible areas that require more work, such as possibly funding an analysis on the scope of antimicrobial resistance in the plant-production and -health sector.

6.2 IPPC partnership framework, including industry engagement

[112] The secretariat presented a paper, the purpose of which was to trigger a strategic discussion on how the IPPC community should approach stakeholders to support the IPPC work programme.¹³ Previous versions of the paper had been presented to the SPG in 2020 and 2021. This latest version took account of the SPG's comments in 2021, namely: whether the document was presenting a strategy or a framework; and what is defined as a "high-value partner". The secretariat emphasized that there would

¹³ 10_SPG_2022_Oct.

always be an evaluation and assessment of risks by governing bodies for written agreements and the CPM would be informed about any written agreements approved by the bureau.

[113] The SPG was invited to discuss the paper and to endorse the paper for discussion by the CPM at its next session.

[114] The SPG chairperson thanked the secretariat and invited comments.

[115] The SPG noted that not all relationships are partnerships, that “partnership” implies a certain level of relationship, but that the paper was not clear about what that level is. The SPG chairperson recalled that this point had also been raised by the bureau and he suggested that perhaps the second section of the paper could refer to the different levels of engagement. One participant expressed the view that a partnership does not necessarily need to have a written agreement. Another noted the demanding criteria for partnerships listed in the document, which could deter potential partners. Suggestions to resolve this included calling the framework an Engagement Framework rather than a Partnership Framework, with “partnerships” as one category of engagement, or distinguishing between informal and formal partnerships. One participant suggested that the various types of collaboration, and which of these were included within the framework, be indicated at the start of the paper.

[116] The secretariat informed the SPG that, as part of their ongoing prioritization of activities, the secretariat were currently reviewing the list of relationships they have with other organizations (which had reached more than 45) to identify which they should focus upon given the implications for staffing and travel resources.

[117] Given the comments made by the SPG, the consensus was that the paper needed further revision before presenting to the CPM and so the SPG was not a position to endorse it in its present form.

[118] The SPG:

(20) *recommended* that the CPM Bureau review the paper on the IPPC Partnership Framework, including clarifying the types of partnerships that are covered by the framework, before submitting for discussion by CPM-17 (2023).

6.3 Other strategic topics submitted by contracting parties

Role of regional plant protection organizations in pest outbreak alert and response systems

[119] Nico HORN (EPPO) referred the SPG to the paper prepared by the Thirty-Fourth TC-RPPOs on the roles of RPPOs in POARS.¹⁴ He explained that one of the tasks of RPPOs is to support implementation of the IPPC, so the RPPOs would like to talk constructively about what they, as RPPOs, can do. As an example of this, the TC-RPPOs had proactively analysed the roles of RPPOs presented in the draft report *Recommendations for an effective pest outbreak alert and response systems* prepared by the POARS Focus Group, and each RPPO had commented on its ability to accomplish the suggested deliverables. Although there had been consensus among RPPOs on several of the action points suggested in the draft report, some important differences between RPPOs had also surfaced. The paper to the SPG collated the comments of the ten RPPOs and provided a summary.

[120] The CPM chairperson thanked Mr HORN and invited comments, both on the roles described in the POARS recommendations and on how RPPO input can be fed into other SFDI plans.

[121] **Comments on the paper.** The paper was welcomed by the SPG and the RPPOs were congratulated on taking the initiative to do this. The secretariat explained that the POARS focus group had tried to avoid being prescriptive about what RPPOs should do and instead to give an inclusive list of things that RPPOs may potentially do, but the secretariat acknowledged that the wording may need improving to ensure that that was the message conveyed.

¹⁴ 08_SPG_2022_Oct.

[122] **Role of RPPOs in focus groups.** A few participants expressed support for RPPOs being consulted as a standard practice for focus groups and other similar groups.

[123] The chairperson of the Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 commented that it should be possible to include something in the overarching implementation plan about how the RPPOs would like to be involved in implementation.

