5. Report from the CPM Bureau on credentials

The CPM chairperson explained that, consistent with advice from the FAO Legal Office, the CPM Bureau had agreed that they would review credentials instead of a Credentials Committee being formed.[[1]](#footnote-2)

The CPM:

1. *noted* the report from the CPM Bureau, who had endorsed a list of 110 valid credentials, which was enough to constitute the quorum of a majority of CPM members (93 members).

12.1 Harmonization of electronic data exchange

The secretariat provided an update on ePhyto (electronic phytosanitary certificate) activities, including preliminary results from a study on the cost–benefits and global impact of ePhytos, and thanked CPs, RPPOs and other partners for their in-kind and financial support.[[2]](#footnote-3) The secretariat also presented the ePhyto Strategic Implementation Plan for 2024–2030.

The CPM Bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution presented the focus group’s proposals for a long-term funding mechanism for the ePhyto Solution.[[3]](#footnote-4) The proposed funding model had been selected from many options and had been revised to take account of feedback from CPM-17 (2023), the SPG in October 2023 and the CPM Bureau. It was proposed that the model be reviewed after two years, with the non-mandatory, first contributions from CPs using the IPPC ePhyto Solution being in the 2025 calendar year.

Some CPs supported the proposed funding model as an important initial step towards a fully-fledged ePhyto system, but others called for changes to it, either now or in the future. These changes included the possibility of waiving fees for least developed countries, not basing the base fees solely on World Bank criteria, making a distinction between the exchange of commercial and non-commercial ePhyto exchanges, and weighting the fees more according to exports than imports. Support was also expressed for continuing to explore the possibility of FAO funding the ePhyto Solution.

Given the anticipated expansion in the number of CPs using the ePhyto Solution in the coming years, the CPM noted a suggestion that the review of the model, which was planned to take place two years after implementation, should analyse the effect of this expansion on the funding-model details, including the balance between the base fee and the usage fee and whether the usage fee part should not be increased*.*[[4]](#footnote-5)

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland committed to provide a voluntary contribution of GBP 75 000 and the United States of America committed to provide annual contributions as they have over the past number of years to the IPPC ePhyto Solution.

Given the range of views, the CPM chairperson suggested that interested CPs participate in a Friends of the Chair meeting, which took place outside of the session. This resulted in an amended set of proposed decisions for the CPM to consider.[[5]](#footnote-6) The CPM Bureau representative on the focus group clarified that those countries who wished to contribute would start to pay in 2025 and those that were not ready to pay did not have to; the model would then be reviewed by the CPM in 2027 and any changes agreed by the CPM at that stage would not apply until 2028.

The CPM chairperson thanked the partners who had provided financial or in-kind contributions to the work on the ePhyto Solution in 2023: Canada, France, United Kingdom, European Union and NAPPO/United States of America.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the successful implementation of the IPPC ePhyto Solution thus far;
2. *approved* the ePhyto Strategic Implementation Plan 2024–2030 as presented in Annex 1 of CPM 2024/14;
3. *agreed* to promote the use of the IPPC ePhyto Solution;
4. *encouraged* contracting parties that had not yet registered to the IPPC ePhyto Hub to do so;
5. *urged* all contracting parties to continue to provide support to the IPPC ePhyto Solution through the Multidonor Trust Fund;
6. *noted* that some CPs were ready to contribute to the IPPC ePhyto Solution using the proposed model;
7. *noted* that some CPs needed more time or wanted modifications to the proposed model to be explored before they could begin contributing to the IPPC ePhyto Solution;
8. *agreed* the *Procedures for the IPPC ePhyto Solution funding model* as presented in Appendix 1 of CPM 2024/15;
9. *noted* that country contributions to the IPPC ePhyto Solution would not be mandatory for any country;
10. *agreed* that, during the transitional period, reports comparing expected contributions and actual contributions by country would not be presented to the CPM (paragraph 23 of the *Procedures for the IPPC ePhyto Solution funding model*);
11. *agreed* that the funding model would be implemented as a transitional pilot and that the funding model would be reviewed after two years (2027) and reported to the CPM;
12. *agreed* that, during the transitional period, alternative fee structures embedded in the model would be explored;
13. *agreed* to extend the term of the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution until CPM-19 (2025) and *requested* that the focus group explore and report to the CPM on alternative modifications and adjustments including those suggested at CPM-18 (2024);
14. *requested* that CPs provide any additional suggested modifications to the funding model to the secretariat with urgency for consideration by the focus group;
15. *agreed* that the CPM Bureau would govern the funding model until an alternative governance mechanism is agreed by the CPM; and

*requested* that CPs wanting FAO to provide funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution promote this through their permanent representatives.

