



International
Plant Protection
Convention



REPORT

Bureau of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures

Rome, Italy

8 - 12 and 19 April 2024

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, 2024



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 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) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting	4
2.	Meeting arrangements	4
2.1	Election of the rapporteur	4
2.2	Adoption of the agenda	4
3.	Administrative matters	4
4.	Progress report of the IPPC Secretariat for 2023.....	4
5.	Review of previous bureau meetings reports (October 2023, December 2023).....	5
5.1	IPPC ePhyto Solution.....	6
5.2	Review of the IPPC meeting report-adoption policy	7
5.3	Draft criteria for the provision of financial support to attend meetings of the SPG and TC-RPPOs	7
5.4	Capturing wording regarding number of interventions.....	8
5.5	Disclaimer for CPM recommendations.....	9
6.	Logistics arrangements for CPM-18 (2024)	9
7.	Review of the CPM-18 (2024) agenda items with key issues for consideration.....	10
7.1	Phytosanitary capacity evaluation update and cost.....	10
7.2	Update on TR4 global coordination.....	11
7.3	Potential Friends of Chair meetings.....	12
7.4	Extension of mandate of CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid	12
7.5	ePhyto funding	13
8.	Other key issues to be considered by the bureau	13
8.1	SC decision and consensus issues and procedure.....	13
8.2	Procedure for adoption of CPM recommendations	14
9.	CPM bureau, Standards Committee and Implementation and Capacity Development Committee members and potential replacement members	15
10.	Any other business (pre-CPM).....	15
11.	Issues arising from CPM-18 (2024) for bureau action.....	16
12.	Arrangements for bureau activities in 2024	17
13.	Planning for future bureau meetings	18
14.	Any other business (post-CPM)	18
15.	Next meeting	19
16.	Close of the meeting.....	19
	Appendix 1: Agenda	20
	Appendix 2: Documents list.....	22
	Appendix 3: Participants list	23
	Appendix 4: References.....	24
	Appendix 5: Action list	25

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The Chairperson of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), Gregory WOLFF (North America), and the IPPC Secretary, Osama EL-LISSY, welcomed all participants to the meeting.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Election of the rapporteur

- [2] The CPM Bureau (hereafter referred to as the “bureau”) elected Diego QUIROGA (Latin America and the Caribbean) as rapporteur.

2.2 Adoption of the agenda

- [3] The bureau adopted the agenda (Appendix 1), modified to consider the CPM-orientation session, sea containers, a One Health paper and the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH) under agenda item 10 (Any other business, pre-CPM session). They also agreed to consider agenda item 5.1 after item 7.5, and they noted that they would review any miscellaneous issues regarding CPM-18 (2024) papers under agenda item 7 (Review of the CPM-18 agenda).
- [4] The bureau also noted that they would need to discuss arrangements for inviting FAO permanent representatives to a bureau meeting, as although it had been intended to invite them for this meeting, this had not happened.

3. Administrative matters

- [5] The list of documents is attached to this report as Appendix 2.
- [6] The list of participants is attached to this report as Appendix 3.

4. Progress report of the IPPC Secretariat for 2023

- [7] The IPPC secretary gave a verbal update to supplement the report from the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”) for CPM-18 (2024).¹ The secretary summarized the secretariat’s ongoing work and reported on two successes regarding workforce planning: the increased grades for General Staff positions, to align them with similar positions elsewhere in FAO; and the recent agreement from FAO that three of the current consultant positions, concerning finance, website management and communications, could be made into permanent positions. He also noted that gender equality had been added to the secretariat’s core values.
- [8] The secretary gave an update on the Africa Phytosanitary Programme and explained that he was in the process of visiting the relevant minister in each of the 11 countries in the pilot to emphasize the importance of national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) and secure their commitment to provide the workforce necessary to deliver the programme.
- [9] The secretary reported that work was ongoing to develop the IPPC Centre of Excellence, with plans to digitize ISPMs and further develop the phytosanitary treatments database. The establishment of the IPPC Global Trade Support Team was, however, still in the vision stage.
- [10] **Antimicrobial resistance.** The bureau discussed one of the areas of work covered in the secretariat’s report: the surveys on the use of antimicrobial products and an intended study on antimicrobial resistance. The bureau recalled their previous discussions about the need to distinguish between antibiotics and fungicides in the phytosanitary arena and reiterated their view that the focus should be on fungicides, given the extent to which fungicides were used in plant protection compared to antibiotics.

¹ CPM 2024/05.

- [11] The bureau noted the information paper submitted to CPM-18 (2024) from member countries of Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE), suggesting that no further work be done on antimicrobial resistance.² They recognized, however, that although the IPPC survey into antibiotic use in plant protection had shown that the usage rate was very low, there was still a perception outside the plant-health community that antibiotic resistance was a problem in the phytosanitary arena. Therefore, conducting surveys and studies could help to counter this misconception. There was also a need to distinguish between the crop-protection implications of potential antimicrobial resistance and the implications for animal and human health. The bureau emphasized the importance of using an evidence-based approach to the issue, based on science.
- [12] The bureau noted that the recent study by the European Food Safety Authority (Verhaegen *et al.*, 2024)³ had found antibiotics to be used in plant health in up to 39 countries, but unlike the IPPC survey it had not been restricted to a predefined list of antibiotics. However, the bureau also noted that the use of antibiotics in plant health accounted for only a very small proportion of the global use of antibiotics.
- [13] The bureau noted that the FAO Committee on Agriculture had encouraged FAO to work with the IPPC Secretariat, as appropriate, to prioritize the development of guidance on the use of antimicrobial agents for phytosanitary purposes.⁴
- [14] The bureau noted that, if the planned study on antimicrobial resistance revealed evidence of such resistance, then a report would be published under the auspices of the secretariat and it would then become a matter for the respective pesticide regulators in countries, as such matters were beyond the scope of the IPPC. When conducting the study, the bureau noted the need to search for evidence not only of resistance in plants but of how the use of these products affects animal health or human health.
- [15] The bureau:
- (1) *noted* the progress report from the secretariat.