[124] One of the RPPO representatives suggested that although there is usually an RPPO representative on focus groups, it was the responsibility of the RPPOs as a group to keep track of the outputs being developed by the various SFDAI focus groups and to ensure that the RPPO representative on each focus group brought suggested actions for RPPOs to the whole RPPOs for consideration. The TC-RPPOs chairperson commented that although the TC-RPPOs could analyse the work of the Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030, doing this for all the SFDAI focus groups was another matter.

[125] **Diversity and functions of RPPOs.** The SPG recognized that RPPOs are not all the same in terms of their capacities, scope and remit, and so focus groups needed to be cognizant of that when allocating tasks. Mindful of this, one participant suggested that there may be value in the TC-RPPOs considering what the core functions of an RPPO should be. Although not all RPPOs may be able to deliver these initially, in the end this could help the CPM deliver the IPPC. This was supported by another participant on the understanding that it would not be an easy task, as individual RPPOs may not wish to include functions on the list that they do not have the current capacity to deliver.

[126] The SPG:

- (21) *suggested* that the Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPOs) consider what the desired functions of an RPPO should be, and that the secretariat check whether this has been discussed in the past;
- (22) *welcomed* the comments from the TC-RPPOs on the roles of RPPOs in pest outbreak and alert systems (POARS) and *recommended* that the TC-RPPOs submit their comments to the POARS Steering Group for consideration, once the comments have been finalized; and
- (23) *supported* the principle of RPPOs being consulted as a standard practice of focus groups and other groups charged with overseeing implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030.

7. Updates

7.1 The IPPC Observatory

[127] The secretariat gave an update on the IPPC Observatory, including the activities of the secretariat and the IC Subgroup on the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS, now the IPPC Observatory).¹⁵ The secretariat had finalized the activities implemented under the European Commission's third cycle of funding for the IRSS, which had ended in May 2022, but no secure resources had yet been identified to implement the forthcoming activities in the IPPC Observatory workplan. The SPG was invited to provide ideas for the operationalization of the IPPC Observatory, including the monitoring of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030, through a sustainable funding mechanism.

[128] The SG chairperson thanked the secretariat for the update and invited comments.

[129] The secretariat commented that it is not yet known whether the European Commission had decided to discontinue funding of the observatory, so there was still a possibility that some funding would be available from that source. The SPG chairperson suggested that it would not be possible for the SPG to provide ideas about the operationalization of the observatory through a sustainable funding mechanism until the situation with funding from the European Commission was known.

¹⁵ 16_SPG_2022_Oct.

[130] The secretariat clarified that the IC's idea had been to open the funding to other sources, perhaps with more partners in more regions. The secretariat had already had some recommendations from a private company on how to make the observatory more effective and efficient.

[131] One participant supported the operationalization of the observatory, but also made the following comments:

- survey participants would be more likely to complete surveys if they were provided with feedback from the survey;
- fixed costs should be drawn from regular secretariat funding but additional funding should be drawn from other sources;
- there are key linkages between the work of the observatory and the IPPC Communications Strategy;
- to ensure that the time of those involved (NPPOs, RPPOs and secretariat) is spent wisely, more thought is needed around which surveys to conduct, and the surveys need to be designed carefully to avoid ambiguity and to ensure that the data collected are of high quality.

[132] One participant suggested holding a side session on the observatory at CPM-17 (2023), at which the observatory could be explained and examples given of surveys and the benefits that ensued from those surveys. There was a general sense within the SPG that there was still not a solid, widespread understanding among the IPPC community about what is meant by "IPPC Observatory".

[133] The SPG:

(24) *noted* the update on the IPPC Observatory.