12.7 Global phytosanitary research coordination – terms of reference for the CPM focus group

Further to the decision by CPM-17 (2023) to establish a CPM focus group to support the DAI on “Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination”, the CPM Bureau lead for this DAI presented draft terms of reference for the focus group for approval by the CPM.[[6]](#footnote-7)

Contracting parties made several suggestions on changes to the draft terms of reference, including ensuring that any changes to the tasks for the focus group were approved by the CPM Bureau rather than the focus group, the need to increase the number of RPPO representatives,[[7]](#footnote-8) changing the status of the representative from academia from an optional observer to a full member, providing translation for the focus group meetings, and changing the main focus to assisting existing organizations that coordinate phytosanitary research.

Given the range of views, the CPM chairperson suggested that interested CPs participate in a Friends of the Chair meeting, which took place outside of the session. This resulted in revised draft terms of reference.[[8]](#footnote-9)

The CPM:

1. *approved* the terms of reference of the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination as modified in this meeting (CPM 2024/CRP/09).

12.8 Diagnostic laboratory networking – terms of reference for the CPM focus group

Further to the decision by CPM-17 (2023) to establish a CPM focus group to support the DAI on “Diagnostic Laboratory Networking”, the secretariat and the CPM Bureau lead for this DAI presented draft terms of reference for the focus group for approval by the CPM.[[9]](#footnote-10) The secretariat updated the CPM on progress with engagement of an international consultant to conduct a gap analysis on existing diagnostic laboratory networking. The CPM Bureau lead emphasized the need for reliable pest diagnosis and a network of laboratories to support this. He also encouraged regions to nominate experts to the focus group, should the CPM approve the terms of reference.

The CPM noted a suggestion that the creation of regional diagnostic laboratory networks be considered and that greater clarity be provided about the scope of the diagnostic laboratory networks and associated rules of procedure. The secretariat clarified that defining the scope was one of the tasks of the focus group.

Contracting parties suggested that the focus group membership include more than one RPPO representative.

Given the range of views, the CPM chairperson suggested that interested CPs liaise with the secretariat to consider the amendments to the draft terms of reference, which resulted in a revised draft being presented to the CPM.[[10]](#footnote-11)

The CPM:

1. *approved* the terms of reference of the CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic-Laboratory Networking as modified in this meeting (CPM 2023/CRP/11).

13.2 Sea containers

Two members of the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers presented an update on the activities of the focus group,[[11]](#footnote-12) including the group’s final report.[[12]](#footnote-13) The presenters explained that, in addition to gathering evidence, the focus group had focused upon revision of the CPM Recommendation on *Sea containers* (R-06), the custodial responsibility concept, updates to the Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units (CTU Code), pest risk assessment, World Customs Organization initiatives (changes to data models and updates to the SAFE Framework) and improvements to sea-container design. These issues had also been collectively discussed and considered at the international workshop on sea containers, held in Australia in July 2023. The focus group had recommended that its mandate be extended to allow it to complete the tasks in its existing terms of reference and pursue further work. The CPM was therefore invited to agree new terms of reference for a three-year extension.[[13]](#footnote-14) The presenters thanked the focus group members, the secretariat, Australia for hosting the second international workshop on sea containers, and the countries that had conducted trials, shared data, contributed financially or submitted consultation comments.

Contracting parties made various suggestions about the proposed extension of the focus group’s mandate and the associated terms of reference. These included changing the status of industry representatives to observers rather than full members (recalling previous advice from the FAO Legal Office), limiting the number of industry representatives on the focus group to two, sequencing the focus group’s activities according to the level of difficulty, extending the sea-container survey to all CPs, and changing the membership criteria to ensure full geographical representation. Questions were raised about the feasibility of implementing the emerging biosecurity technologies at ports; concerns were raised about the implementation costs for developing countries; and a request was made to consider a more efficient way of engaging with customs authorities to avoid each NPPO having to do this individually. In addition, the CPM noted suggestions to amend the functions of the focus group to include the drafting of an ISPM, a reformulation of one of the functions,[[14]](#footnote-15) the provision of evidence demonstrating how the minimization of pest risk to an acceptable level would be achieved, and a shorter extension to the mandate of the focus group.

