1. Opening of the session

QU Dongyu, the FAO Director-General, welcomed participants to the Seventeenth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), which was being held in person for the first time since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. He highlighted the importance of protecting plants and plant sources in achieving the United Nations (UN) sustainable development goals, and the critical role of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) in this regard. He commented on how IPPC work compliments and supports the mandate of FAO, with the IPPC community and FAO sharing some common goals, but that there was also a need to work with partners to invest in and scale-up innovation, research, capacity development and outreach. The FAO Director-General finished by assuring the CPM that FAO remained committed and supportive of the work of the IPPC community in helping to transform agrifood systems to be more efficient, more inclusive, more resilient and more sustainable.

Osama EL-LISSY, the IPPC Secretary, thanked the FAO Director-General and provided some further opening remarks. He thanked contracting parties (CPs), regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs), partner organizations and the various CPM subsidiary bodies for their work and commitment, and financial and in-kind contributors for their support. He highlighted some of the achievements of the year 2022, including the first International Day of Plant Health on 12 May and the first International Plant Health Conference, and thanked Lucien KOUAMÉ KONAN, the outgoing CPM Chairperson, for his exemplary leadership. Looking ahead, the IPPC secretary emphasized the need to invest in innovative approaches and new initiatives, such as a global phytosanitary programme, and urged everyone to continue raising awareness about plant health among the media and the wider public.

2. Keynote addresses

2.1 Keynote address by the United Kingdom’s Minister of State for Biosecurity, Marine and Rural Affairs

Lord BENYON, Minister of State for Biosecurity, Marine and Rural Affairs in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, reflected on the successes of the inaugural International Plant Health Conference held in London in September 2022. The conference had been attended by over 500 participants from over 74 countries, who had shared knowledge and discussed global threats to plant health as well as potential ways of addressing them. The conference had promoted key messages to the public and had also highlighted the need to invest in capacity development, research and outreach activities, and to strengthen collaboration. He encouraged CPM participants to consider offering to host a second conference within the next four years.

Lord Benyon finished by pledging GBP 75 000 from the United Kingdom to support the IPPC ePhyto (Electronic Phytosanitary Certificate) Solution and a further GBP 25 000 to kickstart delivery of the recommendations made by the IPPC Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues.

2.2 Keynote address by the United Kingdom’s Chief Plant Health Officer

Nicola SPENCE, Chief Plant Health Officer and Deputy Director for Plant and Bee Health at the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs of the United Kingdom, gave an overview of the International Plant Health Conference and its legacy. The conference had attracted a wide range of participants, from policymakers to scientists, and had included side sessions on various topics and a poster session for early-career scientists and plant-health professionals. The conference had considered issues of capability and capacity, including some issues that have attracted little attention to date, such as the role of women in the value chain. Looking ahead to the prospect of a conference every four years, the Chief Plant Health Officer viewed this as a fantastic opportunity to bring together people working in the field of plant health and she encouraged other countries to consider hosting a future conference.

2.3 Keynote address by the Commissioner for Agriculture, Rural Development, Blue Economy and Sustainable Environment of the African Union Commission

Josefa Leonel Correia SACKO, Commissioner for Agriculture, Rural Development, Blue Economy and Sustainable Development of the African Union (AU) Commission, introduced the role of the commission in promoting agricultural development and sustainable environmental management across Africa. She referred to the recently adopted Plant Health Strategy for Africa, which would now guide plant-health matters across the continent, and the corresponding implementation plan that was under development. She explained that the plan would further strengthen the role and function of the Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC) as the AU-mandated specialized technical office in coordinating plant health on the continent. The commissioner confirmed that strengthening the plant-health systems of AU members states remained high on the agenda of the commission, with the commission being committed to ensuring that resource-mobilization efforts at national, regional and continental levels would not wane. She therefore assured the CPM of the commission’s support for the proposed IPPC Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP). She finished by urging the CPM, FAO and partner organizations to support Africa in their quest to build a robust phytosanitary system and to support the strengthening of governance and coordination structures, such as IAPSC and the technical working groups of the regional economic communities, for effective coordination and implementation of the APP.

3. Adoption of the agenda

The CPM chairperson welcomed everyone and informed the CPM of two changes to the agenda proposed by the CPM Bureau.

Suggestions for additional agenda items were made by contracting parties.

In response to a request to include an agenda item on the request of Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) to become an RPPO, the CPM chairperson noted that divergent opinions on the matter existed among the African member states and that the topic had not matured or progressed enough for inclusion in the CPM-17 agenda. He added, however, that the secretariat would be providing an update on progress in agenda item 7 (Report from the IPPC Secretariat) and would be holding a meeting with African representatives outside of the main CPM session to discuss the issues.

The CPM agreed to consider agenda item 13.2 (Sea containers) with agenda item 11 (CPM recommendations), to consider agenda item 15.4 (Observer policy for Friends of the Chair) after agenda item 8 (Report from the Strategic Planning Group), and to add a new agenda item (15.5) on *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* Tropical Race 4 (TR4).

The CPM:

*adopted* the agenda as modified (Appendix 1) and *noted* the list of documents (Appendix 2).

3.1 European Union statement of competence

The CPM:

1. *noted* the Declaration of Competences and Voting Rights submitted by the European Union and its 27 member states.[[1]](#footnote-2)

4. Election of the rapporteurs

The CPM:

1. *elected* Mellon KABOLE (Kenya) and Lise KJAERGAARD STEFFENSEN (Denmark) as rapporteurs*.*

5. Establishment of Credentials Committee

The CPM:

1. *appointed* a Credentials Committee; and
2. *noted* the subsequent report from the Credentials Committee, who had elected Federico SORGONI (Italy) as their chairperson and had endorsed a list of 112 valid credentials, which was enough to constitute the quorum of a majority of CPM members (93 members).