8. Items for SPG strategic input

8.1 Discussion on dispute settlement future oversight function

[134] Samuel BISHOP (CPM Bureau member for Europe) presented the paper on this agenda item.¹⁶ He explained that CPM-16 (2022) had requested that the bureau consider whether the newly adopted IPPC Dispute Settlement Procedures (DSPs) could be presented in a simplified way and to consider how best to institutionalize the oversight function of the Dispute Settlement Oversight Body (DSOB). The bureau had subsequently concluded that the DSOB should be a non-permanent sub-body of the bureau, that the office of the IPPC Secretary should be the primary intake point for IPPC dispute submission (with a copy also being sent to the FAO Director General, in compliance with the IPPC), and that development of the terms of reference for the DSOB should be postponed until after the final decision of CPM-17 (2023) about the DSOB. The secretariat had also prepared a simplified presentation of the DSPs in the form of a diagram.

[135] The SPG was invited to discuss the outcomes of the CPM Bureau's discussion, share new ideas on how to administer the DSPs, and review, discuss and agree on the simplified presentation of the DSPs.

[136] The outcomes of the bureau discussions received broad support from the SPG.

[137] One participant welcomed the diagram and offered to share some suggestions on how to improve the arrows on it.

[138] The SPG noted that, given the length of time that it can take to settle a dispute, members of the DSOB may complete their term on the bureau before the dispute case has finished. Mr BISHOP confirmed that the bureau had not considered this but acknowledged that it was a valid point. He suggested that the bureau member leaving would simply be replaced by another bureau member.

[139] One of the RPPO representatives commented that their dispute settlement process had timelines for every step in the process. The representative explained that the terms of reference for the process were

¹⁶ 15_SPG_2022_Oct.

currently being revised but could be shared with Mr BISHOP once they had been reviewed by the RPPO's executive committee.

[140] The SPG:

- (25) *supported* the CPM Bureau outcomes of the discussion on the Dispute Settlement Oversight Body, particularly the role of the IPPC secretary as primary intake point for requests for IPPC assistance in disputes and the establishment of a subsidiary body of the CPM Bureau to work closely with the secretary in overseeing the process (i.e. to serve as the Dispute Settlement Oversight Body); and
- (26) *invited* the CPM Bureau to take account of the amendments to the diagram of the dispute settlement procedure offered at this meeting.

8.2 Development of observer policy

[141] Samuel BISHOP (CPM Bureau member for Europe) presented a draft policy statement prepared by the CPM Bureau regarding who should be permitted to participate in Friends of the Chair meetings at sessions of the CPM.¹⁷ He explained that Friends of the Chair meetings are convened when the CPM is struggling to reach consensus and that the primary participants are representatives from contracting parties as they have the decision-making authority at CPM sessions. Under the policy, however, up to two RPPO representatives could also be invited to participate. The participation of representatives from other bodies would only be considered as an exception, for instance to resolve a difficult technical issue, and their participation would be as silent observers and at the discretion of the CPM chairperson, who would consult with the bureau.

[142] The SPG was invited to endorse the policy statement and to recommend it to CPM-17 (2023) for approval. Mr BISHOP clarified that the policy simply reflected current practice.

[143] In the light of earlier comments about the diversity of RPPOs, the SPG suggested that the number of RPPO representatives should not be restricted to two.

[144] The SPG noted that if an observer is invited to participate because of the value that they can bring to the discussion as a result of their technical expertise, it was not clear how they would contribute if they were a truly silent observer. Mr BISHOP clarified that the intention had been that silent observers could speak only if invited to do so by the chairperson.

[145] One participant commented that the term "silent observer" could give the impression that people are attending because they want to know how the discussion went, rather than because of their expertise, and so it would perhaps be better to restrict observers to those invited because of their expertise and to expect input from them. Another participant pointed out that all accredited observers to CPM sessions are invited because of their expertise, and so queried the need to limit them to being silent.

[146] The SPG noted that one of the reasons for the sensitivity about observers is that the outcomes of Friends of the Chair meeting are usually subsequently agreed by the whole CPM.

[147] One participant suggested that observers could be permitted, but that the level of their participation could be at the discretion of the chairperson and managed by the chairperson.