5. Review of previous bureau meetings reports (October 2023, December 2023)

- [16] The CPM bureau reviewed the progress of actions arising from the October 2023 and December 2023 bureau meetings.⁵
- [17] **Sea containers.** The bureau considered the next steps, should CPM-18 (2024) adopt the revised CPM recommendation on *Sea containers* (R-06). They noted that, although one option would be for the work to be taken forward by subgroup of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) rather than the focus group, the proposed terms of reference for the extension of the focus group's mandate were more appropriate for a focus group, as it had a broader scope.
- [18] **Literature searches on antimicrobial resistance.** The bureau recalled their decision to prepare a paper to CPM-18 (2024), encouraging NPPOs to conduct comprehensive literature searches on antimicrobial use and the development of resistance (including examples of resistance that are linked to human or animal health).⁶ The secretariat confirmed that, in the meantime, they had reached out to the FAO Library, who had conducted a literature search. The bureau agreed to leave the matter until CPM-18 (2024).
- [19] **Rotation of CPM and Strategic Planning Group (SPG) chairing.** The bureau noted that, since the passing of the bureau member for the Near East and North Africa region, the Europe and the Near East and North Africa regions had agreed to alternate the periods allocated for chairing. Under this arrangement, the bureau member from Europe would fill the role of CPM vice-chairperson and SPG

² CPM 2024/INF/20.

³ See Appendix 4.

⁴ Committee on Agriculture (COAG), 2023/07, agenda item II.2.4.

⁵ CPM bureau meetings: <https://www.ippc.int/en/commission/bureau/>

⁶ CPM Bureau 2023/10, agenda item 21.

chairperson until CPM-19 (2025), after which the role would be filled by the bureau member from the Near East and North Africa. The secretariat confirmed that they would post a CPM information paper to advise contracting parties about this arrangement.

[20] The bureau:

- (2) *noted* the progress of actions arising from the October 2023 and December 2023 bureau meetings;
- (3) *agreed* that the CPM chairperson would represent the bureau at the CPM-orientation session at CPM-18 (2024);
- (4) *noted* the suggestion made at their previous meeting that a possible theme for the science session at CPM-19 (2025) could be climate change; and
- (5) *requested* that the secretariat post a CPM information paper on the role of CPM rapporteurs using the text agreed by the bureau at their October 2023 meeting.

5.1 IPPC ePhyto Solution

[21] The bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution, Peter THOMSON (replacement bureau member for Southwest Pacific), was present for this agenda item, which was considered after agenda item 7.5.

Governance and nomination of a bureau representative to the ePhyto Steering Group

[22] The bureau considered a paper regarding governance arrangements for the ePhyto Steering Group and the nomination of a bureau representative to the group.⁷

[23] **Selection process for members of the steering group.** The bureau noted that, under the current terms of reference for the steering group, each regional representative was selected by the regional plant protection organization (RPPO) in the region and the selection communicated to the bureau through the region's bureau member.⁸ The bureau was invited to consider whether to change this to the approach used for the selection of members to other groups (e.g. Standards Committee (SC), IC, focus groups), where regions nominate experts and then the bureau makes the selection. The bureau agreed to this alternative approach and noted that they would need to check whether the existing terms of reference already included selection criteria.

[24] **Replacing non-attending members.** The bureau noted the very poor attendance record of two members of the steering group. They noted that the timing of the meetings may be an issue but agreed that new members should be sought to replace the two who were not attending regularly.

[25] **Governance arrangements.** The bureau recalled their decision in December 2023 that the bureau would serve as the governing body for the IPPC ePhyto Solution and its funding mechanism, at least until such time that a long-term governance arrangement was agreed.⁹ The bureau noted that questions about the governance of the ePhyto Solution had arisen at CPM meetings because of a lack of transparency and because the steering group had been focused on operational matters rather than governance. The bureau agreed to discuss the matter at their June meeting and noted the need to be very clear, in their discussions, about what governance was being sought by contracting parties. The bureau noted that interventions about ePhyto governance at recent CPM meetings could provide the basis for the bureau discussions in June.

⁷ 04_Bureau_2024_Apr.

⁸ Terms of reference for ePhyto Steering Group:

https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2020/07/ESG_ToR_Revised_Nov_2019-10-30.pdf

⁹ CPM Bureau 2023/12, agenda item 4.1.

Select a sitting bureau member for the development-agenda item “Harmonization of Electronic Data Exchange”

[26] The bureau recalled that, at their October meeting,¹⁰ they had deferred the selection of a bureau lead for the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 development-agenda item (DAI) “Harmonization of Electronic Data Exchange”. They agreed to discuss the matter in their post-CPM session.

[27] The bureau:

- (6) *deferred* the nomination of a bureau representative to the ePhyto Steering Group to the bureau meeting immediately after CPM-18 (2024);
- (7) *agreed* that new experts of the ePhyto Steering Group representing FAO regions should be selected to replace those not participating on a regular basis;
- (8) *agreed* that, in terms of the selection process, experts of the ePhyto Steering Group from each of the FAO regions should be nominated (instead of selected), with a statement of commitment from the expert’s employer, through the respective regional bureau members and selected by (instead of communicated to) the bureau (terms of reference of the ePhyto Steering Group to be reviewed accordingly);
- (9) *agreed* that the ePhyto Steering Group would support the IPPC Secretariat to supervise the funding mechanism, in agreement with its current terms of reference;
- (10) *agreed*, depending on CPM-18 (2024) decisions, to include a specific item on governance (oversight of the funding model and provision of strategic direction for the future of the IPPC ePhyto Solution) in the agenda for the bureau meeting in June 2024 (the ePhyto Steering Group terms of reference may also be modified accordingly); and
- (11) *deferred* the selection of a bureau lead for the development-agenda item on “Harmonization of Electronic Data Exchange” to the bureau meeting immediately after CPM-18 (2024).

5.2 Review of the IPPC meeting report-adoption policy

[28] Further to the bureau’s discussions at their last meeting,¹¹ the bureau continued their review of the policy for adoption of reports at IPPC meetings.

[29] The secretariat confirmed that the process for IC meetings, where the whole report was adopted at the end of the meeting, was working well.

[30] The bureau noted that the SC had agreed to adopt the decisions at the end of the meeting but to adopt the whole report afterwards by e-decision. The bureau agreed that, if the SC and the SC chairperson were comfortable with this approach, then there was no need for the bureau to intervene.

[31] The bureau:

- (12) *agreed* that no further discussion was needed about the adoption policy for IPPC meetings.

5.3 Draft criteria for the provision of financial support to attend meetings of the SPG and TC-RPPOs

[32] The bureau recalled their decision to include this item on their agenda, following comments made at the SPG meeting in October 2023 about ways of improving regional representation at meetings of the SPG and Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPOs).¹² The bureau

¹⁰ CPM Bureau 2023/10, agenda item 24.3.

¹¹ CPM Bureau 2023/12, agenda item 4.2.

