

Statements from COSAVE member countries regarding several CPM 18 Agenda items

- Agenda Item 9.1.1 list of topics for IPPC Standards (Document [CPM 2024/07](#)) and Agenda item 16.5 Recommendations from the Task Force on Topics from the IPPC 2023 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation (Document [CPM 2024/34](#)):

Revision of ISPM 12

While no objection is raised to the revision of ISPM 12, we would like to draw attention that this standard has been revised 3 times since its adoption. The last time the revision was adopted by the CPM in 2022. Only one year after its adoption, it was proposed to revise it again. Therefore, we propose to give priority 2 to the revision of ISPM 12.

Annexes to ISPM 46 on the international movement of citrus fruit and the international movement of oranges

If a standard is developed for "citrus", we request that the background information presented in the topic "2023-027: ISPM 46 Annex: International movement of fresh orange (*Citrus sinensis*) fruit" be used as an input material for that development. If the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards is unable to move forward on "citrus", it is proposed that in that case the orange topic be moved to Priority 1.

Topics for commodity standards.

COSAVE countries wish to highlight the importance of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) carrying out an evaluation of the pests to be included in the list of pests for each commodity, based on the contributions made by contracting parties, during the call for topics. The TPCS should not include pests which do not follow the pathway, considering the intended use. It is noted that the same observation was made during the IPPC Regional Workshop for Latin America in 2023.

List of topics

It is noted that the topic lists are presented in 3 different documents, namely: CPM 2024/07 (list of topics for standards); CPM 2024/09 (list of topics for implementation and training material); and CPM 2024/34 (TFT recommendations).

The proposal with the final list of topics for each Committee is complex to analyze under this modality. Therefore, in order to facilitate the review of topic proposals, the COSAVE countries request the IPPC Secretariat that, for the upcoming CPM meetings, the new topics to be approved as well as the modifications to the lists of topics for both the Standards Committee (SC) and the Implementation Committee (IC) be presented unified in a single document for the SC topics and as well in another single document for the IC topics.

-Agenda Item 9.1.2 Modifications proposed to the standard setting procedure (Document [CPM 2024/08](#))

Justification: COSAVE and its member countries consider that commodities submitted during the call for topics should be approved by the CPM. In this regard, COSAVE and its member countries believe that the SC should recommend them to the CPM along with their priorities for addition to the work programme, being the CPM who should make the final decision on which commodities should be developed as Annex to ISPM 46. We suggest a drafting change in paragraph 10 of CPM 2024/08 document.

Regarding the other proposed revisions in the Standard Setting Procedure, COSAVE and its member countries consider that the participation of observers in the groups should be limited to participants from the host country..

Modifications proposed to the Standard Setting Procedure (Standard Setting Procedure and Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee)

Stage 1: Developing the List of topics for IPPC standards

Step 1: Call for topics

[...]

[10] The SC reviews the List of Topics (LOT) (including subjects). The SC recommends to the CPM topics and commodities as subjects and their priority for addition to the work programme. The SC includes other subjects into the work programme and recommends them to the CPM for noting.

[...]

1.Modifications proposed to the Standard Setting Procedure (other proposed revisions)

6. EXPERT WORKING GROUPS

[...]

6.1 Guidelines for the composition and organization of expert working groups

Criteria for the composition of an EWG

[21] An EWG:

[...]

- should ~~not~~ only allow observers from the host country as agreed in advance with the IPPC Secretariat in consultation with the steward of the EWG.

6.2 Guidelines for the operation of expert working groups

[...]

Roles of meeting organizers and participants

[...]

[31] Observers from the host country

[32] Observers from the host country are expected to:

- ~~- take responsibility for their travel and accommodation arrangements and visa requirements;~~
- provide additional information and data, if requested.

[33] Subject to the approval of the Chairperson, observers from the host country may participate in discussions without the right to participate in decision-making process.

[34] Observers from the host country are not eligible to receive travel assistance to attend meetings under any circumstances.

[...]

-Agenda Item 10 Adoption of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) (Document CPM 2024/10)

Justification: COSAVE and its member countries have no objection to the revision of ISPM 4. However, they want to note that the text proposed for adoption by the CPM has undergone many modifications after the second consultation period. Several of the changes made would require drafting adjustments and improvements to technical concepts, but being at the adoption stage the process only allows for objections to be raised.