6. Report from the CPM chairperson

The CPM chairperson presented his report, highlighting some of the key achievements and milestones of the last year.[[2]](#footnote-3) These had included three draft international standards submitted for adoption, one draft CPM recommendation submitted for approval for consultation, the management and delivery of capacity-development projects and phytosanitary capacity evaluations, the production of technical training materials, an international workshop on sea containers, the first International Day of Plant Health on 12 May 2022, and the first International Plant Health Conference. He thanked the various IPPC committees and groups for their work, contracting parties who had provided funds or hosted meetings, and Zambia for their commitment to the establishment of the International Day of Plant Health. He also expressed his gratitude to his colleagues in the CPM Bureau for their active engagement. The CPM chairperson finished by thanking everyone in the IPPC community for their advice and support over the years in advancing plant-health goals.

Contracting parties expressed their appreciation to the CPM chairperson for his work during his term of office and, in particular, leading the CPM through the challenges of the pandemic.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the report presented by the CPM chairperson.

7. Report from the IPPC Secretariat

The IPPC secretary presented the 2022 annual report of the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”).[[3]](#footnote-4) He highlighted some of the main achievements in the core work of the secretariat and explained the efforts that were being made to bring greater workforce stability, given that the majority of personnel were working on temporary terms.

The IPPC secretary provided an update on progress made since CPM-16 (2022) regarding the request by ECOWAS to become an RPPO.[[4]](#footnote-5) In June 2022, the secretariat had organized a meeting with representatives from the African Union’s (AU’s) Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Blue Economy and Sustainable Environment (DARBE), the AU Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC) and ECOWAS, with the CPM chairperson also in attendance. The representatives had tentatively agreed on the way forward, including: 1) maintaining only one RPPO in Africa (i.e. the AU-IAPSC); 2) the AU and ECOWAS continuing to work together through technical working groups; and 3) ECOWAS continuing its important role in coordinating phytosanitary activities among its member countries, including IPPC standard development and implementation. Actions for the secretariat after the meeting had been to: meet with ECOWAS; meet with the AU and the AU Commissioner of Agriculture; draft a proposal on an African Phytosanitary Programme (APP), with a vision of safeguarding agriculture and facilitating safe trade in the continent; and socialize the concept of the APP within the FAO as well as international, regional and national organizations. The last three of these actions had been achieved, but the first had been delayed following changes in the leadership of ECOWAS. The AU commissioner had stated that the commission was fostering a “one voice concept” for Africa and, as such, DARBE recognized IAPSC as the only RPPO in the continent.

The IPPC secretary introduced the CPM to the ideas behind the proposed APP, which aimed to provide the national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) with the capacity to effectively detect plant pests of regulatory, economic and environmental significance in a timely manner. The AU commissioner had expressed full support for the APP and had offered to be a partner in it.

The IPPC secretary informed the CPM of plans to create a Global Phytosanitary Trade Support Team within the secretariat to provide not only training but also respond to queries.

Finally, the IPPC secretary thanked CPs and RPPOs for providing their expertise and resources to support the secretariat’s work programme, and thanked the secretariat staff for their work.

Some CPs noted how imperative it was to have a stable workforce and called on CPs and the IPPC secretary to use any appropriate opportunity to bring the issue to the attention of FAO.

A few CPs urged the CPM to consider the request by ECOWAS to become an RPPO, explaining that the intention was to strengthen the position of Africa not weaken it.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the 2022 annual report presented by the IPPC Secretariat.

8. Report from the Strategic Planning Group

The chairperson of the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) presented the SPG’s 2022 summary report,[[5]](#footnote-6) which highlighted the most significant issues discussed by the SPG at its meeting in October 2022. These had included the long-term funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution, approving an overarching implementation plan for the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030, the next steps for development of a global approach to sea container cleanliness, reaching consensus on the scope of IPPC involvement in the One Health programme at FAO, the IPPC secretary’s vision and proposal to develop a global phytosanitary programme with initial implementation in Africa (the APP), and advising on various IPPC procedural and policy-related issues.

Some CPs, including many from Africa, expressed support for the proposed APP, with a few calling for the needs of individual countries to be taken into account.

A few CPs called for more clarification on the One Health agenda in a phytosanitary context and what CPs are required to do.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the summary of the 2022 meeting of the SPG.

9. Reports from CPM subsidiary bodies

9.1 Report from the Standards Committee

1. The Standards Committee (SC) chairperson presented the report of the SC’s activities during 2022.[[6]](#footnote-7) The SC had met throughout the year, mostly in virtual mode. Two webinars had also been held and SC members had contributed to the IPPC regional workshops, the IC and all CPM focus groups. Nine draft standards and three draft specifications had been submitted for consultation and four standards were being recommended to the CPM-17 (2023) for adoption. The work of the four technical panels had progressed via virtual and face-to-face meetings. The SC chairperson finished her report by thanking those contracting parties and RPPOs who had supported standard setting activities, either through in-kind contributions or hosting meetings, the former SC chairperson, all SC members and the secretariat.
2. In response to questions, the SC chairperson confirmed that, should CPs or RPPOs wish to propose that certain International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) are combined or revised, they should submit a proposal through the call for topics. She noted a call for the development of commodity standards to be speeded up and encouraged CPs and RPPOs to submit proposals for commodity standards during the 2023 IPPC call for topics.
3. Japan offered to host the expert working group for the development of a draft annex on field inspection later in 2023.
4. The secretariat confirmed that they would confirm with the FAO Legal Office regarding the binding or non-binding nature of ISPMs.
5. The CPM:
6. *noted* the report on the activities of the SC in 2022.