¹² CPM Bureau 2023/10, agenda item 21.

had discussed it further at their December 2023 meeting;¹³ and the Finance Committee had discussed the matter earlier in the week but had deferred further consideration to the bureau.¹⁴

- [33] The bureau supported the idea that, in addition to the usual criteria for receiving financial support to attend IPPC meetings, financial support for attendance at meetings of the SPG or TC-RPPOs meetings should be conditional on the recipient playing an active role in the meeting. For the SPG, this could be the submission of a paper or a commitment to give a presentation or act as the rapporteur.
- [34] One bureau member suggested that another criterion could be that the recipient had attempted to secure financial assistance from other sources but without success.
- [35] Another bureau member suggested that the TC-RPPOs be invited to consider what criteria would be appropriate. The CPM chairperson noted that the SPG could also be invited to comment in October 2024, followed by a review by the bureau in December 2024 and then presentation to CPM-19 (2025).
- [36] The secretariat advised that there was sufficient funding for a maximum of five to ten people, for the SPG and TC-RPPOs combined, and for this level of funding it would be appropriate for the criteria to be decided by the bureau rather than the CPM. The CPM chairperson noted the need for transparency and the secretariat confirmed that the criteria could be included in the 2025 revision of the *IPPC procedure manual for governance*.
- [37] The bureau:
- (13) *requested* that the secretariat draft criteria for the provision of financial support to attend meetings of the SPG and TC-RPPOs, for consideration by the bureau at their meeting in June 2024; and
 - (14) *agreed* to consider at their meeting in June 2024 whether the criteria would be submitted to the CPM for approval or approved by the bureau and presented to the CPM for noting.

5.4 Capturing wording regarding number of interventions

- [38] The bureau recalled that, at its June 2023 meeting,¹⁵ they had agreed to continue the practice of using “a few” and “some” to record the number of interventions at CPM meetings but to review the policy after CPM-18 (2024).
- [39] They discussed a possible alternative approach and agreed to try it at CPM-18 (2024), rather than waiting until after the CPM meeting. The secretariat confirmed that they would explain the approach during their procedural introduction at the start of the meeting.
- [40] The bureau:
- (15) *agreed* that, as a trial, the following approach would be used to record interventions in the CPM-18 report:
 - the report would avoid referring to the number of interventions where possible,
 - where this was not possible, the report would use “some” to describe multiple interventions rather than distinguishing between “some” and “a few” interventions,
 - a verbal intervention from the European Union on an item for which the European Union has declared a shared competence would be treated as a multiple intervention,
 - a verbal intervention from a contracting party made on behalf of multiple contracting parties would be treated as a single intervention unless supported by a written statement from the contracting parties concerned, and

¹³ CPM Bureau 2023/12, agenda item 4.9.

¹⁴ FC 2024/04, agenda item 6.

¹⁵ CPM Bureau 2023/06, agenda item 5.2.

- in line with instructions for FAO governing bodies, the report would focus on key discussions and decisions and would include only those interventions that were critical to the understanding of the context and the decisions reached; and
- (16) *agreed* to review this approach before CPM-19 (2025).

5.5 Disclaimer for CPM recommendations

- [41] **Disclaimers.** The bureau recalled their previous discussions on the possible inclusion of a disclaimer in CPM recommendations, which was aimed at addressing concerns from contracting parties about the potential for guidance other than ISPMs to be cited in trade disputes under the World Trade Organization's Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement).¹⁶ The bureau had not reached consensus on the best way to differentiate between ISPMs, CPM recommendations and IPPC guides and training materials to satisfy the concerns and so had agreed to invite, at CPM-18 (2024), contracting parties to submit further suggestions on how to resolve this.
- [42] The bureau recalled the legal advice they had received, with two branches of the FAO Legal Office advising against the inclusion of a disclaimer. The bureau noted that the different types of guidance could not be described in terms of a hierarchy of obligation, as none of them contained mandatory obligations other than those prescribed in the convention itself. Also, it was not the role of the CPM to dictate what evidence countries used in trade disputes. The bureau agreed, however, that it may be helpful to include text in the procedure manual, referring to the level of rigour of the approval process for the different categories of guidance.
- [43] **Other issues related to adoption.** The bureau also considered two other issues relating to adoption: the approach to take when contracting parties have technical issues that are not objections to draft ISPMs being presented for adoption (reported under agenda item 8.1); and the adoption process for CPM recommendations (reported under agenda item 8.2).
- [44] The bureau:
- (17) *agreed* that Samuel BISHOP (Europe) would draft some text for inclusion in the *IPPC procedure manual for governance*, outlining the differences in the approval processes for ISPMs, CPM recommendations and IPPC guides and training materials; and
- (18) *agreed* to return to the issue of a disclaimer for CPM recommendations at their meeting in June 2024.

6. Logistics arrangements for CPM-18 (2024)

- [45] The secretariat referred bureau members to the schedule for CPM-18 (2024),¹⁷ and outlined the logistical arrangements.
- [46] The bureau considered the arrangements, including the likely nominations for rapporteurs.
- [47] The bureau commended the secretariat on the revamped International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP).
- [48] The secretariat informed the bureau that they had arranged for a reprint of the convention and that a copy would be in the delegate bag for each head of each delegation.
- [49] The bureau:
- (19) *agreed* that Mamoru MATSUI (Asia) would moderate the CPM-18 (2024) agenda item on successes and challenges in implementing the IPPC and Diego QUIROGA (Latin America and the Caribbean) would moderate the science session on systems approaches.

¹⁶ CPM Bureau 2024/06, agenda item 8; CPM Bureau 2024/10, agenda item 6.

¹⁷ CPM 2024/INF/01.

7. Review of the CPM-18 (2024) agenda items with key issues for consideration

- [50] The bureau reviewed key issues on the agenda for CPM-18 (2024) that needed prior consideration by the bureau.¹⁸
- [51] **CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues.** The bureau noted that the focus group's mandate lasted until CPM-19 (2025). They recognized that the work on climate change would extend beyond this but acknowledged that, although the mandate of the focus group could be extended, it would not be appropriate for it to be open-ended.
- [52] **Adoption of ISPMs.** The bureau discussed the recognition of experts who had contributed to ISPMs being adopted by the CPM, former members of the bureau, IC and SC, and outgoing RPPO executive directors.
- [53] **Investment prospectus for DAIs.** The bureau noted that there were some significant errors in the draft prospectus for the DAIs of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030. The secretariat encouraged bureau members to send their comments to the secretariat and confirmed that the main aim of presenting the prospectus to the CPM was to gather feedback. The bureau noted, however, that in the respective CPM paper the CPM was asked to not only review the prospectus but also approve it.¹⁹ The bureau considered that it was not appropriate for the CPM to be asked to approve communications materials, as this would constrain future updates, and so they agreed to modify the recommended CPM decision.
- [54] The bureau:
- (20) *agreed* that the CPM should note rather than approve the investment prospectus for the eight development-agenda items of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030, as the secretariat needed to retain the flexibility to update the prospectus as and when needed and so agreement from the bureau would be sufficient;
 - (21) *requested* that the secretariat revise the CPM paper²⁰ accordingly; and
 - (22) *agreed* that they would review the prospectus, as revised following CPM feedback, at their meeting in June 2024.

