



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



International  
Plant Protection  
Convention

# **REPORT**

## **Bureau of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures**

**Rome, Italy**

**13-16 June 2023**

**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, 2023



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](http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules) and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

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

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

## Contents

1.	Opening of the meeting .....	5
2.	Meeting arrangements .....	5
2.1	Election of the rapporteur.....	5
2.2	Adoption of the agenda .....	5
3.	Administrative matters .....	5
3.1	Document list .....	5
3.2	Participant list.....	5
3.3	Local information.....	5
4.	IPPC Secretariat updates.....	5
4.1	Update from the IPPC secretary .....	5
4.2	Update from the Standard Setting Unit and the Standards Committee .....	6
4.3	Update from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit and the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee .....	7
4.4	Update from the Financial Committee .....	8
4.5	Update on sea containers.....	8
5.	CPM organizational issues .....	9
5.1	Discussion on future status of Credentials Committee .....	9
5.2	Policy on how to record number of contracting-party interventions at CPMs.....	10
5.3	Review of situation regarding intersessional decisions on behalf of the CPM that was introduced during the COVID-19 pandemic .....	11
5.4	Discussion on whether the number of focus groups established by the CPM should be limited .....	11
5.5	Feedback on CPM-17 (2023) .....	11
6.	Process by which countries become contracting parties to the convention .....	12
7.	FAO advice on the legal status of the IPPC and ISPMs .....	13
8.	FAO legal advice on CPM recommendations, guides and training materials .....	14
9.	IPPC Secretariat workforce planning .....	15
10.	Strategic Framework Development Agenda Items .....	15
10.1	Terms of reference for the Focus Group on Global Research Coordination.....	15
10.2	Terms of reference for the Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking .....	15
10.3	Update on the Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid.....	16
10.4	Update on the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System .....	17
10.5	Update on development of guidance on the use of third-party entities.....	17
10.6	Update on assessment and management of climate-change impacts on plant health .....	17
10.7	Management of e-commerce and postal and courier pathways.....	17
10.8	Commodity- and pathway-specific ISPMs .....	18
11.	Update on the African Phytosanitary Programme .....	18
12.	Update on IPPC communications.....	19

12.1	Update on communication strategy and the International Phytosanitary Portal .....	19
12.2	Observations and recommendations on communications relating to the International Day of Plant Health .....	19
13.	Discussion on terms of reference for the bureau Dispute Settlement Oversight Body .....	20
14.	Discussion on ePhyto funding .....	22
14.1	Discussion on funding streams in support of ePhyto .....	22
14.2	Confirmation of membership of the Focus Group on Sustainable Funding of the ePhyto Solution after extension of its mandate for a year .....	23
15.	Discussion on One Health and antimicrobial resistance (outcome of survey by the IPPC Observatory) .....	24
16.	Discussion on <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> Tropical Race 4 .....	25
17.	Bureau representative in the IC IPPC Observatory Subgroup .....	26
18.	Any other business .....	26
18.1	Bureau reports .....	26
18.2	IPPC regional workshops .....	26
18.3	Agenda items for the next bureau meeting, the SPG and CPM-18 (2024) .....	26
18.4	Call for topics .....	27
19.	Next meeting .....	27
20.	Adoption of the decisions and closing of the meeting .....	27

## Appendices

Appendix 1: Agenda .....	28
Appendix 2: List of documents .....	30
Appendix 3: List of participants .....	31
Appendix 4: Roles, responsibilities and tasks assigned to CPM Bureau members .....	33
Appendix 5: Agenda items for forthcoming meetings .....	35

## **BUREAU OF THE COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

**Rome, Italy**

**13–16 June 2023**

### **1. Opening of the meeting**

- [1] The Chairperson of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), Greg WOLFF, and the IPPC Secretary, Osama EL-LISSY, welcomed all participants to the meeting, which was being held in person.
- [2] The CPM chairperson informed the CPM Bureau (hereafter referred to as “the bureau”) that, since becoming chairperson, he had withdrawn from various international positions to ensure his impartiality as chairperson. He commented that his focus as CPM chairperson would be the implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030.

### **2. Meeting arrangements**

#### **2.1 Election of the rapporteur**

- [3] The bureau elected Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH (Southwest Pacific) as rapporteur. For future meetings, they agreed that the bureau members, excluding the chairperson, would take it in turns to act as rapporteur.
- [4] The bureau:
- (1) *requested* that the secretariat prepare a document explaining the role of the rapporteur for guidance in all governance meetings, for potential inclusion in the IPPC procedure manual.

#### **2.2 Adoption of the agenda**

- [5] The bureau adopted the agenda, modified to broaden the scope of some agenda items, and confirmed matters to be discussed under agenda item 18 (Any other business). The revised agenda is attached to this report as Appendix 1.

### **3. Administrative matters**

#### **3.1 Document list**

- [6] The list of documents had been circulated and is attached to this report as Appendix 2.

#### **3.2 Participant list**

- [7] The list of participants is attached to this report as Appendix 3.

#### **3.3 Local information**

- [8] A document providing local information had been shared with bureau members.<sup>1</sup>

### **4. IPPC Secretariat updates**

#### **4.1 Update from the IPPC secretary**

- [9] The IPPC secretary provided an overview of the core work of the secretariat, including work in support of standard setting, implementation of standards, governance and communication, and ePhyto, as well

---

<sup>1</sup> Local information for meeting participants: Rome, Italy: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1034>

as internal management initiatives designed to optimize the performance of the secretariat. He referred to the more detailed updates to be covered later in this agenda item.

- [10] The IPPC secretary clarified that the secretariat's role in the proposed Global Trade Support Team would only be to direct countries to relevant ISPMs, not to act as arbitrators or facilitators between countries in market-access negotiations. He confirmed that the service would comprise both a proactive element, delivered through a programme of training and workshops, and a responsive element, responding to individual requests, but the concept was only in the initial stages of development and documentation to explain the service provision would be developed.

## 4.2 Update from the Standard Setting Unit and the Standards Committee

- [11] The secretariat presented an update from the Standard Setting Unit and the Standards Committee (SC).<sup>2</sup>
- [12] The bureau discussed the following issues.
- [13] **Systems approaches.** The secretariat explained that the SC had agreed that the draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) was not ready to be submitted for first consultation. The SC had agreed that a small working group of SC members would develop a paper for the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) on how a common understanding may be achieved within the IPPC community about what systems approaches are and how they are developed, as this would facilitate development of the draft annex.
- [14] The bureau considered the relative merits of discussing systems approaches at the SPG. They acknowledged that it may be helpful for contracting parties to share their experiences of implementing systems approaches, but also recognized that the intention was not to reopen ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*) for revision. The bureau concluded, therefore, that it may be better to address the problems with the draft annex through the bureau rather than the SPG.
- [15] The secretariat confirmed that implementation guidance to help countries build a systems approach was available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) in the form of the Beyond Compliance tools.
- [16] **Draft definition for “emerging pest”.** The secretariat explained that one of the issues considered by the SC had been a draft definition for the term “emerging pest” (2018-003), for which work had resumed following a request by the CPM. The Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) had developed a draft definition for consideration by the SC, but the SC had concluded that the definition was not ready to be submitted for consultation. Instead, the SC had recommended that the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS) Steering Group continue the work of the POARS Focus Group in developing criteria for what constitutes an emerging pest and had invited the bureau to advise on the next steps.
- [17] The bureau noted that it was a complicated definition that could be difficult to understand. Bureau members commented that the meaning of the term “pest-intrinsic factors” was not clear; the verb “assessed” may be better than “deemed”; it may be better to refer to a pest being a “potential quarantine pest” rather than having the “characteristics of a quarantine pest”; and there were other ways of expressing the concept of a “pandemic level” that would be more suitable to a definition in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*). With regards to concepts, one bureau member noted that some pests that are referred to as emerging pests (e.g. *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* Tropical Race 4 (TR4)) are of global concern but have been present for some time and so are no longer truly “emerging”. Another bureau member suggested that an emerging pest was an incipient pest and that the main concepts to capture were those of rapid spread and high economic impact, rather than the introduction of a pest: an emerging pest was one for which there was a risk of a regional explosion in its distribution with high economic impact.

---

<sup>2</sup> 13\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun; 14\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun\_rev1.

- [18] Later in the meeting (agenda item 10.4), the bureau agreed that there was no need for an adopted definition of “emerging pest” and that a simple working definition, developed by the POARS Steering Group, would suffice.
- [19] The bureau:
- (2) *noted* the update from the Standard Setting Unit and SC and its planned activities in 2023;
  - (3) *recommended* that the paper being prepared by the SC on systems approaches be submitted to the October 2023 meeting of the bureau;
  - (4) *requested* that the secretariat circulate the link to the Beyond Compliance tool to all bureau members;
  - (5) *noted* the concerns and difficulties with the development of a definition for “emerging pest”, *invited* the POARS Steering Group to develop a working definition for what constitutes an emerging pest for POARS purposes, and *recommended* that the SC remove the subject “emerging pest” (2018-003) from the work programme of the TPG;
  - (6) *noted* that there will be an additional consultation period for DPs only in January 2024;
  - (7) *noted* the revision to Specification TP 1 (*Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols*);
  - (8) *noted* the proposal for a commodity standards database;
  - (9) *noted* that a footnote to adopted commodity standards will be added as an ink amendment following the usual standard setting process when there is evidence that a phytosanitary measure may no longer be effective or when there is a taxonomic change concerning a pest; and
  - (10) *noted* that contracting parties are encouraged to use the template form developed by the TPCS when proposing a commodity standard in a call for topics.

### 4.3 Update from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit and the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee

- [20] The secretariat presented an update on the activities of the Implementation and Facilitation Unit and the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC).
- [21] The bureau discussed the following issues.
- [22] **Phytosanitary capacity evaluations (PCEs).** The bureau noted that problems can arise if correspondence is sent to a government ministry other than the national plant protection organization (NPPO), as that ministry may neither respond or forward it to the NPPO. The secretariat confirmed that, depending on the funding stream, such correspondence may be sent by another FAO department, but agreed to explore whether the official IPPC contact point could be copied into correspondence to ensure that the NPPO was kept informed.

