



## **Agenda Item 9.2: Report from Implementation and Capacity Development Committee**

**CPM Document:** CPM 2024/41

### **EU STATEMENT:**

The EU and its 27 Member States express their appreciation for the collaborative efforts of the IC and its Subgroup and Teams throughout 2023. We extend our gratitude to the experts involved in the development of IPPC Guides and recognize the invaluable support provided by the IPPC Secretariat to the IC.

It is essential to acknowledge that the effectiveness of IPPC activities relies on the contribution of temporary staff and project financing from various donors. EU contributes and provides funds to support such activities as the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System (POARS), Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation, IPPC Observatory, and others. Therefore, the EU and its 27 Member States encourage other contracting parties, Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs), and other relevant organizations to allocate resources to programs that are under-financed.

In light of this, we kindly urge the organizing committees of IPPC Regional Workshops to incorporate dedicated activities aimed at identifying and discussing important plant health issues related to IPPC implementation in the regions during IPPC Regional workshops in 2024. These may include but are not limited to the pest situation within respective regions or countries, pest surveillance, outbreak management strategies, and the application of phytosanitary measures.

**Agenda Item 12.1: Update from the CPM focus group on  
Sustainable funding of the IPPC ePhyto Solution**

**CPM Document:** CPM 2024/15\_Rev1

**EU STATEMENT:**

The EU and its 27 Member States thank the Task Force, the Bureau and the Secretariat for the proposed Procedures for the IPPC ePhyto Solution Funding Model. Since the ePhyto Solution inception, we have been fully supportive to its development. We thus welcome the proposal and can accept it as an important initial step towards a fully-fledged ePhyto system.

We however stress the need to move towards a more sustainable means of funding this tool, and therefore reiterate that funding the ePhyto solution by FAO should be the priority option.

As the current use of the ePhyto solution has not achieved its full potential, we believe that its use will increase, and that the large majority of, if not all, Contracting Parties will progressively join in. We hope that most of the countries not using the system for now will do so in the near future. We therefore expect the review planned to take place after 2 years to analyse thoroughly the situation at the time and its effect on the model details. This should include *the review of the balance between the base fee and the usage fee and whether the usage fee part should not be increased.*

## Agenda Item 12.2: Commodity specific ISPMs

CPM Document: CPM 2024/16

### **EU STATEMENT:**

The EU and its 27 Member States thank the IPPC TPCS and the SC for the work done so far on the development of commodity specific ISPMs. The EU strongly believes that this is a very important item that will shape the future of international trade of plants and plant products and facilitate phytosanitary controls on those commodities.

Considering that the development of Commodity specific ISPMs is in its early stage, it is important to continue to devote sufficient time and resources to ensure the highest quality of the first standards. Therefore, we suggest that the first draft Commodity standard that would be presented in a forthcoming CPM meeting for vote could be presented in detail in a CPM side session or to a wider audience in a webinar to demonstrate its quality and its potential added value for international trade.

Finally, the EU is devoted to financially and scientifically support the activities on the development of commodity specific ISPMs.

## **Agenda Item 12.5: Strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems (POARS)**

**CPM Document:** CPM 2024/19

### **EU STATEMENT:**

The EU and its Member States note the update on POARS activities and highlights that the SG POARS was first convened on 1 March 2024.

Regarding the update document, the EU and its Member States recognise that national reporting obligations (NRO) is linked to POARS system and should be considered together with other source of information for identification of emerging pests.

We suggest that the timeline of activities for the work program should be moved forward and invite the SG POARS to present a revised timeline of activities for the work program to the next SPG for discussion.

Finally, the EU and its Member States emphasise the relevance to set the POARS system according to SF 2020-2030 and the EU is devoted to financially and scientifically support the activities of POARS.

## Agenda Item 12.7: Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination

CPM Document: CPM 2024/21

### **EU STATEMENT:**

The EU and its Member States are favourably welcoming this proposal to establish a Focus Group on the Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination.

