



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Bureau of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures

**Rome, Italy
17–21 June 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	5
2.	Meeting arrangements	5
2.1	Election of the rapporteur	5
2.2	Adoption of the agenda	5
3.	Administrative matters	5
4.	IPPC ePhyto Solution.....	5
4.1	Selection of bureau representative for the development-agenda item “Harmonization of Electronic Data Exchange”	5
4.2	ePhyto governance arrangements	6
4.3	ePhyto funding	6
4.3.1	ePhyto sustainable funding	6
4.3.2	Cost revision of the Service Delivery Agreements (SDAs) with UNICC for operating and maintaining the Hub and the GeNS	6
4.3.3	Confirmation of membership for the Focus Group on ePhyto Sustainable Funding... 7	7
4.4	ePhyto updates.....	7
5.	Improvements to Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations.....	8
6.	Updates from CPM Focus Groups.....	8
6.1	CPM Focus Group on One Health.....	8
6.2	CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues.....	9
6.3	CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers.....	9
6.4	CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination.....	10
6.5	CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid.....	10
6.6	CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Network.....	10
7.	Strategic Planning Group (SPG).....	11
7.1	Draft criteria for financial support to attend meetings of the SPG and TC-RPPOs... 11	11
7.2	SPG paper on procedure for adoption of CPM recommendations	12
7.3	Encouraging the SC and SPG to consider ways of streamlining and accelerating standard setting.....	12
7.4	Discussion ideas for the agenda and format of the SPG	13
8.	Disclaimer text for CPM recommendations.....	14
9.	Technical issues with ISPMs for adoption that are not objections (post-SC May discussions) 15	15
10.	Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP)	16
11.	Antimicrobial resistance survey	17
12.	Steering group for the regional communications network.....	18
13.	One Health	18
14.	Review of CPM-18	19
14.1	Review of DAI investment prospectus.....	19
14.2	Recording interventions in the CPM-18 report	19
14.3	Discussion on the future status of the Credentials Committee.....	20
14.4	Feedback from CPM-18	20

14.5	Dates for CPM-19 (2025) and arrangements	20
15.	Other follow-up to previous bureau meetings	21
15.1	Private–public partnership examples	21
15.2	Outcome of SC decisions on the draft annex to ISPM 38	22
15.3	How to improve low response rates to surveys	22
15.4	IDPH theme for 2025: Plant health in the context of One Health – How to influence the FAO decision and the content for presentations	22
16.	Any other business	22
16.1	Next International Plant Health Conference	22
16.2	Funding from Canada for the systems approach workshop	23
17.	Date of the next meeting	23
18.	Adoption of decision points	23
19.	Close of the meeting	23
	Appendix 1: Agenda	24
	Appendix 2: Documents list	27
	Appendix 3: Participants list	28
	Appendix 4: Action list	29

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 Mamoru MATSUI (Asia) as rapporteur.

2.2 Adoption of the agenda

[3] The bureau adopted the agenda (Appendix 1), modified to consider agenda item 4 in its entirety (4.1–4.4) after agenda item 15.2. They also agreed to consider agenda item 15.1 after item 4.4, and agenda item 8 after item 16. They confirmed matters to be discussed under agenda item 16. The revised agenda is attached to this report as Appendix 1.

3. Administrative matters

[4] The list of documents is attached to this report as Appendix 2.

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

4. IPPC ePhyto Solution

[6] These agenda items (4.1–4.4) were considered after agenda item 15.2.

4.1 Selection of bureau representative for the development-agenda item “Harmonization of Electronic Data Exchange”

[7] The CPM chairperson recalled that, at their April meeting,¹ they had deferred the selection of a bureau representative for the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 development-agenda item (DAI) “Harmonization of Electronic Data Exchange” and the nomination of a bureau representative to the ePhyto Steering Group (ESG) to the bureau meeting immediately after CPM-18 (2024).

[8] As the bureau representative for the ESG, Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH (Southwest Pacific) clarified that bureau representatives were needed for both the ESG and for the CPM Focus Group on the Sustainable Funding of the IPPC ePhyto Solution and noted that one member of this focus group (Peter THOMSON) wanted to step down at some point. The bureau discussed the best arrangements to select leads for both those groups.

[9] The bureau noted the results of a study carried out in Morocco on the impact of ePhyto.²

[10] The bureau:

- (1) *selected* Barik DRIS (Near East) as the bureau representative for the ePhyto Steering Group (ESG); and
- (2) *selected* Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH as the bureau representative for the CPM Focus Group on the Sustainable Funding of the IPPC ePhyto Solution.

¹ CPM Bureau 2024/04, agenda item 5.1.

² <https://www.tradefacilitation.org/project/measurable-agri-food-trade-efficiencies/>

4.2 ePhyto governance arrangements

Future funding governance arrangements

- [11] The bureau recalled that at their April meeting,³ bureau members had agreed to put a specific item on governance (oversight of the funding model and provision of strategic direction for the future of the IPPC ePhyto Solution) on the agenda.
- [12] The bureau representative for the ESG summarized the three options for ePhyto funding governance presented in a meeting document,⁴ and pointed out that the mandate of the focus group for the ePhyto Funding Solution had been extended for another year.
- [13] The CPM chairperson noted concerns about a lack of transparency and expressed the view that developing an alternative body might present difficulties arising from the fact that two groups would be active.
- [14] One member raised concerns about giving financial control over to the steering group.
- [15] The bureau:
- (3) *discussed* the three options for ePhyto governance;
 - (4) *noted* the need for additional secretariat support for all three options proposed; and
 - (5) *agreed* to maintain the status quo (option 1) and to reconsider establishing an alternative financial governance body or group (option 3) in a year's time.

4.3 ePhyto funding

4.3.1 ePhyto sustainable funding

Update on FAO funding

- [16] The IPPC secretary thanked everyone for engaging the permanent representatives, and noted the need to increase funding in the next budget cycle for the IPPC in general and for ePhyto in particular, as expressed in the report that came out of CPM-18 (2024), sending a strong message to FAO.
- [17] In another update, the IPPC secretary informed the bureau that the IPPC Secretariat was trying to establish a dedicated trust fund for the ePhyto Solution and was hoping that FAO would come up with substantial support to bridge the gap between now and the next FAO funding cycle. The secretariat noted that some progress had been made, despite not having received a definitive answer yet.
- [18] The bureau:
- (6) *noted* the secretariat's updates on ePhyto funding.

4.3.2 Cost revision of the Service Delivery Agreements (SDAs) with UNICC for operating and maintaining the Hub and the GeNS

- [19] The IPPC secretary informed bureau members that he had requested a meeting with the United Nations International Computing Centre (UNICC) to seek an explanation as to why the estimated costs of their services had unexpectedly doubled, and was told that they were planning to make some technological improvements, notably to their security features. The IPPC secretary explained that UNICC was undergoing an organizational realignment, which may also explain the additional costs, and reported that he had succeeded in limiting those to an increase in the range of USD 40 000. The IPPC secretary reported that they had a verbal agreement to keep it at that level and to have a follow-up discussion

³ CPM Bureau 2024/04, agenda item 5.1.

⁴ 12_Bureau_2024_Jun.

about this. One bureau member noted that USD 40 000 was a significant sum for the IPPC to have to foot and that it was likely to create a dent in its budget.

[20] The bureau:

- (7) *noted* the increased cost of the UNICC services for operating and maintaining the Hub and the GeNS;
- (8) *requested* that the secretariat engage with the UNICC to clarify what extra security features they planned to introduce to justify the additional costs.