[148] Mr BISHOP commented that, given the comments, the bureau would need to give further thought to the draft policy. He suggested that perhaps participation at Friends of the Chair meetings should be restricted to NPPOs and RPPOs, with the chairperson allowed to invite others if they add value, but that the policy should omit all the references to observers.

[149] This prompted a few other suggestions from participants (captured in the following decision point).

¹⁷ 18_SPG_2022_Oct.

[150] The SPG:

(27) *invited* the CPM Bureau to review the draft policy statement on CPM Friends of the Chair and *recommended* and consider the following suggestions, before presenting it to CPM-17 (2023) for approval:

- Make it clear that the purpose of Friends of the Chair meetings is to facilitate the resolution of issues by contracting parties for the CPM.
- Remove the restriction on the number of RPPO representatives permitted to participate in Friends of the Chair meetings.
- Remove reference to observers being silent and instead make it clear that the level of participation of observers, if approved to attend, is at the discretion of the CPM chairperson and will be managed by the chairperson.
- Consider amending the text to say that it is anticipated that Friends of the Chair meetings will not have accredited observers in attendance unless agreed by the CPM Chairperson and all the members attending the meeting.
- Omit all reference to observers and restrict participation at Friends of the Chair meetings to NPPOs and RPPOs, with the chairperson allowed to invite others on a case-by-case basis and if they are deemed to add value.

8.3 Disclaimer for CPM recommendations, IPPC guides and training materials

[151] Samuel BISHOP (CPM Bureau member for Europe) introduced the paper on this agenda item, which addressed concerns that had been raised over the legal status of CPM recommendations in the context of the World Trade Organization's Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement).¹⁸ He explained that the Secretariat of the SPS Agreement had confirmed that the SPS Agreement does not discriminate between ISPMs, CPM recommendations and other IPPC guidance and that it was therefore being proposed, after consultation with the FAO Legal Office, that CPM recommendations carry a suitably worded disclaimer, adapted from the disclaimer that is already included in IPPC guides. This modified disclaimer would be submitted to the CPM for approval.

[152] The SPG was invited to consider and discuss the paper and discuss the concerns raised and proposed solutions.

[153] In answer to a query, Mr BISHOP confirmed that the disclaimer would be carried by every IPPC publication except for ISPMs. There were no other comments.

[154] The SPG:

- (28) *agreed* to the inclusion of a disclaimer in CPM recommendations and requested that a paragraph be prepared clarifying their scope and intention;
- (29) *agreed* that the disclaimer in IPPC guides and training materials be reviewed along the same lines;
- (30) *recommended* that the IPPC secretariat and the CPM Bureau champion on this topic, in consultation with the FAO Legal Office, draft a disclaimer and summary paragraph; and
- (31) *invited* the CPM Bureau to review the draft texts and send to CPM-17 (2023) for approval.

9. Any other business

IPPC Secretariat vision for new global initiatives

[155] Continuing from his presentation under agenda item 4.1, the IPPC secretary introduced the SPG to three potential initiatives being considered by the secretariat, which were aimed at helping the IPPC community deliver the CPM's mission of protecting plant health and facilitating safe trade. He then sought the views of the participants on these ideas.

¹⁸ 19_SPG_2022_Oct.