Several mechanisms to coordinate research already exist and the EU and its Member States are of the opinion that the main role for the IPPC is to facilitate the coordination of Phytosanitary Research by supporting the existing organizations coordinating phytosanitary research, in assisting them with their coordination mechanisms or in fulfilling any possible gaps.

In this regard, we think that this Focus Group should first understand the current coordination mechanisms. This scoping exercise should not extensively focus on how the research mechanisms are working but should draw the attention on how the IPPC could facilitate the interconnection between those different existing research coordination mechanisms. If during the Scope phase, the Focus Group were to reach the conclusion that existing mechanisms are sufficient, then there will be no more reason for further work on this topic. However, if gaps or needs are determined, then the next steps would consist in developing an implementing plan as stated in the Draft Terms of Reference for the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination (CPM 2024/21).

The EU and its Member States would like to emphasize this two-steps approach by modifying the 'Purpose' section in the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination as follows:

*“... During the Scope and Plan phase, a study is to be conducted to build an understanding of the coordination mechanisms that already exist, such as Euphresco, what gaps the IPPC could fill (or whether existing mechanisms are sufficient), and how ~~they~~ the IPPC will contribute to and support ~~them~~ these mechanisms. The need for developing an implementation*

*plan and the continuation of the DAI would depend on the outcome of the Scope study and be subject to a CPM decision based on this work.*

The EU and its Member States also suggest to modify the tasks of the ‘Functions’ section in the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination as follows:

- (1) undertake a scoping study to build an understanding of the existing research coordination mechanisms that are necessary for the IPPC to advance collaboration and accelerate development of ~~science~~ scientific evidence to support all regulatory phytosanitary activities;*
- (2) ~~(5)~~ as part of the scoping study, analyze consult with and explore existing international research coordination structures and mechanisms, and ~~explore~~ map the options for enhancing regional and global research coordination;*
- (3) as part of the scoping study, explore assess the benefits of developing an IPPC policy and structure for international phytosanitary research coordination, especially with regard to determining the role of RPPOs in such coordination;*
- ~~(4) consult with, explore, and analyze existing international research organizations’ policies and perspectives to draft an IPPC international research coordination policy;~~*
- ~~(4)~~ ~~(2)~~ as part conclusion of the scoping study, assess whether existing international research coordination mechanisms are sufficient and identify what gaps the IPPC could fill in interconnecting or in facilitating them;*
- (5) following further CPM approval, draft an IPPC international research coordination policy.*
- (6) following further CPM approval, provide advice for CPM consideration on the possible mechanisms for implementing the IPPC Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination SF 2020-2030 development agenda item, on both the research coordination policy the CPM may adopt and the identified coordination facilitators, mechanisms and/or structures;*
- (7) as part of this advice, develop a draft implementation and monitoring plan for IPPC Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination including proposed milestones to be reached within a seven-year period;*
- ~~(8) Perform other related functions as required;~~*
- (8) provide any further observations or recommendations to the CPM as deemed appropriate;*

Besides the tasks enumerated in the ‘Functions’ section in the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination (CPM 2024/21), the EU and its

Member States recognize the importance for the Focus Group members to have sufficient flexibility to adjust their tasks according to the experience gained. Nevertheless, if the Focus Group decides to modify, add or remove tasks, these decisions should at least be presented for approval to another relevant IPPC body such as the CPM Bureau or the IC. We would like to suggest to reformulate the first sentence of the ‘Functions’ section in the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination (CPM 2024/21) as follows:

*“The focus group may, upon approval of the CPM Bureau or the IC, decide to add tasks or amend the tasks listed below according to the information they gather during the active period”.*

We also suggest to delete the second sentence in the ‘Functions’ section in the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination (CPM 2024/21) because, as suggested above, this will appear as a task of the Focus Group (task 8 above).

*“~~The focus group may also provide any further observations or recommendations to the CPM as deemed appropriate.~~”*

With respect to the membership, the EU and its Member States do not fully understand the Focus Group composition. The need in terms of research might differ from one region to another and this regional view is of great importance. It seems thus important to include more representatives from the regional plant protection organizations. In addition to this, the EU and its Member States want to emphasize the need to include in this Focus Group representatives of existing coordination structures.