The secretariat confirmed that the forthcoming desk-top study on the PCE tool would evaluate its use and make recommendations on how to improve it, as defined by the terms of reference agreed by the IC.

- [23] **IPPC training courses.** The secretariat confirmed that the courses were provided on the FAO elearning Academy platform. An announcement was made each time an e-learning course was launched and a webinar to promote the courses was also planned for later in 2023. One bureau member suggested that all announcements on e-learning be sent to official IPPC contact points, who could then disseminate within their respective NPPOs.
- [24] **Guides and training materials.** The secretariat confirmed that communication activities promoting IPPC guides and training materials increase the take-up of materials. The forthcoming revamp of the IPP would also hopefully help NPPOs access materials more easily. Suggestions made by bureau members to further enhance the uptake of IPPC guides and training materials included the following: giving practical examples on how countries have used a particular guide; giving links to relevant guides and training materials on the List of adopted standards page of the IPP; and regional plant protection

organizations (RPPOs) sharing, via the RPPOs' representative on the IC, how countries in their region have used the guides.

[25] **Interpretation at IC meetings.** The bureau noted that the IC had again called for interpretation at IC meetings. The secretariat recalled that the original decision not to have interpretation had been because of financial constraints.

[26] The bureau:

- (11) *noted* the update from the Implementation and Facilitation Unit and the IC; and
- (12) *requested* that the secretariat ask FAO for correspondence to ministers regarding PCEs to be copied to the relevant official IPPC contact point.

#### 4.4 Update from the Financial Committee

[27] The secretariat presented an update from the Financial Committee, summarizing the financial resources available to the secretariat annually and the corresponding expenditure.<sup>3</sup> The secretariat confirmed that the finances were in good standing.

[28] The secretariat confirmed that regular-programme funding was allocated on a bi-annual basis and was not adjusted for inflation. The higher than usual inflation in the last year had not, however, had an effect on the budget to date.

[29] The bureau:

- (13) *noted* the update from the Financial Committee.

#### 4.5 Update on sea containers

[30] The secretariat presented an update on preparations for the 2023 *International workshop on pest risk mitigation of sea containers and their cargoes and the facilitation of international trade – Defining the way forward*,<sup>4</sup> which was scheduled to be held from 17 to 19 July 2023 in Brisbane, Australia.

[31] The CPM chairperson added that the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers had proposed that they act as a channel through which feedback from workshop participants, which would include stakeholders, could be gathered on the draft revision of the CPM recommendation on *Sea containers* (R-06). Such comments would supplement the comments submitted during consultation. He also explained that CPM-18 (2024) would not only need to consider the revised CPM recommendation for adoption but also whether more substantial guidance was needed.

[32] The bureau discussed the following issues.

[33] **Comments on draft CPM recommendation.** The bureau was cautious about setting a precedent of opening up additional channels for comments during consultation periods but agreed that it would be reasonable to gather comments on the draft CPM recommendation from workshop participants as part of the general feedback survey on the workshop.

[34] **Regional representation.** Noting that the participation at the workshop by some regions may be low because of difficulties obtaining travel authorization for such a short meeting, the bureau suggested that a breakdown of participants by region be provided after the workshop. The secretariat explained that the workshop could not be held in hybrid mode but would be streamed.

[35] **Role of industry.** The CPM chairperson explained that industry involvement in the IPPC sea containers' work in recent years had been critical to achieving progress but the final decisions always rested with the CPM, which consisted of NPPOs. The CPM chairperson also emphasized that, for implementation to be successful, negative impacts on trade needed to be minimized.

---

<sup>3</sup> 17\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun.

<sup>4</sup> 07\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun.



[36] **Animal health.** The CPM chairperson suggested that, once the revised CPM recommendation is adopted, the secretariat could inform the World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH) and suggest that WOAH bear the CPM recommendation in mind when developing any future guidance on sea containers, to avoid conflict between phytosanitary and animal-health guidance.

[37] The bureau:

(14) *noted* the update on sea containers; and

(15) *agreed* that the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers could capture comments on the draft revision of the CPM recommendation on *Sea containers* (R-06) from participants at the 2023 *International workshop on pest risk mitigation of sea containers and their cargoes and the facilitation of international trade – Defining the way forward* as part of the general feedback survey on the workshop.

## 5. CPM organizational issues

### 5.1 Discussion on future status of Credentials Committee

[38] A representative from the FAO Legal Office joined the meeting for this agenda item. The secretariat thanked the representative for the time and effort spent in conducting the background research necessary to advise on this and other agenda items.

[39] **Necessity for a Credentials Committee.** The legal representative referred the bureau to the rules of procedure of the CPM, Rule 1.2 of which specified that, before the opening of each CPM session, each contracting party shall communicate to the FAO Director-General the names of all the persons appointed by that contracting party to represent it during the session. She clarified that neither the rules of procedure nor the convention itself specified that there had to be a Credentials Committee, but there was an obligation (from the rules of procedure) to check the credentials. She explained that it was FAO practice, in interpreting the General Rules of the Organization (Rule III) applicable to the FAO Conference, for a Credentials Committee to review the credentials, because it would not be practicable for the Director-General to do this. The CPM could amend the rules of procedure to remove Rule 1.2, but she advised that the CPM should first consider the consequences of doing that, as one of the functions of the CPM is to approve standards that will be applicable in international trade. Moreover, most of the work on credentials was done by the secretariat in advance of the CPM session and so there was relatively little for the Credentials Committee to do.

[40] The legal representative confirmed that it was not obligatory for the Credentials Committee to include a bureau member: this had not been foreseen by the rules of procedure. She explained that the rules for the FAO Conference stipulated that the Credentials Committee is composed of nine member nations, and so the CPM had applied this model by having seven regional representatives and one bureau representative.

[41] The legal representative confirmed that the bureau's functions did not include the functions of the Credentials Committee, but the CPM could decide, if it wished, to either elect the bureau members as the Credentials Committee or to delegate the role to the secretariat. However, it would need to do this at the start of each CPM session.

[42] Some bureau members expressed concern over the weight of responsibility carried by the members of the Credentials Committee, given that they may not be able to determine whether credentials were signed by the person authorized to do so. The legal representative reassured the bureau that the committee was only expected to check that the position of the signatory satisfied the required criteria and that there were no indications that the credentials may be other than the original copy. The secretariat commented that the revision of the IPPC manual on preparing for CPM sessions should help reduce the number of invalid credentials, as more delegates would be aware of the requirements.

[43] **Format of credentials.** The legal representative confirmed that the FAO rules, which were derived from United Nations rules and could not be changed independently, allowed for an electronic copy provided

that the original copy was submitted subsequently. She explained, however, that where a country's laws prohibited the credentials being printed, FAO had printed a copy from the electronic version.

[44] **Next steps.** The bureau thanked the legal representative for clarifying the legal position and noted that there was no need for an urgent decision and that bureau members may wish to discuss the matter further within their respective regions.

[45] The bureau:

(16) *agreed* to discuss the need for a Credentials Committee further at their meeting in October.

## 5.2 Policy on how to record number of contracting-party interventions at CPMs

[46] The bureau recalled the intervention made during the adoption of the CPM-17 (2023) report, questioning the policy of using “a few” to denote two to four interventions in CPM reports and “some” to denote more than four interventions, as this encouraged unnecessary repetition of interventions and also did not distinguish between interventions made by one contracting party and those made by a contracting party on behalf of a region.

[47] The bureau member for Europe explained that interventions from the European Union were considered as coming from all the member states of the European Union (i.e. *some* contracting parties) because there was a treaty that gave the European Union competence to speak on behalf of its member states. This distinguished such interventions from interventions made by contracting parties on behalf of regions or interventions from RPPOs (including the RPPO for Europe).

[48] The bureau noted the value of being able to somehow express the scale of interventions, but also recognized the concerns expressed at CPM-17 (2023). They noted that the number of participants called to speak was at the discretion of the CPM chairperson, so the chairperson could minimize unnecessary repetition, but it was also important not to have strict rules about limiting the number of interventions.

[49] The CPM chairperson suggested that the policy on how interventions are reported could be explained to participants during the NPPO orientation session.

[50] The secretariat referred the bureau to the report of the bureau meeting at which the decision to use “few” and “some” had been made.<sup>5</sup> At that meeting, the bureau had also noted that “when decisions are made by consensus, standardized terms to describe numbers of member interventions should not be necessary”. The secretariat explained that the general writing style for the CPM report was to avoid reporting the number of interventions where possible and only to record single interventions if absolutely critical to the understanding of the context. The secretariat also emphasized that any “rule” on how to record interventions needed to be simple.

[51] The bureau noted that the current policy of using “a few” and “some” had been in place for several years and had not caused a problem until CPM-17 (2023). Given this, and the need to be consistent from year to year, the bureau therefore agreed that it was better to continue with the current policy for CPM-18 (2024) and review it afterwards.

[52] The bureau:

(17) *agreed* to continue with the current policy of using “a few” and “some” to record the number of interventions in CPM reports;

(18) *requested* that the secretariat explore how other organizations record the number of interventions at meetings of governing bodies; and

(19) *agreed* to review the policy after CPM-18 (2024).

---

<sup>5</sup> CPM Bureau 2009-06, agenda item 7.

### 5.3 Review of situation regarding intersessional decisions on behalf of the CPM that was introduced during the COVID-19 pandemic

[53] The bureau considered whether the arrangements that had been agreed by the CPM for intersessional decisions during the COVID-19 pandemic, which allowed decisions to be made by the bureau on behalf of the CPM using a four-week silent consent procedure, were still needed or could be withdrawn.<sup>6</sup>

[54] The bureau recognized that the procedure for intersessional decisions may be needed again in emergency situations and that, in such a situation, it may not be possible for the CPM to meet virtually to decide to reactivate the policy. The bureau therefore agreed that it was better to suspend the policy rather than withdrawing it.

[55] The bureau:

(20) *agreed* to suspend use of the arrangements for intersessional decisions by the bureau on behalf of the CPM that had been introduced during the COVID-19 pandemic.

### 5.4 Discussion on whether the number of focus groups established by the CPM should be limited

[56] The bureau discussed whether there was a need to limit the number of CPM focus groups, given the resources required in terms of the secretariat's time and the time of bureau members.