- [156] **Global phytosanitary programme.** The IPPC secretary explained that, in the face of ever-increasing damage to food crops by pests, the secretariat was developing ideas for a global phytosanitary programme that would empower NPPOs to detect pests as early as possible and then to deal with detected pests using their preparedness and response programmes. The global phytosanitary programme would comprise proactive surveillance, timely and accurate pest diagnostics, and effective and efficient data collection, storage and analytics. The intention is that it would be a global programme, but as the needs of Africa are particularly great in terms of food security, it was proposed that the programme start in Africa, first with a few countries as a pilot and then gradually expanding to include all African countries. The programme would aim to empower countries to build on their gained experience and sustainably expand the programme. The estimated budget for the African programme was a total of USD 37.8 million over five years, with NPPOs providing personnel in addition to this, as they would be the ultimate implementers of the programme.
- [157] The SPG chairperson thanked the IPPC secretary and invited comments from the SPG.
- [158] The SPG welcomed this proposal as a good way of achieving the CPM's mission and strategic objectives, building the capacity of countries to implement ISPMs, and increasing the visibility and understanding of IPPC work by countries. It would also demonstrate to FAO what the IPPC community can contribute to its efforts against world hunger. They commended the secretariat for the ambition of the proposal and noted that it would require long-term commitments from all parties involved and careful management, but they acknowledged that without ambition there is no progress. The IPPC secretary clarified that the aim was to empower countries to continue with the programme using their own expertise, rather than simply providing countries with the solutions.
- [159] The SPG noted that the selection of the first countries would be critical, as it would be essential that these pilots were successful so that they could form a model and provide an impetus for the next phase. One participant commented that there would need to be a joint commitment from the IPPC secretariat, donors and the countries in question (e.g. to ensure that the countries had the necessary infrastructure). Another commented that, to ensure the sustainability of the programme, the first countries would need to have the capacity to then help their neighbours at the next stage.
- [160] One participant speculated that, as training would be needed for the NPPOs, countries could perhaps be "twinned" to exchange expertise and that maybe RPPOs could help in developing such ideas. This participant also suggested that plant-health clinics could play a role in first-line diagnosis.
- [161] The SPG noted the alignment of the proposal with the three IPPC strategic objectives, relating to food security, the environment and trade, and that this proposal could perhaps be incorporated into the IPPC Strategic Framework when it is reviewed in 2025. The SPG also noted the linkages between this proposed programme and the work of the POARS Steering Group and the CPM Focus Group on Communications.
- [162] In terms of next steps, the secretariat confirmed that they would be "testing the waters" with potential donors and continuing to explore how to select countries and pests, with the idea being that each subregion is engaged to identify the two countries that are most ready to participate in that subregion. The secretariat planned to give an update to CPM-17 (2023).
- [163] **Global phytosanitary trade support team.** The IPPC secretary explained that this idea was not at such a mature stage of development as the global phytosanitary programme. The vision was that a team of personnel within the IPPC secretariat who had credible expertise in ISPMs and phytosanitary agreements between NPPOs could provide a proactive and responsive service to "signpost" enquirers to relevant ISPMs and other IPPC guidance.
- [164] The SPG chairperson thanked the IPPC secretary and invited comments from the SPG.
- [165] The SPG expressed support for this idea but noted that the team should help identify where guidance is but not interpret ISPMs, as the latter is the sovereign responsibility of contracting parties.

[166] The SPG noted that, if the team were able to catalogue the queries received, this may help to identify where new standards or revisions of existing standards are needed and hence may help the CPM to identify new topics.

[167] **IPPC centre of excellence.** The IPPC secretary explained that the idea is to develop a database to bring together, in digital format and in searchable form, IPPC-approved products including ISPMs and IPPC guides and training materials, so that NPPOs can search for information on specific topics (e.g. information relevant to a specific pest). It may also be possible to include products approved by regions or other credible organizations (e.g. Euphresco). He emphasized, however, that this idea was not yet mature, so was still only a concept.

[168] The SPG chairperson thanked the IPPC secretary and invited comments from the SPG.

[169] The SPG noted that the IC had identified a similar need and, together with the secretariat, had developed a set of pages on the IPP that act as a portal to resources on specific components of phytosanitary systems. The SPG also noted that there was already a tool for searching PDFs of ISPMs, but recognized that the scope of the new concept was broader.

[170] The SPG encouraged the secretariat to explore what other resources were available, to avoid duplication of effort, and noted that much information is available through RPPOs. They highlighted the importance of being very clear at the outset about the objectives of the database, so it was important to consult not only technology experts but also potential users. There would also be a need to define which types of institution would be linked from the database, to avoid controversy.