4.3.3 Confirmation of membership for the Focus Group on ePhyto Sustainable Funding

[21] The bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution, Peter THOMSON (former bureau member), was present for this agenda item, which was considered after agenda item 17.

[22] The CPM chairperson presented a list of proposed nominations for confirmed members and replacement members for the Focus Group on ePhyto Sustainable Funding, including Lucien KOUAMÉ KONAN (Côte d'Ivoire), Marco TRAA (Kingdom of the Netherlands), Rodriguez ROBLESS (Chile), Islam FARHAT (Egypt), Christian DELLIS (United States of America), Lisa WINTHROP (New Zealand), Venkatram VENKATESWARAN (UNICC representative), Shawna ENZ-CROSS and Rose SOUZA RICHARDS (ePhyto Industry Advisory Group representatives).

[23] In addition, the bureau gave their approval for Tom BUTTERLY (Global Alliance for Trade Facilitation) and Simon PADILLA (Standards and Trade Development Facility) to participate in the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution as observers.

[24] The bureau:

- (9) *agreed* that Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH (Southwest Pacific) would take over acting as bureau representative for the development-agenda item “Harmonization of Electronic Data Exchange” from Peter THOMPSON (former bureau member), who would continue to assist the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding of the IPPC ePhyto Solution;
- (10) *approved* the proposed nominations for focus group members and replacement members; and
- (11) *agreed* that the alternate members may sit in on meetings as observers.

4.4 ePhyto updates

Forwarding ePhytos to digital platforms as third entities

[25] The secretariat explained the pilot scheme that the ESG had agreed to launch in February 2024, which included a figure illustrating the channel-forwarding feature of the Hub (Annex 1) and the template confidentiality letter drafted by FAO Legal Office to satisfy the request on the part of one of the digital platform companies approached for a confidentiality agreement signed by FAO (Annex 2).

[26] One member voiced concerns about the industry putting pressure on NPPOs to forward ePhytos to digital platforms as third entities, pointing out that they do not have to do this and emphasizing the financial implications and the risks involved.

[27] The IPPC Secretary said that certain questions needed to be answered by blockchain specialists, including what guarantee there was that the information they had access to would not be used to influence trade arrangements between countries.

[28] The bureau:

- (12) *discussed* the pros and cons of forwarding ePhytos to third-entity digital platforms specializing in the electronic transfer of trade documents as increasingly requested by exporters;

- (13) *requested* that the secretariat seek greater clarity as to the legal and financial implications as well as any unintended consequences of the proposal; and
- (14) *agreed* not to take a decision on this item and to return to it at their meeting in October 2024.

5. Improvements to Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations

- [29] The bureau noted updates on planned improvements to the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE) stemming from discussions at the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) meeting in May.
- [30] The secretariat outlined a roadmap for improving the PCE based on the desk study recommendations,⁵ and went over the six key result areas of the PCE Strategy 2020–2030.
- [31] The bureau discussed the funding for implementing PCEs. The IPPC secretary informed bureau members about new funding allocated by the European Union, of which EUR 50 000 had been slated to improve the online PCE system.
- [32] A question was raised about the meaning of “sustainable funding”. The IPPC Secretariat explained that an in-depth discussion on the subject should take place during the Financial Committee (FC) meeting.
- [33] In response to the CPM chairperson’s query regarding the cost estimate provided by the UNICC to build a platform for the PCE, the secretariat noted that the quotation from 2021 would need to be revised and further clarified that the tool was already available on FAO servers.
- [34] The bureau:
- (15) *noted* advancements in the PCE activities in line with the PCE strategy 2020-2030;
 - (16) *selected* Jan Hendrik VENTER (Africa), Sam BISHOP (Europe) and Diego QUIROGA (Latin America and the Caribbean) to be part of the PCE Board;
 - (17) *noted* the recommendations from the desk study on PCE and the future steps as detailed in the roadmap;
 - (18) *noted* that one COMESA country funded by COMESA and one representative from the African Union Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (AU-IAPSC) would be invited to the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) to share their PCE experiences; and
 - (19) *agreed* that, at its next meeting in October 2024, the SPG would discuss what improvements could be made to the PCE tool.

6. Updates from CPM Focus Groups

- [35] The secretariat updated bureau members on the activities of the CPM Focus Groups.

6.1 CPM Focus Group on One Health

- [36] The secretariat reported on a call for nominations of potential focus group members (with a deadline of 19 July) and said that the results would be available for the bureau meeting in October 2024.
- [37] The secretariat informed bureau members that they had submitted a request for a side session on linkages between plant health and One Health at the 8th World One Health Congress. In addition, the IPPC Secretariat has been invited to contribute to the one health agenda item at the 29th Session of the Committee on Agriculture (COAG), which would take place from 30 September to 4 October 2024, in a bid to raise the profile of plant health.
- [38] The CPM chairperson noted that a bureau representative would need to be identified for the COAG meeting, unless the Secretary were to provide the presentation, but deferred the selection until all bureau

⁵ 05_Bureau_2024_Jun.

members were present, either at their virtual meeting in September or at the next face-to-face meeting in October 2024.

[39] The bureau:

- (20) *noted* the verbal updates on progress made in establishing the CPM Focus Group on One Health;
- (21) *noted* that the secretariat submitted a request for a side session of the 29th Session of the COAG in October 2024 to be dedicated to the linkages between plant health and One Health; and
- (22) *deferred* the selection of the bureau representative until the next bureau meeting, either held virtually (September 2024) or in person (October 2024).

6.2 CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues

Selection of new members

[40] The bureau considered the CVs of two candidates nominated to become members of the FG-CCPI, which currently has eight members and is lacking an Asia representative.

[41] In response to the CPM chairperson's query as to whether they had to choose between the two candidates, the secretariat clarified that one would represent Asia and the other would be an FAO representative.

[42] The secretariat clarified that, after attempts to secure a member from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) proved unsuccessful, the FG-CCPI decided to invite a representative from FAO's Office of Climate Change, Biodiversity and Environment (OCB) to become a member.

[43] The bureau representative for the FG-CCPI was of the view that it would be beneficial to have an FAO representative on board and pointed out that the candidate's expertise when it comes to climate change was likely to increase with time.

[44] The bureau:

- (23) *reviewed* and *approved* the nomination from the NPPO of Nepal (Annex 1); and
- (24) *reviewed* and *approved* the FAO OCB nomination (Annex 2).

6.3 CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers

[45] The secretariat gave an update on the focus group's activities. The focus group presented its final report to CPM-18 in April 2024, which included the revision of the CPM Recommendation on sea containers (R-06). The draft revised CPM recommendation was adopted by CPM-18, and it was agreed that the focus group's mandate would be extended for three years until CPM-21 (2027) with new terms of reference.⁶ To complete the membership as per the new terms of reference and replace members who were not able to continue for another three years, the IPPC Secretariat opened a call for two members, one RPPO and one NPPO representative, with a deadline of 15 July 2024 for nominations. The secretariat explained that a third Industry Advisory Group member had been added to the group (as specified in the agreed new terms of reference) and the representative for the World Customs Organization (WCO) was replaced by the new IPPC WCO contact point, as the previous representative has moved on from their position.

[46] The secretariat informed bureau members that a virtual meeting of the focus group would be held in July 2024, possibly followed by an in-person meeting in Rome at the end of the year.