[57] The secretariat pointed out that, if focus groups were limited only to the Strategic Framework development agenda items (DAIs), no further focus groups would need to be established. The bureau noted that situations could arise in future where a focus group was needed on some other issue, but these could be decided on a case-by-case basis and there was no need for a detailed process.

[58] The bureau noted that although some of the focus groups did already have a defined duration in their terms of reference, this was not always the case.

[59] The bureau:

(21) *agreed* that there was no need to limit the number of CPM focus groups and that decisions about establishing new focus groups should be made on a case-by-case basis; and

(22) *agreed* that the terms of reference of any new focus group should give clear deliverables, and the mandate of the focus group should end once these have been delivered unless agreed otherwise by the CPM.

### 5.5 Feedback on CPM-17 (2023)

[60] The bureau members shared feedback from their regions on CPM-17 (2023).

[61] The feedback had generally been positive. Specific suggestions had been to do the following:

- structure the agenda more around the DAIs;
- move the agenda item on technical cooperation among RPPOs up the agenda to a more prominent position (e.g. after the reports from CPM subsidiary bodies) and make it longer;
- allocate the seats for the RPPO representatives so that they are all sitting together;
- use a different plenary room, as the Green Room was uncomfortable;
- hold a side session for presentations from observers if there is insufficient time to include such presentations in the plenary sessions;
- include interactive side sessions on topical issues such as TR4 to allow participants to share information and discuss opportunities for collaboration; and
- hold the evening cocktail event off-site, as this would be more enjoyable.

---

<sup>6</sup> CPM-15 (2021), agenda item 19; CPM-16 (2022), agenda item 8.2.

[62] The secretariat noted the need to balance the desire for side sessions with the need for delegates to have bilateral meetings.

[63] **Interpretation and side sessions.** The secretariat recognized that, to be effective, side sessions needed interpretation, but explained that this was costly and needed to be requested well in advance. The high costs may mean that there are fewer side sessions. The bureau discussed how to prioritize which side sessions were funded.

[64] **Dates for CPM, SPG and bureau meetings.** The secretariat informed the bureau of the following dates:

CPM bureau	9 October and morning of 10 October 2023
SPG	10 October (afternoon) to 13 October 2023
CPM bureau	10 to 12 April 2024
CPM-18 (2024)	15 to 19 April 2024
CPM bureau	either 24 to 28 June or 3 to 7 June 2024 (tentative)
SPG	8 October (afternoon) to 11 October 2024

[65] The CPM chairperson suggested that, for the April 2024 bureau meeting, the executive session be held on the first morning. For the June 2024 meeting, some bureau members expressed a preference for the earlier of the two dates offered.

[66] The bureau:

(23) *noted* the feedback on CPM-17 (2023);

(24) *agreed* to reinstate the agenda item on “Successes and challenges in implementing the IPPC” in the agenda for CPM-18 (2024); and

(25) *agreed* that, subject to sufficient funds being available, interpretation should be provided for the NPPO orientation session and for IPPC-sanctioned side sessions at CPM sessions, but not for side sessions requested by third parties.

## 6. Process by which countries become contracting parties to the convention

[67] The representative from the FAO Legal Office was in attendance for this agenda item.

[68] The bureau considered a paper summarizing the process by which a country becomes a contracting party to the International Plant Protection Convention,<sup>7</sup> which had been prompted by a question about whether any checks of competence were made to ensure that a country had the capacity to comply with the convention.

[69] The legal representative explained that a country wishing to become a contracting party to the convention submits an “instrument of adherence” to the Director-General of FAO; the FAO Legal Office then reviews it from a legal perspective and, if it complies with the requirements for such instruments, the request is then forwarded to the United Nations for registration. No checks of competence are carried out. The legal representative pointed out that, as an international treaty, the convention was open to all states recognized by the United Nations, but that a country would not be subject to its obligations until the instrument of adherence had been registered. There could, therefore, be no checks of competence at the point of submitting a request.

[70] The legal representative explained that the rules about who has the authority to ratify a new international treaty, or to sign an instrument of adherence to an existing treaty, would be within the legislation of the country concerned. She confirmed that the situations where a request is not accepted include those where the instrument of adherence does not comply with the requirements or where the country is not recognized by the United Nations General Assembly.

---

<sup>7</sup> 04\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun.

- [71] The bureau:  
(26) *noted* the procedure for ratification and adherence to the convention (IPPC).

## 7. FAO advice on the legal status of the IPPC and ISPMs

- [72] Further to the request by CPM-17 (2023) that the secretariat consult the FAO Legal Office regarding the legal status of ISPMs,<sup>8</sup> the representative from the FAO Legal Office was in attendance for this agenda item.
- [73] **The status of the IPPC.** The legal representative confirmed that, as an international treaty, countries that either ratified the IPPC when it was first adopted or subsequently adhered to it were legally bound to comply with it.
- [74] **The status of ISPMs.** The legal representative referred to Article X.4 of the IPPC, the English text of which said that “contracting parties should take into account, as appropriate, international standards when undertaking activities related to this Convention”. She explained that this wording had arisen as a pragmatic solution when the IPPC was amended in 1997 to incorporate ISPMs, which in turn had been triggered by the recognition of ISPMs in the World Trade Organization’s Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement). In the initial drafting of Article X.4, it had been envisaged that contracting parties would be obliged to adopt ISPMs. However, Article XXI of the IPPC stipulates that any amendments involving new obligations for contracting parties come into force in respect of each contracting party only on acceptance by it, whereas amendments that do not involve new obligation come into force upon approval by the CPM and after acceptance by two-thirds of the contracting parties. To avoid delay in amending the IPPC to align with the SPS Agreement, the draft wording of Article X.4 had therefore been modified so that it did not include a new obligation.
- [75] Later in the meeting, the bureau noted the legal status of ISPMs in relation to signatories of the SPS Agreement (see agenda item 8).
- [76] **Spanish version of the IPPC.** The legal representative commented that although the Spanish version of the IPPC used stronger language in Article X.4 (the equivalent of “must take into account”), this was still qualified by “as appropriate”. She confirmed that, although the 1997 amendments to the IPPC had been adopted in all FAO languages simultaneously, the amendments had been developed through a technical consultation process conducted in English; she therefore considered the English version to represent the intended meaning. She confirmed that any translation amendments would need to follow the FAO process for amending translations of international treaties and could not be implemented through an ink amendment.
- [77] **Trade disputes.** One bureau member explained that the question about the legal status of ISPMs had arisen because the SPS Agreement did not appear to discriminate between ISPMs, CPM recommendations and IPPC guides and training materials, even though these materials had been subjected to differing levels of scrutiny and only ISPMs and CPM recommendations were adopted by the CPM. This could therefore lead to problems in trade disputes if, for example, one country has followed an ISPM and another has followed an IPPC guide that has different guidance. The bureau member recalled that the SPS Secretariat had made it clear that it was up to the governing body of each convention to decide how to interpret its respective convention and the hierarchy of its documents. The bureau noted that the difference between these materials would be discussed further under agenda item 8 (FAO legal advice on CPM recommendations, guides and training materials). The legal representative confirmed that she was not in a position to offer advice on trade disputes lodged with the World Trade Organization.

---

<sup>8</sup> CPM-17 (2023), agenda item 9.1.

[78] The bureau thanked the representative from the FAO Legal Office for the advice provided.

## 8. FAO legal advice on CPM recommendations, guides and training materials

[79] The bureau considered a draft paper for the SPG, proposing that a disclaimer be included in CPM recommendations.<sup>9</sup> The wording of the proposed disclaimer had been revised following advice from the FAO Legal Office at the March meeting of the bureau.<sup>10</sup>

[80] **The need for a disclaimer.** The bureau noted that CPM recommendations go through one round of consultation and are adopted by the CPM, whereas IPPC guides do not, and that it is up to the CPM to decide on any hierarchy of material in terms of the level of obligation. They noted that neither the Codex Alimentarius nor WOHAI have the equivalent of ISPMs, so no precedents were available from those.

[81] The legal representative agreed that the status of documents adopted by the CPM was different to the status of documents that were not.

[82] The bureau noted that, given the background provided by the legal representative, it was clear that ISPMs were the core of the IPPC and the concept of CPM recommendations had arisen for matters that the CPM wished to bring to the attention of contracting parties without specifying what contracting parties should do to address them. The bureau member for the region that had raised the question about the relative legal status of ISPMs, CPM recommendations and IPPC guides and training materials, agreed to go back to the region to explain this and report back to the bureau in October. At the October meeting, the bureau may then be in a better position to decide whether a disclaimer is needed in CPM recommendations or not. The legal representative commented that, in the long-term, it may be counter-productive to include a disclaimer.

[83] One bureau member suggested that it would be useful to have a document that explained the background and legal standing of the various materials. The legal representative and the IPPC Secretary advised caution, because of the complexity of the issues and the potential for misinterpretation, but the legal representative agreed to forward the relevant historical documentation to the secretariat for information, for forwarding to the bureau.

[84] The bureau noted that countries that are signatories to the SPS Agreement are obliged to base their phytosanitary measures on ISPMs, and that the principles set out in the IPPC and in ISPM 1 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*) are aligned with the provisions of the SPS Agreement.

[85] In answer to a question from the bureau, the legal representative clarified that the provisions of an international treaty only become legally binding to citizens of a country when they are incorporated into the national legislation of that country.

[86] **The wording of the draft disclaimer.** One bureau member asked whether the disclaimer should be expanded to cover IPPC guides and training materials, and the bureau noted that they could consider this at their October meeting.

[87] The secretariat queried the use of the word “should” in the phrase “recommendations should not place obligations on contracting parties to the convention”, as this implied that it was a requirement for drafting CPM recommendations rather than an explanation of the content of the document in which the disclaimer appeared. The bureau noted that the phrase would be appropriate for the CPM to agree as a drafting guideline, but that the actual wording in the disclaimer itself could say that “this recommendation does not place obligations ...”.

---

<sup>9</sup> 12\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun.

<sup>10</sup> CPM Bureau 2023-03, agenda item 8.1.

[88] One bureau member pointed out that, if the disclaimer said that CPM recommendations do not place obligations on contracting parties, this may imply that other materials *do* place obligations on contracting parties.