7.1 Phytosanitary capacity evaluation update and cost

- [55] The secretariat gave a verbal update on phytosanitary capacity evaluation (PCE) activities and presented a paper summarizing the PCE process, the three modalities in which a PCE may be conducted, a breakdown of the costs of a PCE, and how PCEs are financed.²¹ The bureau was invited to discuss how to improve the funding sustainability of conducting PCEs and improve the PCE process and online system.
- [56] **Costs of PCEs.** One bureau member questioned whether the first mission was needed and commented on the relative expense of hiring consultants and PCE facilitators. The secretariat explained that the consultants' rates had to be competitive in relation to other international organizations in order to attract skilled candidates, although they remained in the lower range. However, countries could reduce the costs of a PCE by opting for the "independent modality", whereby the NPPO had access to the online tool but conducted the PCE themselves. The bureau also noted that the paper outlined the other ways in which costs could be reduced.
- [57] The secretariat clarified that the costs presented in the paper included time before and after missions, not just the days on the mission itself. The bureau suggested that this be made clear when presenting the costs of PCEs. They also suggested that internal costs within the NPPO could be omitted from the cost

¹⁸ CPM 2024/03.

¹⁹ CPM 2024/13.

²⁰ CPM 2024/13.

²¹ 05_Bureau_2024_Apr; CPM 2024/29.

breakdown, as some countries would not treat these as project costs, and these should not be referred to as “in-kind contributions”, as “in-kind contributions” were contributions from other organizations.

- [58] **Improving communication about PCE.** The bureau congratulated the secretariat on improving the transparency of the PCE process and encouraged the secretariat to continue along similar lines, providing reports about the PCE process, successes arising from PCEs, the intended expansion of the pool of facilitators, and so on. The bureau suggested that, even if funding was not yet available to train new facilitators, it would be beneficial to make it clear that the intention was to expand the pool of facilitators and that funding was sought for this.
- [59] The bureau asked whether it would be possible to make an example output from a PCE publicly available, with the country’s name removed. The secretariat explained their intention to conduct a gap analysis using a collection of PCEs and the bureau agreed that this would be a suitable alternative to giving an example output and suggested that this be highlighted in the presentation to CPM-18 (2024).
- [60] **PCE Board.** The secretariat explained that they would be establishing a PCE Board to assess newly trained PCE facilitators. The board members would need to sign the agreed-upon confidentiality statement that is available on the IPP. The bureau commented that, depending on legislation concerning freedom-of-information requests, some NPPO staff may not be able to sign such a statement.
- [61] **Online PCE system.** The secretariat informed the bureau that there was some earmarked funding set aside for improvements to the online PCE system, as the current system was not very user-friendly. The bureau suggested that a user-interface specialist be engaged to improve it. The secretariat explained that the work needed to be done by the United Nations International Computing Centre because of the requirements for data confidentiality.
- [62] The secretariat explained that they would be preparing a detailed paper on improvements to PCEs to the IC in May and would then report back to the bureau in June.
- [63] The bureau:
- (23) *noted* the budget considerations for conducting a PCE; and
 - (24) *agreed* to discuss the use of a PCE by a developed country at their meeting in June 2024.

7.2 Update on TR4 global coordination

- [64] The secretariat presented an update on global coordination of action on *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *cubense* Tropic Race 4 (Fusarium TR4).²² The secretariat explained, however, that no funding for activities was available after the end of May 2024. Diego QUIROGA (Latin America and the Caribbean) supplemented the update by reporting on the work being undertaken in the Latin America and the Caribbean region and emphasizing the importance of securing resources.
- [65] **Resources.** The secretariat confirmed that they were continuing to explore ways of accessing resources, including looking at the funding sources used for other relevant FAO work and how to bring together various entities, including private partners. The bureau noted the importance of finding out what resources were available and how to leverage them. They noted that the banana industry had a vested interest in protecting against Fusarium TR4 and so may be interested in participating in public–private partnerships.
- [66] **Coordinating action.** In terms of coordinating action against Fusarium TR4, the bureau noted the need to operate at a high level, identifying which entities (from large organizations to small holders) were best placed to work on which parts of the coordination. The bureau noted the synergy with the IPPC work on pest outbreak alert and response systems, which should help to foster a more coordinated approach between countries. The bureau discussed the lessons learned from the work on fall armyworm and the Africa Phytosanitary Programme. The secretariat highlighted the importance of scientific rigour in planning and implementing action against the pest and the need for any centrally managed database

²² CPM 2024/30.

to be owned by FAO, with the appropriate level of data security and with access by countries to their data. The secretariat advised that it was best for the technical framework and vision to be established under the auspices of the secretariat, within which the relevant protocols, tools and mechanisms could be developed for implementation by countries.

[67] **Diagnosis.** The bureau noted the challenges in conducting surveys for Fusarium TR4, given the high risk of cross-contamination, and the difficulties of the subsequent diagnosis. The secretariat recalled that the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 proposed that diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments be developed to accompany commodity-specific standards. Therefore, if CPM-18 (2024) were to agree to develop the proposed commodity standard on banana, then the SC may consider adding the development of diagnostic protocols for pests of banana to the work programme of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols. The secretariat also confirmed that a hands-on training course on Fusarium TR4 diagnostics was scheduled for 22–26 April 2024 at the Joint FAO/International Atomic Energy Agency Centre of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture for countries of the Common Market for Southern and Eastern Africa (COMESA). The secretariat also indicated that the first ever simulation exercise on TR4 in Africa was being organized for the third week of May with the technical support of the FAO Subregional Office for Mesoamerica.

[68] The bureau:

(25) *noted* the update on TR4 global coordination.

7.3 Potential Friends of Chair meetings

[69] The bureau discussed which agenda items may need a Friends of the Chair meeting.