The EU and its Member States suggest to modify points (2), (6) and add a new point (7) in the ‘Membership’ section of the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination as follows:

*(2) ~~One representative of the ten~~ Three members representing regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs);*

*(6) Three members representing existing research coordination structures;*

*(7) ~~(6)~~ (Optional) up to three observers representing academia, industry or civil society.*

In order to be in line with the above suggested modifications, the section on ‘Expected start date and Duration’ of the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination should be updated as follows:

*“The focus group will be established by the Bureau by June 2024 to first perform the scoping exercise and present its findings and conclusions to the SPG in October 2025, to the IC in November 2025 and to the CPM Bureau in 2025. The final study-based report and recommendations will be presented by the focus group to CPM-20 (in 2026) for decision on whether to further proceed with the drafting of ~~draft~~ a new policy, structure, and plan for the global phytosanitary research coordination. In case the scoping study demonstrates a need for the IPPC to be further involved and upon approval of CPM-20, the focus group could remain effective until the CPM approves the implementation plan and mechanism of the Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination that could be considered by ~~CPM-20 (in 2026)~~ CPM-21 (in 2027).”*

With respect to the expected outputs, the EU and its Member States would like to make clear that point (1), in the ‘Expected Outputs’ of the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination, would be presented and related conclusions would be subject to the approval of CPM-20 (in 2026). Whereas the completion of point (2) will be depend on the CPM-20 decisions and be presented, if agreed by CPM-20, in CPM-21 the earliest. We therefore suggest the following adaptations:

*“ (1) For CPM-20, a report of the scoping study to be conducted by the focus group to explore the current international and regional phytosanitary research structures and policies to identify gaps to be filled in policy and structure coordination mechanisms ~~and structure.~~*  
*(2) Upon approval of CPM-20 and for CPM-21, a proposal on policy and structure of a coordination mechanism to be established.”*

The EU and its Member States views as an advantage that the Focus Group reports its findings to the CPM Bureau, the SPG and the IC. We suggest to modify the section on ‘Reports to’ as follows:

*“ Reports to: SPG, IC, CPM Bureau and CPM”*

Finally, the EU and its Member States would like to express some concerns with respect to the financing of this Focus Group. Budget forecasts for the financing of all DAIs are included in the CPM



document 2024/13\_01, i.e. the investment prospectus developed by the IPPC Secretariat. However, the prospectus is intended to support further resource mobilization. It remains currently unclear if the IPPC Secretariat has provided sufficient provisions for funding the work on this DAI.

## **Agenda Item 12.8: Diagnostic Laboratory Networking**

**CPM Document:** CPM 2024/22

### **EU STATEMENT:**

On behalf of the EU and its 27 Member States, we would like to thank the Bureau and the Secretariat for the submission of the paper. We consider the issue of the diagnostic laboratories networking an important one, that directly supports surveillance activities of the NPPOs, and may play an important role in securing the NPPOs' capacities in a timely discovery of plant health risks and in a rapid response to them.

Nevertheless, we would like to make the following proposals:

- 1) Considering that the RPPOs may play an important role in the establishment and operation of the laboratory network, we find it appropriate that the composition of the focus group includes more than one RPPOs. This could be achieved for example, by either increasing the maximum number of members in the Focus Group, or by allowing the possibility that at least one of the seven members representing the NPPOs, one from each of the FAO regions, should also be nominated from the RPPO staff members.
- 2) the possibility of adding tasks or amend the tasks listed in ToRs should not be left solely up to the Focus Groups's discretion, but rather include also a filter with a Bureau involvement.