[47] The secretariat drew the bureau's attention to the focus group's involvement in a symposium entitled "Optimizing Container Design to Mitigate Risks of Pest Contamination in the International

⁶ CPM 2024/25_02.

Containerized Supply Chain” taking place in Rotterdam on 11 November 2024, a Container Owners Association (COA) initiative.

[48] The bureau:

- (25) *noted* the updates on the focus group’s activities, including its involvement in an international symposium that would take place in Rotterdam on 11 November 2024, which the secretariat was supporting; and
- (26) *noted* two new focus group members and a replacement for the World Customs Organization.

6.4 CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination

[49] The secretariat explained that the focus group’s terms of reference had been updated in line with recommendations made at CPM-18 (2024).⁷ The secretariat informed bureau members that the call for nominations had so far yielded no results, despite the deadline being in a week’s time, and suggested that it should be extended. Some bureau members reported on expressions of interests in their respective regions.

[50] The bureau:

- (27) *noted* that the focus group’s terms of reference had been updated in line with recommendations made at CPM-18 (2024); and
- (28) *noted* that a call for nominations had been put out but that it may need to be extended as no nominations have yet been received.

6.5 CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid

[51] The secretariat reminded the bureau that the focus group’s mandate had been extend until CPM-20 (2026) at the last CPM meeting.⁸ The secretariat noted the focus group’s efforts to enhance engagement with donor agencies and reported on a USD 300 000 donation from Australia to support the focus group’s activities.

Selection of new members

[52] The secretariat explained that, because of the extension of the focus group’s mandate, a call for experts and research coordinators had been put out and noted that six out of eight existing members confirmed that they were prepared to carry on as members. The secretariat informed the bureau that a face-to-face meeting of the focus group was planned for October 2024 and pointed out that the selection of new members would ideally take place ahead of the meeting.

[53] The bureau:

- (29) *noted* the focus group’s ongoing efforts to secure financial support for its activities from donor agencies and that Australia has pledged to donate USD 300 000; and
- (30) *noted* that the focus group’s mandate had been extended until CPM-20 (2026) and that, as a result, a call for experts to join the group and replace two existing members had been put out.

6.6 CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Network

[54] The secretariat noted that the terms of reference for this focus group were approved at CPM-18 (2024), with a mandate running until CPM-20 (2026),⁹ and that USD 70 000 was set aside for this focus group. The secretariat informed the bureau that an in-kind contribution from South Africa for the initial work of information gathering and first reports was being confirmed, and that the chosen staff member was expected to start in August 2024.

⁷ CPM 2024/CRP/09.

⁸ CPM-18 (2024), agenda item 13.1.1.

⁹ CPM 2024/22 and CPM 2024/CRP/11.

[55] The secretariat informed bureau members that a face-to-face meeting was planned for the first or the second quarter of 2025.

[56] The bureau:

(31) *noted* the update on the financial arrangements relating to this focus group and that the Government of South Africa will be providing the Coordinator position as an in-kind contribution; and

(32) *agreed* to consider the preliminary assessment by an international consultant of the current status and gaps in the diagnostic laboratory network during the bureau meeting in December 2024.

7. Strategic Planning Group (SPG)

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

[57] The bureau agreed to defer discussing some aspects of this matter until the FC meeting on Thursday morning.

[58] The secretariat reminded bureau members that they currently do not fund attendance at SPG and TC-RPPO meetings and that the proposal under review was a first attempt at drafting criteria. The secretariat gave an overview of the IPPC meetings that are prioritized when it comes to enabling the participation of developing countries, amounting to a total of USD 542 000 financed by the FAO regular programme allotment, EU projects, trust funds and various other sources.

[59] The secretariat presented the SPG and TC-RPPO criteria for funding, namely that the IPPC secretariat could fund up to three participants per region for SPG meetings and one RPPO representative from each region for TC-RPPO meetings (subject to funding availability and the participants' meeting World Bank eligibility criteria), and, in the case of SPG meetings, that a relevant topic or discussion paper should be submitted three months in advance for the IPPC Secretariat to review, on a first come, first served basis.¹⁰ The secretariat specified that the proposed criteria applied only to those who hoped to receive funding to participate in the either meeting; they had no bearing on anyone else wishing to attend or take part in them.

[60] Bureau members pointed out that it would be expensive to fund up to three participants per region to attend an SPG meeting. One member raised concerns about the sustainability of the proposed financial support and how it might affect the availability of funding for other initiatives.

[61] The CPM chairperson recommended adding the mention "provided World bank eligibility criteria are met" to the TC-RPPO Criteria, as for the SPG Criteria, and noted that there needed to be more clarity about FAO employees not being eligible for funding. The secretariat specified that the World Bank funding applied only to NPPOs.

[62] One member suggested that an additional criterion could be whether the discussion papers are supported by RPPOs. Although he agreed that this could lend more weight to a proposal, the CPM chairperson cautioned against making this a mandatory criterion.

[63] In response to the CPM chairperson's query as to the need for topics and discussion papers to be submitted three months in advance of the SPG meeting in October 2024, the IPPC secretary explained that the secretariat was anticipating a greater number of submissions as a result of the financial support on offer and that, consequently, more time would be needed to review the proposals.

[64] The CPM chairperson suggested that the June bureau meeting could be the cut-off point for submitting discussion papers. The secretariat elaborated on this idea, saying that the call for topics could be opened at the CPM meeting and that it could carry on until two weeks before the June meeting, so that bureau

¹⁰ 10_Bureau_2024_Jun.

members could shape the SPG agenda based on the topics received at the June meeting. One member suggested that this revised timeline could be added to the agenda for the next CPM.

[65] One bureau member noted that it was time to start thinking about the next Strategic Framework, and that this could inform the topics or themes of discussion papers. The CPM chairperson pointed out that in the past the agenda had been left open, but that this did not rule out making some suggestions (e.g. One Health). The secretariat was of the view that sharing a draft agenda would direct the participants' choice of topics.

[66] The CPM chairperson pointed out that discussion papers should be in English.

[67] The bureau:

- (33) *noted* the secretariat's proposal regarding the criteria for financial support to attend meetings of the SPG and TC-RPPOs, contingent on funding availability and the participants' meeting the World Bank eligibility criteria, and *agreed* to further explore and develop the proposed model to be applied in 2025;
- (34) *noted* that the secretariat was in a position to fund up to three participants per region for the SPG meetings and one representative per RPPO for the TC-RPPO meetings; and
- (35) tentatively *agreed* to a timeline starting with a call for discussion papers at the CPM meeting (March or April, depending on the CPM dates), followed by a review of the discussion papers by the secretariat and bureau members at their June meeting, giving the secretariat a full three months to make travel arrangements for the IPPC-funded participants before the SPG meeting in October.

7.2 SPG paper on procedure for adoption of CPM recommendations

[68] Responding to concerns raised by the chairperson of the Focus Group on Sea Containers during the April 2024 bureau meetings, the chairperson presented a meeting document intended to modify the procedure for the adoption of CPM recommendations, modelled on the successful approach used for adopting ISPMs.¹¹

[69] The CPM chairperson drew the bureau's attention to the fact that subjecting recommendations to two rounds of consultations was not part of the proposal. In addition, regarding the fifth and sixth step in the process for developing and adopting CPM recommendations, the CPM chairperson and other bureau members queried whether the revised draft of CPM recommendations should be presented to the SC, instead of the bureau, for them to consider the comments, make any required revisions and recommend it for adoption by the CPM.