7.4 Extension of mandate of CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid

[70] The bureau considered a communication from the vice-chairperson of the CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid to the CPM chairperson, advising him that the focus group now considered that they needed an extension of two years (24 months), rather than the 12 months proposed in the CPM papers.²³ The focus group had also proposed that an additional task be added to their terms of reference for this extension, which would be to address the consultation comments received on the draft specification on *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid* (2021-020) should CPM-18 (2024) approve it for consultation. A conference room paper on these proposed adjustments to the focus group's terms of reference had been submitted, supported by a group of contracting parties.²⁴ The bureau also considered comments from another group of contracting parties, suggesting that the SC address the consultation comments on the draft specification.²⁵

[71] **Addressing the consultation comments.** The secretariat explained that, although the aim was to develop an ISPM, this was not yet certain, and hence it was better for the consultation comments to be addressed by the focus group, rather than the SC or the IC. The secretariat recalled that the initial drafting of ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) provided a precedent for a focus group drafting an ISPM, which had subsequently been passed to the SC to elaborate.

[72] **Extending the focus group mandate.** The bureau noted that the involvement of aid organizations in the focus group meetings had helped focus group members better understand the pathways for aid and had also been informative for the aid organizations. They noted that the risks were probably fairly well managed for pathways involving large aid organizations, but the aid pathway as a whole was complex. The aim of the focus group was therefore to identify the gaps in risk that were not covered by existing

²³ CPM 2024/23; CPM 2024/24.

²⁴ CPM 2024/CRP/01.

²⁵ CPM 2024/INF/20.

ISPMs and identify whether new ISPMs were needed to fill these gaps or whether an overall ISPM was needed.

- [73] The secretariat explained that this complexity was the reason for the proposed extension to the focus group's mandate, to give time to analyse the complex aid pathway and provide a solid recommendation to the IPPC community.

7.5 ePhyto funding

- [74] The bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution, Peter THOMSON (replacement bureau member for Southwest Pacific), joined the meeting for this agenda item.
- [75] The bureau noted that neither the proposed funding model nor the option of FAO providing full funding were truly sustainable, given that the first system relied on voluntary payments and the second on biennial funding agreements, but FAO funding would be more sustainable. They agreed that long-term financial security was the aim.
- [76] The IPPC secretary gave an update on his discussions with FAO about the possibility of additional FAO regular-programme funding for the ePhyto Solution. He confirmed that the FAO leadership had been very supportive and had provided an assurance that FAO would continue to explore potential options, but that process was still ongoing because of competing priorities.

8. Other key issues to be considered by the bureau

8.1 SC decision and consensus issues and procedure

SC decision and consensus issues and procedure

- [77] The bureau considered two related matters:
- The first was a generic matter about delays in reaching consensus when issues are raised that do not have a clear technical basis, clear technical explanation or concrete suggestion about a way to address the issue. The SC had discussed whether, if consensus could not be reached, there was a way to advance work to resolve the impasse; however, on the advice of the FAO Legal Office, they had decided against changing the rules to allow voting on ISPMs and specifications going for consultation or to the CPM for adoption.
 - The second matter was a letter to the bureau from two regional plant protection organizations, COSAVE and the North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO). The two RPPOS had expressed concern over the delay in advancing the draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) to the consultation stage – a delay which they felt was without technical justification. It was this specific delay that had prompted the generic procedural discussion within the SC about reaching consensus.
- [78] The bureau noted the need for technical concerns to be clearly articulated and communicated in order to facilitate a resolution by the SC when consensus cannot be reached.
- [79] **Work by the SC small group.** The bureau noted that the letter from COSAVE and NAPPO also drew attention to an apparent disparity between what was reported in the SC November 2023 report about the next steps and what was said in the SC's report to CPM-18 (2024):²⁶ the former referred to a small group of SC members redrafting the specification for this annex (Specification 70) and the latter said that this small group would develop a paper articulating concerns with the text and exploring options on how a common understanding of systems approaches may be achieved. The secretariat confirmed that the latter followed a decision by the SC in May 2023, but the small group had not been able to reach consensus about the paper and so the matter had been brought back to the SC in November 2023, where the SC

²⁶ CPM 2024/06.

had decided to redraft the specification. The draft revision of the specification would be considered by the SC in May 2024.

[80] **Revising a specification.** The bureau noted that although there was precedent for reconvening an expert working group (EWG), there was no precedent for revising a specification. The secretariat confirmed that the CPM would need to add the revision of Specification 70 to the SC's work programme before the revised specification could be submitted for consultation.

[81] **Next steps.** The bureau commented on the desirability of improving the current draft annex, rather than starting again from scratch, to avoid further delay and to respect the Standard Setting Procedure given that the existing specification had been through consultation and approved by the SC. If another EWG were to be called, the bureau expressed a preference for it being the same members as the first EWG, to provide continuity, but without having an invited expert from industry. Alternatively, if the SC wished to proceed with a revision of the specification, the bureau preferred that this proceeded to consultation in 2024, which would need the approval of CPM-18 (2024). Whichever approach was taken, the bureau also noted the need for transparency.

Technical issues with ISPMs that are not objections

[82] The bureau referred to a CPM information paper submitted by a group of contracting parties regarding the approach to take when contracting parties have technical issues with draft ISPMs being presented for adoption but those issues are not objections.²⁷ The group had requested that the SC explore this.

[83] The bureau agreed to review this after CPM-18 (2024), pending the outcome of CPM-18.

[84] The bureau:

- (26) *agreed* to defer further discussion on SC decision and consensus issues and procedure, along with the letter from COSAVE and NAPPO, until the bureau meetings during the week of CPM-18 (2024);
- (27) *noted* the CPM information paper submitted by COSAVE member countries, requesting that the SC explore mechanisms to address technical issues that are raised about draft ISPMs submitted for adoption but that are not objections;
- (28) *suggested* that, pending the CPM-18 (2024) response to the CPM information paper from COSAVE member countries, a possible approach would be for the SC to discuss this at their May 2024 meeting, followed by discussions at the June 2024 bureau meeting and October 2024 SPG meeting; and
- (29) *invited* the SC chairperson to join the bureau meeting on Friday 19 April 2024 to discuss these matters.

8.2 Procedure for adoption of CPM recommendations

[85] The CPM chairperson questioned why modifications could be made to draft CPM recommendations when presented for adoption, whereas only technical objections were allowed for draft ISPMs presented for adoption.

[86] The bureau:

- (30) *agreed* that the CPM chairperson would draft a paper for the 2024 SPG meeting about possible improvements to the adoption process for CPM recommendations.

²⁷ CPM 2024/INF/20.