One observer from the sea-container industry acknowledged that ensuring sea-container cleanliness was a shared responsibility and referred to the joint industry guidelines for cleaning of containers, which had been revised in 2023.[[15]](#footnote-16)

The CPM chairperson explained the rationale for inclusion of representatives from industry in the focus group, given the complexity of the sea-container pathway, the varied expertise required, the need for engagement by industry, and the risk to the IPPC reputation if the solution reached proved to be inadequate.

Given the range of views, the CPM chairperson suggested that interested CPs participate in a Friends of the Chair meeting, which took place outside of the session. This resulted in revised draft terms of reference and revised suggested decisions for the CPM to consider.[[16]](#footnote-17)

Regarding the participation of industry representatives in the focus group, the CPM chairperson clarified that any substantive decisions of the focus group were only recommendations, with these recommendations then being brought to the CPM for decision.

1. The CPM:
2. *noted* the 2023 report of the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers;
3. *agreed* to extend the mandate of the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers until CPM-21 (2027);
4. *approved* the terms of reference for the extended mandate of the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers as modified in this meeting (CPM 2024/CRP/14);
5. *agreed* to the establishment of an ongoing feedback channel, with staff assigned within the Secretariat to receive and collate information on the uptake and effectiveness of the revised CPM Recommendation R-06 and to provide this to the focus group at periodic intervals to facilitate its work;
6. *asked* the secretariat to continue to collaborate with International Maritime Organization, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the World Customs Organization, the World Organisation for Animal Health, and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, with a view to aligning guidance on sea-container cleanliness based on CPM Recommendation R-06 and any new information; *[Note for deletion upon adoption of the report: UNECE added for consideration by the secretariat in relation to the CTU Code]*
7. *agree* to add a third member from the Industry Advisory Group to the focus group’s current membership to ensure that the broad range of industry sea-container logistics activities are appropriately represented and to provide the necessary scope of expertise;
8. *requested* that the secretariat issue a call for experts to the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers if needed to fulfill the membership according to the terms of reference; and

*agreed* that the focus group may temporarily coopt experts or advisors as required to address specific issues, with the term of such coopting not to exceed six months.

16. Other emerging topics

16.1 Update on One Health

A member of a drafting group drawn from the SPG presented a paper on One Health, including background information, current secretariat activity and some potential objectives for the CPM to consider.[[17]](#footnote-18) The paper emphasized that the aim was not to create a new initiative or programme specific to One Health but rather that the IPPC community identify and communicate the work it was already doing that directly supported and contributed to One Health outcomes. The presenter also presented draft terms of reference for a CPM focus group to draw up an action plan for communication and advocacy.[[18]](#footnote-19)

The CPM noted three written interventions: one suggesting that any changes to the functions of the focus group should be subject to CPM Bureau approval;[[19]](#footnote-20) a second proposing that the work be taken forward by a small expert group rather than a focus group and suggesting the streamlining of the terms of reference;[[20]](#footnote-21) and a third suggesting a two-step approach, starting with a preliminary study.[[21]](#footnote-22)

The CPM considered the relative merits of a focus group (higher profile) versus a small expert group (less of a burden on the secretariat). Some CPs supported greater engagement with One Health activities, whereas others thought the main focus of IPPC activities should be on the IPPC mission and IPPC Strategic Framework.

Given the range of views, interested parties agreed to meet outside of the session to progress this . This resulted in revised draft terms of reference.[[22]](#footnote-23)

The CPM:

1. *established* a CPM Focus Group on Plant Health in the Context of One Health to develop recommendations and outputs for CPM consideration in 2025;
2. *approved* the terms of reference for this focus group as presented in CPM 2024/CRP/16;
3. *agreed* that the focus group, in the course of its analysis, would consider the merits of:
* devoting an IDPH to One Health in the near future, and
* developing a One Health component to the IPPC Communications Strategy;
1. *noted* the secretariat action to organize a CPM side session on One Health for CPM-19 (2025) to continue informing CPM members and soliciting CPM input and views towards refining IPPC plans and objectives in the One Health space; and

*noted* the IPPC secretary’s arrangements to represent the IPPC community and, along with CPM Bureau members and other experts from academia, present a side session at the Eighth World One Health Congress in 2024.