[70] The bureau discussed the proposed changes, based on the text relating to the final adoption of draft ISPMs contained in the standard-setting procedural manual, and suggested modifications to the wording of the text prepared by the CPM chairperson.

[71] The bureau:

- (36) *agreed* to the proposed modified procedure for the adoption of CPM recommendations, provided that the wording of the text be modified as discussed in preparation for the SPG meeting in October 2024; and
- (37) *noted* that the suggested modification did not propose to subject draft recommendations to two rounds of consultations.

7.3 Encouraging the SC and SPG to consider ways of streamlining and accelerating standard setting

[72] Following its request for the Standards Committee (SC) and the SPG to consider ways of streamlining and accelerating standard setting at the bureau meetings in April 2024, the bureau considered a meeting document prepared by Dominique PELLETIER and Sophie PETERSON, the chairpersons of the IC and

¹¹ 06_Bureau_2024_Jun.

the SC, respectively, addressing the relevance of the Task Force on Topics (TFT) and presenting a proposal aiming to improve the overall efficiency of the standard-setting process.¹²

- [73] The chairperson observed that the meeting document boiled down to a proposal that the TFT be effectively dissolved.
- [74] One member noted that some kind of gatekeeping was needed and that was what the TFT was intended for.
- [75] The secretariat pointed out that there was a history of topics placed on the list that never become a priority and that this issue needed to be addressed as the number of standards had become unmanageable. Some bureau members raised similar concerns and expressed the view that the emphasis should be placed on commodity standards other than diagnosis and treatment standards, since other standard-setting activities amounted to revisions.
- [76] The CPM chairperson noted that there are currently two rounds of consultations for draft ISPMs and one round of recommendations. One member pointed out that a certain level of rigour was necessary. The CPM chairperson suggested that the bureau come back to this agenda item and recommended that bureau members present short discussion papers addressing this issue at the SPG.
- [77] Regarding the proposed amended process outlined at the end of paragraph 8 in said meeting document,¹³ the chairperson raised the concern that it might lead to potential confusion and suggested that a single CPM paper be prepared by the two committee chairs instead of two separate documents as was indicated.
- [78] The bureau:
- (38) *discussed* the merits of the proposal developed by the chairpersons of the IC and the SC, and identified some modifications to the meeting document as follows: that, in the proposed amended process, the two chairs would coordinate to prepare a single CPM document [instead of two, as per para. 8] capturing the decisions made by both committees at their November meetings to avoid potential confusion, and that the meeting document proposing the dissolution of the TFT and amended criteria for the evaluation of submissions be prepared and submitted to the SPG for further consideration;
 - (39) *invited* bureau members to submit discussion papers to the SPG with suggestions on how to improve the efficiency of standards setting; and
 - (40) *agreed* to devote more time to discussing this issue at their meeting in December 2024.

7.4 Discussion ideas for the agenda and format of the SPG

- [79] The CPM chairperson reminded bureau members that they had previously discussed inviting discussion papers from representatives of developing countries. A member also noted that they were halfway through the Strategic Framework, which prompted the secretariat's suggestion that a discussion paper on the mid-term assessment be presented at the SPG.
- [80] The CPM chairperson noted that trying to raise the profile of plant health within national government organizations, using the same approaches time and again, was a struggle and suggested that the SPG could look for other ways of raising awareness of plant health, which would be intended to help both the IPPC and its contracting parties, at its next meeting in October 2024.
- [81] The IPPC secretary concurred that more strategic thinking was needed and that the SPG would do well to consider questions regarding the current state of play and the direction the IPPC Secretariat was heading in.

¹² 09_Bureau_2024_Jun.

¹³ 09_Bureau_2024_Jun.

- [82] The CPM chairperson noted a list of topics for the SPG to consider.
- [83] Based on discussion by members about holding SPG meetings in locations conducive to strategic discussions, the CPM chairperson suggested that the SPG meeting be held at the Italian Geographical Society or another location outside of FAO HQ, as this was more open in terms of seating arrangements and thus lent itself better to a productive strategic discussion. Other bureau members supported this idea. The CPM chairperson acknowledged that additional costs may be involved, and the secretariat agreed to explore this option.
- [84] Regarding the format of the meeting, the bureau thought that formal presentations should not be required, although they may be offered, and that the presenters should give presentations in no more than five minutes.
- [85] The bureau:
- (41) *agreed* on a provisional list of topics to discuss at the next SPG meeting, including:
 - update from the bureau,
 - Environmental Scan,
 - the theme of the next IDPH,
 - One Health,
 - how to raise the profile of plant health,
 - the next International Plant Health Conference,
 - the APP,
 - the PCE,
 - the POARS,
 - regional communications network (TC-RPPO lead)
 - the implementation or the mid-term review of the Strategic Framework,
 - preliminary discussions on the next iteration of the long-term strategy,
 - resource mobilization,
 - discussion of Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE) proposals on technical issues with ISPMs for adoption that are not objections,
 - the agenda for CPM-19 (2025), including the topics for the side and the science session, and
 - additional topics proposed as a result of an open call.
 - (42) *requested* that the secretariat send out a call for papers and the invitation by the end of June 2024; and
 - (43) *requested* that the secretariat explore whether the meeting could be held in a less formal setting, at a venue other than FAO HQ, possibly the Italian Geographical Society in Rome, but *noted* that additional costs would be involved.

8. Disclaimer text for CPM recommendations

- [86] The agenda item was discussed after item 16.

Difference between guidance documents in relation to the rigour of adoption

- [87] The bureau recalled that, at its April meeting, they had agreed that it may be helpful to include in the *IPPC procedure manual for governance* some reference to the level of rigour of the approval process for the different categories of guidance, and that Samuel BISHOP (Europe) would draft a text outlining the differences in the approval processes for ISPMs, CPM recommendations, and IPPC guides and training materials.¹⁴
- [88] Samuel BISHOP reminded the bureau that the disclaimer for CPM recommendations was meant to address concerns raised by contracting parties from his region as to the possibility of adducing categories of guidance lacking the rigour of an ISPM to resolve trade disputes.¹⁵
- [89] The bureau considered the resulting text,¹⁶ and suggested some minor changes, pending more substantial editorial revisions aimed at making the text more concise.
- [90] Mindful of prior consultations on this subject with FAO Legal Office, who advised against the inclusion of a disclaimer, arguing 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, the CPM chairperson asked whether FAO Legal Office would be asked to review the text. Another bureau member also raised concerns about how FAO Legal Office would react.
- [91] Samuel BISHOP noted that, as the text was intended for the procedure manual, FAO Legal Office need not be involved, and explained that he introduced the qualification “ISPMs *are intended to* place obligations on contracting partner” at the start of the paragraph dealing with ISPMs in response to FAO Legal Office’s point concerning the non-mandatory nature of all three categories of guidance, as distinct from the convention itself, which places certain obligations on contracting parties.
- [92] The secretariat queried where the proposed text would feature in the procedure manual, and whether it would be presented as a whole or as three separate paragraphs fitted around the relevant sections of the procedure manual.
- [93] The bureau:
- (44) *reviewed* a proposed text provided by a bureau member, intended for the IPPC procedure manual on governance; and
 - (45) *requested* that the IPPC editor review the proposed text in advance of the bureau meeting in October 2024.