[89] The bureau:

(27) *agreed* to return to the issue discussed in this agenda item at their meeting in October 2023.

## 9. IPPC Secretariat workforce planning

[90] The secretariat presented a paper on the work currently underway to stabilize the secretariat's workforce, including converting some consultancy positions to full-time positions, upgrading General Staff positions and creating some new professional positions.<sup>11</sup> The secretariat explained that the short-term proposals should not require additional funding, but the long-term plans would.

[91] The secretariat confirmed that a programme manager for implementation of the Strategic Framework and an ePhyto manager could not be appointed until sufficient funding for these positions was secured.

[92] The CPM chairperson clarified that workforce planning was a secretariat matter and not a matter for bureau decision but thanked the secretariat for being transparent about the issues being faced and the plans to resolve them.

## 10. Strategic Framework Development Agenda Items

### 10.1 Terms of reference for the Focus Group on Global Research Coordination

[93] The secretariat presented draft terms of reference for the CPM Focus Group on Global Research Coordination that CPM-17 (2023) had agreed should be established.<sup>12</sup>

[94] The secretariat confirmed that, by establishing the focus group now, the focus group would have sufficient time to prepare their recommendations for the 2024 meeting of the SPG, for adoption by the CPM in 2025, which was the start date recommended by the SPG.

[95] The bureau shared some initial thoughts on possible amendments to the draft terms of reference, including that the focus group should continue until its objectives have been achieved and that reference be made to the role of RPPOs in gathering information.

[96] The bureau noted that the implementation plan for the Strategic Framework indicated a budget allocation for each DAI, so the resources needed for the focus group should be available.

[97] The bureau:

(28) *agreed* to provide comments on the draft terms of reference for the CPM Focus Group on Global Research Coordination to the secretariat by 15 July, consider the revised document at the October 2023 bureau meeting, and submit it for comment by the SPG, with a view to submitting it to CPM-18 (2024) for approval.

### 10.2 Terms of reference for the Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking

[98] The secretariat presented draft terms of reference for the CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking that CPM-17 (2023) had agreed should be established.<sup>13</sup>

[99] Noting that an international consultant was being recruited to assess the current state of the art in diagnostic laboratory networks, one bureau member suggested that an in-kind contribution be sought if it proves difficult to recruit a suitable candidate because of the short-term nature of the contract.

---

<sup>11</sup> 10\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun.

<sup>12</sup> 11\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun; CPM-17 (2023), agenda item 12.1.

<sup>13</sup> 19\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun; CPM-17 (2023), agenda item 12.1.

[100] The bureau shared some initial thoughts on possible amendments to the draft terms of reference. These included saying that the focus group would continue until its objectives have been achieved, and that the expertise listed for the focus group was the collective expertise among the focus group not the expertise of individual members of it. The bureau also noted that the proposed timeline was rather ambitious.

[101] The bureau recognized the synergies between this DAI, POARS and the Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP), but recognized that the latter differed by aiming to provide or develop infrastructure.

[102] The bureau:

(29) *agreed* to provide comments on the draft terms of reference for the CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking to the secretariat by 15 July, consider the revised document at the October 2023 bureau meeting, and submit it for comment by the SPG, with a view to submitting it to CPM-18 (2024) for approval.

### 10.3 Update on the Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid

[103] The secretariat presented an update from the Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid.<sup>14</sup> The group had concluded most of the tasks listed in its terms of reference. It had revised the draft specification on *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid* (2021-020), drafted a gap-analysis diagram for the “emergency pathway”, and proposed that a webinar be held to raise awareness of 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). The focus group had also proposed that the mandate of the focus group be extended and an action plan be developed in collaboration with WOA, the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat and the World Food Programme.

[104] The bureau noted that the World Food Programme had only become involved in the focus group since CPM-17 (2023) and so extending the mandate of the focus group would allow time for the Food Programme to engage with the work of the focus group.

[105] Noting that the focus group had drafted a proposed definition of the term “emergency pathway”, the bureau discussed whether there was a need for such a definition to be included in ISPM 5. The bureau noted that, for this to happen, a contracting party would need to propose the term as a topic during the call for topics. The secretariat advised that the TPG should only be asked to develop a definition if the term was likely to be used in ISPMs and the concept was already secure. The bureau noted that, if the mandate of the focus group was being extended, then developing the concept of “emergency pathway” could be one of the focus group’s tasks.

[106] One bureau member suggested that the draft specification be revised to reduce the number of tasks for the expert drafting group, so that the tasks were feasible.

[107] The bureau:

(30) *noted* the work of the CPM Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid to date;

(31) *supported* an extension to the mandate of the Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid; and

(32) *agreed* to provide comments on the following items to the secretariat by 15 July, consider the revised items at the October 2023 bureau meeting, and submit them for comment by the SPG:

- draft revised specification on *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid* (2021-020) (Appendix 2 of 16\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun),
- draft aid pathway gap-analysis diagram and draft definition for the term “emergency pathway” (Appendix 3 of 16\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun), and

---

<sup>14</sup> 16\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun.



terms of reference for the extended mandate of the focus group.

#### 10.4 Update on the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System

[108] The secretariat presented an update on development of a global POARS.<sup>15</sup> The secretariat explained that the membership of the POARS Steering Group had been established, but the start of the focus group had been delayed pending the appointment of a staff member who would serve as the secretariat lead for POARS. It was anticipated, however, that the Steering Group would start its work in early 2024.

[109] **Start of the Steering Group.** The secretariat advised that the Steering Group not meet before a secretariat lead had been appointed, as the group would need its full two-year mandate from that point on in order to complete their tasks.

[110] **Definition of “emerging pest”.** The bureau returned to the issue of a definition for “emerging pest” (agenda item 4.2) and concluded that, although there may not be a single understanding of the meaning of the term, there are likely to be sufficient common characteristics to form a simple definition. There was, however, no need for this to be an adopted ISPM 5 definition, as a working definition for the purposes of the POARS Steering Group would be sufficient. (The bureau decision is captured in agenda item 4.2.)

[111] The bureau:

- (33) *noted* the POARS activities within the context of the overarching implementation plan for the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030;
- (34) *noted* that the POARS Steering Group would start its work once a secretariat lead had been appointed;
- (35) *agreed* that one of the first tasks of the Steering Group should be to consider a working definition of “emerging pest” but that there was no need to report back on this to the SC; and
- (36) *agreed* that the POARS Steering Group should ensure that the African Phytosanitary Programme is integrated with the POARS.

#### 10.5 Update on development of guidance on the use of third-party entities

[112] The secretariat explained that an IC Team had been established to lead this DAI. Two guides were planned, funded by Canada: a guide to phytosanitary audits, for which a draft specification would be submitted to consultation in 2023; and a guide on authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions, for which the specification had already been approved. The secretariat explained that the intention was to develop the two guides in parallel to ensure consistency and avoid duplication. Drafting would probably start in the second half of 2024 and it was likely to take one to one-and-a-half years to reach the publication stage.

#### 10.6 Update on assessment and management of climate-change impacts on plant health

[113] Samuel BISHOP (Europe), the bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on Assessment and Management of Climate-Change Impacts on Plant Health, gave a verbal update on the activities of the focus group. He informed the bureau that the draft IPPC *Guide for the assessment and management of climate change impacts on plant pests* had been reviewed by the focus group, following which it would be reviewed by the IC and then submitted for consultation. The focus group would also need to elect a new chairperson, as the former chairperson could no longer be the IC representative on the focus group as he was no longer an IC member.

#### 10.7 Management of e-commerce and postal and courier pathways

[114] Diego QUIROGA (Latin America and the Caribbean), the bureau lead for e-commerce, and the secretariat gave a verbal update on activities related to e-commerce. They explained that an IC Team had worked on this topic. An IPPC guide had been drafted and reviewed by the IC, with publication

---

<sup>15</sup> 15\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun.

scheduled for later in 2023. A presentation on the guide would be included in the IPPC regional workshops. Later in 2023, there would also be a survey to gather case studies and various communication activities. The IC had proposed that a side session on e-commerce be held as part of CPM-18 (2024) and the RPPO for North America had offered to provide financial support for this. The bureau lead expressed his support for the proposal, as such a side session would be a useful way by which contracting parties could share their experiences of e-commerce.

[115] In answer to a question from the bureau, the secretariat confirmed that WOA and the Convention on Biological Diversity Secretariat had been identified as stakeholders with whom the secretariat should liaise, but this liaison had not yet happened.

[116] The bureau:

(37) *noted* the suggestion that a side session on e-commerce be held at CPM-18 (2024).

## 10.8 Commodity- and pathway-specific ISPMs

[117] Samuel BISHOP (Europe), the bureau lead for commodity- and pathway-specific ISPMs, gave a verbal update on this DAI. The SC had approved the first draft annex to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*), which was on fresh mango fruit, for first consultation. The Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) were hoping that, once adopted, this could then be used as a template for future commodity standards. The SC had recommended to CPM-18 (2024) that the Standard Setting Procedure be changed to allow draft specifications for commodity standards to be revised by the SC and the TPCS without going through consultation, as the draft specifications would all be almost the same. The TPCS had also developed a form for contracting parties to complete to the best of their ability when proposing a commodity standard and several potential topic proposals for commodity standards were being developed by contracting parties and regions.

[118] The bureau lead explained that the TPCS had agreed not to give confidence categories in commodity standards. Transparency would be provided by publishing the panel's working procedures and recording the rationale for excluding pests and measures. The SC had asked the TPCS to consider the development of a commodity standards database. The SC had also agreed that, when a measure in an adopted commodity is found to be ineffective, a footnote would be added as an ink amendment to make it clear that the measure no longer met the criteria for inclusion in the standard. In addition, the SC had agreed to give more prominence to CPM-adopted phytosanitary treatments in commodity standards than to other measures not adopted by CPM.

[119] The bureau lead explained that commodity standards should help developing countries build capacity, as they should help with pest risk assessments and provide the minimum information a country would need to protect themselves. Commodity standards should also help countries in market-access negotiations.

[120] The bureau lead commented that webinars on commodity standards could be offered to interested regions.

