



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Strategic Planning Group

Rome, Italy

28 – 30 October 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, 2025



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	Adoption of the agenda	5
2.2	Election of the rapporteur	5
3.	Administrative matters	5
4.	Update from the CPM Bureau	5
5.	Breakout session – Environmental scan of the IPPC to identify strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats	5
6.	Topics submitted for discussion by SPG participants and accompanied by papers	7
6.1	Antimicrobial resistance in plant health (submitted by the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada, New Zealand and Australia)	7
6.2	Is it time to rethink ISPMs? (submitted by New Zealand)	8
6.3	Development of international standards and guidance (submitted by the United Kingdom)	9
6.4	Concept note for an IPPC workshop on systems approaches (submitted by Canada)	10
6.5	Consideration of IPPC work on seaweed (submitted by the CPM chairperson)	10
7.	Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030	11
7.1	Update on DAI 1 (Making trade safe by harmonizing electronic data exchange) and the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution	11
7.2	Update on DAI 2 (Easing market access through commodity-specific plant-health standards) and the IPPC Technical Panel on Commodity Standards	13
7.3	Update on DAI 3 (Managing e-commerce and postal and courier pathways)	13
7.4	Update on DAI 4 (Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities)	14
7.5	Update on DAI 5 (Strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems)	14
7.6	Update on DAI 6 (Assessing and managing climate-change impacts on plant health) and the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues	15
7.7	Update on DAI 7 (Establishing global phytosanitary research coordination) and the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination	15
7.8	Update on DAI 8 (Establishing a diagnostic laboratory network)	16
7.9	IPPC Observatory – mid-term monitoring and evaluation of the strategic framework in 2025	16
7.10	Breakout session – Preliminary discussions on the next iteration of the strategic framework	17
8.	Updates from other CPM focus groups	18
8.1	Update on the CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid	18
9.	One Health and antimicrobial resistance	18
10.	Breakout session – How to raise the profile of plant health and mobilize resources	19
11.	IPPC standards and implementation topics	19
11.1	Status of the Task Force on Topics	19

11.2	Breakout session – Expediting the development of standards	21
11.3	Discussion of COSAVE proposals on technical issues with ISPMs for adoption that are not objections.....	21
11.4	Breakout session – Pest outbreak alert and response systems	23
11.5	Improvements to phytosanitary capacity evaluation.....	24
12.	Procedure for adoption of CPM recommendations.....	25
13.	Establishment of regional communications networks and draft principle.....	25
14.	Update on the Africa Phytosanitary Programme	26
15.	Breakout session – Discussion on the theme of the next and future International Days of Plant Health	27
16.	The International Plant Health Conference.....	27
16.1	Review of the first International Plant Health Conference.....	27
16.2	Breakout session – Discussion on the next International Plant Health Conference ..	28
17.	Preparations for CPM-19 (2025)	28
17.1	Keynote speakers.....	28
17.2	Side sessions	29
18.	Any other business.....	29
19.	Meeting feedback and discussion on format and possible themes for future SPG meetings....	29
20.	Next meeting.....	30
21.	Close of the meeting.....	30
	Appendix 1: Agenda	31
	Appendix 2: Documents list.....	34
	Appendix 3: Participants list	36
	Appendix 4: Summary of the group’s deliberations from the breakout session - Environmental scan of the IPPC to identify strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats	40
	Appendix 5: Summary of the group’s deliberations from the breakout session - Preliminary discussions on the next iteration of the strategic framework	45
	Appendix 6: Summary of the group’s deliberations from the breakout session - Expediting the development of standards	51
	Appendix 7: Summary of the group’s deliberations from the breakout session – Pest outbreak alert and response systems	57
	Appendix 8: Summary of the group’s deliberations from the breakout session – Discussion on the theme of the next and future International Days of Plant Health	61

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The Chairperson of the Strategic Planning Group (SPG), Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom), welcomed everyone and explained that the purpose of the SPG was to provide strategic advice to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) and subsidiary bodies. The Acting IPPC Officer-in-Charge for daily matters, Arop DENG, introduced some of the issues to be discussed during the meeting.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Adoption of the agenda

- [2] The SPG adopted the agenda (Appendix 1), modified to consider item 9 (One Health and AMR) after item 6.1 (Antimicrobial resistance in plant health) and to omit item 10 (Breakout session – How to raise the profile of plant health and mobilize resources) but consider the question it raised as a theme running through all the meeting, including the breakout sessions.

2.2 Election of the rapporteur

- [3] The SPG elected Matthew EVERATT (United Kingdom) as rapporteur.