9. CPM bureau, Standards Committee and Implementation and Capacity Development Committee members and potential replacement members

[87] The secretariat referred the bureau to the CPM papers concerning the election of members and potential replacement members for the bureau, the SC and the IC,²⁸ and updated the bureau on nominations received to date and those that were still awaited.

[88] Bureau members reported on efforts to fill vacancies. The bureau member for North America commented that their region had communicated that a second replacement bureau member was not needed, as the region consisted of only two countries. Referring to Rule IV of the bureau's rules of procedure, the secretariat confirmed that each region nominated a maximum of two replacements, so it was not mandatory to have a second replacement.

10. Any other business (pre-CPM)

[89] **Draft annex to ISPM 38.** The bureau had considered this issue earlier in the meeting (see agenda item 8.1).

[90] **Terminology issue regarding DAI on commodity- and pathway-specific ISPMs.** The bureau considered a communication received by the secretariat from the outgoing executive director of NAPPO, who had drawn attention to the continued inclusion of pathway-specific ISPMs in the title of the DAI "Commodity and pathway-specific ISPMs". The bureau recalled that, although standards developed as annexes to ISPM 46 were restricted to commodity-specific standards, it was still the intention to also develop pathway-specific standards, in the broad sense, under the DAI. The title of the DAI was therefore correct. The secretariat confirmed that they had already replied to this effect.

[91] **CPM-orientation session.** The bureau reviewed the arrangements for the orientation session, which was scheduled to take place before CPM-18 (2024).

[92] **Sea containers.** The CPM chairperson informed the bureau that, during the agenda item on sea containers at CPM-18 (2024), he would be reading out two amendments to the proposed CPM decisions, which had been provided by the secretariat: one clarifying the end date for the proposed extension of the focus group's mandate and the other adding the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe to the list of organizations with whom the focus group would collaborate. He also clarified that the rationale for proposing that a third member from industry join the focus group was to ensure that all three areas of sea-container logistics were represented: container owners, maritime logistics and land-based hauliers.

[93] **One Health paper.** The CPM chairperson updated the bureau about preparations for IPPC involvement in the Eighth World One Health Congress, to be held in Cape Town, South Africa, in September 2024. It was hoped that the IPPC secretary would be giving a keynote speech and that there would be an IPPC side session on plant health.

[94] **International Day of Plant Health.** The bureau recognized that the IPPC annual theme for 2025 was "Plant Health and Trade Facilitation" and that the themes of international days, including the IDPH, were decided by FAO. However, in the light of discussions about greater involvement of the plant-health community in One Health initiatives, they strongly recommended that the IDPH theme for 2025 be changed to "One Health".

[95] The bureau:

- (31) *invited* CPM-18 (2024) to strongly recommend that FAO adopt the theme of "One Health" for the 2025 International Day of Plant Health and to request that the secretariat make representations to this effect;
- (32) *noted* the suggestion that "One Health" was a possible theme for a side session at CPM-19 (2025);

²⁸ CPM 2024/38; CPM 2024/39; CPM 2024/40.

- (33) *agreed* to include the long-term operational plans for the Africa Phytosanitary Programme on the agenda for the June 2024 bureau meeting; and
- (34) *agreed* to invite FAO permanent representatives to the June and October meetings of the bureau and *agreed* that the secretariat would send a letter of invitation under the signature of the CPM chairperson.

Adoption of decisions

[96] The bureau adopted the decisions reached thus far. This completed their pre-CPM session.

Post-CPM session

[97] The newly elected bureau replacement member for the Southwest Pacific, Temarama ANGUNA-KAMANA, was present as an observer for this session.

11. Issues arising from CPM-18 (2024) for bureau action

[98] The bureau reviewed the decisions reached in the pre-CPM bureau session and during the CPM session.

SC decision and consensus issues and procedure

[99] The SC chairperson was present for the discussion of these issues.

[100] **Draft annex to ISPM 38.** The bureau returned to the concerns over delays in advancing the draft annex to ISPM 38, which they had discussed in their pre-CPM session following receipt of the letter from COSAVE and NAPPO (agenda item 8.1). The bureau noted the decision reached by CPM-18 (2024), pending its adoption, which encouraged the SC to make its best efforts, at its meeting in May 2024, to resolve the technical issues and achieve an agreement to submit the draft annex to first consultation in July 2024. In the light of the letter and the CPM decision, the bureau agreed to encourage the SC members who had objected to the draft to provide revisions. The bureau confirmed that the letter from COSAVE and NAPPO could be shared with the region of these SC members.

[101] **Consensus procedure.** The bureau recognized the need to separate the issues regarding the development of the draft annex to ISPM 38 from the wider issue of SC decision-making procedures. The bureau acknowledged the constraints of working by consensus but also the desirability of achieving consensus, particularly when standards are being recommended to the CPM for adoption. The SC chairperson referred to the advice given to the SC in November 2023 by the FAO Legal Office, which advised against changing Rule 6 of the SC rules of procedure, which specified that “approvals relating to specifications or draft standards are sought by consensus”.²⁹ One bureau member noted that “sought by consensus” did not preclude voting, provided that best efforts had been made to reach consensus, and suggested that this be confirmed with the FAO Legal Office.

[102] The secretariat confirmed that the SC’s terms of reference included the revision of ISPMs, so where progress with a draft ISPM stalled because a major revision of the draft was needed, it was within the remit of the SC to do this redrafting.

[103] **Technical issues with ISPMs that are not objections.** The bureau noted the decision by CPM-18 (2024), pending its adoption, to ask the SC to explore mechanisms to address technical issues that are raised about draft ISPMs submitted for adoption but that are not objections.³⁰ The SC chairperson informed the bureau that she had asked the SC members from the region that had raised the issue to draft a paper for the SC meeting in May 2024. The bureau member for the region confirmed that the issue raised was a generic one, with ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) being used as an example, rather than the issue being specifically about ISPM 4.

²⁹ SC 2023/11, agenda item 2.4 & agenda item 8.1.

³⁰ CPM-18 (2024), agenda item 10.

Other issues³¹

[104] **Diagnostic laboratory networking.** The secretariat confirmed that the provisional outputs from the CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking would probably be presented to the June 2025 meeting of the bureau, followed by the SPG later in the year.