## 11. Update on the African Phytosanitary Programme

[121] The secretariat gave a verbal update on the APP, which was intended to be the first stage in a wider Global Phytosanitary Programme to empower NPPOs to detect pests in an effective and timely way and build their capacity to protect agriculture and natural resources and facilitate safe trade.

[122] The secretariat explained that the pilot phase of the APP would comprise two countries from each of the five subregions in Africa, to be selected by each subregion. In the pilot, each country would identify five pests to focus upon and the IPPC secretariat would then provide relevant information and training to equip each country with the necessary survey and diagnostic methodologies and to facilitate the assembly of an information management system. The final outcome would be the development of preparedness, response and recovery guidelines for the selected pests. The secretariat would provide the overarching technical coordination, the African Union Inter-Phytosanitary Council would provide the

overall strategic coordination among the five regional economic communities; Africa's regional economic communities would provide regional programme coordination and logistical support; FAO regional and country offices would provide administrative and operational support; and NPPOs would be responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the programme in their respective countries.

- [123] The secretariat confirmed that the pilot countries had already been selected as follows: Egypt and Morocco (Northern Africa); Guinea-Bissau, Mali and Sierra Leone (Western Africa); Cameroon and the Democratic Republic of Congo (Central Africa); Kenya and Uganda (Eastern Africa); and Zambia and Zimbabwe (Southern Africa). The list of pests to focus upon in each country was close to being finalized and care would be taken to avoid duplication of effort with other initiatives. Once the pest list was finalized, subject experts would be asked to compile relevant information, including diagnostic and survey protocols, the respective countries would then be asked to verify these, and training (both virtual and in person) would follow. Several donors had already expressed interest in providing financial support.
- [124] The bureau highlighted the importance of leveraging resources by linking with other initiatives where possible.
- [125] The secretariat agreed to circulate the presentation about the APP to bureau members, so that it could be used when seeking funds, but noted that the presentation was constantly updated.
- [126] The bureau noted that the relevant DAI for the APP was the DAI on POARS (see agenda item 10.4).
- [127] The secretariat confirmed that, once it was clear that the APP was working well – perhaps after a couple of years – the programme could be rolled out to other regions.
- [128] The bureau:
- (38) *recognized* that significant progress has been made on the Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP) but that more progress was still needed;
  - (39) *noted* the need for donors to come forward to support the APP;
  - (40) *agreed* to include a specific, recommended decision point on the CPM agenda to give contracting parties the opportunity to confirm support for the APP; and
  - (41) *agreed* to provide an update to the 2023 SPG meeting.

## 12. Update on IPPC communications

### 12.1 Update on communication strategy and the International Phytosanitary Portal

- [129] The secretariat presented an update on IPPC communications,<sup>16</sup> and also the proposed structure and look of the forthcoming revamp of the IPP.
- [130] The secretariat confirmed that the IPP would continue to evolve and that the need to make IPPC guides more prominent on the IPP had already been incorporated into the planned redesign of the IPP.
- [131] The bureau:
- (42) *noted* the update on IPPC communications; and
  - (43) *suggested* that, where possible, objectives given on the IPP should be described in relation to the relevant development agenda item or items of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030.

### 12.2 Observations and recommendations on communications relating to the International Day of Plant Health

- [132] The bureau offered suggestions relating to the communications aspects of the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH).

---

<sup>16</sup> 06\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun.

- [133] The CPM chairperson noted the usefulness of the two-page summary of the IDPH produced by the secretariat and suggested that a copy be sent to all bureau members so that they could forward to their respective communications teams.
- [134] One bureau member asked about the possibility of having a two-way communication of ideas for IDPH. The secretariat confirmed that this could be achieved through an online community, even if it was only an informal one.
- [135] Recalling previous bureau guidance about how to refer to the IDPH, the bureau agreed that although references to “celebration” may attract people, the word “celebration” should be avoided except in relation to achievements, as the purpose of the IDPH was to raise awareness about a serious matter – plant-health challenges.
- [136] The bureau:
- (44) *requested* that the International Day of Plant Health summary used for promotional purposes be circulated to the bureau; and
  - (45) *encouraged* the IPPC community to use appropriate language (such as “mark” or “observe”) when referring to the International Day of Plant Health and to avoid using “celebrate” and its derivatives except when referring to achievements.

### 13. Discussion on terms of reference for the bureau Dispute Settlement Oversight Body

- [137] The representative from the FAO Legal Office was in attendance for this agenda item.
- [138] The bureau considered draft terms of reference and rules of procedure for the Dispute Settlement Oversight Body (DSOB), which CPM-17 (2023) had agreed would be non-permanent sub-body of the bureau.<sup>17</sup>

#### *Terms of reference*

- [139] **Sub-body status.** The legal representative explained that, according to the rules and general practice of the United Nations, a bureau of a statutory body of FAO cannot have subsidiary bodies, so CPM could have subsidiary bodies but not the bureau. The legal representative therefore advised the bureau to remove reference to a non-permanent sub-body from the terms of reference and instead simply refer to the DSOB consisting of three members of the bureau, selected by the bureau. She also suggested that this be moved from the terms of reference to the rules of procedure, as the terms of reference describe the functions of the DSOB. However, the bureau noted that the section on Structure in the terms of reference already described the composition of the DSOB, and the legal representative confirmed that that was a satisfactory place to provide this information.
- [140] **Structure of the DSOB.** The legal representative suggested that, in line with good legal practice for this type of document, the parentheses be removed from the section on Structure of the DSOB.
- [141] **Conflicts of interest.** The bureau considered a clause saying that the members of the DSOB must be free from any conflict of interest. The CPM chairperson suggested that the concept could be expanded to include any “real or perceived” conflict of interest and the legal representative supported this. The bureau clarified that the clause was included because, even though the DSOB was not making decisions about the outcomes of disputes, bureau members would feel uncomfortable serving on the DSOB if the dispute in question involved their country and there was a possibility that a bureau member may have a vested interest in one of the countries involved in a dispute.

---

<sup>17</sup> 08\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun.

[142] **Expert committee process.** The legal representative explained that the FAO Legal Office would have no role in reviewing reports from expert committees and suggested the reference to the FAO Legal Office in this context be removed.

[143] **Other functions as directed by the CPM.** The bureau raised several issues regarding the examples given in this clause and agreed that it was better simply to delete all the examples as they were not necessary.

### *Rules of procedure*

[144] **Membership.** On advice from the legal representative, the bureau agreed to rephrase the first sentence of the rule on membership, to say that the DSOB consisted of three bureau members, selected by the bureau. One bureau member suggested that appropriate wording could perhaps be derived from the rules of procedure of other subsidiary bodies.

[145] The bureau confirmed that the DSOB would only be appointed when a dispute arose; it could not be appointed in advance, as the bureau would not know which bureau members were free from any conflict of interest. They also noted that, regardless of whether a dispute was ongoing, the bureau could select a bureau lead for dispute settlement, in the same way that it does for other areas of IPPC activity, but this would not need to be mentioned in the DSOB rules of procedure.

[146] **Meetings.** The CPM chairperson pointed out that the document did not specify whether meetings could be held in person or in virtual mode.

[147] The secretariat confirmed that the disputing parties cover the costs of the process and this is explained in the IPPC Dispute Settlement Procedures themselves. The CPM chairperson suggested that perhaps this should also be explained in the DSOB terms of reference to aid understanding.

[148] **Observers.** The legal representative pointed out that it was no longer appropriate to refer to Rule VII of the Rules of Procedure for the CPM. She advised that, as the DSOB would be dealing with confidential matters, it should not be open to observers. She also pointed out that the bureau is closed and not open to observers. The secretariat commented on the importance of providing a safe environment for contracting parties to resolve their trade differences. The bureau discussed whether observers could be allowed if both parties agreed, but agreed that it was better simply to delete this rule.

[149] **Decision-making.** The bureau agreed to retain the rule on decision-making, as some of the functions of the DSOB, such as approving reports from expert committees, would involve decisions. On the advice of the legal representative, however, the bureau agreed to delete the wording about voting, as it made no sense to require a two-thirds majority when the DSOB consisted of only three people.

[150] **Amendments to the rules of procedure.** The legal representative suggested that the rule on amendments be revised to refer only to the rules of procedure, with a similar sentence included in the terms of reference (referring to the terms of reference), or that the rule simply be deleted because it would be obvious that as the CPM approved the rules of procedure it would also be the body responsible for approving any amendments. The bureau agreed to include a similar sentence in both the terms of reference and the rules of procedure. The bureau also noted that the numbering of the rules needed correcting.

[151] **Confidentiality.** The legal representative advised that there was no need for the DSOB to report back to the bureau and it would also not be appropriate to do so given that there may be conflicts of interest among the non-DSOB members of the bureau.

### *General comments*

[152] The CPM chairperson noted that, when referring to the CPM, it was important for the text to be clear as to whether this was CPM-17 (2023) or the CPM more generally.

[153] One bureau member commented on the importance of raising awareness of the IPPC Dispute Settlement Procedures but noted that the procedures did not appear to be on the IPP.

[154] The CPM chairperson invited the FAO legal representative to review the revised terms of reference and rules of procedure, modified as discussed at this meeting, at the October 2023 meeting of the bureau.

[155] The bureau:

- (46) *agreed* to consider the draft terms of reference for the Dispute Settlement Oversight Body, modified as discussed at this meeting, at their meeting in October 2023, for subsequent consideration by the SPG; and
- (47) *requested* that the secretariat ensure that the IPPC Dispute Settlement Procedures are available on the IPP.

## 14. Discussion on ePhyto funding

[156] The bureau lead for the DAI on harmonization of electronic data exchange, Peter THOMSON (Southwest Pacific replacement member), joined the meeting via video link for this agenda item.

### 14.1 Discussion on funding streams in support of ePhyto

#### *Sustainable funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution*

[157] The bureau lead gave an update on the work achieved by the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding of the ePhyto Solution since CPM-17 (2023) and the bureau discussed the issues raised.

[158] **Funding model.** The bureau lead explained that, following feedback from contracting parties at CPM-17 and afterwards, the focus group had developed a provisional model that was based on both development status and usage. The model assumed certain baseline funding from FAO and donors, with the rest being drawn from a combination of a fixed fee and a usage fee. The fees would be reviewed every three years. The fixed fee would be based on development status. The usage fee would be determined by deducting the baseline funding and total fixed-fee income from the total cost, and allocating the remainder across users according to their usage. The bureau lead explained that the focus group was in the process of testing this provisional model over a range of scenarios.