[171] The IPPC secretary thanked everyone for their comments and confirmed that, over the next few months, the secretariat would continue to develop these ideas, making sure that the products to be developed are absolutely aligned with the needs of the IPPC community.

Other business

[172] One participant recalled that, before the COVID-19 pandemic, the secretariat had started to provide some financial support to participants from developing countries and this had resulted in an increase in such participants at the SPG. In contrast, however, the number of participants from developing countries at this meeting appeared to be lower. The participant suggested, therefore, that the practice of providing financial support be resumed to broaden the representation of contracting parties at the SPG.

[173] The SPG:

(32) *recommended* that efforts be made to encourage the participation of representatives from developing countries at future meetings of the SPG.

10. Next meeting

[174] The next meeting of the SPG is tentatively scheduled for 23–25 October 2023 (or, if a room is not available, 16–18 October 2023), to be held in person at FAO in Rome, Italy.

11. Close of the meeting

[175] The SPG chairperson thanked all participants for their contributions and the secretariat for their support.

[176] The chairperson closed the meeting.

Appendix 01 - Agenda

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER / IPPC Secretariat support
1.	Opening of the Meeting		IPPC Secretary / John GREIFER
2.	Meeting Arrangements		John GREIFER
2.1.	Adoption of the Agenda	01_SPG_2022_Oct	
2.2.	Election of the Rapporteur	--	
3.	Administrative Matters		Arop DENG
3.1.	Document lists	02_SPG_2022_Oct	
3.2.	Participant list	03_SPG_2022_Oct	
4	Governance and strategy		
4.1	IPPC Secretary reflections	--	Osama EL-LISSY
4.2	Proposal for restructure of CPM agenda	04_SPG_2022_Oct	Greg WOLFF
5	Discussion items from CPM Focus Groups (FGs)		
5.1	Implementation of the Strategic Framework 2020 – 2030 Development Agenda Items.	06_SPG_2022_Oct 07_SPG_2022_Oct	CPM FG Chairperson Peter THOMSON / IPPC Secretariat
5.2	Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues action plan	17_SPG_2022_Oct	CPM FG Chairperson Samuel BISHOP / Erika MANGILI
5.3	ePhyto Sustainable Funding	09_SPG_2022_Oct	CPM FG Chairperson Peter THOMSON / Craig FEDCHOCK
5.4	Safe Provision of Food and other Humanitarian Aid	13_SPG_2022_Oct	CPM FG Chairperson Konan L. KOUAME / Adriana MOREIRA
5.5	Sea Containers	20_SPG_2022_Oct	CPM FG Chairperson / Artur SHAMILOV
5.6	Discussion on International Workshop on Sea Containers	20_SPG_2022_Oct	Artur SHAMILOV
5.7	Communications strategy	11_SPG_2022_Oct	CPM FG Chairperson Gabrielle VIVIAN-Smith / IPPC Secretariat
6	Other Emerging Strategic Topics		
6.1	Follow up discussion on “One Health and AMR issues”	05_SPG_2022_Oct 12_SPG_2022_Oct 14_SPG_2022_Oct	Sarah BRUNEL / Lucien KONAN KOUAME
6.2	IPPC Partnership strategy, including industry engagement	10_SPG_2022_Oct	Arop DENG

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER / IPPC Secretariat support
6.3	Other strategic topics submitted by contracting parties	08_SPG_2022_Oct	Stephanie BLOEM
7	Updates		
7.1	The IPPC Observatory	16_SPG_2022_Oct	Descartes KOUMBA
8	Items for SPG Strategic Input		
8.1	Discussion on Dispute Settlement Future Oversight Function	15_SPG_2022_Oct	Sam BISHOP / Descartes KOUMBA
8.2	Discussion on the IPPC Observer Policy	18_SPG_2022_Oct	Sam BISHOP
8.3	Disclaimer for CPM recommendations, IPPC guides and training materials	19_SPG_2022_Oct	Sam BISHOP/Adriana MOREIRA
8.4	Conceptual initiatives going forward	-	Osama EL-LISSY
9	Any Other Business		John GREIFER
10	Next Meeting		John GREIFER
11	Close of the Meeting		John GREIFER