[105] **IPPC surveys.** The bureau noted that the survey response rate could be a possible subject for discussion at the 2024 SPG meeting. They noted the value of a good survey design so that contracting parties would see the benefit in completing the survey, and one bureau member provided the name of a contact within FAO who had provided useful advice on survey design to the Secretariat of the Codex Alimentarius. The secretariat confirmed that they had already liaised with the Codex secretariat about how to improve response rates; furthermore, they were in the process of recruiting an expert in surveys recognized by the World Organisation for Animal Health and would also be implementing the recommendations of PricewaterhouseCoopers, who had conducted an analysis of IPPC surveys a few years previously.

[106] The bureau noted that it may be better to conduct fewer, better-designed surveys and use other ways of gathering information, such as interviews. They agreed that it would be beneficial to identify which survey was the most important each year and to incorporate that into the IPPC regional workshops.

[107] **Investment prospectus.** Further to the decision of CPM-18 (2024) to provide feedback on the draft investment prospectus by 15 May 2024,³² the bureau noted that, as well as reviewing the feedback on the prospectus at their June meeting, they would also need consider how to use the prospectus. They agreed that they would use the prospectus as a basis for discussion in their next meeting with FAO permanent representatives, but with a particular focus on the ePhyto Solution.

[108] The bureau:

- (35) *strongly encouraged* the SC members who had objected to the draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds* (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) being circulated for consultation to provide a revised version of the draft to the SC as soon as possible and no later than October 2024 that demonstrates how their concerns could be addressed in such a way that the draft annex could proceed to consultation;
- (36) *selected* Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH (Southwest Pacific) as the bureau representative to the ePhyto Steering Group;
- (37) *selected* Gregory WOLFF (North America) as the bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on One Health;
- (38) *recommended* that, at each IPPC regional workshop, one IPPC Observatory survey be conducted among participants (starting with the survey on e-commerce for the 2024 workshops), with the survey questions being provided in advance to allow participants to prepare; and
- (39) *agreed* to invite FAO permanent representatives to join the bureau meeting on 20 June 2024 (see agenda item 10 regarding the letter of invitation).

12. Arrangements for bureau activities in 2024

[109] The bureau confirmed the dates of their meetings in 2024, including a change to the date for their meeting in December:

- 17–21 June 2024, Rome;
- 23–25 and 31 October 2024, Rome, with the SPG 28–30 October; and
- 10 and 12 December, 12:00–14:00 CET (virtual meeting).

³¹ Excluding those issues that are captured entirely in a decision under this agenda item or in agenda item 12 (agenda items for the June bureau meeting).

³² CPM-18 (2024), agenda item 12.

13. Planning for future bureau meetings

June 2024 bureau meeting

[110] The bureau identified the following items for discussion at their meeting in June 2024 (in no particular order):

- governance arrangements for the IPPC ePhyto Solution (Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH to provide some considerations for discussion);
- selection of bureau lead for the development-agenda item on “Harmonization of Electronic Data Exchange”;
- surveys:
 - review of questions for follow-up antimicrobial resistance survey (with survey results to be considered at the October 2024 meeting of the bureau), and
 - how to improve low response rates (for discussion by bureau and SPG);
- review of investment prospectus following post-CPM feedback;
- SPG agenda;
- criteria for financial assistance for attendance at meetings of the SPG and TC-RPPOs;
- review of the use of collective nouns in CPM reports;
- difference between guidance documents in relation to the rigour of adoption;
- SPG paper on procedure for adoption of CPM recommendations (Gregory WOLFF to prepare);
- how to propose improvements to the technical clarity of ISPMs presented for adoption when no objection to adoption is made (from the discussion during the May SC meeting);
- financing of the PCE;
- private–public partnership examples (e.g. from Australia);
- meeting with FAO permanent representatives;
- encouraging the SC and SPG to consider ways of streamlining and accelerating standard setting;
- long-term plans for the Africa Phytosanitary Programme;
- outcome of SC decisions on the draft annex to ISPM 38;
- membership of the CPM Focus Group on Plant Health in the Context of One Health;
- CPM-19 (2025):
 - dates for the meeting,
 - Credentials Committee procedure,
 - report-writer breaks and support, and
 - level of detail in secretariat updates (length of time for delivery);
- update on CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking;
- IDPH theme for 2025: how to influence the FAO decision and the content for presentations;
- Second International Plant-Health Conference (bureau members to discuss within their regions regarding suggestions for a possible host country).

October 2024 bureau meeting and Strategic Planning Group meeting

[111] The bureau noted that the items on governance arrangements for the IPPC ePhyto Solution and meeting with FAO permanent representatives would also need to be included on the agenda of their meeting in October 2024, with the former also on the agenda of the SPG 2024 meeting.

14. Any other business (post-CPM)

[112] **CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues.** The bureau noted that Brazil had offered to host a face-to-face meeting of the focus group, but that financial assistance may be needed to support it. The bureau recognized the value of this meeting, given the importance of the subject matter,

and suggested that the focus group submit a concept note to the secretariat, who could then advise on funding possibilities.

15. Next meeting

[113] The next meeting of the bureau is scheduled for 17–21 June in Rome, Italy.

[114] The secretariat confirmed that CPM-19 (2025) was scheduled for 31 March to 4 April 2025, with the associated bureau meeting starting on Monday, 24 March 2025 (although the FAO headquarters may be closed on Friday, 28 March).

16. Close of the meeting

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

[116] For ease of reference, a list of action points for bureau members arising from the meeting, together with roles and responsibilities, is provided as Appendix 5.

Appendix 1: Agenda

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
PRE CPM-18 (2024) SESSION (15-19 April 2024)			
1.	Opening of the Meeting		EL-LISSY / KONAN
2.	Meeting Arrangements		
2.1	Election of the Rapporteur		CHAIR
2.2	Adoption of the Agenda	01_Bureau_2024_Apr	CHAIR
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1	Document list	02_Bureau_2024_Apr	DENG
3.2	Participants list	03_Bureau_2024_Apr	DENG
3.3	Local information	Link to the Local Information	DENG
4.	Progress Report of the IPPC Secretariat for 2023 - IPPC Secretariat staffing	Link to IPPC Secretariat paper CPM 2024/05	EL-LISSY
5.	Review of Previous Bureau Meetings Reports (October 2023, December 2023)	CPM Bureau October 2023 Report CPM Bureau Dec 2023 Virtual Meeting Report	CHAIR
5.1	IPPC ePhyto Solution - Governance and nomination of a bureau representative to the ePhyto Steering Group - Select a sitting bureau member for the DAI “Harmonization of Electronic Data Exchange”	04_Bureau_2024_Apr	CHAIR / MENON
5.2	Review of the IPPC meeting report-adoption policy	--	CHAIR
5.3	Draft criteria for the provision of financial support to attend meetings of the SPG and TC-RPOs	--	BENOVIC
5.4	Capturing wording regarding number of interventions	--	CHAIR
5.5	Disclaimer for CPM recommendations	--	CHAIR
6.	Logistic Arrangements for CPM-18	Link to CPM-18 schedule	DENG
7.	Review of the CPM-18 Agenda Items with Key Issues for Consideration - Selection of rapporteurs	Link to CPM-18 agenda	DENG
7.1	PCE improvement update and cost	05_Bureau_2024_Apr CPM 2024/29	BRUNEL
7.2	Update on TR4 Global Coordination	CPM 2024/30	BRUNEL/QUIROGA
7.3	Potential Friends of Chair meetings	--	CHAIR
7.4	CPM Focus Group on Safe Provisions of Food and other Humanitarian Aid - extension mandate	--	CHAIR
7.5	ePhyto funding	--	THOMSON
8.	Other Key Issues to be Considered by Bureau		