[159] The bureau noted that the three-year review cycle afforded more predictability for contracting parties than the earlier usage model. The bureau lead confirmed that only countries that are using ePhyto would pay fees, and that countries that were in the lowest World Bank category for development status would pay no fee at all. The focus group had not yet addressed what a country would pay in their first year, but the bureau lead suggested that a new user could perhaps pay the fixed fee from the start of their use and then pay the usage fee from the date of the first subsequent fee review, as the usage was likely to be low at first.

[160] **Payment mechanism.** The bureau lead recalled that there had been general support at CPM-17 (2024) for using a letter to inform users of their fees but also a concern that if an invoice was not issued, some users would not pay. He informed the bureau that the focus group had subsequently sought further advice from FAO, who had advised that FAO would only issue an invoice if a contracting party had already either paid or said it would pay. The secretariat confirmed that this was the case, and that being an Article XIV governing body did not provide the CPM with any greater flexibility about invoicing.

[161] The bureau lead suggested that the default could perhaps be a letter, with an invoice issued if a country requested one and confirmed that they would pay. The secretariat confirmed that there was no precedence for a decision by the CPM serving as a collective confirmation that contracting parties would pay, but advice on this could be sought from the FAO finance team.

[162] The bureau considered to whom an invoice should be addressed and suggested that it could, in the first instance, be sent to the official IPPC contact point, who could then forward as appropriate.

[163] The bureau suggested that the focus group explore the mechanisms by which contracting parties provide funding to RPPOs, as this provided a precedent for contracting parties paying for a service.

- [164] The bureau noted that requiring contracting parties to agree to pay when signing up for the ePhyto Solution could deter contracting parties from participating in it.
- [165] **Procedures for payment mechanism.** The bureau lead outlined the components of the draft procedure for the payment mechanism that had been prepared by the focus group. The procedure included a clause on exemptions, which gave the bureau the authority to exempt a contracting party from a fee in extenuating circumstances. The bureau noted the need for procedures regarding exemptions to ensure transparency, but recognized that this could prompt an avalanche of claims for exemption.
- [166] **Financial management.** The bureau recognized that, in planning the financial model, allowance would need to be made for contracting parties that were unable to pay because of extenuating circumstances such as natural disasters. If many contracting parties did not pay, the bureau lead speculated that, in the first instance, the shortfall may have to be covered by increasing the fees for the other contracting parties at the next review and using up any funds left over from donor contributions. He acknowledged, however, that the sums received by this mechanism may not last long. The bureau lead highlighted the need for transparency about who has paid and who has not.
- [167] The bureau agreed that they would raise the issue of sustainable funding from FAO, to support ePhyto and more generally for the secretariat's work programme, with FAO permanent representatives (see agenda item 18.3).
- [168] The secretariat and the bureau lead confirmed that individual countries choose whether to charge for ePhytos: some countries do charge and may pass some of this onto the secretariat; other countries do not charge.

#### *Update on other ePhyto activities*

- [169] The secretariat gave a verbal update on other ePhyto activities, including forthcoming webinars, the volume of ePhytos now being exchanged (up to 180 000 per month), countries that would soon be onboarding, and technical issues being resolved with individual countries.
- [170] The bureau representative for Latin America and the Caribbean reported on the successful ePhyto workshop that had been held in hybrid mode in his region in April, with 30 countries participating.
- [171] The bureau:
- (48) *noted* that the focus group would forward a copy of the procedures document to the bureau and *agreed* to provide comments on it by mid-August;
  - (49) *recommended* that the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding of the ePhyto Solution present their revised options for sustainable funding to the 2023 meeting of the SPG, including the options presented to CPM-17 (2023) and three scenarios for the new funding model developed by the focus group; and
  - (50) *agreed* that the funding options and procedures should be presented to CPM-18 (2024) for approval.

## **14.2 Confirmation of membership of the Focus Group on Sustainable Funding of the ePhyto Solution after extension of its mandate for a year**

- [172] Following the decision by CPM-17 (2023) to extend the mandate of the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution by one year,<sup>18</sup> the bureau considered the membership of the focus group.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> CPM-17 (2023), agenda item 12.2.

<sup>19</sup> 18\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun.

[173] The bureau:

(51) *confirmed* that the membership of the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution would be as follows:

- Africa – Lucien KOUAMÉ KONAN (Côte d’Ivoire)
- Asia – Teppei SHIGEMI (Japan)
- Europe – Marco TRAA (Kingdom of the Netherlands)
- Latin America and the Caribbean – Rodriguez ROBLESS (Chile)
- Near East – Islam FARHAT (Egypt)
- North America – John GREIFER (United States of America)
- Southwest Pacific – Lisa WINTHROP (New Zealand)
- bureau representative – Peter THOMSON
- United Nations International Computing Centre representative – Venkatram VENKATESWARAN
- ePhyto Industry Advisory Group representatives – Shawna ENZ-CROSS and Rose SOUZA RICHARDS; and

(52) *confirmed* that the following representatives may participate in the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution as observers:

- Global Alliance for Trade Facilitation – Tom BUTTERLY
- Standards and Trade Development Facility – Melvin SPREIJ and Simon PADILLA.

## 15. Discussion on One Health and antimicrobial resistance (outcome of survey by the IPPC Observatory)

[174] Further to the decision of CPM-17 (2023) that a survey on the use of antimicrobials should be conducted utilizing the IPPC Observatory, the secretariat presented the preliminary results of the survey, which had been conducted from 3 to 29 May 2023.<sup>20</sup> The results indicated that the number of countries using antimicrobial products for phytosanitary purposes is relatively low, and these countries were mostly developed countries. The products used were mainly used to manage fungal and bacterial diseases, with the most commonly used products being kasugamycin and streptomycin. The secretariat planned to extend the survey by another month to encourage more contracting parties to respond. The secretariat confirmed that a more developed report of the survey results would be submitted for consideration at CPM-18 (2024).

[175] **Terminology.** The bureau noted that care should be taken with terminology when conducting surveys, as the term “antimicrobial” included fungicides. The survey had used the term “antimicrobial” but the products listed in the survey had all been antibiotics.

**Fungicides.** The bureau noted that the use of fungicides in crop protection would dwarf that of antibiotics. Given their importance to crop protection, one bureau member suggested that the focus should mainly be on fungicides. The CPM chairperson suggested that fungicides be categorized separately from bactericides.

[176] The secretariat explained that the intention had been to conduct a survey on antibiotics first, followed by a survey on fungicides.

[177] **Survey design.** One bureau member suggested that the survey should have been more open and should have asked the following questions: do you use antimicrobial products; what products do you use; what crops and pests do you use the products for; and how do you regulate the products?

---

<sup>20</sup> 09\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun.



- [178] Regarding the countries who had said that they did not use antimicrobials, the bureau noted that it was important to be clear whether these countries did not use any antimicrobials at all or whether they did not use the products listed in the survey.
- [179] **Aims of the survey.** The bureau noted the need to be clear about what a survey is trying to achieve. The secretariat confirmed that the concern related to pests developing resistance to antimicrobials. The survey was just a first step and aimed to determine the level of usage, as the more that is used the more likely it is that resistance would develop. A survey on fungicides would follow, and a study would then be conducted to better understand the nature and scope of the risks associated with AMR in the phytosanitary context, including resistance to fungicides.<sup>21</sup>
- [180] **Resistance to antimicrobials.** The bureau noted that, in areas other than human health, there was much more evidence of resistance to fungicides (antifungals) than to antibiotics, but the ultimate question was whether the resistance could be transferred to humans, which was why it was a One Health issue. It was important to gather evidence on resistance in a plant-health context, so that any problems could be addressed and any unfounded assumptions about risks could be challenged.
- [181] The bureau:
- (53) *noted* the preliminary results of the IPPC Observatory survey on antimicrobial resistance and the secretariat's plan to extend the survey, with a report to be presented to CPM-18 (2024); and
  - (54) *agreed* that fungicides (antifungals) and antibiotics should be addressed separately when gathering data on antimicrobial products, with care taken to be explicit about the intended meaning when the term "antimicrobial" is used.

## 16. Discussion on *Fusarium oxysporum* Tropical Race 4

- [182] The secretariat presented a paper summarizing IPPC activity on *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* TR4 and plans for future work.<sup>22</sup> An IC Team on TR4 had been established in 2021 and activities had included webinars, the publication of *Prevention, preparedness, and response guidelines for Fusarium TR4*, support for the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela following an outbreak of TR4 in January 2023, participation in a regional simulation exercise on TR4 held in Nicaragua (with the support of the RPPO for the region), and some activities of more general relevance to emergency responses to pest outbreaks. The secretariat recalled the decision by CPM-17 (2023) that the secretariat coordinate global action on TR4 based on recommendations in a conference room paper.<sup>23</sup> The secretariat, being cognizant of the need to avoid duplication with the work of others, had met with other FAO colleagues during CPM-17 (2023) to share information about their respective activities. The secretariat had subsequently drafted a provisional table of proposed secretariat activities to follow through the recommendations in the CPM conference room paper. The secretariat shared the provisional table with the bureau.
- [183] The secretariat confirmed that the IPPC regional workshop in Africa would include two days dedicated to TR4, but this was within the usual five-day duration of workshops because the general agenda only lasted three days.
- [184] The secretariat confirmed that TR4 had already been detected in three states in Venezuela, so it was unlikely that the pest could be eradicated, given its biology.
- [185] One bureau member suggested that a column be added to the table of activities to indicate who was leading each activity.
- [186] The bureau recognized the huge amount of work on TR4 underway by various parties and acknowledged that the main challenge was how to coordinate all these efforts. There was also a need for research, for

---

<sup>21</sup> CPM-17 (2023), agenda item 15.1.

<sup>22</sup> 05\_Bureau\_2023\_Jun.

<sup>23</sup> CPM-17 (2023), agenda item 15.5.

instance to confirm the risk of intercontinental movement of the pest, develop tolerant or resistant cultivars and explore new technologies.