Appendix 02 – Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE
01_SPG_2022_Oct	02.1	Agenda - link
02_SPG_2022_Oct	03.1	Documents List - link
03_SPG_2022_Oct	03.2	Participants List -
04_SPG_2022_Oct	04.1	Proposal to structure CPM agendas around the IPPC Strategic Framework – Canada - link
05_SPG_2022_Oct	06.1	The Integral Role of Plant Health in One Health – US - link
06_SPG_2022_Oct	05.1	Draft Report – IPPC SFDAs 2020-2030 - link
07_SPG_2022_Oct	05.1	Implementing the SFDAs - link
08_SPG_2022_Oct	06.3	POARS and the role of RPPOs - link
09_SPG_2022_Oct	05.4	Sustainable funding of ePhyto solution - link
10_SPG_2022_Oct	06.2	IPPC Partnership Framework - link
11_SPG_2022_Oct	05.3	CPM FG on Communications – Updates - link
12_SPG_2022_Oct	06.1	Integrating the One Health approach into IPPC activities – EPPO - link
13_SPG_2022_Oct	05.5	CPM Focus Group on food and other humanitarian aid - link
14_SPG_2022_Oct	06.1	One Health and AMR issues - link
15_SPG_2022_Oct	08.1	IPPC Dispute Settlement procedures - link
16_SPG_2022_Oct	07.1	The IPPC Observatory - link
17_SPG_2022_Oct	05.2	Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues action plan - link
18_SPG_2022_Oct	08.2	Draft CPM Friends of the Chair Observer Policy - link
19_SPG_2022_Oct	08.3	Disclaimer for CPM recommendations, IPPC guides and training materials - link
20_SPG_2022_Oct	5.6; 5.7	Update from CPM FG on Sea containers and workshop on sea containers - link
IPP LINKS:		
SPG October 2019 Report		
SPG October 2020 Report		
SPG October 2021 Report		

Appendix 03 – Participants list

Region/ Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
CPM Bureau Africa <i>CPM Chairperson</i>	Mr Konan KOUAME Inspecteur Direction de la Protection des Végétaux, du Contrôle et de la Qualité Ministère de l'Agriculture B.P. V7 Abidjan, Phone: (+225) 20 218442 Mobile: (+225) 07 07903754 COTE D'IVOIRE	l_kouame@yahoo.fr ;
CPM Bureau Southwest Pacific	Mr Peter THOMSON Ministry for Primary Industries Pastoral House 25 The Terrace PO Box 2526 Wellington 6140 Tel: 64-4-894 0353 NEW ZEALAND	peter.thomson@mpi.govt.nz ;
CPM Bureau Europe	Mr Sam BISHOP Head of International Plant Health Policy Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs York UK	sam.bishop@defra.gov.uk
CPM Bureau North America <i>SPG Chairperson</i>	Mr John GREIFER Assistant Deputy Administrator Plant Protection and Quarantine APHIS, USDA1400 Independence Av. SW Washington, DC 20250 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	john.k.greifer@usda.gov ;
CPM Bureau Latin America	Mr Diego QUIROGA Director Nacional de Protección Vegetal SENASA ARGENTINA	dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar
EPPO	Mr Nico M. HORN Director-General European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO/OEPP) 21 boulevard Richard Lenoir 75011 PARIS Tel: + 33 (0) 1 45 20 77 94 EPPO	nico.horn@epo.int ;
RPPO	Ms Stephanie BLOEM Executive Director – Directora Ejecutiva North American Plant Protection Organization Organizacion Norteamericana de Proteccion a las Plantas 1730 Varsity Drive, Suite 145 Raleigh, NC 27606 (919) 617-4040 office NAPPO	Stephanie.bloem@nappo.org ;