3. Administrative matters

- [4] The documents list (Appendix 2) and the participants list (Appendix 3) had been posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) before the meeting.

4. Update from the CPM Bureau

- [5] The CPM chairperson, Gregory WOLFF (Canada), gave a verbal update from the CPM Bureau (hereafter referred to as the “bureau”), the report of which would be published on the IPP.¹

- [6] The CPM chairperson explained that the bureau members had met with FAO permanent representatives after the bureau meeting and had discussed several issues, including funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution, One Health, the long-term “home” for the Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP), and the positioning of the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as the “secretariat”) within FAO. The bureau had urged the permanent representatives to make interventions in support of greater funding of the IPPC ePhyto Solution and expediting the establishment of the ePhyto Multidonor Trust Fund.

- [7] The SPG:

(1) *noted* the update from the bureau.

5. Breakout session – Environmental scan of the IPPC to identify strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats

- [8] The CPM chairperson gave a wide-ranging strategic review of the strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities of the internal and external operating environment of the IPPC, which provided key discussion points for the breakout session.

- [9] **Internal operating environment.** The CPM chairperson highlighted the crucial importance of the role of the IPPC secretary in the functioning of the secretariat and its wider positioning with regard to advocacy and engagement within FAO, and how recruitment for this role was ongoing but secured. He also noted that the current FAO director-general would complete his term in 2027, which would prompt the need for a new leadership process that could impact IPPC work.

- [10] Noting FAO’s upcoming eightieth anniversary in 2025, the CPM chairperson highlighted the opportunity to raise key awareness of the IPPC ePhyto Solution. He also reiterated the challenges

¹ CPM Bureau meeting reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/commission/bureau/>

associated with FAO's biennial budget cycle and funding instability, and asked the SPG to consider resource mobilization in their discussions.

[11] **External operating environment.** The CPM chairperson stressed the challenges associated with the many global elections across the year, which could lead to substantial shifts in government policies affecting plant health and related processes. He noted the risk of increased tariffs on imports instigating a trade war, potentially resulting in the misuse of sanitary and phytosanitary measures as disguised trade barriers, and highlighted the importance of raising awareness of plant-health issues among decision-makers. The CPM chairperson addressed the increase in human migration as a direct result of global conflicts and climate change, and noted how these activities could affect the spread of pathogens and risk assessments, alongside periodic supply-chain issues influenced by disasters or climate events (such as flooding and forest fires). This activity could then lead to less scrutiny and inspection of plant health during periods of crisis. He also highlighted misinformation as being a significant barrier to rational discourse, undermining scientific communication and eroding government support for plant-health initiatives. The CPM chairperson noted how the rapid advancement of artificial intelligence presented opportunities for plant-health applications that integrated extensive data. He speculated that the growing emphasis on regional trade agreements to support multilateral cooperation may strengthen support for the IPPC among major governments. He also mentioned how public-private partnerships could present an opportunity for contracting parties to explore collaborative approaches with industry.

Group discussion

[12] The SPG participants broke into five groups to identify strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats relating to the IPPC. Upon reconvening together, one participant from each group gave a summary of their group's deliberations (Appendix 4).

[13] The SPG chairperson summarized the key themes across the focus groups, which included:

- an emphasis on the CPM and the secretariat enhancing their visibility and their contributions within FAO;
- an evolution of the CPM (supported by the secretariat) from a standard setting body to a body of greater relevance and impact;
- the importance of leveraging opportunities to collaborate with better-known organizations, such as the Codex Alimentarius Commission and Secretariat and the World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH);
- the need to strengthen the IPPC's monitoring and evaluation frameworks to demonstrate effectively the impact of IPPC work, improving access to funding opportunities;
- the idea of being an independent IPPC body, outside of FAO, which raised questions on external funding;
- the need for the IPPC community to improve its value in the global community, by increasing data sharing in national reporting;
- the need to produce fit-for-purpose budgets;
- the need to counter the misuse of trade tariffs; and
- the idea of positioning the IPPC as a reliable source of truth, countering misinformation (in a similar way to, for example, the CABI compendium).

[14] The CPM chairperson also summarized his thoughts on the discussion, including:

- the need to better communicate the role of the IPPC community;
- the need to strengthen integration with other groups such as the Codex Alimentarius Commission and Secretariat, to raise the profile of IPPC work;
- the risks posed by weaknesses in budgetary processes, reliance on voluntary contributions, and the IPPC Secretariat's positioning within FAO's Plant Production and Protection Division;
- the opportunity for new staff members to bring strength to the IPPC Secretariat;

- the recognition of IPPC community's strong reputation and associated benefits, including the vast library of standards; and
- the commendable recognition of the IPPC community's collective and united ambition and commitment to plant health, despite political and global challenges.