[187] The secretariat informed the bureau that a call for experts would be opened to reinforce the membership of the IC Team on TR4, as some members had left the group or were not attending meetings.

[188] The bureau:

(55) *agreed* that the table of proposed secretariat activities for global coordination of action on *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* TR4 should be presented to the 2023 meeting of the SPG for feedback on any missing activities; and

(56) *agreed* to consider holding a side session on TR4 at CPM-18 (2024).

## 17. Bureau representative in the IC IPPC Observatory Subgroup

[189] The secretariat gave a verbal update on the activities of the IPPC Observatory and informed the bureau that the EU was intending to provide some funding for the observatory.

[190] The bureau:

(57) *selected* Samuel BISHOP (Europe) as the bureau representative on the IC IPPC Observatory Subgroup.

## 18. Any other business

### 18.1 Bureau reports

[191] The bureau:

(58) *requested* that the secretariat include a summary of roles, responsibilities and tasks assigned to bureau members as an appendix to the bureau report (Appendix 4), with another appendix listing the items to be considered at the next meeting of the bureau, the 2023 meeting of the SPG and CPM-18 (2024) (Appendix 5).

### 18.2 IPPC regional workshops

[192] The secretariat presented the draft global agenda for the 2023 IPPC regional workshops. The agenda was for three days, with each region being able to add extra days if they wished.

[193] The bureau:

(59) *agreed* that implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 should be added to the agenda for the IPPC regional workshops, including an update on each development agenda item.

### 18.3 Agenda items for the next bureau meeting, the SPG and CPM-18 (2024)

[194] The bureau compiled a list of agenda items for the following meetings: CPM Bureau, October 2023; SPG, October 2023 and CPM-18 (2024).

[195] The bureau noted that SPG participants may also propose an agenda item and submit a paper for it.

[196] The bureau shared ideas about how to attract more people to attend SPG meetings, recalling that at one previous SPG meeting, there had been an open invitation to submit papers and more people had attended as a result.

[197] For CPM-18 (2024), the CPM agreed that it was best to limit the number of side sessions to a maximum of two, to allow time for participants to hold bilateral meetings.

[198] The bureau:

(60) *requested* that, one week before starting to develop the agenda for the next bureau meeting, the secretariat email bureau members to ask whether there are any agenda items they wish to include;

- (61) *agreed* that bureau members would invite their respective FAO permanent representatives to join the bureau meeting on Monday 9 October 2023 at 10.30 for an hour to discuss the sustainable funding of the IPPC Secretariat;
- (62) *agreed* items for inclusion in the agendas of the October meeting of the bureau, the SPG meeting in October 2023 and CPM-18 (2024) (Appendix 5);
- (63) *agreed* to include no more than two side sessions at CPM-18 (2024), the topics for which would be considered further by the bureau at its meeting in October and at the 2023 meeting of the SPG; and
- (64) *agreed* that the CPM chairperson would explore the possibility of a Canadian minister giving a keynote address to CPM-18 (2024) and *agreed* that all bureau members and the secretariat would give further thought about who to approach to be a second keynote speaker.

#### **18.4 Call for topics**

[199] The bureau representative on the Task Force for Topics reminded bureau members about the two webinars being held the following week about the 2023 call for topics.

#### **19. Next meeting**

[200] The next meeting of the bureau is scheduled for 9–10 October 2023 in Rome, Italy.

[201] The bureau:

- (65) *agreed* to adopt the decisions from this meeting at the end of the meeting.

#### **20. Adoption of the decisions and closing of the meeting**

[202] The bureau adopted the decisions.

[203] The CPM chairperson thanked everyone and closed the meeting.

**Appendix 1: Agenda**

	<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>
1.	<b>Opening of the meeting</b>	-	EL-LISSY / WOLFF
2.	<b>Meeting arrangements</b>	-	
2.1	Election of the rapporteur		WOLFF
2.2	Adoption of the agenda	01_Bureau_2023_Jun	WOLFF
3.	<b>Administrative matters</b>		
3.1	Document list	02_Bureau_2023_Jun	DENG
3.2	Participants list	03_Bureau_2023_Jun	DENG
3.3	Local information	<a href="#">Link to the Local Information</a>	DENG
4.	<b>IPPC Secretariat updates</b>		
4.1	Secretary update	-	EL-LISSY
4.2	SSU/SC update	13_Bureau_2023_June 14_Bureau_2023_June_rev1	NERSYSIAN
4.3	IFU/IC update		BRUNEL
4.4	Financial Committee (FC) update	17_Bureau_2023_June	BENOVIC/ VIVIAN-SMITH
4.5	Sea containers update	07_Bureau_2023_Jun	SHAMILOV/ STIRLING
5.	<b>CPM organizational issues</b>	-	WOLFF
5.1	Discussion on future status of Credentials Committee	-	IPPC SECRETARIAT/ FAO LEGAL
5.2	Policy on how to record number of contracting-party interventions at CPMs (currently four or less equals "a few CPs"; more than four equals "some CPs")	-	IPPC SECRETARIAT
5.3	Review of situation regarding intersessional decisions on behalf of the CPM that was introduced during the COVID-19 pandemic	-	WOLFF
5.4	Discussion on whether the number of focus groups established by the CPM should be limited	-	WOLFF
5.5	Feedback on CPM-17	-	ALL
6.	<b>Process of countries to become contracting parties to the convention</b>	04_Bureau_2023_Jun	IPPC SECRETARIAT/ FAO LEGAL
7.	<b>FAO advice on the legal status of the IPPC and ISPMs.</b>	-	EL-LISSY/ FAO LEGAL
8.	<b>FAO legal advice on CPM recommendations, guides and training materials</b>	12_Bureau_2023_Jun	IPPC SECRETARIAT/ FAO LEGAL/ BISHOP
9	<b>IPPC secretariat workforce planning</b>	10_Bureau_2023_Jun	EL-LISSY/ BENOVIC
10.	<b>Strategic Framework development agenda items</b>		
10.1	Terms of reference of the Global Research Coordination	11_Bureau_2023_Jun	GILMORE/ DENG/ MATSUI
10.2	Terms of reference of the Diagnostic Laboratory Networking	19_Bureau_2023_Jun	MOREIRA / VENTER

10.3	Update on the Focus Group on the Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid	16_Bureau_2023_Jun	MOREIRA/ VIVIAN-SMITH
10.4	Update on POARS	15_Bureau_2023_Jun	BRUNEL/ VENTER
10.5	Update on development of guidance on the use of third-party entities	-	BRUNEL
10.6	Update on assessment and management of climate-change impacts on plant health	-	BISHOP
10.7	Update on management of e-commerce and postal and courier pathways	-	QUIROGA/BRUNEL
10.8	Update on commodity- and pathway-specific ISPMs	-	BISHOP
<b>11.</b>	<b>Update on the African Phytosanitary Programme (APP)</b>	-	EL-LISSY
<b>12.</b>	<b>Update on the IPPC communication</b>		IPPC SECRETARIAT
12.1	Update on communication strategy and the IPP	06_Bureau_2023_Jun	FRIO/SENTINELLI
12.2	Observations and recommendations on communications relating to the International Day of Plant Health	-	WOLFF/ ALL
<b>13.</b>	<b>Discussion on terms of reference for the Bureau Dispute Settlement Oversight Body</b>	08_Bureau_2023_Jun	KOUMBA/ FAO LEGAL/ BISHOP
<b>14.</b>	<b>Discussion on ePhyto funding</b>	-	
14.1	Discussion on funding streams in support of ePhyto	-	EL-LISSY/ FEDCHOCK/ THOMSON/BENOVIC
14.2	Confirmation of membership of FG on sustainable funding of ePhyto solution after extension of its mandate for a year	18_Bureau_2023_Jun	EL-LISSY/ FEDCHOCK/ THOMSON/BENOVIC
<b>15.</b>	<b>Discussion on One Health and antimicrobial resistance</b> (outcome of survey by the IPPC Observatory)	09_Bureau_2023_Jun	KOUMBA/ BRUNEL
<b>16.</b>	<b>Discussion on <i>Fusarium oxysporium</i> TR4</b>	05_Bureau_2023_Jun	BRUNEL/ QUIROGA
<b>17.</b>	<b>Bureau representative in the IPPC Observatory Subgroup</b>	-	KOUMBA
<b>18.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	-	WOLFF
18.1	Bureau reports	-	ALL
18.2	IPPC regional workshops	-	GILMORE
18.3	Agenda items for the next bureau meeting, SPG and CPM-18 (2024)	-	ALL
18.4	Call for topics	-	QUIROGA
<b>19.</b>	<b>Next meeting</b>	-	WOLFF
<b>20.</b>	<b>Closing of the meeting</b>	-	EL-LISSY/ WOLFF

**Appendix 2: List of documents**

<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TITLE</b>	<b>DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED</b>
01_Bureau_2023_June	02.2	Agenda	2023-06-05
02_Bureau_2023_June	03.1	Documents List	2023-06-06
03_Bureau_2023_June	03.2	Participants List	2023-06-06
04_Bureau_2023_June	06	Procedure to become a Contracting Party to the IPPC	2023-05-29
05_Bureau_2023_June	16	Update on <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> TR4	2023-05-29
06_Bureau_2023_June	12.1	Update on IPPC Secretariat Communications	2023-05-29
07_Bureau_2023_June	04.5	Update from CPM Focus Group on Sea containers Workshop 2023	2023-05-29
08_Bureau_2023_June	13	Draft ToRs and RoPs for Dispute Settlement oversight body	2023-05-29
09_Bureau_2023_June	15	IPPC Survey on AMR	2023-05-29
10_Bureau_2023_June	09	IPPC Secretariat Workforce Plan	2023-05-29
11_Bureau_2023_June	10.1	ToRs Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination	2023-05-29
12_Bureau_2023_June	08	Disclaimer CPM Recommendations, IPPC guides and training materials	2023-05-29
13_Bureau_2023_June	04.2	SC update on the progress of the term “emerging pest” to be included in ISPM 5	2023-05-29
14_Bureau_2023_June_rev1	04.2	Standard Setting Unit Update	2023-06-05
15_Bureau_2023_June	10.4	Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems	2023-05-29
16_Bureau_2023_June	10.3	Focus Group on safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid update	2023-05-31
17_Bureau_2023_June	04.4	Budgetary and Financial Highlights	2023-05-31
18_Bureau_2023_June	14.2	Membership of the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC Ephyto Solution	2023-06-05
19_Bureau_2023_June	10.2	Draft ToRs – FG Diagnostic Laboratory Newtworking	2023-06-06