9. Technical issues with ISPMs for adoption that are not objections (post-SC May discussions)

CPM-18 COSAVE comments

- [94] Diego QUIROGA (Latin America and the Caribbean) gave a summary of the relevant section of the statements prepared by COSAVE relating to specific agenda items at CPM-18 (2024),¹⁷ and noted that it was important for contracting parties to have the opportunity to share concerns about the draft ISPMs ahead of the CPM decisions. Diego QUIROGA also informed the bureau about a document prepared by SC members from Latin America and the Caribbean region that proposed a calendar for trying to address these issues prior to their adoption.¹⁸

¹⁴ CPM Bureau 2024/04, agenda item 5.5.

¹⁵ CPM Bureau 2023/06, agenda item 8; CPM Bureau 2023/10, agenda item 6.

¹⁶ 14_Bureau_2024_Jun.

¹⁷ CPM 2024/INF/20.

¹⁸ 23_SC_2024_May.

[95] The secretariat informed the bureau that the SC decided to allocate time to this issue at their meeting in November 2024. The CPM chairperson suggested that it should equally be discussed by the SPG. The secretariat expressed support for this idea, noting that what is intended by “technical issues” needed to be clarified and that the SPG could help with that.

[96] The bureau:

(46) *agreed* that this agenda item should be put forward to the SPG for discussion with the intention of providing some ideas to the SC to help them with their planned continued review scheduled for their meeting in November 2024. among other to clarify what is intended by “technical issues” by providing an example.

10. Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP)

[97] The IPPC secretary reminded the bureau about the rationale for the APP, which was intended as a first stage in a global phytosanitary programme designed to address specific issues, such as the economic impact of plant pests or climate change resulting in an expansion of plant pests. In a joint initiative with the African Union’s Commission on Agriculture, Rural Development, Blue Economy, and Sustainable Environment (ARBE), Africa was chosen because it lacked a robust phytosanitary system that would allow NPPOs to fulfil their mission.

[98] **Phased-in approach.** The IPPC secretary presented the phased-in approach to the APP implementation and the pest selection process. In the pilot phase, 11 countries had been selected from Africa’s five subregions and asked to provide a list of five prioritized pests. The next step consisted of developing a survey methodology and diagnostic protocols for all the pests put forward by the different countries, a GIS hub and a digital platform, hands-on training workshops, ranging from tabletop to full-scale field exercises, as well as train-the-trainer workshops. The IPPC secretary reported on regularly meeting with NPPO representatives and ministers to ensure that they remained committed to the process. As the successive phases of the APP implementation involve adding new countries each year, which would be ranked to select 11 out of 15 countries. The IPPC secretary presented the countries that had been nominated so far for the next phase of the programme: Algeria and Tunisia for North Africa; Chad and Congo for Central Africa; and Malawi and South Africa for southern Africa.

Long-term operational plans

[99] **Programme coordination.** The IPPC secretary presented the overall framework, in which the IPPC Secretariat would provide the global coordination; Africa’s regional plant protection organizations, regional economic communities (RECs) and FAO regional offices would ensure regional programme coordination and logistical support; while NPPOs, FAO country offices, national cooperators and stakeholders would be responsible for the implementation of the programme in their respective countries.

[100] **Governance structure.** Having emphasized that POARS would act as a linkage between the secretariat and the rest of the IPPC governing structure, the IPPC secretary reported on progress in establishing a technical working group designed to provide technical support, address diagnostic protocols and identify research questions to work on.

[101] **Funding.** The IPPC secretary explained that that the multi-donor trust fund envisioned for the APP called for a coordinated approach, bringing all the funds together to generate synergies. The United States had already committed financial and in-kind support to the programme. The IPPC Secretariat was finalizing deals with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the European Union, and preparing a proposal for the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

[102] On the question of the longer-term positioning of the APP within FAO, the IPPC secretary informed the bureau that, after considering different FAO divisions and regional units, they concluded that the APP should be part of the IPPC Secretariat, seeing as is it aligned with its mission. The IPPC secretary pointed out that the IPPC Secretariat is the only organization within FAO that boasts a delivery mechanism for all the standards, access to all the countries, transparency and accountability.

- [103] The IPPC secretary drew attention to the fact that this would involve a significant commitment on the part of the IPPC, and that a dedicated team consisting of two technical officers (an English and a French speaker) and a GIS specialist was envisaged to work with POARS.
- [104] One bureau member expressed his support for the synergistic approach, while warning that there was a potential overlap with the 12 intended outcomes from POARS; to avoid a duplication of effort and capacity with other initiatives, the member suggested that the APP might be developed based on the GIS data model.
- [105] In response to a question about how the technical working groups were selected, the secretariat explained that they had asked different organizations working in Africa, including CABI, the African Academy of Sciences and WAVE, to nominate experts in their own field. The bureau member suggested that they could also reach out to South Africa's Agricultural Research Council and Citrus Research International.
- [106] The IPPC secretary commended Descartes KOUMBA, Arop DENG and Anita TIBASAAGA from the IPPC Secretariat for their dedication to this initiative.
- [107] The bureau:
- (47) *noted* the IPPC secretary's updates on the APP's ongoing activities and future plans; and
 - (48) *noted* the IPPC secretary's recommendation that the APP remain under the IPPC Secretariat's direction over the long term.

11. Antimicrobial resistance survey

- [108] The secretariat presented the background to the two antimicrobial resistance surveys developed by the IPPC Observatory and considered the next steps in the light of decisions reached in this regard at the CPM-18 (2024) session, notably to extend the two surveys and to identify those fungicides and antifungals used in the context of One Health, a list of which is included in Appendix 1.¹⁹
- [109] The CPM chairperson commended the secretariat on finding the publication highlighted in the paper as part of the literature-review findings used to draw up the list in Appendix 1, and especially the summary that stood out for him: "Trans-kingdom fungal pathogens infecting both plants and humans, and the problem of azole fungicide resistance".²⁰

Review of survey questions for follow-up

- [110] One bureau member pointed out that there is no value in asking the same questions twice and that they should be rephrased or framed differently. Given that the number of countries using antibiotics in plant protection was relatively low, the bureau member was of the view that the survey questions should focus instead on fungicides, despite what had been agreed at CPM-18 (2024).
- [111] The IPPC secretary suggested that the survey could be used in the context of the regional workshops.
- [112] The bureau:
- (49) *discussed* and *approved* the reformatted questionnaire of the IPPC survey on antibiotics use in plant protection;
 - (50) *discussed* and *approved* the reformatted questionnaire of the IPPC survey on fungicides use in plant protection, but only to include the list of fungicides which belong to the following chemical family: polyenes, azoles, pyrimidine analogues or echinocandins; and
 - (51) *noted* the secretariat's plan to launch the new fungicides survey at the end of August to coincide with the IPPC regional workshops and the reformatted antibiotics survey at the end of September 2024 addressed to all the IPPC contracting parties.

¹⁹ 11_Bureau_2024_Jun.