## Agenda Item 13.1: Safe Provision of Food and other Humanitarian Aid

CPM Document: CPM 2024/23

### **EU STATEMENT:**

The EU and its Member States thank the Focus Group on safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid (FGSA) and its experts for their work on this important topic. Of course, we fully share the view that food and other humanitarian aid should be free from pests, as these can cause mid- and long-term impacts on economies, environments, communities and livelihoods in the receiving countries. We therefore agree that NPPOs should do everything in their power to reduce the pest risk associated with food aid as much as possible. This means encouraging NPPOs of donor countries firstly to communicate with donor organizations to make them aware of the pest risks and the phytosanitary requirements to be met in order to limit these risks as much as possible, and secondly, for the rare situation where food aid passes through their hands, to carry out prompt and effective controls.

The EU understands that, according to the FGSA, in addition to the awareness raising activities with donor agencies and to the CPM Recommendation R-09 already adopted, developing a standard may help to achieve these objectives. We therefore welcome the draft specification for an ISPM which has been revised by the FGSA as asked by CPM-17 in 2023.

However, as developing an ISPM is a standard setting issue, we consider that the draft specification should be reviewed by the Standards Committee (SC) before being submitted for consultation in July 2024. This would allow in particular the SC to consider more thoroughly task 10 of the draft specification:

“(10) With reference to ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*) and other ISPMs and information resources as required, consider generating a holistic table of goods (plant products and regulated articles), risks and possible pest risk management options, together with the corresponding information resources.”

which we fear could prove too heavy (demanding) for the Expert Drafting Group (EDG) that will develop the draft standard on food and other humanitarian aid, because this task as currently formulated would mean elaborating a large number of commodity standards, developing one is already a major task, and we still have little experience in the field. The EU therefore considers that restricting this task would be necessary, to keep it realistic and fit for purpose, perhaps for example replacing task 10 with asking the EDG to work in co-operation with donor agencies (e.g. World Food Programme) to identify and list the most feasible options to manage the plant pest risk associated with provision of food and other humanitarian aid.

As regards the draft aid pathway diagram gap analysis, which includes the draft definition for the term “emergency pathway” (term which we find misleading and therefore propose tentatively to replace by the term “unregulated aid movement”), the EU considers that they should be further considered by the EDG that will develop the draft standard, in addition to the 2024 IPPC regional workshops. The SC could therefore consider adding a task 14(a) and a task 14(b) to the draft specification in this respect, so that the EDG is also tasked to:

“(14a) Consider whether there is a need for developing one term (to be used within the standard only or for ‘global’ adoption as a Glossary term) to express the concept of “*moving aid via unregulated means, with the NPPO of the recipient (or transit) country unable to fulfil its normal functions (e.g. pest risk analysis, inspection, treatments, communication of phytosanitary import requirements)*”, and if so, provide a tentative recommendation for such term and its definition.

(14b) Review the draft aid pathway diagram gap (attached to the draft specification) and, if necessary, revise it to bring it fully in line with the concept defined in task 14(a).

Lastly, the EU fully supports the one-year extension of the mandate of the focus group until CPM 19, in particular to collaborate closely with the World Food Programme as a member of the Focus Group and other international organizations to develop an action plan to more holistically address the issue.

In conclusion, in view of our comments as set out above, we suggest amending the CPM decisions of document CPM 2024/23 as follows:

“The CPM is invited to:

- (1) *note* the work of the focus group on safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to date.
- (2) *request the Standards Committee to review the revised draft Specification for an ISPM (Appendix 1) and to approve it for consultation period in July 2024.*

- (3) *agree* that the draft aid pathway diagram gap analysis ~~and draft definition for the term “emergency pathway”~~ (Appendix 2) will be further consulted throughout the IPPC community for example via the 2024 IPPC regional workshops.
- (4) *agree* to extend the mandate of the focus group until CPM-19 (2025) (as described in document CPM 2024/24 of agenda item 13.1.1, “Draft ToR for the extension of the CPM Focus Group.”)

## Agenda Item 13.2: Sea Containers

CPM Document: CPM 2024/25

### EU STATEMENT:

The EU and its Member States would like to extend their thanks and appreciation to the Focus Group on Sea Containers for their work, as described in the report and for the proposals to continue their work. We can agree to most decision points but we would like to suggest a few amendments.