**Appendix 3: List of participants**

Attending	Participant role / Region	Name	e-mail
✓	<b>Africa</b>	<b>Mr Jan Hendrik VENTER</b> Director Plant Health Department of Agriculture Land Reform and Rural Development South Africa <b>Phone:</b> (+27) 12 319 6529	<a href="mailto:janhendrikv@dalrrd.gov.za">janhendrikv@dalrrd.gov.za</a>
✓	<b>Asia</b>	<b>Mr. Mamoru MATSUI</b> Director (Operation Division) Kobe Plant Protection Station (PPS), Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries of Japan (MAFF) <b>JAPAN</b>	<a href="mailto:mamoru_matsui430@maff.go.jp">mamoru_matsui430@maff.go.jp</a>
✓	<b>Europe</b>	<b>Mr Sam BISHOP</b> Head of International Plant Health Policy Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs <b>UK</b> Ph.(+44) 2080262506	<a href="mailto:sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk">sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk</a>
✓	<b>Latin America and Caribbean</b>	<b>Mr Diego QUIROGA</b> Director Nacional de Protección Vegetal SENASA  <b>ARGENTINA</b>	<a href="mailto:dquiroga@senasa.gob.ar">dquiroga@senasa.gob.ar</a>
✓	<b>Near East</b> <i>(Vice- Chairperson)</i>	<b>Mr Ahmed Kamal EL- ATTAR</b> Head of Central Administration of Plant Quarantine Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation Giza <b>EGYPT</b>  Phone: (+20) 100 660 2373	<a href="mailto:ippc@capq.gov.eg">ippc@capq.gov.eg</a> <a href="mailto:ahmadkamalarc@hotmail.com">ahmadkamalarc@hotmail.com</a>
✓	<b>North America</b> <i>(Chairperson)</i>	<b>Greg Wolff</b> Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A0Y9 <b>CANADA</b> Phone: +1613325-2941	<a href="mailto:greg.wolff@canada.ca">greg.wolff@canada.ca</a>

✓	<b>Southwest Pacific</b>	<b>Ms Gabrielle Vivian SMITH</b> Chief Plant Protection Officer Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forest <b>AUSTRALIA</b> Phone: +61481912117	<a href="mailto:gabrielle.vivian-smith@aff.gov.au">gabrielle.vivian-smith@aff.gov.au</a>
---	--------------------------	---	--

<b>Region / Role</b>	<b>Name, mailing, address, telephone, nationality</b>	<b>Email address</b>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Osama EL-LISSY</b>	<a href="mailto:Osama.Ellissy@fao.org">Osama.Ellissy@fao.org</a> ;
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Avetik NERSISYAN</b>	<a href="mailto:Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org">Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Arop DENG</b>	<a href="mailto:Arop.Deng@fao.org">Arop.Deng@fao.org</a> ;
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Marko BENOVIC</b>	<a href="mailto:Marko.Benovic@fao.org">Marko.Benovic@fao.org</a> ;
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Craig FEDCHOCK</b>	<a href="mailto:Craig.Fedchock@fao.org">Craig.Fedchock@fao.org</a> ;
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Adriana MOREIRA</b>	<a href="mailto:Adriana.Moreira@fao.org">Adriana.Moreira@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Sarah BRUNEL</b>	<a href="mailto:Sarah.Brunel@fao.org">Sarah.Brunel@fao.org</a>
IPPC Secretariat / Report writer	<b>Ms Karen ROUEN</b>	<a href="mailto:karen@karenrouen.com">karen@karenrouen.com</a>



## Appendix 4: Roles, responsibilities and tasks assigned to CPM Bureau members

### 1. Roles and responsibilities assigned to CPM bureau members

Work area	Bureau lead	Date appointed
<b>Strategic Framework development agenda items</b>		
Harmonization of electronic data exchange	Peter THOMSON (replacement bureau member for Southwest Pacific)	2023-03
Commodity- and pathway-specific ISPMs	Samuel BISHOP (Europe)	2023-03
Management of e-commerce and postal and courier pathways	Diego QUIROGA (Latin America and Caribbean)	2023-03
Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities	Greg WOLFF (North America)	2023-03
Strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems	Jan Hendrik VENTER (Africa)	2023-03
Assessment and management of climate-change impacts on plant health	Samuel BISHOP (Europe)	2023-03
Global phytosanitary research coordination	Mamoru MATSUI (Asia)	2023-03
Laboratory diagnostic networking	Jan Hendrik VENTER (Africa)	2023-03
<b>Committees</b>		
Head of Finance Committee	Gabrielle Vivian SMITH (Southwest Pacific)	2023-03
Standards Committee	Samuel BISHOP (Europe)	2023-03
Implementation and Capacity Development Committee	Greg WOLFF (North America)	2023-03
Task Force on Topics	Diego QUIROGA (Latin America and Caribbean)	2023-03
<b>Other groups and initiatives</b>		
CPM Focus Group on the Sustainable Funding of the IPPC ePhyto Solution	Peter THOMSON (replacement bureau member for Southwest Pacific)	2023-03
CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers	Greg WOLFF (North America)	2023-03
CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid	Gabrielle Vivian SMITH (Southwest Pacific)	2023-03
IPPC Observatory Subgroup	Samuel BISHOP (Europe)	2023-06
Africa Phytosanitary Programme	Jan Hendrik VENTER (Africa) (with involvement of the CPM chairperson)	2023-03

## 2. Tasks assigned to CPM bureau members

Meeting	Agenda item (decision)	Task	Person or persons responsible	Deadline
2023-06	5.2 (19)	After CPM-18 (2024), review policy on how to record number of contracting-party interventions at CPMs	Bureau	2024-06
2023-06	10.1 28	Provide comments to secretariat on draft terms of reference for CPM Focus Group on Global Research Coordination	ALL	2023-07-15
2023-06	10.2 (29)	Provide comments to secretariat on draft terms of reference for CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking	ALL	2023-07-15
2023-06	10.3 (32)	Provide comments to secretariat on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- draft revised specification on <i>Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid</i> (2021-020) (Appendix 2 of 16_Bureau_2023_Jun);</li> <li>- draft aid pathway gap-analysis diagram and draft definition for the term “emergency pathway” (Appendix 3 of 16_Bureau_2023_Jun); and</li> <li>- terms of reference for extended mandate of CPM Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid (see Appendix 1 of 16_Bureau_2023_Jun for current terms of reference)</li> </ul>	ALL	2023-07-15
2023-06	14.1 (48)	Provide comments to secretariat (Dominique MENON & Craig FEDCHOCK) and Peter THOMSON (replacement member for Southwest Pacific) on financial procedures for sustainable funding of IPPC ePhyto Solution	ALL	2023-08-15
2023-06	18.3 (61)	Invite FAO permanent representatives to join bureau meeting on Monday 9 October 2023 at 10.30 for an hour to discuss the sustainable funding of the IPPC Secretariat	Bureau	-
2023-06	18.3 (64)	Explore possibility of a Canadian minister giving a keynote address to CPM-18 (2024)	WOLFF	2023-10
2023-06	18.3 (64)	Give further thought about who to approach to be a second keynote speaker at CPM-18 (2024)	ALL	2023-10

Note: Does not include tasks that are to consider an agenda item at the next meeting, if these have already been captured in the list of agenda items agreed for the next meeting.

## Appendix 5: Agenda items for forthcoming meetings

The following items were agreed, in addition to the standing agenda items.

### CPM Bureau October 2023

- Future status of Credentials Committee
- Disclaimer for CPM recommendations
- Dispute Settlement Oversight Body (terms of reference and rules of procedure)
- Terms of reference for CPM Focus Group on Global Research Coordination
- Terms of reference for CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking
- Update from the CPM Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid (terms of reference for extended mandate, draft specification for ISPM, gap analysis diagram)
- ePhyto funding (funding model and procedures)
- Update from sea containers workshop
- Update on antimicrobial resistance
- Global coordination of *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* TR4 (table of activities)
- Sustainable funding for IPPC Secretariat (with FAO permanent representatives invited)
- Preparations for CPM-18 (2024):
  - Agenda for CPM-18 (2024)
  - Keynote speakers
  - Side sessions (e.g. TR4, e-commerce, systems approach case studies)
- Adoption of decisions

### SPG October 2023

- Disclaimer for CPM recommendations (if appropriate)
- Dispute Settlement Oversight Body (terms of reference and rules of procedure)
- Terms of reference for CPM Focus Group on Global Research Coordination
- Terms of reference for CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking
- Update from the CPM Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid
- ePhyto funding (funding model and procedures)
- Update on sea containers (update from workshop and thoughts about whether to progress to an ISPM)
- IPPC guide on *Guide for the assessment and management of climate change impacts on plant pests*
- Update on antimicrobial resistance
- Global coordination of *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* TR4 (table of activities)
- Update on Africa Phytosanitary Programme
- Preparations for CPM-18 (2024):
  - Keynote speakers
  - Side sessions (e.g. TR4, e-commerce, systems approach case studies)

### CPM-18 (2024)

- Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 (core part of the agenda, with individual agenda items on each of the development agenda items)
- Terms of reference for CPM Focus Group on Global Research Coordination
- Terms of reference for CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking
- Update from the CPM Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid

- 
- ePhyto funding (funding model and procedures)
  - Sea containers (draft CPM recommendation on sea containers for adoption and whether CPM wish to progress to an ISPM)
  - E-commerce
  - Update on antimicrobial resistance
  - Update on coordination of *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *ubense* TR4 action
  - Update on Africa Phytosanitary Programme
  - Dispute Settlement Oversight Body (terms of reference and rules of procedure)
  - (tentative) Science session (Thursday afternoon, 2 hours; e.g. living modified organisms, systems approaches)
  - Successes and challenges for implementation of the IPPC (Thursday afternoon, 1 hour, after the science session).
  - Two side sessions (e.g. TR4, e-commerce, systems approach case studies)