6. Topics submitted for discussion by SPG participants and accompanied by papers

6.1 Antimicrobial resistance in plant health (submitted by the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada, New Zealand and Australia)

- [15] Michelle GRAY (United States of America) presented the discussion paper.² This considered the use of antimicrobial products for plant protection and associated antimicrobial resistance (AMR), the wider strategic objectives of the One Health approach, recent IPPC discussion and decisions related to One Health, and possible ways forward for the plant-health community. Given the ongoing work in the human and animal sectors regarding AMR transmission, research development, and data collection and sharing, the paper suggested that it was an opportune time to advocate for the inclusion of the plant-health sector in these discussions. Ms GRAY also stressed the need to highlight the contribution of plant health to human health, particularly regarding increased resistance to fungicides.
- [16] The SPG shared and discussed its views regarding current antimicrobial use and the potential implications of AMR in plant health, in light of the information and suggestions provided in the discussion paper.
- [17] The SPG recognized the importance of understanding not only the risk of AMR from the use of antimicrobials to protect plant health but also the role antimicrobials played in plant production and hence in food security.
- [18] One SPG participant highlighted the necessity of gaining cooperation from contracting parties to facilitate further discussions and noted the importance of sustainable business management and coordinating pesticide management. The SPG chairperson recognized the need for connection with other government sectors, given that the regulation of antimicrobials was often outside the remit of national plant protection organizations (NPPOs).
- [19] A representative from the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) suggested that the online *EPPO database on resistance cases* may be a useful resource for IPPC work on AMR.
- [20] The SPG highlighted the key alignment of the IPPC's mission to the One Health framework, that now encompassed broader ecosystem concerns that could be of relevance regarding fungicides and food security. They also stressed the importance of integrated pest management techniques to proactively address problems associated with AMR and the need for policy specialists to work at the intersection of human, animal and plant health.
- [21] One SPG participant shared enthusiasm for the IPPC Observatory and encouraged NPPOs to participate in the survey regarding fungicide use. The participant remarked on the evolution of the understanding of AMR in plant health, noting that the focus of the survey would narrow to those fungicides of greater importance to plant health, which was a positive development.
- [22] The SPG acknowledged the significance of the paper and the progress it represented in changing perceptions within the CPM. They also advocated for sharing the paper with the CPM Focus Group on Plant Health in the Context of One Health to enhance further discussion and bring valuable context and guidance to the CPM.
- [23] The SPG agreed to return to this issue under agenda item 9 (One Health and AMR).

² 04_SPG_2024_Oct.

6.2 Is it time to rethink ISPMs? (submitted by New Zealand)

- [24] Peter THOMSON (New Zealand) presented the discussion paper.³ This explored issues that may make International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) hard for some contracting parties to understand and implement and suggested how this situation could be improved. The latter included using plain language, including visual and digital tools (e.g. diagrams, mouseover definitions), layering information (e.g. a summary followed by more detailed guidance), including core requirements only, and learning from other standard setting organizations. He commented that the biggest challenge was likely to be cultural inertia and, to succeed, everyone would need to be committed to the pursuit of change, because it would not be easy. He also referred to the need to include a mechanism for checking that the aims of the process were being achieved.
- [25] **The need for change.** The SPG welcomed the paper and recognized the need for ISPMs to be understood by the target audience so that they could be implemented effectively. The SPG also noted that ISPMs that were difficult to understand or implement could be a barrier to trade.
- [26] **Other benefits.** The SPG noted that simpler ISPMs may result in fewer comments during consultation.
- [27] **Technical content.** While supporting the need to make ISPMs more accessible, the SPG recognized that it was important to strike a balance to avoid losing important technical content or having insufficiently precise language. The SPG noted the importance of developing guidance material in parallel with ISPMs (see agenda item 6.3) so that technical information was not lost.
- [28] The SPG noted that the process of simplifying ISPMs was not just a question of including only those requirements indicated by the use of “should”, as some requirements indicated by “may” related to actions that applied only in certain circumstances rather than optional actions.
- [29] **Readability.** The SPG noted that ISPMs should be written with a reading age that is appropriate for the target audience, so the reading age may not be the same for every ISPM.
- [30] **How to proceed.** Suggestions made by participants included the following (in no particular order):
- Artificial intelligence may be useful in simplifying ISPM text.
 - It may be better to conduct a pilot of the proposed approach on one or two new draft standards before extending it further. A draft commodity standard may be a useful starting point, as commodity standards have a simple structure and so it should be straightforward to improve their readability.
 - Regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) could collect proposals from contracting parties within their respective regions on the possible changes in structure of ISPMs, and the RPPOs could then consolidate the proposals and submit them to the Standards Committee (SC) for consideration, who could then submit their thoughts to the CPM.
 - Consideration should be given to how to resource the simplification of ISPMs, whether this be through in-kind contributions or other means.
 - As well as layering within ISPMs, there could also be layers or categories of standards.
 - If the CPM decided to simplify ISPMs, then the number of terms included in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) should also be reduced, as the need to understand a large number of terms can be a barrier to understanding ISPMs.
- [31] The secretariat confirmed that the Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU) had already agreed to assess the readability of new IPPC guides, including the structure and design of the guides, from now on.