16.2 Update on antimicrobial resistance

The secretariat presented an update on their activities related to antimicrobial resistance (AMR),[[23]](#footnote-24) following the request by CPM-17 (2023) that the secretariat consider how best to undertake a study to better understand the nature and scope of the risks associated with AMR in the phytosanitary context.[[24]](#footnote-25) The secretariat was in the process of implementing a two-phased approach, firstly collecting data on the use of antimicrobial products and secondly studying resistance linked to the use of antimicrobial products in plant protection. Although the response rate to the surveys had been relatively low, the results thus far had shown that the number of countries using antibiotics in plant protection was relatively low and the use of fungicides was as high as expected. A follow-up survey and more in-depth analysis were planned for the second phase of the study, to ascertain the extent to which the use of these products at these amounts contributed to the overall antimicrobial-resistance challenge.

The CPM noted suggestions that the surveys focus on the composition of pesticides and that information be gathered from producers on cases of resistance. The CPM also recognized the need for research to be undertaken in the context of One Health.

Contracting parties expressed diverging views about whether a study on antimicrobial resistance should proceed, noting that the use of antimicrobials in plant protection was very low but gathering evidence could help determine the extent of AMR in plant health and to allay concerns outside the plant-health community that the use of antimicrobials in plant protection leads to resistance in the context of animal and human health.

The CPM returned to this issue later in the meeting and agreed to restrict the number of fungicides included in the study on antimicrobial resistance.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the preliminary results of the IPPC Observatory surveys on antibiotics and fungicides used in plant protection;
2. *thanked* the countries’ respondents for the two surveys for their contributions to better understanding of antimicrobial use in plant health;
3. *requested* that the secretariat extend the two surveys and strongly encourage countries that had not yet responded to the surveys to do so in order to obtain representative data of the IPPC community; and
4. *agreed* that the study on antimicrobials would be extended to analysis of antimicrobial resistance and that the necessary resources should be allocated for this purpose; and

*agreed* that the fungicides to be included in the study should be only those related to the One Health concept (i.e. those chemical groups that are used not only for plant health but also for animal or human health).

16.3 Update on the Africa Phytosanitary Programme

The IPPC secretary gave an update on the Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP),[[25]](#footnote-26) which was designed to empower national governments and stakeholders with the technical capacity and support necessary to manage plant pests of regulatory, environmental and economic significance effectively and consistently. The pilot phase, involving a total of 11 countries from Africa’s five subregions, was underway: each country had selected five pests to be considered for inclusion in the pilot phase; various tools had been developed; a train-the-trainer workshop had been held in Cairo, Egypt; those trainers were then delivering the same training to at least 50 field technicians in each of their respective countries; and the secretariat was in the process of visiting each country in the pilot to meet with relevant ministers to ensure that each country was in a position to implement the programme. The work thus far had been supported by donations of cash, in-kind contributions, supplies and materials from the United States of America, for which the IPPC secretary expressed his gratitude. The secretary explained that the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) had agreed to continue their support in 2024 and the secretariat was in the process of developing agreements with other donors.

The CPM chairperson recognized the efforts of the IPPC secretary in achieving the outstanding progress on the APP to date. Contracting parties added their appreciation to the IPPC secretary and the secretariat for the programme and the updates provided during CPM-18 (2024). The CPM noted requests for donors to contribute funds to the APP, including for surveillance, and for FAO to support this activity financially. The CPM also recognized the importance of the programme in developing diagnostic capacity. Some CPs also suggested that the longer-term positioning of the APP within FAO be considered, and the CPM chairperson confirmed that this would be discussed by the CPM Bureau and added to the agenda for the October 2024 SPG meeting.

The United State of America confirmed its commitment to continue provision of in-kind technical support for 2024 and the European Union committed to support the APP financially.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the significant progress made by the IPPC community in support of the development of the Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP);
2. *noted* the significant contribution and support provided by the United States of America;
3. *recognized* the significant work of, and commitment by, the pilot-phase contracting parties, including Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Guinea Bissau, Kenya, Mali, Morocco, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe;
4. *urged* contracting parties and the IPPC Secretariat to advocate for donor technical and financial support for the APP; and

*supported* the continued development of APP, with the potential vision for it to become a global phytosanitary programme.