9.1.1 Adjustments to the Standard Setting Procedure: length of consultation period for draft specifications and consultation comments

1. The SC chairperson presented recommendations from the SC for adjustments to the Standard Setting Procedure regarding the participation of entities other than CPs and RPPOs and the length of the consultation period for draft specifications from 60 to 90 days.[[7]](#footnote-8) She drew the attention of the CPM to an error in the proposed text, which had already been highlighted in one written intervention:[[8]](#footnote-9) although the SC had agreed that reference to “information points” would be deleted, one instance had accidentally been left in the text. This correction had been incorporated into the amendments presented to the CPM.
2. The CPM:
3. *adopted* the modified Standard Setting Procedure recommended by the SC as presented in Attachment 1 of CPM 2023/08, subject to the correction explained at this meeting.

9.1.2 List of topics for IPPC standards

1. The SC chairperson presented a paper on changes to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.[[9]](#footnote-10) This listed the modifications to subjects (Glossary terms, diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments for consideration by the relevant technical panels) that had been made by the SC.
2. The CPM:
3. *noted* the adjustments made by the SC to the list of subjects in the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (as presented in Part II of CPM 2023/09); and

*adopted* the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, with the above adjustments.

9.2 Report from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee

The Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) chairperson presented the report of the IC’s activities during 2022.[[10]](#footnote-11) This highlighted some of the key accomplishments and decisions of the IC during 2022, and provided a summary of IC meetings and the activities of the IC subgroups and IC teams.

The IC had agreed three changes to IC subgroups, pending approval from the CPM: updates to the terms of reference of the IC Subgroup on IPPC Observatory (based on the new scope and missions of the IPPC Observatory); the dissolution of the IC Subgroup on Dispute Avoidance and Settlement (given that CPM-16(2022) had assigned the role of the Dispute Settlement Oversight Body to the CPM Bureau); and the dissolution of the Sea Containers Task Force (given that the task force had completed its mandate and sea containers were now the subject of a CPM Focus Group).

The IC chairperson reported that the emergency preparedness guide and the prevention, preparedness and response guidelines on *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* TR4 had just been published and he emphasized that providing tools such as this, to facilitate the implementation of the IPPC, should remain a priority.

As he approached the end of his term of office, the IC chairperson commented on what a privilege it had been to serve as IC chairperson and thanked all IC members and the secretariat for an extremely fruitful collaboration.

The CPM agreed to make some further, minor amendments to the terms of reference for the IC Subgroup on IPPC Observatory, as proposed in CPM 2023/CRP/02.

In response to questions, the IC chairperson encouraged CPs or RPPOs to submit proposals during the calls for topics, should they wish a new IPPC guide or training materials to be developed. He also encouraged CPs and donor agencies to become involved with the development of such materials. He drew the attention of the CPM to the e-learning courses available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) and the effort made to translate guides into FAO languages.

Some CPs called upon the secretariat to establish permanent staff to work on implementation and capacity development activities and called upon other organizations to provide resources for such activities.

The CPM:

1. *thanked* the experts who had contributed to the e-learning courses on *Pest risk analysis*, *Phytosanitary export certification system*, *Surveillance and reporting obligations* and *Phytosanitary inspection* (Appendix XX);
2. *noted* the work of the IC in 2022 and the outcomes of the IC meetings in 2022;
3. *supported* the inclusion of a link to the phytosanitary systems pages on the IPP home page to facilitate their accessibility and increase their use;
4. *agreed* that the four completed e-learning courses be deleted from the *List of implementation and capacity development topics*:
* *Pest risk analysis* e-learning course (2020-002),
* Surveillance and reporting obligations e-learning course (2020-012),
* Phytosanitary export certification system e-learning course (2020-003), and
* *Inspection* e-learning course (2020-011);
1. *noted* the activities of the IC Subgroup on IPPC Observatory;
2. *adopted* the updated Terms of Reference of the IC Subgroup on IPPC Observatory as modified in this meeting (Appendix X);
3. *approved* the dissolution of the IC Subgroup on Dispute Avoidance and Settlement and thanked the members of the subgroup for their work;
4. *acknowledged* that the mandate of the IC contributes to dispute avoidance;
5. *approved* the dissolution of the Sea Containers Task Force and thanked the members of the task force for their work;
6. *noted* the activities of the IC teams on national reporting obligations, e-commerce, *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* TR4, projects, guides and training materials, Framework for Standards and Implementation, contributed resources, and web-based resources;
7. *noted* the activities undertaken towards advancing the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Strategy 2020–2030;
8. *noted* that the *Process for the development of IPPC guides and training materials* had been updated; and

*noted* the improvements to the IPPC guides and training materials web pages.

10. Adoption of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures

The secretariat introduced the papers for this agenda item, which presented the draft ISPMs proposed by the SC for adoption by the CPM and activities related to translation of adopted standards.[[11]](#footnote-12) The summary paper also highlighted the need for a coordinator for the Language Review Group for French, noting that the group had not reviewed any standards for seven consecutive years because the coordinator position had been vacant.