Similar cases have been raised at other CPM meetings, and the CPM is invited to take note of this situation and the Standards Committee is invited to explore possible solutions.

COSAVE and its member countries propose to add a new decision point to CPM 2024/10 after decision point 4:

- *“request the SC to explore mechanisms to address technical issues to the drafts for adoption not being objections”.*

-Agenda Item 12.7 Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination terms of reference for the CPM focus group (Document [CPM 2024/21](#)), 12.8 Draft terms of reference for focus group on diagnosis laboratory networking ([CPM 2024/22](#)), and 16.1 Attachment 01: Draft Terms of Reference for CPM Focus Group on One Health (Document CPM2024/31_1)

Justification:

Regarding the tasks of the Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination, Laboratory Diagnostic Networks, and One Health, COSAVE and its member countries consider they should only be modified by the Bureau and not by the group itself. In the event that the Focus Group considers adding tasks or amending them, the FG should propose them to the Bureau for approval.

Modifications proposed to the Agenda Item 12.7 (Document [CPM 2024/21](#))

Functions

.....

The focus group may ~~decide to~~ add tasks or amend the tasks listed below according to the information they gather during the active period, for approval by the CPM Bureau.

Modifications proposed to the document Agenda item 12.8 (Document [CPM 2024/22](#))

Functions (tasks)

The focus group may ~~decide to~~ add tasks or amend the tasks listed below according to the information they uncover during the active period, for approval by the CPM Bureau

Modification proposed to the Agenda item 16.1 (Document [CPM 2024/31_1](#))

Functions (tasks)

The focus group may ~~decide to~~ add tasks or amend the tasks listed below according to the information they uncover during the active period, for approval by the CPM Bureau.

-Agenda Item 13.1 Update from the CPM focus group on safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid (Document [CPM 2024/23](#))

COSAVE and its member countries do not object to this Specification being sent for country consultation in July 2024.

However, decision point (2) in CPM 2024/23 does not specify which IPPC group will review the comments received during 2024 consultation and develop the Specification, therefore COSAVE and its member countries suggests adding text to clarify that Standards Committee should review the consultation comments and further develop and approve the specification.

Regarding decision point (3) in CPM 2024/23, we understand that a draft definition within the framework of the standard setting should be developed by the drafting expert group (before being discussed at the IPPC regional workshops). Therefore, we suggest that the EWG discuss in a first instance the need to define the term that is being proposed.

Therefore, we suggest the following amendments to CPM 2024/23

(2) review the revised draft Specification for an ISPM (Appendix 1) and approve it for consultation period in July 2024.

(3) note that the SC will review consultation comments and further develop and approve the specification, according to the Standard Setting Procedure.

(4) ~~(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 via the 2024 IPPC regional workshops~~ evaluated for developing the concept of “emergency pathway”

The specific comments to the specification will be provided during the consultation process. However, we are of the opinion that some parts of the text should be rephrased. In addition “emergency”, although not defined in the Glossary, is used in ISPMs to encompass adverse situations as created by pests, i.e with a more IPPC-specific meaning than suggested (where it covers all sorts of human-induced or natural disasters).

-Agenda Item 16.2 IPPC Survey on Antimicrobial products used in phytosanitary context (Document [CPM 2024/43](#))

Justification: As presented in Document CPM 2024/43, COSAVE and its member countries consider that the study of antimicrobial resistance should not be taken forward because survey results indicate that the use of antimicrobials in plant protection is very low.

COSAVE and its member countries disagree to extend the study on antimicrobials to analyse antimicrobial resistance, and therefore suggest to delete decision point (4) from the document CPM 2024/43.

~~(4) agree that the study on antimicrobials is extended to analyse of antimicrobial resistance and that the necessary resources should be allocated for this purpose.~~

- Agenda Item 16.4 IPPC Dispute Settlement Procedures (Document [CPM 2024/33](#))

COSAVE and its member countries agree with the terms of reference and rules of procedure of the Dispute Settlement Body presented in Appendix 1 of document 33. Therefore, we suggest that decision point (3) of document 33 be deleted.

~~(3) request the IPPC secretariat to consult with the FAO Legal Office if future amendments to the Terms of reference and rules of procedure for the Dispute Settlement Oversight Body need to be approved by the CPM or could be approved by the CPM bureau.~~