Region/ Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
NPPO	Ms Sophie PETERSON Assistant Director Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment GPO Box 858, Canberra ACT 2615, Australia Tel: +61 2 6272 3769 AUSTRALIA	sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au ;
AUSTRALIA	Ms Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH Australian Chief Plant Protection Office AUSTRALIA	gabrielle.vivian-smith@agriculture.gov.au ;
BRAZIL	Mr Carlos GOULART Head of the Department of Plant Health and Agricultural Inputs Secretariat of Animal and Plant Health and Inspection (SDA) Ministry of Agriculture Livestock and Food Supply (MAPA) Esplanada dos Ministerios, Bloco D sala 303 Anexo B 70.043-900, Brasilia/DF, BRAZIL	carlos.goulart@agro.gov.br ;
CANADA	Mr Gregory WOLFF Senior Director, Plant Import/Export Division Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive OTTAWA, ON. K1A 0Y9 CANADA	greg.wolff@inspection.gc.ca ;
NETHERLANDS	Mr Marco TRAA Senior Staff Officer Phytosanitary Affairs Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality NETHERLANDS	m.j.w.traa@minlnv.nl ;
NETHERLANDS	Mr. T. (Thorwald) Geuze MSc Senior Plant Health Officer Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA)	t.geuze@nvwa.nl ;
GEORGIA	Mr. Zurab CHEKURASHVILI Head of the National Food Agency of GEORGIA	zurab.chekurashvili@nfa.gov.ge ;
USA	Mr Ibrahim SHAQIR Associate Deputy Administrator International Phytosanitary Management and Standards Program Plant Protection and Quarantine APHIS, USDA 4700 River Road Riverdale, MD 20737 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	ibrahim.shaqir@usda.gov ;
UZBEKISTAN	Sultan-Makhmud SULTANOV Head of the International relations department UZBEKISTAN	glavkaruz@mail.ru ;

Region/ Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
JAPAN	Mr. Masatoshi KOBAYASHI IPPC contact point of Japan Director, International Affairs Office Plant Protection Division Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) JAPAN	ippc_contact@maff.go.jp ;
RUSSIAN FEDERATION	Ms. Ekaterina VYBORNOVA Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to FAO and other UN Agencies in Rome, Italy RUSSIAN FEDERATION	ekaterinavybornova@gmail.com ;
REPUBLIC OF KOREA	Ms. Do Nam KIM Assistant Director Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency/Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs 177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, REPUBLIC OF KOREA	dongam75@korea.kr ;
REPUBLIC OF KOREA	Ms. Mi Chi YEA Deputy Director Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency/Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs 177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, REPUBLIC OF KOREA	kittymc@korea.kr ;
SWEDEN	Ms. Rebecka RAMSTEDT Programme and Policy Officer Permanent Representation of Sweden to FAO, WFP and IFAD Embassy of Sweden, Piazza Rio de Janeiro 3, 001 61 Rome SWEDEN	rebecka.ramstedt@gov.se
SWEDEN	Mr. Adrian VALLIN Plant Health Officer National Plant Protection Organisation, Jönköping, Sweden. Tel: +46 36155207 +46 702901338 SWEDEN	Adrian.Vallin@jordbruksverket.se ;
CEZCH REPUBLIC	Michal Hnizdil Director of Section of seed, planting materials and plant health Central Control Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture Zemědělská 1a, BRNO, PSČ 613 00 Tel.: +420 545 110 467, +420 235 010 303; GSM: +420 773 743 901 The Czech Republic	michal.hnizdil@ukzuz.cz

Region/ Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
CZECH REPUBLIC	TÁNA KLAILOVÁ Specialist on EU Affairs Department of Phytosanitary Risk Management Division of Plant Health CENTRAL INSTITUTE FOR SUPERVISING AND TESTING IN AGRICULTURE Section of Seed, Propagating Material and Plant Health Filipov 19, 286 01 Čáslav The Czech Republic	Tana.Klailova@ukzuz.cz ;