The secretariat informed the CPM that the deadline for objections specified in the Standard Setting Procedure was three weeks before CPM-17 (2023), namely 6 March 2023, but by that date no objections had been received.[[12]](#footnote-13)

The CPM:

1. *adopted* the 2021 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001), as presented in CPM 2023/11\_01, and *revoked* the previously adopted version;
2. *adopted* Annex 2 (Use of specific import authorizations) (2008-006) to ISPM 20 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*), as presented in CPM 2023/11\_02;
3. *adopted* the revision of ISPM 18 (*Requirements for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) (2014-007), as presented in CPM 2023/11\_03, and *revoked* the previously adopted version;
4. *adopted* PT 45 (Irradiation treatment for *Pseudococcus jackbeardsleyi*) (2017-027), as presented in CPM 2023/11\_04, as Annex 45 to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*);
5. *thanked* the experts of the groups who drafted the adopted standards and their contracting parties or international organizations (Appendix XX) for their active contribution to the development of these standards;
6. *noted* that the following nine ISPMs (including annexes) had been reviewed by the Arabic, Chinese, Russian and Spanish Language Review Groups and FAO Translation services, and the IPPC Secretariat had incorporated the modifications accordingly and posted the new versions on the Adopted standards page of the IPP to replace the previously adopted versions:
* 2019–2020 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*),
* ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) (focused revision),
* ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*),
* ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*), and
* annexes to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*):

PT 40 (Irradiation treatment for Tortricidae on fruits),

PT 41 (Cold treatment for *Bactrocera zonata* on *Citrus sinensis*),

PT 42 (Irradiation treatment for *Zeugodacus* *tau*),

PT 43 (Irradiation treatment for *Sternochetus frigidus*),

PT 44 (Vapour heat-modified atmosphere treatment for *Cydia pomonella* and *Grapholita molesta* on *Malus pumila* and *Prunus persica*);

1. *thanked* contracting parties and RPPOs involved in the Language Review Groups, as well as FAO Translation services, for their efforts and hard work to improve the language versions of ISPMs, including annexes; and
2. *acknowledged* the contributions of the members of the SC who had left the SC in 2022:
* Argentina, Ezequiel FERRO.

11. CPM recommendations

1. The CPM also considered agenda item 13.2 under this agenda item, thereby addressing together the paper on the development of draft CPM recommendations,[[13]](#footnote-14) the draft CPM Recommendation on *Sea containers* (R-06) being proposed for consultation,,[[14]](#footnote-15) and an update on the activities of the Sea Container Focus Group.[[15]](#footnote-16)
2. The chairperson of the focus group explained the purpose of the focus group and outlined the challenges inherent in managing plant-health risks related to sea container movements. He emphasized that the contamination risk posed by containers, whether empty or packed, is essentially the same, and that while the IPPC community is keen on providing appropriate phytosanitary measures, any impediments to the movement of sea containers can impact supply chains with consequential effects. He recalled key milestones in the consideration of sea container issues by the CPM and acknowledged that although consolidated risk-based information is still being assembled, there may also be deleterious consequences to the supply chain if each CP opts for a different approach to the challenge – a situation that may be brought about if the production of harmonized guidance is unduly delayed. There was also the risk of reputational damage to the IPPC. The focus group chairperson outlined the outcomes of the 2022 Sea Containers Workshop, where significant progress had been made. One of the key outcomes had been the emergence of the concept of a non-mandatory, “general framework” comprising a series of complementary activities which, when combined, would reduce risk significantly. The proposals from the workshop had been incorporated into the draft CPM recommendation being proposed to the CPM for approval for consultation. A second workshop was to be held in Australia in July 2023.
3. The CPM noted that a paper originally planned for consideration at CPM-17, proposing the wording of a disclaimer to be included in every CPM recommendation, had been withdrawn following advice from the FAO Legal Office. One CP asked for reassurance that this would be presented to CPM-18 (2024).
4. The CPM:
5. *agreed* to submit to consultation, starting on 1 July 2023, the draft revision of the CPM Recommendation on *Sea containers* (R-06) as presented in CPM 2023/12\_01.
6. *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers;
7. *noted* the prospective components of the emerging systematic approach identified as part of the 2022 workshop;
8. *noted* the [concerns raised by several NPPOs](https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/sea-containers/international-workshop-on-reducing-the-introduction-of-pests-through-the-sea-container-pathway/) about the lack of risk-based data relating to sea containers and *encouraged* contracting parties to submit where possible any related information that may be available to the focus group;
9. *noted* that the secretariat will engage with contacts at the World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH) to determine what concerns, plans or work may exist in their organization in relation to sea containers and animal health, and that leads from WOAH may be invited to observe certain focus group meetings; and

*noted* the arrangements being made to hold a second workshop on sea containers in Australia in mid-2023 and *encouraged* NPPOs and RPPOs to plan to send participants as appropriate.

12. Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework

12.1 Overarching report on implementation of IPPC Strategic Framework – development agenda themes

The chairperson of the CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 Development Agenda Items presented a paper giving a final update from the focus group and outlined the recommendations from the group.[[16]](#footnote-17) The “Overarching Implementation Plan” for the development agenda items (DAIs), prepared by the focus group, was provided as an attachment to the paper.[[17]](#footnote-18)

A few CPs suggested that investment prospectuses be developed for each individual DAI.

A few CPs expressed support for the proposal to establish a dedicated programme-manager position to manage delivery of the implementation plan.

A few CPs suggested that a CPM focus group be established for each of those DAIs currently lacking a working group: global phytosanitary research coordination and diagnostic laboratory networking. A suggestion was made that these could be set up by authority of the CPM Bureau.

Some CPs suggested that the “scope and plan” phase for the DAI on pest outbreak and alert systems (POARS) be extended from 2023 to 2024. They also noted the overlapping scope of the DAI on global phytosanitary research coordination and the proposed EUPHRESCO III project, and suggested that the secretariat therefore play an active role in the EUPHRESCO project to ensure that the EUPHRESCO project results contribute to the implementation of the DAI. In addition, they referred the CPM to other comments submitted as a written intervention.[[18]](#footnote-19)

Other suggestions included the need for work on early detection and response to pests, a request that the CPM accelerate those DAIs that have not yet started, an encouragement to submit proposals for topics for commodity standards in the forthcoming call for topics, a suggestion that future CPM agendas include an item on each of the DAIs, a plea for financial support for the least developed countries, an encouragement to CPs to increase their pest reporting, and a suggestion that the DAI on POARS be incorporated within the APP as the APP could be used as a pilot for POARS.