First of all, for us to agree to an extension of the mandate of the Focus Group, we would like to suggest to reformulate point 5 of the Functions (tasks) in the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers (CPM 2024/25\_02) as follows:

*(5) Analyse the information gathered in points 1-4 (above), assess the potential remaining pest risk and provide recommendation to CPM which long-term guidance is a preferred option for regulatory and non-regulatory measures, which are science based and proportionate to the pest risk, and if appropriate, develop a draft specification for such guidance.*

Furthermore, we would like to suggest to reformulate decision point 8 of CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers (CPM 2024/25) as follows:

*Agree that the Focus Group continue to assess possible regulatory and non-regulatory measures proportionate to the pest risk, and the value and feasibility of developing long-term guidance, in accordance with IPPC procedures, and that any decisions on developing long term guidance would be considered by the CPM in the future.*

In our view, the long term guidance can take any form and not all types of guidance have to developed according to the standard setting procedure e.g. a guide or an e-learning course. We think it would be good to keep all options open at the moment.

We are of the opinion that possible future measures, either regulatory or non-regulatory, should be science based and proportionate to the pest risk. We therefore would like to suggest to reformulate the, in our view, very important Function (task) number 4 in the proposed ToR as follows:

*Consider the practicalities and possible negative impacts of the identified options on container logistics, supply chains and NPPOs, as well as the required systems and tools and make sure that identified options are science based and proportionate to the pest risk.*

## Agenda Item 16.1: Update on One Health

CPM Document: CPM 2024/31 & CPM 2024/31\_01

### **EU STATEMENT:**

The EU and its Member States are favourably welcoming this proposal to establish a Focus Group on the One Health topic. The EU and its Member States agree that there is an increasing interest towards the One Health approach and that there is perhaps a missing opportunity for the plant health community to be more visible within this One Health canvas.

The EU and its Members States support the necessity for this Focus Group to work on improving the communication and advocacy of the IPPC community within this One Health paradigm, but we also believe that the Terms of Reference are lacking tasks with a more strategic vision and methodology.

The EU and its Member States are convinced that optimizing the recognition and the place of plant health within this approach could only be reached if a better understanding is first achieved on how plant health is connected within this approach. The first and most important task of this Focus Group should thus be to understand and enumerate the links between plant health and One Health in both ways. The purpose of the Focus Group should also include a preliminary study aiming at understanding and listing the One Health topics where either plant health is contributing to One Health or in the other way around where One Health could impact plant health. We recommend to change the ‘Background and purpose’ section in the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for the CPM Focus Group on One Health (CPM 2024/31\_01) as follows:

*“...The paper emphasized the need for communication and advocacy and the CPM decided to establish a focus group to conduct a preliminary study aiming at understanding and listing the One Health topics where either plant health could contribute to One Health or in the other way around where One Health could impact plant health and this Focus Group will then draw up an action plan for communication and advocacy, including steps for ensuring and enhancing the IPPC community’s participation and voice in the FAO One Health Committee structure and activity.”*



Therefore, with respect to the tasks listed in the 'Functions (tasks)' section of the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for the CPM Focus Group on One Health (CPM 2024/31\_01), we would like to suggest the addition of this task as point 1. Once the Focus Group will determine if and where there is an added value for the IPPC community to be more engaged in this One Health approach, these justifications will have to be enumerated and made available to the IPPC community. This necessitates to add another task in the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for the CPM Focus Group on One Health (CPM 2024/31\_01).