16.4 Dispute Settlement Oversight Body (terms of reference and rules of procedure)

A CPM Bureau representative referred the CPM to a paper on the proposed terms of reference and rules of procedure for the Dispute Settlement Oversight Body, which had been drafted by the CPM Bureau and amended to incorporate feedback from the SPG.[[26]](#footnote-27) As suggested by the SPG in 2023, the CPM Bureau had also reviewed the simplified diagram of the IPPC Dispute Settlement Procedures adopted by CPM-17 (2023). The revised version was presented to the CPM.

The bureau representative agreed with a suggestion that there was no need for any further consultation with the FAO Legal Office for future amendments of the terms of reference or rules of procedure.[[27]](#footnote-28)

In response to a suggested amendment to the simplified diagram, the CPM chairperson clarified that amendments could not be made to the substance of the diagram without opening up the dispute procedures themselves for revision, as the diagram reflected the procedures adopted by CPM-16 (2022).

The CPM agreed that any future decision to consult the FAO Legal Office about the terms of reference and rules of procedure was at the discretion of the CPM Bureau.

The CPM noted a correction that was required to the French version of the terms of reference, where “must” in the English version (which was correct) was translated as the equivalent of “can” in the French version.

The CPM:

1. *approved* the terms of reference and rules of procedure for the Dispute Settlement Oversight Body as presented in CPM 2024/33; and
2. *approved* the revised version of the simplified diagram of the Dispute Settlement Procedures as presented in Appendix 2 of CPM 2024/33.

17. Science session on case studies of systems approaches

A science session was held with the aim of providing strategic insights into systems approaches.[[28]](#footnote-29) Building on the experience of countries in implementing ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*), the session sought to facilitate profound discussion on the challenges, successes and insights gained in applying systems approaches.

The following speakers gave presentations:

* Rieks van Klinken (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation) – “Best Practices and Quantitative Perspectives”;
* Martin Edgardo Delucis (Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria (SENASA), Argentina) – “Lessons learned and challenges faced”;
* Cory Penca (United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) Science & Technology) “US experience with the use of a systems approach for export purposes”; and
* Justin Wall (USDA-APHIS-PPQ Pest Exclusion and Import Programs) – “US experience with the use of a systems approach for import purposes.

This was followed by a panel discussion and questions from the floor.

The CPM Bureau representative moderating the session noted the insights gained from the speakers and the questions from the audience. He emphasized the importance of systems approaches in providing an appropriate level of protection for importing countries, equivalent to other phytosanitary measures such as quarantine treatment. He also highlighted how science-based systems approaches offer a way to manage pest risk in a way that is both effective and least trade restrictive. The bureau representative noted a request from the floor for the presentations to be made available and thanked the speakers for their presentations and the organizers of the session. He finished by urging participants to heed the call to action for continued collaboration within the IPPC community and to leverage the knowledge shared today to inform further decision-making and to enhance the IPPC community’s collective efforts to safeguard plant health.

18. Successes and challenges in implementing the IPPC

The following contracting parties shared their successes, challenges and solutions relating to implementation of the IPPC:[[29]](#footnote-30)

* Argentina – “Going paperless in Argentina with the IPPC ePhyto Solution”;
* Nicaragua – “Fusarium Tropical Race 4 (TR4) simulation exercise in Nicaragua”;
* The Philippines – “Revolutionizing plant health: the impact of remote microscopy systems in the Philippines”;
* Uganda – “Leaving the old, embracing the new: Uganda’s success with ePhyto”; and
* Uzbekistan – “Phytosanitary capacity evaluation in Uzbekistan”.

19. Financial report and budget

19.1 IPPC financial report 2023

The secretariat presented its financial report, detailing the resources that were available in 2023 from the FAO regular-programme budget, extra-budgetary sources and in-kind (non-financial) sources.[[30]](#footnote-31)

The CPM noted funding commitments for 2024 from Australia (AUD 760 000 for 2024) and Japan, as well as the contributions already made by Canada (CAD 328 000), Ireland (EUR 100 000) and the Republic of Korea.