The CPM:

1. *noted* that, consistent with the request of the CPM, a sequenced overarching implementation plan for the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 development agenda items had been developed;
2. *noted* that the indicative annual cost of the programme ranged from USD 1 400 000 to USD 2 400 000 per annum (USD 850 000 to USD 1 130 000 per annum excluding the ePhyto Solution);
3. *agreed* on the implementation plan, including the proposed sequencing and budgets (CPM 2023/13\_01);
4. *agreed* that regular reviews of development agenda item (DAI) plans and budgets should occur and that a review of the IPPC Strategic Framework should start in 2025 and be reported to the CPM in 2026;
5. *agreed* that each DAI should have its own implementation group (largely comprised of CP participants) and be supported by one or more members of the secretariat;
6. *agreed* that projects should not proceed to the “Delivery” phase until sufficient resources have been secured to support delivery, and *noted* that:
* as strategic priorities, the DAIs need to be properly resourced, and
* the secretariat should not be asked to commence work for which there is not adequate resourcing;
1. *requested* that the IPPC secretary consider establishing a new position of programme manager, to coordinate, monitor, report and mobilize funds for the programme;
2. *requested* that the secretariat develop an investment prospectus, to be used to raise awareness of the overarching implementation plan among contracting parties and relevant international bodies and to support resource mobilization with donor countries and organizations;
3. *recommended* that the Technical Consultation among RPPOs (TC-RPPOs) discuss the relevant annual, overarching report on the strategic framework implementation, with the aim of identifying topics that the RPPOs could start addressing, within the RPPOs respective mandate, at the regional level;
4. *noted* that RPPOs can play an important role in supporting and coordinating national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) to implement the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 DAIs, but also *noted* that the way and the extent to which RPPOs can contribute depends on their mandate, background, needs of the region, resources and experience, which differ between RPPOs, and will differ for each one of the DAIs;
5. *requested* that the bureau, assisted by the secretariat, establish focus groups for the DAI on global research coordination and the DAI on diagnostic laboratory networking so that they can start scoping and planning for this work; and
6. *noted* the update on the implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 development agenda items.

12.2 Update on development agenda item “Harmonization of electronic data exchange”

The chairperson of the CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 Development Agenda Items presented a paper on behalf of the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding of the IPPC ePhyto Solution.[[19]](#footnote-20) He reported that, although the CPM bureau and the SPG were both of the opinion that it was worthwhile pursuing the possibility of funding from FAO, there was also an acceptance that this could take some time and so other options for a sustainable funding mechanism needed to be explored. The paper recommended a mechanism that had been selected from a set of options discussed with the SPG. Issues to consider included the scope of the cost to be covered, how those costs would be shared between users, and the mechanism by which users would pay.

Contracting parties shared their views on the various options. For the scope of costs to be covered, a majority of those CPs commenting favoured option (a) (i.e. all costs to be covered), but a few CPs preferred option (b) (i.e. limited costs). For the basis of sharing costs, a majority of CPs favoured option (a) (i.e. allocating on the basis of development status), but a few CPs suggested that alternative methods be developed, including a possible combination of options (a) and (b). For the payment mechanism, some CPs were comfortable with the focus group’s recommendation, some favoured an invoice, and a few suggested that alternatives be explored.

Some CPs voiced concerns about the difficulties that would be experienced by developing countries in meeting the expected contributions, especially if they were early in the process of ePhyto use and so were still needing to invest in the necessary infrastructure. Proceeding with the proposal requiring payment from such CPs may discourage the ones not onboarded to ePhyto from joining.

A suggestion was made that the funding mechanism could be phased in gradually, or at least be reviewed after an initial three years, and that CPs be allowed more time to consider the proposed options.

It was also suggested that the mandate of the focus group be extended for another year.

It was suggested that a contingency financial reserve be built in case the contributions received did not meet the costs.

The Republic of Korea confirmed that it would continue to support the ePhyto Solution by contributing to the Multidonor Trust Fund (MDTF). The United Kingdom reiterated its financial pledge recorded under agenda item 2. The United States of America confirmed that it would be committing USD 150 000 to the ePhyto Solution for 2023.

Regarding efforts to seek funding from FAO, the CPM noted that this related to additional funds, not a reallocation of existing regular-programme funds. A few CPs suggested that all CPs should encourage their permanent FAO representatives to pursue the possibility of additional funding for the ePhyto Solution from FAO.

The CPM to:

1. *noted* that the expected long-term annual cost of the ePhyto Solution is approximately USD 1 263 000 but could be as low as USD 933 000 depending on the scope of costs agreed;
2. *agreed* that, as part of the funding mechanism, the secretariat would provide an annual report for the ePhyto Solution containing the following information:
* activities carried out in the past year,
* activities planned for the coming year,
* costs for the reporting year,
* budget forecast for the coming year,
* total usage by country including sent and received transactions,
* revenue received from all sources, and
* (if the funding mechanism includes an expected contribution from a CP using the ePhyto Solution) the level of contribution expected and whether the contribution has been received into the IPPC Multidonor Trust Fund (MDTF);
1. *agreed* that the funding mechanism should be reviewed two years after it becomes operational and then every five years;
2. *noted* the need for continuing contributions from donors to the MDTF until the funding mechanism is fully implemented;
3. *agreed* that, if voluntary contributions for the ePhyto Solution are received into the MDTF after the funding mechanism is fully implemented, these will be used to contribute to a contingency reserve for the ePhyto Solution or be used to reduce the overall costs to be covered by expected contributions from participating contracting parties;
4. *agreed* that the funding mechanism would not be used to subsidise any IPPC costs outside the scope of the ePhyto Solution;
5. *requested* that, in parallel with establishing a sustainable funding mechanism, FAO member nations, the FAO Director General, and the relevant FAO Committees explore the possibility of additional FAO regular-programme funding to cover the ePhyto Solution costs;
6. *discussed* the scope of costs for the funding model:
* option (a) Scope 1: All Costs, *or*
* option (b) Scope 2: Limited Costs, *or*
* option (c) develop and agree an alternate option for the scope of costs to be included in the sustainable funding mechanism;
1. *discussed* the method to allocate costs to determine expected contributions:
* option (a) Allocation 1: Development status, *or*
* option (b) Allocation 2: Transaction volume, *or*
* option (c) develop and agree an alternate option for how to allocate costs in the funding mechanism;
1. *discussed* the proposed payment mechanism:
* option (a) the proposed payment mechanism (a letter from the secretariat, stating the expected contribution); *or*
* option (b) to develop and agree an alternate option for contracting parties to be informed of their expected contribution and for payments to be made;
1. *agreed* to extend the mandate of the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding of the IPPC ePhyto Solution for a further year;
2. *agreed* that the focus group, secretariat and CPM bureau would work together to develop a detailed final proposal on the system for the funding mechanism, including a detailed overview of the expected financial contributions from individual contracting parties exchanging ePhytos through the Hub, to be adopted by CPM-18 (2024); and

*requested* that contracting parties provide additional information and proposals with urgency for consideration by the focus group.

12.3 Update on development agenda item “Assessment and management of climate change impact on plant health”

The CPM Bureau “champion” for the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues gave an update on the DAI “Assessment and Management of Climate Change Impacts on Plant Health” on behalf of the focus group’s chairperson.[[20]](#footnote-21) This outlined the progress in implementing the 2022–2025 IPPC Action Plan on *Climate Change Impacts on Plant Health*, approved by CPM-16 (2022).

The United Kingdom referred to their financial pledge reported under agenda item 2. Brazil informed the CPM that they were considering hosting a meeting of the focus group in future.

Contracting parties made various suggestions, including having more webinars in FAO languages to raise awareness, improving the climate change web page on the IPP, developing IPPC guides or factsheets, and including a progress report on the agenda of the 2023 SPG.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues;
2. *agreed* to promote the use of IPPC and FAO materials on the impacts of climate change on plant health; and

*encouraged* contracting parties, NPPOs, RPPOs, stakeholders and all those linked with the IPPC community to participate actively in webinars, workshops and activities related to the impacts of climate change on plant health.

13. Updates from other CPM focus groups

13.1 Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid

The Vice-Chairperson of the CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid gave a verbal update on the activities of the group on behalf of the chairperson.[[21]](#footnote-22) The group had met in Fiji in February 2023. They had reviewed materials submitted in response to a call for information, developed the principles that a standard could contain, revised the draft specification for a standard that had been submitted during the 2021 call for topics, and analysed the feasibility of developing and implementing such a standard. The focus group considered that revising the CPM recommendation on *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation* (R-09) would not address the needs of CPs. Moreover, the focus group had stressed that there was also a need to address the gaps in which the current adopted ISPMs do not cover this topic. Several potential links were sought that may help to support efforts to address this topic (e.g. links with IPPC work on contaminating pests and sea containers, climate change and plant health, and on diagnostic laboratory networking). The focus group had given some thought to an emergency pathway and had acknowledged the need to work more closely with other relevant organizations, noting the need to strengthen engagement with customs and trade-facilitation actors. The vice-chairperson confirmed that the focus group will report to SPG in 2023 and provide recommendations to CPM-18 (2024).

The CPM noted the absence of participation by the World Food Programme in the focus group, hoped that the secretariat would continue to pursue this, and encouraged CPs to also use their contacts to this end. The CPM also noted the need to consider all possibilities of cooperation with other potential donors and that awareness raising is necessary. Suggestions for technical and scientific studies to be carried out and to expand the focus group were made.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the update of the CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid.

13.2 Sea containers

This item was considered under agenda item 11.

13.3 Communications Strategy

On behalf of the focus group chairperson, a member of the CPM Focus Group on Communications presented an update on the activities of the group.[[22]](#footnote-23) The group had fulfilled its core mandate in developing the IPPC Communications Strategy 2023–2030, which was presented to the CPM for adoption.

Suggestions made by CPs included making the IPP more user-friendly, simplifying messages and using digital channels to capture the attention of the younger generation, and CPs identifying “national champions” for communication. Some CPs also advocated joint communication initiatives with the CBD Secretariat that would allow IPPC’s messages to reach a wider audience. Some CPs also suggested that a focus group be established to facilitate implementation of the strategy.

The secretariat was asked to ensure that the reports from meetings and events are posted on the IPP in a timely manner.

The member of the focus group presenting the agenda item agreed to incorporate some drafting amendments to the strategy as proposed in CPM 2023/CRP/03.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the report of the CPM Focus Group on Communications;

*acknowledged* the contribution of the focus group and *thanked* the focus group members for their work;

*adopted* the IPPC Communications Strategy 2023–2030 as presented in CPM 2023/18\_01 subject to the minor drafting amendments raised at this meeting.

14. Implementation issues

14.1 IPPC guides and training materials

The secretariat presented an update on the development of IPPC guides and training materials.[[23]](#footnote-24) This highlighted the key activities from 2022, including progress with guides, e-learning courses, translations and promotional activities, and outlined the guides and material currently under development.