²⁰ <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/microbiology/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2024.1354757/full>

12. Steering group for the regional communications network

Concept note and TORs

- [113] The secretariat reminded bureau members that the CPM-18 (2024) approved the proposal to establish regional communication networks (RCNs) managed by the secretariat, which would provide a platform for individual regions to address their communications and advocacy needs, along with a steering group that would advise on how to establish and maintain the seven intended regional networks as well as developing and implementing an annual action plan.²¹
- [114] The bureau considered the proposed draft principle of the IPPC RCNs (Annex 1) and the terms of reference for the RCN Steering Group (Annex 2).²²
- [115] One member reported that his region expressed concerns about the added layers of management that would be involved, while acknowledging that, in the long run, an increased focus on communications would be a good thing.
- [116] Commenting on the draft principle, another bureau member suggested that the document should be reworded to give more prominence to the active role played by the secretariat in what is intended as a “two-way communications process”, namely by sharing its vision and the different communications activities that it develops. As regards Annex 2, the same bureau member pointed out that the steering group should include a member from the TC-RPPOs.
- [117] The CPM chairperson advised to have the SPG review this item.
- [118] The bureau:
- (52) *reviewed* the draft principle of the IPPC regional communication networks and *asked* that the secretariat revise the annex to emphasize the active role that the secretariat plays in what is a two-way process;
 - (53) *reviewed* the terms of reference of the Steering Group and *asked* that the secretariat add a member from TC-RPPOs; and
 - (54) *agreed* to request that the TC-RPPOs review the draft at their meeting in September and lead the presentation on this item at the SPG meeting in October 2024.

13. One Health

Side session and keynote speech at the 8th World One Health Congress in 2024

- [119] The IPPC secretary updated the bureau on logistical arrangements in preparation for the parallel session and keynote speech at the 8th World One Health Congress in Cape Town (20–23 September 2024), which he has been coordinating with the bureau representative from South Africa. The IPPC secretary confirmed that four papers and two poster presentations would be presented at a dedicated session on “Linkages between One Health and plant health”. The bureau discussed the IPPC secretary’s keynote address and expressed the view that it should be delivered at the plenary opening of the congress.
- [120] The IPPC secretary explained that, in order to reduce the costs of attendance, the IPPC Secretariat decided to sponsor the entire session on plant health within the context of One Health, rather than having to cover the individual registration fees for all the presenters attending the congress.
- [121] The IPPC secretary reported on encouraging feedback from the organizing committee and progress in making the IPPC’s presence known within the One Health community, as demonstrated by the fact that the One Health task force is considering adding plants to the One Health infographic diagram, which currently features three interlocking icons representing healthy humans, animals and ecosystems.

²¹ CPM 2024/35, agenda item 20.

²² 13_Bureau_2024_Jun.

[122] The bureau:

- (55) *noted* the progress in planning the IPPC's contribution to the 8th World One Health Congress;
- (56) *noted* that the "side session" had been upgraded to a dedicated "main session" on plant health in the context of One Health; and
- (57) *agreed* that the IPPC secretary's keynote speech should be included in the main opening session of the Congress, if possible.

14. Review of CPM-18

14.1 Review of DAI investment prospectus

[123] The bureau discussed the editorial comments and proposed revisions to seven of the nine promotional flyers developed by the secretariat for each of the development-agenda items (DAIs) and the additional summary flyer,²³ excluding the flyers on DAI 3 and DAI 5, which needed some further input from the IC Team on e-commerce and the POARS Steering Group respectively.

[124] The secretariat confirmed that Canada and the European Union were the only contracting parties that provided comments on the prospectus, presented for review at the CPM-18 (2024).²⁴

[125] The bureau suggested some modifications to the draft text of DAI 1, DAI 2 and DAI 4.

[126] The secretariat confirmed that the text of the individual DAI flyers would be open to changes and further adjustments.

[127] In response to the CPM chairperson's query concerning the distribution of the investment prospectus to target audiences, potential sponsors and donors, other than through the International Phytosanitary Portal, the secretariat pointed out that they would value additional guidance and input from bureau members as regards the specific donors to whom the flyers could be sent out. The CPM chairperson suggested that, for one thing, every country that had contributed to the trust fund should be on the list.

[128] Some bureau members remarked on the prominence of the FAO logo on every single flyer, and queried whether this was necessary.

[129] The bureau:

- (58) *approved* 6 out of 8 prospectus flyers (excluding DAI 3 and DAI 5) and the summary flyer for publication, provided that the suggested word revisions be made; and
- (59) *reviewed* the progress made on the e-commerce (DAI 3) and POARS (DAI 5) flyers by the IC Team on e-commerce and the POARS Steering Group respectively, and *agreed* to approve them through an e-decision once they had been finalized by these groups.

14.2 Recording interventions in the CPM-18 report

Review of use of form of collective nouns used in CPM reports

[130] The secretariat reminded the bureau that, after discussing this issue at their meeting in April, they had agreed to avoid referring to the number of interventions where possible (with some caveats) and to try out in the CPM-18 report an approach to recording interventions outlined in the bureau meeting report of April 2024.²⁵

²³ 07_Bureau_2024_Jun.

²⁴ CPM 2024/13_01, agenda item 12.

²⁵ CPM Bureau 2024/04, agenda item 5.4.

[131] One bureau member queried the point regarding verbal interventions from the European Union and whether these should be treated as multiple interventions in the proposed approach, and offered to further investigate this

[132] The CPM chairperson and the secretariat reported that they had received no feedback regarding this issue from any of the contracting parties following CPM-18 (2024).

[133] The bureau:

(60) *agreed* to pursue the approach approved by the bureau and adopted, as a trial, at the CPM-18 (2024) meeting going forward.

14.3 Discussion on the future status of the Credentials Committee

[134] The bureau discussed whether they should be expected to carry on reviewing the credentials issued by contracting parties for all the delegates designated to attend the CPM sessions, which was extremely time-consuming given the number of delegates involved. The secretariat presented several options for the bureau to consider and informed them that FAO Legal Office had made it clear that it was not their duty to check credentials.

[135] One bureau member informed fellow members that his region had queried the need for this extra level of governance as other multilateral bodies do not appear to have a Credentials Committee. The member also pointed out that, since bureau members lacked the competence to assess credentials, they would continue to have to rely on the assistance of FAO Legal Office.

[136] The secretariat clarified that credentials were reviewed and checked ahead of the Credentials Committee meeting, but that FAO Legal Office had pointed out that making final decisions on whether credentials were acceptable or not was outside of the remit of the secretariat.

[137] The bureau:

(61) *agreed* to go on assessing the credentials but *asked* the secretariat to screen the credentials to flag up any questionable ones and present them to the bureau for review; and

(62) *agreed* to devote half a day to reviewing the credentials at their meeting in March, in the week preceding CPM-19 (2025).

14.4 Feedback from CPM-18

[138] The secretariat informed the bureau that the list of participants was not the final list of participants since it included those who had been pre-registered.

[139] The CPM chairperson reported on feedback from the floor that too many speakers on the podium were reading their documents verbatim rather than presenting the highlights and that the documents that do not include any decision points should be kept to a minimum, while those without decision points should not generally be opened for discussion (unless there is a request from the floor).

[140] One bureau member shared some feedback concerning the last-minute modifications to the set agenda, which made the agenda difficult to follow.

[141] The bureau:

(63) *noted* the feedback from CPM-18 (2024).

14.5 Dates for CPM-19 (2025) and arrangements

[142] The secretariat confirmed that the CPM-19 (2025) meeting would take place on 17–21 March, and that the CPM bureau would meet the week before, on 11–14 March.

[143] The secretariat noted that that meant that the CPM-19 (2025) taking place earlier than usual next year had a knock-on effect on all the deadlines. The secretariat said that an early December deadline for the

bureau review might be advisable, especially as the discussion papers would be copy-edited and translated on this occasion.

Report-writer breaks and support

- [144] The CPM chairperson pointed out that the idea of screening videos during the CPM session to give the report writer a much-needed rest did not work well because participants had seized this opportunity to leave the room and that the announcements were too brief to allow for a proper break.
- [145] The secretariat informed the bureau of the decision to have two report writers present at CPM-19 (2025), and added that Karen ROUEN's suggestions would be discussed internally by the secretariat before being considered at the bureau meeting in October 2024.