The CPM chairperson emphasized the importance of financial and in-kind contributions and thanked all those CPs who had provided funds or committed to do so in future.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the financial report of the IPPC Secretariat for 2023;
2. *adopted* the financial report for 2023 of the IPPC Multidonor Trust Fund (Special Trust Fund of the IPPC) as presented in Table 3 of CPM 2024/44;
3. *encouraged* contracting parties to contribute to the IPPC Multidonor Trust Fund (Special Trust Fund of the IPPC) and IPPC projects, preferably on an ongoing basis; and

*thanked* contracting parties that had contributed to the secretariat’s programme of work in 2023.

19.2 2024 IPPC Secretariat workplan and budget

The secretariat presented the workplan and budget of the secretariat for 2024,[[31]](#footnote-32) explaining that these were aligned with the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 and covered all parts of the secretariat and all types of funding.

The CPM considered an issue raised regarding one of the items in the workplan – consultation on a draft specification for the draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*). The CPM noted the diverging views among CPs and RPPOs, with some suggesting that the draft annex be submitted for consultation in 2024 rather than the specification for it being revised, and others considering that the draft annex was not ready for consultation. The CPM also noted, however, that there were grounds for optimism that progress could be made within regional meetings being held in preparation for the SC meeting in May.

The CPM:

1. *approved* the workplan and budget of the IPPC Secretariat for 2024; and

*encouraged* the SC, at its meeting in May 2024, to make its best efforts to resolve the technical issues concerning the draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) and achieve an agreement to submit the draft annex to first consultation in July 2024, avoiding unnecessary delays.

20. Implementation of communications strategy

The secretariat presented an update on their communications and advocacy activities.[[32]](#footnote-33) This was based on the eight milestones identified in the IPPC Communications Strategy 2023–2030 and included an update on the forthcoming International Day of Plant Health, which was to be observed on 12 May 2024. Following subsequent discussions with RPPOs and internally within the secretariat, the secretariat recommended that centrally managed, regional communications networks be established rather than establishing a “community of practice” in communications as envisaged in the communications strategy. The secretariat also recommended that a steering group be established to provide advice in setting up these networks and to develop the associated terms of reference, governance mechanism and guidelines for engagement.

The CPM commended the secretariat on their excellent communication materials.

The CPM chairperson informed the CPM that the bureau, at its meeting the previous week, had agreed to invite CPM-18 (2024) to strongly recommend that FAO adopt the theme of “One Health” for the 2025 IDPH.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the updates on the implementation of the IPPC Communications Strategy 2023–2030;
2. *approved* the establishment of IPPC Regional Communications Networks and an associated steering group; and

*strongly recommended* that FAO adopt the theme of “The Importance of Plant Health to One Health” for the 2025 International Day of Plant Health and *requested* that the secretariat make representations to FAO to this effect.

21. External cooperation

21.1 Update from IPPC regional workshops

The secretariat presented a paper on the 2023 IPPC regional workshops,[[33]](#footnote-34) and highlighted the CPM Bureau’s recommendation of having a fourth day in the regional workshops’ agenda.

The CPM noted a suggestion that the secretariat discuss the length and content of each workshop with the respective RPPO. Contracting parties also urged the workshop organizing committees to incorporate dedicated activities aimed at identifying and discussing important plant-health issues related to implementation of the IPPC in the 2024 workshops (see agenda item 9.2).

The CPM:

1. *noted* the update from the 2023 IPPC regional workshops; and

*noted* the CPM Bureau’s recommendation of a fourth day in the regional workshops’ agenda and *encouraged* the secretariat to work with each RPPO to determine the length and content for each workshop.

21.2 Update on international cooperation

The secretariat presented a report highlighting the main cooperative activities with international organizations, research and academic organizations, and RPPOs in 2023.[[34]](#footnote-35)

Contracting parties encouraged the secretariat to continue engagement with the Berne process on biodiversity and report this activity to the CPM. In response to a suggestion that the secretariat liaise with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) to avoid any duplication of effort with work on sea containers, a representative from the CBD Secretariat assured the CPM that there was no duplication and that they would be reporting on their joint work with the IPPC Secretariat to the Sixteenth Conference of the Parties of the CBD.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the report on the 2023 international cooperation activities.