Some CPs expressed appreciation for the IPPC guides and materials, with a suggestion also made that new digital technologies continue to be explored to deliver materials. The CPM noted the need for continued development of guides and training materials to help CPs build capacity, especially in developing countries.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the activities of the secretariat in developing high-quality guides and training materials;
2. *noted* the efforts of the secretariat to promote and translate the guides and training materials; and

*recognized* the need to further enhance the implementation of IPPC guides and training materials that are published under the auspices of the secretariat and the oversight of the IC.

14.2 Projects managed by the IPPC Secretariat

The secretariat presented a paper on the ten projects managed by the secretariat’s Implementation and Facilitation Unit in 2022.[[24]](#footnote-25)

Some CPs recognized that the projects managed by the secretariat are presented in a transparent way and in compliance with the secretariat and IC procedures.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the deliverables of projects managed by the secretariat as well as their compliance with secretariat and IC procedures and the increased transparency as presented in Appendix 1 of CPM 2023/20.

14.3 IPPC Observatory

The secretariat presented a short video on the IPPC Observatory, formerly known as the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS), explaining how CPs can contribute to and benefit from it. The secretariat then presented an update on the activities of the IPPC Observatory.[[25]](#footnote-26) The secretariat acknowledged the funding provided by the European Commission over three successive three-year cycle projects up until May 2022, but noted that, since the end of that funding, a large part of the IPPC Observatory workplan for 2023 remained unfunded, despite contributions from Canada and the Republic of Korea.

The European Union informed the CPM that the European Commission are seriously considering continuing their financial support for the IPPC Observatory and are already in discussion with the secretariat about this.

The CPM noted a suggestion that CPs share work they are doing on e-commerce so that the wider IPPC community may benefit from their experience.

1. The CPM:
2. *noted* the update on the IPPC Observatory and the achievements delivered though the European Commission IRSS third cycle project;
3. *thanked* theEuropean Union for its financial support of IRSS activities during the last decade;
4. *thanked* the Republic of Korea for its financial contribution for the operationalization of the IPPC Observatory;
5. *thanked* Canada for its allocation of funds to conduct IPPC Observatory studies; and

*encouraged* other contracting parties and institutions to fund the operationalization of the IPPC Observatory.

14.4 Update on ePhyto activities

The secretariat presented a paper giving an update on ePhyto activities,[[26]](#footnote-27) first thanking CPs and other donors for their financial support and all those CPs who use the IPPC ePhyto Solution. The secretariat congratulated those CPs who have recently onboarded to the GeNS, with 122 countries now using the system, and indicated the level of financial savings that CPs may make by exchanging ePhytos. The secretariat informed the CP that further webinars on ePhyto are planned, with plans also for an ePhyto symposium in autumn 2023 and some regional symposia organized by RPPOs. The secretariat encouraged CPs to contact the secretariat if they are interested in using ePhyto.

Contracting parties shared their experiences of using ePhyto, including both the benefits and the challenges. The latter included the existence of different electronic “windows” for trade, different countries using different formats for phytosanitary certificates (paper and ePhyto), technical difficulties, and the need for infrastructure (including electricity and internet access at borders). The CPM noted that, when implementing, the specificities on the ground in various countries need to be considered. One CP sought clarification on how the ePhyto Solution worked in the context of imports, as ISPMs do not specify that consignments need to carry an identification number.

Some CPs who had received financial support to onboard the ePhyto Solution expressed appreciation to donors. The CPM noted, however, a call for continued support from donors, including financial support to help build capacity in developing countries.

The CPM noted the plans for two regional workshops – one in central Asia (hosted by Uzbekistan) and the other in Latin America and the Caribbean (hosted by Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur).

The CPM noted that simplifying and streamlining trade mechanisms is part of the obligations of WTO members. The ePhyto Solution supports trade facilitation under both the Sanitary and Phytosanitary and Trade Facilitation Agreements and is the leader among the “Three Sisters” in helping countries meet their commitment.

The secretariat responded to the various comments, explaining that single windows for countries are feasible and that the secretariat would do what it could to help countries secure financial and technical support.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the successful implementation of the IPPC ePhyto Solution thus far; and

*encouraged* and *agreed to support* contracting parties that have not yet registered to the system to do so.

15. Other emerging topics

15.1 One Health

The secretariat presented a paper on issues related to “One Health” and antimicrobial resistance (AMR).[[27]](#footnote-28) This included global developments (including the activities of the quadripartite partnership and the One Health High Level Expert Panel), developments within FAO, the scope of the plant-health component of One Health, the role of the IPPC Secretariat in One Health activities, and the need to better understand the risks associated with AMR in the phytosanitary context. The secretariat read out the definition of “One Health” agreed by the One Health High Level Expert Panel, also recalling that the SPG had noted that the concept of plant health in the IPPC context is narrower than in One Health.

The CPM noted that the role of the IPPC secretariat was not visible in One Health materials, despite an agreement by the United Nations that plant health would be included within the One Health concept, and that plant-health issues feature in few One Health action plans adopted by individual countries.

The CPM noted that, in many countries, One Health may be the responsibility of the Ministry of Health, but those ministries may not consider plant-health issues for inclusion and so it may be difficult for NPPOs to access the One Health programme.

Recognizing the lack of clarity about what is meant by “microbial” in AMR in a phytosanitary context, the CPM considered whether resistance to fungicides, insecticides and other pesticides should be specifically mentioned in the scope of the proposed study on AMR risks, or whether it was sufficient to refer simply to “antimicrobials”. To ensure that the study was focused and specific, the CPM agreed to refer to fungicides and not insecticides and other pesticides, but acknowledged that the scope of AMR considerations in a phytosanitary context may need expanding in future.

The CPM noted a suggestion that the Technical Panel for the Glossary be asked to consider developing a definition of “antimicrobial”, also noting that the World Health Organization had developed such a definition.