Time allocations for presenters

- [146] The secretariat pointed out that there were more presentations than usual at CPM-18 with over 60 discussion papers that needed to be translated, and queried whether it was necessary for so many discussion papers to be presented.
- [147] One member noted that the different types of discussion papers were explained during the orientation session and in the *Guide to participating in the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures of the International Plant Protection Convention* (2024).²⁶
- [148] Another bureau member suggested that a timer for the podium would help to impress on speakers that they needed to respect the time allotted for their presentations.
- [149] The bureau:
- (64) *recommended* that the time frame for each presentation be specified in advance and that podium speakers be reminded that they need to stick to the allotted times; to facilitate this a timing clock will be provided to speakers on the podium.

15. Other follow-up to previous bureau meetings

15.1 Private–public partnership examples

- [150] The secretariat reminded bureau members that funding for the global coordination of action on *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* Tropical Race 4 (TR4) was currently on hold, and that a delegate from the United States had suggested at the SPG meeting in October 2023 that a private-public partnership (PPP) could be explored as an alternative. The secretariat also informed the bureau that the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) was developing a knowledge product on PPPs in developing countries and that they had relayed their call for case studies.
- [151] One bureau member offered to share a discussion paper presented at the International Atomic Energy Agency conference based on his experience of working on the F3 fruit fly free project, a partnership between two NPPOs in Mozambique and South Africa, various research institutions and government departments, which is funded by the STDF and implemented by South Africa's Agricultural Research Council.
- [152] The IPPC secretary explained that, in the case of the boll weevil (*Anthonomus grandis*) eradication programme, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) would foot 20 percent of the costs and the industry the remainder, and added that there were several examples in the US context of the industry providing substantial resources. The IPPC secretary further noted that multinational companies in the banana industry had a vested interest in seeing that plant protection agencies be involved.
- [153] The bureau:

²⁶ https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/uploads/Test/dtp4_cpm_guide_to_participation_version_for_ipp.pdf

(65) *agreed* to send in examples of private–public partnerships to be discussed at their meeting in October 2024.

15.2 Outcome of SC decisions on the draft annex to ISPM 38

[154] The bureau recalled that it had received a letter from two regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs), COSAVE and the North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) in this regard.²⁷ The two RPPOs had expressed concern over what they believed was an unjustified delay in moving forward 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.

[155] The secretariat informed bureau members that the issue has effectively been resolved, as the SC had made the appropriate revision at its meeting in May and approved the draft annex for first consultation.

[156] One bureau member commended the SC's excellent work in resolving this issue, and anticipated positive feedback from contracting parties.

[157] The bureau:

(66) *noted* the secretariat's update on the decisions that the SC had reached to address concerns over delays in sending the draft annex to the first round of consultations.

15.3 How to improve low response rates to surveys

[158] The CPM chairperson reported on the content and responses at the regional workshops, which suggested survey fatigue and the need of putting the questions differently.

[159] Suggestions made by bureau members on how to improve low response rates to surveys included the following: limiting the number of surveys and questions; being clearer about what the output was going to be and how the data were going to be used; thanking the individual countries that responded and naming them.

[160] The bureau:

(67) *discussed* some suggestions from bureau members on how to improve the response to surveys.

15.4 IDPH theme for 2025: Plant health in the context of One Health – How to influence the FAO decision and the content for presentations

[161] The IPPC secretary gave an update on his discussions with FAO about the proposal to have One Health as the theme for the IDPH 2025. A strong request has gone out to FAO; the secretariat is awaiting a response and will follow up on this.

[162] The bureau:

(68) *noted* the secretariat's update on their discussions with FAO concerning the proposed theme for IDPH 2025.

16. Any other business

16.1 Next International Plant Health Conference

[163] Following the success of the inaugural International Plant Health Conference, which was held in London, United Kingdom in September 2022, and brought together more than 500 experts and advocates from 74 countries to discuss the scientific, technical and regulatory aspects of global plant protection, the bureau looked ahead to the next edition.

[164] One bureau member suggested that the conference could happen every 4 to 5 years.

²⁷ CPM Bureau 2024.04, agenda item 8.1.

[165] The bureau discussed arrangements, such as funding considerations and the relative merits of hosting the conference again in Europe rather than choosing another location.

[166] The bureau:

(69) *agreed* to continue considering arrangements for the next International Plant Health Conference.

16.2 Funding from Canada for the systems approach workshop

[167] The CPM chairperson confirmed that Canada has allocated USD 70 000 (CAD 100 000) for the system approach workshop to be held in the second half of 2025 but noted that Canada did not offer to host the workshop, which could be held in Rome, Italy, if no other country was willing to host it. The CPM chairperson invited bureau members to broach the subject of hosting the workshop in their respective regions and to consider what they hoped to gain from it.

[168] The IPPC secretary pointed out that, ideally, the workshop would take place out in the field to experience first-hand how a systems approach is operated and, with this in mind, suggested hosting it in the United States. Another bureau member said that an Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) or COSAVE country would be a good alternative as they have adopted the systems approach.

[169] Another member informed the bureau that someone from FAO's Food Systems and Food Safety Division (ESF) took a live interest in this initiative and thought that they may be in a position to support it.

[170] The bureau:

(70) *noted* the update regarding the options for holding the System Approach workshop; and

(71) *agreed* to keep FAO's ESF division in the loop regarding plans for the workshop.

17. Date of the next meeting

[171] The bureau agreed to hold a virtual bureau meeting to discuss the agenda for the SPG meeting on Tuesday, 10 September 2024, at 12.00–14.00 CET (with a placeholder meeting scheduled for Thursday, 12 September 2024, at the same time, in case more time is needed).

[172] The bureau confirmed the date for their next meeting on 23–25 and 31 October 2024, in Rome, coinciding with the SPG on 28–30 October 2024.

18. Adoption of decision points

[173] The bureau adopted the decisions reached during the week.

19. Close of the meeting

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

Appendix 1: Agenda

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		EL-LISSY / CHAIR
2. Meeting arrangements		
2.1 Election of the rapporteur		CHAIR
2.2 Adoption of the agenda	01_Bureau_2024_Jun	CHAIR
3. Administrative matters		
3.1 Document list	02_Bureau_2024_Jun	DENG
3.2 Participants list	03_Bureau_2024_Jun	DENG
3.3 Local information	Link to the Local Information	DENG
4. IPPC ePhyto Solution		
4.1 Selection of bureau lead for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the development-agenda item on “Harmonization of Electronic Data Exchange” 	--	CHAIR / ALL
4.2 ePhyto governance arrangements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESG Future funding governance arrangements 	12_Bureau_2024_Jun	VIVIAN-SMITH / MENON
4.3 ePhyto funding		
4.3.1 ePhyto sustainable funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on FAO funding 	--	EL-LISSY / BENOVIC
4.3.2 Cost revision of the Service Delivery Agreements (SDAs) with UNICC for operating and maintaining the Hub and the GeNS	--	MENON / EL LISSY
4.3.3 Confirmation of membership for the focus group on ePhyto sustainable funding	--	BENOVIC / THOMSON
4.4 ePhyto updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forwarding ePhytos to digital platforms as third entities 	04_Bureau_2024_Jun	MENON
5 Improvements to PCEs (post IC May discussions)	05_Bureau_2024_Jun	BRUNEL
6. Update from CPM Focus Groups		
6.1 CPM FG on One Health	--	BRUNEL
6.2 CPM FG on Climate Change	08_Bureau_2024_Jun	FRIO

