



## REVISED TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EXTENDED MANDATE (2024-2026) OF THE CPM FOCUS GROUP ON SAFE PROVISION OF FOOD AND OTHER HUMANITARIAN AID

(Developed by IPPC secretariat and Focus Group members. Approved by CPM-18 (2024))

### Background

- [1] The IPPC recognizes the necessity for international co-operation to prevent the global spread of plant pests. In emergency crisis situations, affected countries can be temporarily constrained in their ability to implement their phytosanitary responsibilities. Contracting parties that are donors of aid do have more capacity at that time and thus their commitment to comply with Article IV of the IPPC becomes more critical.
- [2] During an emergency situation, conditions at borders can be very abnormal. There may also be increased unregulated movement of military personnel and refugees. Reduction or absence of inspection and diagnosis may occur due to personnel, equipment and infrastructure being inaccessible. Treatment and processing infrastructure may be damaged or inaccessible; water, electricity, manpower and other services are often cut, and roads and ports are often destroyed, preventing the use of dedicated facilities and requiring activities to occur outside of declared ports of entry. Inspection staff may be unable to travel to work or may be diverted to emergency tasks; and other government agencies and officials frequently urge the national plant protection organization (NPPO) and other agencies to release goods to people in need without delay. Thus, unless appropriately prepared to meet the phytosanitary import requirements of the recipient country prior to export, the provided aid can cause long-term damage to plant resources on which vulnerable people and communities depend.
- [3] Some examples of humanitarian aid being a pathway for the introduction and spread of plant pests are stated in the [FAO’s State of Food and Agriculture report 2001](#), in which it identifies the introduction of the larger grain borer (*Prostephanus truncates*) into Tanzania as a result of food aid shipments and the introduction of the corn rootworm (*Diabrotica virgifera*) first into Yugoslavia and then Europe as a result of military movements ([FAO 2001](#)). The introduction of Strawberry Latent Ringspot Virus into Timor-Leste is another example of a serious exotic disease introduced into a country through aid consignments.
- [4] Some other examples of invasive pests via the food aid pathway are reported in the Republic of Korea. Many new stored product pests invaded Korea during the period from the Korean War in 1950 to 1980. During this time, Korea imported a great quantity of rice, wheat, barley, and livestock feed to cover the shortage of food through aid from other countries. It should also be highlighted that most of the warehouses were first established after the Korean War due to the necessity of preserving a large quantity of imported grain. Thus, these warehouses provided alien insects, especially tropical and subtropical species (e.g. *Rhyzopertha dominica*), with favorable breeding habitats. Most of the alien stored product insects in the families Cleridae, Nitidulidae, Tenebrionidae, and Pyralidae are considered to have invaded Korea by this pathway, as they similarly invaded Japan (cited in Hong et al., 2012).
- [5] The impact of pests is not limited to production agriculture. The weed known as giant mimosa (*Mimosa diplotricha*) was introduced to the Vava’u Islands (Tonga) with sand from Tahiti as part of reconstruction assistance following Cyclone Waqa in 2002. Parthenium is another example of an invasive weed introduced first into Ethiopia through humanitarian grain shipments that has since spread throughout the country (Murphy and Cheesman 2006). Additional examples of pest introductions through humanitarian assistance can be found in Reaser et al. 2003.

- [6] Despite the increasing knowledge of invasive pests and their impacts in general, there is relatively little data available for developing countries and even less for the food and other humanitarian aid pathway (or “emergency pathway”). The majority of people living in countries receiving aid are smallholders and are almost totally dependent on agriculture and natural resources for their survival. Thus, more information and assessments regarding the potential of invasive pests be carried by aid pathway would be of great importance to help estimate, predict and potentially support the application of measures to help tackle this issue.
- [7] Although the IPPC has an adopted [CPM Recommendation on “Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation \(R-09\)”](#), no international standard currently exists to guide countries on the safe movement of aid during the unique pressures and logistical constraints of emergency situations. Given the predicted increase in frequency of natural disasters, potential human-made disasters, and the historical incidence of pest introductions through humanitarian aid, it is timely that an international standard is developed to address this gap in robust phytosanitary processes. It is known that biosecurity policies and procedures are frequently intended to prevent the introduction, or slow the spread, of invasive alien species. However, there is still a significant gap in what we know about invasion pathways, especially those related to human activities.

## References

- [8] IPPC Secretariat. 2021. Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation. Commission on Phytosanitary Measures Recommendation No. 9. Rome. FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention. (<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89786/>)
- [9] FAO (2001). State of Food and Agriculture 2001. <http://www.fao.org/3/x9800e/x9800e15.htm>
- [10] Hong, K.-J., Lee, J.-H., Lee, G.-S., and Lee, S. (2012). The status quo of invasive alien insect species and plant quarantine in Korea. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Entomology*, volume 15 (2012), pp. 521-532. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1226861512000702>
- [11] Murphy, S.T. and Cheesman, O.D. (2006). *The Aid Trade: International Assistance Programs as Pathways for the Introduction of Invasive Alien Species*. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, Washington, USA.
- [12] Reaser J.K., Yeager, B.B., Phifer P.R., Hancock A.K. & Gutierrez A.T. (2003). Environmental diplomacy and the global movement of invasive alien species: a US perspective. In *Invasive Species: Vectors and Management Strategies* (eds. G.M. Ruiz & J.T. Carlton), pp.362-381. Island Press, Washington DC, USA.