21.3 Written reports from international organizations

The following international organizations provided written reports:[[35]](#footnote-36)

* CAB International (CABI);
* Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
* The Committee Linking Entrepreneurship-Agriculture-Development. (COLEAD);
* Centre International de Hautes Etudes Agronomiques Méditerranéennes (CIHEAM)
* International Forestry Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG);
* International Maritime Organization (IMO)
* International Seed Federation (ISF)
* Joint FAO/IAEA Centre of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture (IAEA)
* The International Grain Trade Coalition (IGTC)
* Ozone Secretariat for the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer
* Phytosanitary Measures Research Group (IPRG);
* Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF);
* World Trade Organization (WTO).

The CPM:

1. *noted* the reports from international organizations.

22. Memberships and potential replacements for CPM Bureau, Standards Committee and the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee

22.1 Membership and potential replacements for CPM Bureau

The CPM was invited to confirm the CPM Bureau member for one region and elect some CPM Bureau replacement members.[[36]](#footnote-37)

The CPM noted a request for greater better visibility of the selection criteria for members of the CPM Bureau and the SC. IPPC secretary explained that the process of selection was well-documented and approved. He suggested that the secretariat reach out to regions to communicate the process.

The CPM chairperson drew the attention of the CPM to an agreement that had been reached between the Near East and Europe regions, following the unexpected passing of the CPM Bureau representative from the Near East region. The two regions had agreed that they would alternate the periods allocated for their vice-chairing of the CPM, chairing of the SPG, and chairing of the CPM.[[37]](#footnote-38)

Regarding replacement members of the CPM Bureau, the CPM chairperson informed the CPM that, according to the wishes of the North America region, a second replacement was not being sought for this region.

The CPM:

1. *noted* the current membership of the CPM Bureau as presented in Annex 1A of CPM 2024/38;
2. *confirmed* Dris BARIK (Morocco) as the CPM Bureau member from the Near East region (CPM 2024/CRP/08);
3. *noted* the current replacements for members of the CPM Bureau as presented in Annex 1B of CPM 2024/38; and

*elected* CPM Bureau replacement members from the Europe, Asia, the Near East and North Africa, and Southwest Pacific regions as presented in CPM 2024/CRP/08.

22.2 Membership and potential replacements for SC members

The CPM was invited to confirm the membership and potential replacements for the SC.[[38]](#footnote-39)

The CPM:

1. *noted* the current membership of the SC as presented in Annex 1A of CPM 2024/39 and the potential replacements for the SC as presented in Annex 1B of CPM 2024/39;
2. *confirmed* new members and potential replacements for the SC, and the order in which potential replacements will be called upon for each region, as presented in CPM 2024/CRP/08; and
3. *acknowledged* the contributions of the members of the SC who had left the SC since CPM-17 (2023):
* Costa Rica, Hernando Morera GONZÁLEZ,
* Islamic Republic of Iran, Maryam Jalili MOGHADAM,
* Sudan, Abdelmoneem Ismaeel ADRA ABDETAM,
* Thailand, Chonticha RAKKRAI, and
* United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Samuel BISHOP.

22.3 Membership and potential replacements for IC members

The secretariat invited the CPM to confirm the membership and potential replacements for the IC.[[39]](#footnote-40)

The CPM:

1. *confirmed* the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee members, as well as the replacement members and the order in which the replacement members will be called upon for each region, as presented in Appendix 1 of CPM 2024/40\_Rev1;
2. *encouraged* Asia and Southwest Pacific to nominate IC regional replacement members for their respective regions; and
3. *acknowledged* the contribution of the following former members of the IC:
* Ruth AREVALO MACIAS (Chile),
* Lalith BANDUL KUMARASINGHE (New Zealand),
* Stephanie BLOEM (United States of America),
* Nilesh Ami CHAND (Fiji),
* Christopher DALE (Australia), and
* Magda GONZALEZ ARROYO (Costa Rica).

On behalf of the CPM, the IPPC secretary thanked the former and outgoing members of the CPM Bureau, the SC and the IC, and also recognized the contributions of four long-standing members of the IPPC community who were retiring.

23. Any other business

Two side-sessions were held during CPM-18 (2024): one on e-commerce and the other on Fusarium TR4. A CPM-orientation session was also held before the start of the CPM session.
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