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection of new members 		
6.3	CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers	--	SHAMILOV
6.4	CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary research coordination	--	DENG
6.5	CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid - Selection of members	--	MOREIRA
6.6	CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic laboratory network	--	MOREIRA / VENTER
7.	Strategic Planning Group (SPG)		
7.1	Draft criteria for financial support to attend meetings of the SPG and TC-RPPOs	10_Bureau_2024_Jun	BENOVIC
7.2	SPG paper on procedure for adoption of CPM recommendations	06_Bureau_2024_Jun	CHAIR
7.3	Encouraging the SC and SPG to consider ways of streamlining and accelerating standard setting	09_Bureau_2024_Jun	CHAIR
7.4	Discussion ideas for the agenda and format of the SPG	--	CHAIR / ALL
8,	Disclaimer text for CPM recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difference between guidance documents in relation to the rigour of adoption 	14_Bureau_2024_Jun	BISHOP
9.	Technical issues with ISPMs for adoption that are not objections (post SC May discussions) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPM-18 COSAVE comments 	Link to CPM paper	QUIROGA
10.	Africa Phytosanitary Programme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • long-term operational plans 	--	EL-LISSY / DENG
11.	Antimicrobial resistance survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • review of survey questions for follow-up 	11_Bureau_2024_Jun	KOUMBA
12	Steering group for the regional communications network <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept note and TORs 	13_Bureau_2024_Jun	FRIO
13.	One Health <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Side session and keynote speech at the Eighth World One Health Congress in 2024 	--	EL-LISSY / CHAIR
14.	Review of CPM-18	Link to CPM report	
14.1	Review of DAI investment prospectus	Link to CPM paper	DENG / FRIO

		07_Bureau_2024_Jun	
14.2	Recording interventions in the CPM-18 report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of use of form of collective nouns used in CPM reports 	--	DENG
14.3	Discussion on the future status of the Credentials Committee	--	DENG
14.4	Feedback from CPM-18	--	CHAIR / ALL
14.5	Dates for CPM-19 and arrangements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report-writer breaks and support time allocations for presenters 	--	EL-LISSY / DENG
15	Other follow up to previous bureau meetings		
15.1	Private–public partnership examples	--	CHAIR / VIVIAN SMITH
15.2	Outcome of SC decisions on the draft annex to ISPM 38	--	CHAIR / NERSISYAN
15.3	How to improve low response rates to surveys	--	CHAIR / ALL
15.4	IDPH theme for 2025: Plant health in the context of One Health – how to influence the FAO decision and the content for presentations;	--	CHAIR / ALL
16.	Any other business		CHAIR/ALL
16.1	Next international plant health conference		CHAIR/ALL
16.2	Funding from Canada on the systems approach workshop		CHAIR/ALL
17.	Date of the next meeting		
18.	Adoption of decision points		
19.	Closing of the meeting		

Appendix 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
01_Bureau_2024_Jun	2.2	Agenda	2024-05-31 2024-06-05
02_Bureau_2024_Jun	3.1	Documents List	2024-06-05
03_Bureau_2024_Jun	3.2	Participants List	
04_Bureau_2024_Jun	4.4	Forwarding ePhytos to digital platforms as third entities	2024-06-05
05_Bureau_2024_Jun	5	PCEs update and roadmap	2024-06-11
06_Bureau_2024_Jun	7.2	Proposed modifications to the adoption of CPM Recommendations	2024-06-05
07_Bureau_2024_Jun	14.1	Update on DAI investment prospectus flyers	2024-06-06
08_Bureau_2024_Jun	6.2	Nominations for the CPM focus of climate change	2024-06-06
09_Bureau_2024_Jun	7.3	Reflection on the relevance of the task force on topics and potential resource savings for the secretariat	2024-06-07
10_Bureau_2024_Jun	7.1	Draft criteria for financial support to attend meetings of the SPG and TC-RPPOs	2024-06-10
11_Bureau_2024_Jun	11	IPPC survey on antimicrobial products used in phytosanitary context	2024-06-11
12_Bureau_2024_June	4.2	IPPC ePhyto Solution: Governance	2024-06-11
13_Bureau_2024_June	12	Draft principle of the IPPC regional communications networks and terms of reference of the steering group	2024-06-11
14_Bureau_2024_June	8	Disclaimer text for CPM recommendations	2024-06-18

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 Dominique Menon	Dominique.Menon@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Descartes KOUMBA	Descartes.Koumba@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Aoife CASSIN	Aoife.Cassin@fao.org
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Agnieszka GRATZA	Agnieszka.Gratza@fao.org

Appendix 4: Action list

Meeting	Agenda item (decision)	Task	Person or persons responsible	Deadline
2024-06	4.2 (5)	Reconsider establishing an alternative financial governance body or group in relation to the IPPC ePhyto Solution in a year's time.	Bureau	2025-06
2024-06	4.3.2 (8)	The secretariat to engage with the UNICC to clarify what extra security features they planned to introduce to justify the additional costs.	Secretariat	2024-10
2024-06	4.4 (13)	The secretariat to seek greater clarity as to the legal and financial implications as well as any unintended consequences of the proposal.	Secretariat	2024-10
2024-06	6.1 (22)	Select a bureau representative for the CPM focus group on One Health	Bureau	2024-10
2024-06	6.6 (32)	Consider the preliminary assessment by an international consultant of the current status and gaps in the diagnostic laboratory network.	Bureau	2024-12
2024-06	7.1 (33)	Further explore and develop the proposed model for financial support to attend meetings of the SPG and TC-RPPOs	Bureau	2025-06
2024-06	7.2 (36)	Modify the wording in the proposed procedure for the adoption of CPM recommendations, as discussed in this meeting as preparation for the SPG meeting in October 2024	CPM Chairperson	2024-10
2024-06	7.3 (38)	Update the paper on ways of streamlining and accelerating standard setting for the SPG in October as discussed during this meeting.	Secretariat / SC and IC Chair	2024-10
2024-06	7.3 (39, 40)	Draft discussion papers to the SPG with suggestions on how to improve the efficiency of standards setting and discuss this item further at the December Bureau meeting	Bureau	2024-10 and 2024-12
2024-06	7.4 (42, 43)	the secretariat to send out a call for SPG discussion papers and the invitation by the end of June 2024; and explore other venues to host the SPG meeting	Secretariat	2024-06
2024-06	8 (45)	Review a proposed text provided on disclaimer text, intended for the IPPC procedure manual on governance	Secretariat	2024-10
2024-06	12 (52, 53)	The secretariat to revise the annex on the draft principle of the IPPC regional communication to emphasize the active role that the secretariat plays in what is a two-way process; and add a member from TC-RPPOs	Secretariat	2024-10
2024-06	14.1 (59)	Reviewed and approve the e-commerce (DAI 3) and POARS (DAI 5) flyers via an e-decision once they had been finalized.	Secretariat / Bureau	2024-10
2024-06	14.3 (61)	The secretariat to screen the credentials for the CPM and to flag up any questionable ones and present them to the bureau for review;	Secretariat / Bureau	2025-03
2024-06	15.1 (65)	Submit examples of private–public partnerships for the next bureau meeting in October	Bureau	2024-10