## CPM-16 (2022)

- [13] To support the objectives of the IPPC strategic framework 2030 to enhance global food security and protect the environment from the impacts of plant pests and, where appropriate, environmental pests, the IPPC and its Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) agreed to establish a Focus Group on this matter. The CPM-16 (2022) established the focus group on safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid (FGSA) in light to the proposal by the Standards Committee (SC) and the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) to explore ways to address this complex issue, as this topic was not supported to develop an international standard for phytosanitary measures (ISPM) at that moment as a result from the 2021 IPPC call for topics.
- [14] More information about the focus group, including the current terms of reference (ToR) and membership, is available on the FGSA [webpage on the IPP](#).

## CPM Bureau June 2023 and IPPC Strategic Planning Group

- [15] An update was presented to the CPM Bureau in June 2023 (see Bureau 2023-06 meeting report [here](#)). It was reported to the Bureau that the focus group had concluded most of the tasks listed in its terms of

reference: *i*) it had revised the draft specification on *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid* (2021-020), *ii*) drafted a gap-analysis diagram for the “emergency pathway”, *iii*) and proposed that a webinar be held to raise awareness of the CPM recommendation on *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation* (R-09).

- [16] Furthermore, the focus group had also proposed that the mandate of the focus group be extended and an action plan developed in collaboration with World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH), the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat and the World Food Programme (WFP).
- [17] The bureau noted the update and that the WFP had only become involved in the focus group since CPM-17 (2023), and so, extending the mandate of the focus group would allow time for the Food Programme to engage with the work of the focus group. Thus, the Bureau *supported* an extension to the mandate of the focus group on the safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid.
- [18] Noting that the focus group had drafted a proposed definition of the term “emergency pathway”, the bureau discussed whether there was a need for such a definition to be included in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*). The bureau noted that, for this to happen, a contracting party would need to propose the term as a topic during the call for topics. The secretariat advised that the TPG should only be asked to develop a definition if the term was likely to be used in ISPMs and the concept was already secure. The bureau noted that, if the mandate of the focus group was being extended, then developing the concept of “emergency pathway” could be one of the focus group’s tasks. Additionally, it was suggested that the draft specification for a ISPM be revised to reduce the number of tasks for the expert drafting group, so that the tasks were feasible, and that some could be incorporated to the extension of the focus group’s mandate.
- [19] The IPPC Strategic Planning Group in 2023 welcomed the report and the proposal for the extension of the focus group mandate. It was highlighted the need to continue the discussions about this important topic, especially now with WFP and others engaged.

### **1. Tasks for the extension of the Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid (FGSA) as approved by CPM-18 (2024)**

- [20] The FGSA mandate was extended for two additional years and up to CPM-20 (2026). The interim outcomes from the focus group would be presented to the CPM-18 (2024) as originally proposed is posted [here](#).
- [21] The additional tasks for the FGSA for the additional two years are as follows:
- (a) The focus group to prepare a cover note outlining the steps and process to go along with the draft Specification for consultation period.
  - (b) The focus group to review the 2024 consultation comments received for the draft specification on *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid* (2021-020) and present a revised draft Specification, and responses to the comments, to the Standards Committee.
  - (c) Continue the engagement and seek collaboration of the WFP, FAO emergency responses and other donor agencies.
  - (d) With WFP now engaged, further collaboration with them on this topic would be highly beneficial and in collaboration with their wider network, strengthen the applicability of all the materials developed.
  - (e) Development of an Action Plan in collaboration with WOAHA, CODEX, WFP and FAO (in the first instance), to facilitate work as the three sisters and more holistically address the issues raised by IPPC community members.
  - (f) Further exploration of the various pathways that exists for aid provision and identification of specific actors and materials that may support the objective of reduced pest spread.
  - (g) Consider the description of the definition of “emergency pathway”.

- (h) Collaboratively with the IPPC Secretariat, deliver a webinar<sup>1</sup> using the already adopted CPM Recommendation R-09 as a basis to raise awareness of the topic and the CPM Recommendation as a resource to contracting parties and donor coordination agencies. A concept note for the webinar will be presented to the CPM Bureau for feedback.
- (i) Collaboratively with the IPPC Secretariat, develop a video with learning and educational content for NPPOs to use in a crisis situation relating to safe food and other humanitarian aid, using the already adopted CPM Recommendation R-09 as a basis to raise awareness and for advocacy material.
- (j) Consider further the need of other support and implementation material on this topic (e.g. review examples and case studies to identify short, medium and long-term consequences of establishment of pests associated with humanitarian aid and identify potential phytosanitary management options).
- (k) Consider, in consultation with RPPOs, their potential role in supporting the work of the focus group.

[22] Funding to secure the extension of the focus group’s mandate and the IPPC Secretariat staff support is needed and foreseen.

[23] It is also foreseen that additional face-to-face meetings will be required (time and location to be determined).

[24] A preliminary report and recommendations will be presented to SPG in October 2024, Standards Committee (SC) and the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) in November 2024. A final report and recommendations to CPM-20 (2026) for final decisions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Extra-budgetary funding will be needed for interpretation of the webinar into UN official languages.