The EU and its Member States suggest the first tasks in the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for the CPM Focus Group on One Health (CPM 2024/31\_01) to be presented as follows:

- 1. As part of the preliminary study, understand how plant health could contribute to the One Health approach by determining the interrelations and interdependencies between plant health and the other pillars of this approach.*
- 2. ~~As part of the preliminary study,~~ collect national and regional experiences from NPPOs and RPPOs relating to One Health.*
- 3. ~~As part of the preliminary study,~~ liaise with the steering group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems, the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues, and other relevant focus groups and CPM, United Nations or FAO bodies.*
- 4. As conclusion of the preliminary study, enumerate the One Health topics where plant health is contributing*

The EU and its Member States are of the opinion that those first four tasks, constituting the preliminary study, will ease the understanding of plant health contribution to One Health and facilitate the implementation of the remaining tasks. By having a clear picture of the links between plant health and One Health, the Focus will then be able to suggest adaptation within the IPPC strategies and develop a plan for enhancing IPPC communication and advocacy. At the end of this preliminary study, the Focus Group should provide a report of this preliminary study and once the content of this study will be approved by the relevant CPM body, then the Focus Group should move on to the second step related to the drafting of the action plan for communication and advocacy.

Therefore, the EU and its Member States suggest to change the numbering of the following five tasks of the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for the CPM Focus Group on One Health (CPM 2024/31\_01) as follows:

- ~~5.~~ *4. Consider the addition of ...*
- ~~6.~~ *5. Draw up an action plan ...*
- ~~7.~~ *3. Consider the added value ...*
- ~~8.~~ *9. Provide information and ...*
- ~~9.~~ *10. Consider whether a formal ...*

Furthermore, the EU and its Member States support the need to be more involved at FAO level. The IPPC is part of the FAO structure and it seems logical to contribute more in FAO groups related to the One Health concept. The related tasks of the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for the CPM Focus Group on One Health (CPM 2024/31\_01) could therefore be presented as follows:

- ~~10.~~ *8. Consider how the IPPC ...*
- ~~11.~~ *7. Consider how participation ...*
- ~~12.~~ *6. Develop a plan for enhancing ...*

Finally, it seems important for the EU and its Member States that the Focus Group presents observations and recommendations in a timely manner to CPM. We therefore agree with the following task which has been moved to task 13 as follows:

- ~~13.~~ *11. Present any observations ...*

In order to be in line with the above suggested modifications, the section on ‘Expected outputs’ of the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for the CPM Focus Group on One Health should be updated as follows:

*“The focus group will initiate work by mid-2024 to first perform a preliminary study and present its findings and conclusions to the Bureau in December 2024 and to CPM-19 (in 2025) and remain then active until early 2026 or upon completion of its outputs and the presentation of its final report and recommendations with respect to the action plan for communication and advocacy to the CPM.”*

With respect to the expected outputs, we suggest the section on ‘Expected outputs’ to be modified as follows:

1. For CPM-19, one report detailing the findings and conclusions of the preliminary studies
- ~~2.~~ 1. For a later CPM, one or more reports to the CPM detailing:

- ~~national and regional experiences from NPPOs and RPPOs relating to One Health;~~
- advice to the CPM on whether to request FAO to dedicate an International Day of Plant Health to One Health;
- support to the IPPC secretary in preparing a CPM side session on One Health; and
- a report containing any observations and recommendations relevant to the CPM.

~~3. 2. For a later CPM,~~ a draft action plan to communicate and advocate “Plant Health” as one of the pillars of One Health as an additional component of the IPPC Communications Strategy (first to be presented to the SPG and CPM Bureau before presenting it to the CPM).

The EU and its Member States views as an advantage that the Focus Group reports its findings to the CPM Bureau and the CPM. We suggest therefore to modify the section ‘Reports to’ as follows:

*“Reports to: CPM Bureau and CPM”*

Finally, the EU and its Member States recognize the importance for the Focus Group members to have sufficient flexibility to adjust their tasks according to the experience gained. Nevertheless, if the Focus Group decides to modify, add or remove tasks, these decisions should at least be presented for approval to another relevant IPPC body such as the CPM Bureau or the IC. We would therefore like to suggest to reformulate the first sentence of the Functions (tasks) in the proposed Draft Terms of Reference for CPM Focus Group on One Health (CPM 2024/31\_01) as follows:

*“The focus group may, upon approval of the CPM Bureau or the IC, decide to add tasks or amend the tasks listed below according to the information they uncover during the active period”.*