8.1	SC Decision and Consensus issues and procedure		VIVIAN SMITH
8.2	Procedure for adoption of IPPC CPM Recommendations		CHAIR
9.	CPM Bureau, SC and IC members and potential replacement members	Link to Bureau membership paper CPM 2024/38 Link to SC membership paper CPM 2024/39 Link to IC membership paper CPM 2024/40	DENG / NERSYSIAN / BRUNEL
10.	Any Other Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draft Annex to ISPM 38 (<i>Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds</i>) - Terminology issue with DAI on Commodity – and Pathway – Specific ISPMs - CPM Orientation session - Sea containers - One health paper - IDPH 		CHAIR/ALL
POST CPM-18 (2024) SESSION (19 April 2024) Canada Room (A356/7)			
1.	Issues Arising from CPM-18 for Bureau Actions		CHAIRPERSON
2.	Arrangements for Bureau Activities in 2024		CHAIRPERSON
3.	Planning for Bureau Meeting in June 2024	Criteria for funding Guidance (Sam) Adoption of recommendations (Greg) SS procedure ePhyto Governance Prospectus and the use (CPs comments) Plant Health Conference Low response rates to IPPC surveys and actions	CHAIRPERSON
4.	Any Other Business		ALL
5.	Next Meeting		EL-LISSY
6.	Closing of the Meeting		CHAIRPERSON

Appendix 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
01_Bureau_2024_Apr	2.1	Agenda	2024-04-08
02_Bureau_2024_Apr	3.1	Documents List	-
03_Bureau_2024_Apr	3.2	Participants List	-
04_Bureau_2024_Apr	5.1	IPPC ePhyto Solution	2024-03-27
05_Bureau_2024_Apr	7.1	PCE improvement update and cost	2024-04-08

Appendix 3: Participants list

	Region/ Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	North America <i>CPM Chairperson</i>	Mr Gregory WOLFF Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A0Y9 CANADA	greg.wolff@inspection.gc.ca
✓	Europe	Mr Samuel BISHOP Head of International Plant Health Policy Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs UNITED KINGDOM	sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk
✓	Africa	Mr Jan Hendrik VENTER Director Plant Health Department of Agriculture Land Reform and Rural Development SOUTH AFRICA	janhendrikv@dalrrd.gov.za
✓	Asia	Mr Mamoru MATSUI Director (Operation Division) Kobe Plant Protection Station (PPS), Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries of Japan (MAFF) JAPAN	mamoru_matsui430@maff.go.jp
✓	Latin America and Caribbean	Mr Diego QUIROGA Director Nacional de Protección Vegetal SENASA ARGENTINA	dquiroga@senasa.gob.ar
✓	South West Pacific	Ms Gabrielle VIVIAN SMITH Chief Plant Protection Officer Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forest AUSTRALIA	gabrielle.vivian-smith@aff.gov.au

IPPC Secretariat

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone, nationality	Email address
IPPC Secretariat	Mr. Osama EL-LISSY	Osama.Ellissy@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Avetik NERSISYAN	Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Arop DENG	Arop.Deng@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Sarah BRUNEL	Sarah.Brunel@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Adriana MOREIRA	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Artur SHAMILOV	Artur.ShamilovQ@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Descartes KOU MBA	Descartes.Koumba@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Aoife CASSIN	Aoife.Cassin@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Tanja LAHTI	Tanja.Lahti@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Karen ROUEN	karen@karenrouen.com

Appendix 4: References

Verhaegen, M., Mahillon, J., Caulier, S., Mingeot-Leclercq, M.-P. & Bragard, C. 2024. Data collection on antibiotics for control of plant pathogenic bacteria. *EFSA supporting publication* 2024, 21(1): EN-8522. 195 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/sp.efsa.2024.EN-8522>

Appendix 5: Action list

Meeting	Agenda item (decision)	Task	Person or persons responsible	Deadline
2024-04	5 (5)	The secretariat to post a CPM information paper on the role of CPM rapporteurs using the text agreed by the bureau at their October 2023 meeting.	Secretariat	2024-04
2024-04	5.1 (10)	ePhyto governance (oversight of the funding model and provision of strategic direction for the future of the IPPC ePhyto Solution)	Bureau	2024-06
2024-04	5.1 (11)	Selection of bureau lead for the development-agenda item on “Harmonization of Electronic Data Exchange”	Bureau	2024-06
2024-04	5.3 (13)	Draft criteria for the provision of financial support to attend meetings of the SPG and TC-RPPOs	Secretariat	2024-06
2024-04	5.4 (16)	Recording of interventions in the CPM reports	ALL	2024-06
2024-04	5.5 (17)	raft some text for inclusion in the IPPC procedure manual for governance, outlining the differences in the approval processes for ISPMs, CPM recommendations and IPPC guides and training materials	Bureau representative from Europe	2024-06
2024-04	7 (22)	Revise the investment prospectus for DAIs post CPM-18 with feedback from CPs	Secretariat	2024-06
2024-04	8.2 (30)	Draft a paper for the 2024 SPG meeting about possible improvements to the adoption process for CPM recommendations	CPM Chairperson	2024-10
2024-04	10 (33)	Long-term operational plans for the Africa Phytosanitary Programme	Secretariat	2024-06
2024-04	10 (34)	Invite FAO permanent representatives to the June and October meetings of the bureau and agreed that the secretariat would send a letter of invitation under the signature of the CPM chairperson	CPM Chairperson, Secretariat	2024-06 / 2024-10
2024-04	11 (38)	One IPPC Observatory survey be conducted among participants and IPPC regional workshops (starting with the survey on e-commerce for the 2024 workshops)	Secretariat	Mid-2024