The secretariat suggested that, to properly focus the proposed study on AMR, a survey could be conducted via the IPPC Observatory to gather information on the products used in countries, on which crops, for what pests, and the approximate value of those products.

Some CPs acknowledged the resource constraints for the secretariat but encouraged the secretariat to maximize the possibility of involvement in the FAO One Health discussions. They also encouraged CPs to respond to the call from the European Food and Safety Authority /Université catholique de Louvain project PLANTIBIO for data.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the latest global developments on One Health, in particular the new definition of One Health, the new quadripartite arrangement between FAO, World Health Organization, WOAH and the UN Environment Programme, and the establishment of the One Health High Level Expert Panel;
2. *noted* that the quadripartite partnership is expected to approach the IPPC Secretariat for further involvement on One Health;
3. *requested* that the secretariat and the IC consider how best to undertake a study to better understand the nature and scope of the risks associated with AMR in the phytosanitary context, including resistance to fungicides;
4. *agreed* thata survey on the use of antimicrobials should be conducted by the secretariat utilizing the IPPC Observatory;
5. *requested* that the secretariat represent the CPM at the FAO One Health meetings, share information about ongoing relevant IPPC initiatives at those meetings, and keep the CPM Bureau informed on developments in this space that may impact the CPM or require CPM awareness or action; and
6. *encouraged* contracting parties to note the call from the European Food and Safety Authority /Université catholique de Louvain project PLANTIBIO for the collection and exchange of data on antimicrobial resistance in plant pathogenic bacteria.

15.2 Dispute settlement

The CPM Bureau Vice-Chairperson presented proposals on the institutionalization of the IPPC Dispute Settlement Procedures adopted by CPM-16 (2022) and a simplified, diagrammatic presentation of the procedures.[[28]](#footnote-29)

Some CPs expressed support for the proposal, as it would be instrumental in dealing with disputes in a timely and effective manner.

The CPM:

1. *approved* the role of the IPPC secretary as primary intake point for IPPC dispute submission;
2. *approved* the establishment of a non-permanent sub-body of the CPM Bureau to function as the Dispute Settlement Oversight Body under CPM Bureau oversight;
3. *agreed* the simplified diagram of the IPPC Dispute Settlement Procedures presented as Appendix 1 of CPM 2023/24; and
4. *requested* that the CPM Bureau develop,with thesupport of the FAO Legal Office, the terms of reference for the Dispute Settlement Oversight Body.

15.3 Partnership framework

The secretariat presented a paper on a proposed IPPC Partnership Framework.[[29]](#footnote-30) The paper, which outlined an approach to establishing partnerships to support the IPPC workplan, described two categories of relationships: “cooperation” and “partnership”. The CPM was invited to discussthe paper, particularly providing strategic guidance on the role of a partner and the principles of engagement.

Some CPs expressed concern over possible consequences on the resources of the secretariat and hence advised the secretariat to be careful in considering which partners do, and which do not, merit a development of a partnership agreement. They also suggested some drafting changes to the text of the framework,[[30]](#footnote-31) which were accepted by the CPM.

Acknowledging that collaboration between NPPOs is also important, the secretariat highlighted the contribution that national reporting obligations make in improving communication between NPPOs.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the paper on the IPPC Partnership Framework; and

*adopted* the IPPC Partnership Framework as presented in CPM 23/25 subject to the modifications agreed at this meeting.

15.4 Observer policy

1. The CPM Bureau member for Europe referred the CPM to a proposed policy statement on the operation of Friends of the Chair meetings at CPM sessions, the aim of the statement being to codify the current practice.[[31]](#footnote-32)
2. The CPM:
3. *approved* the policy statement on the operation of Friends of the Chair meetings at CPM sessions (as presented in CPM 2023/26).

15.5 Fusarium *oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* Tropical Race 4

The secretariat introduced this agenda item on *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* TR4, which had been included when adopting the agenda. The secretariat outlined the work done by the IPPC Secretariat, FAO, the World Banana Forum, and the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture on TR4 and proposed some steps that could be taken to improve coordination and mobilize resources. These included the possibility of organizing regional workshops on TR4 (perhaps as an extension of the IPPC regional workshops), further simulation exercises, and engaging stakeholders, particularly in the banana industry, to provide resources to support TR4 initiatives.

One RPPO presented some suggestions about actions that could be taken, on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean group (GRULAC).[[32]](#footnote-33) These included the coordination of TR4 activities at a global level by the secretariat, in liaison with international organizations; carrying out a communication and advocacy campaign in banana- and plantain-producing countries (including a possible ministerial conference); undertaking emergency simulations; promoting the creation of an international centre for the improvement of bananas and plantains; and strengthening capacities of countries in detection and diagnostics, surveillance and monitoring, containment of outbreaks, biosafety measures, managing and restoring soil health, training and dissemination of materials about the prevention or containment of TR4, research (including the development of varieties of banana resistant to TR4), survival and sustainability strategies for affected producers, rapid response teams to respond to outbreaks, and studies and projects.

Some CPs expressed their support for the suggestions put forward by GRULAC, noting also the need for coordinated global action. The CPM noted that TR4 affects not only livelihoods but also food security, as in some countries bananas are a staple food. Some CPs also shared the actions that they are taking to prevent or suppress TR4 and stop its spread. The potential future use of tissue culture to provide TR4-clean, propagative material was suggested as an option to explore, as well as the development of TR4-resistant varieties.

Ecuador invited the IPPC Secretary to the ministerial conference on TR4 planned for their region.

The CPM:

1. *requested* that the secretariat coordinate global action on TR4, using the proposals presented in CPM 2023/CRP/08 as an initial framework.
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