³ 05_SPG_2024_Oct.

[32] The SPG:

- (2) *recommended* that issues and opportunities for improving ISPMs be explored further to ensure that ISPMs meet the needs of contracting parties regardless of their developmental status; and
- (3) *suggested* that the bureau work with the SC to further analyse issues with ISPMs and propose the next steps.

6.3 Development of international standards and guidance (submitted by the United Kingdom)

[33] Alan MACLEOD (United Kingdom) presented the discussion paper, which addressed the question of how the IPPC community could ensure that ISPMs and supporting guidance material were developed together.⁴ The paper proposed that one option would be to reduce the size of the SC and transfer the resulting savings into the budget of the IFU. This reallocation of regular-programme funding would provide more stable funding for the IFU. The paper emphasized the continued need for appropriate regional representation on the SC and suggested ways in which the workload of the SC could be reduced.

[34] **Developing implementation in parallel.** The SPG recognized the value in developing implementation material in parallel with ISPMs, especially as issues raised during consultation were often about implementation rather than requirements. One participant suggested that the same team of people could possibly draft both the ISPM and the associated implementation material.

[35] **Size of the SC.** The SPG noted the potential sensitivity of some of the proposed changes, including reducing the size of the SC. One participant suggested that the current SC chairperson and the former one could be asked for their opinion. The SPG recognized that the workload of the SC may need to be reduced if there were fewer members, but they also acknowledged that it was the number of active members, rather than the total number of members, that was critical in relation to workload.

[36] The secretariat commented that the key measure for whether a reduction in SC size was feasible was whether it undermined the effectiveness of standard setting.

[37] **Views of SC chairperson and Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) vice-chairperson.** The SC chairperson acknowledged that there were still aspects of SC and IC collaboration that needed further consideration, including the fact that consultation comments on potential implementation issues with new ISPMs did not necessarily result in implementation material. She suggested that one way to resolve this could be to add topics and assign priorities in parallel, so that if a topic was added to the work programme of the SC, a topic for guidance material on that standard was added to the work programme of the IC at the same time. She also suggested that guidance for ISPMs could be prioritized within the IC work programme, but she recognized that the development of implementation material was funded through projects and extrabudgetary contributions. Regarding a reduction in the size of the SC, she emphasized the sensitivity of this question and the need to consider what a fair regional representation would be.

[38] In the absence of the IC chairperson, the IC vice-chairperson confirmed that all IC topics were funded through projects and extrabudgetary contributions and the IC could only work on topics that were funded. He welcomed the discussion on how to achieve more stable funding for IC activities and confirmed that, if this was achieved, more guides on standards could be developed.

[39] The SPG:

- (4) *welcomed* the paper as a good starting-point for further discussions about how to achieve stable funding for the IFU so that implementation material can be developed in parallel with ISPMs.

⁴ 06_SPG_2024_Oct.

6.4 Concept note for an IPPC workshop on systems approaches (submitted by Canada)

- [40] Gregory WOLFF (Canada) presented a concept note for a proposed IPPC workshop on systems approaches.⁵ The concept note had been developed by the United States of America and Canada with input from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia and New Zealand. Mr WOLFF explained that the aim of the workshop was to gain a better understanding of the concept of systems approaches, share experiences, discuss challenges and foster collaboration. He noted that Canada had provided funding (CAD 100 000) to support the workshop and it was anticipated that the United States of America would provide additional funding. Workshop participants could be drawn from NPPOs, RPPOs and possibly industry.
- [41] **The need for the workshop.** The SPG supported the idea of an IPPC workshop on systems approaches, with one participant stressing the need for a clear understanding of what systems approaches are and how systems approaches contribute to plant health and to One Health. The SPG chairperson highlighted the need to revise ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*) to provide clearer guidance and to better reflect current practice in the operation of systems approaches.
- [42] **Suggestions for improving the workshop.** The SPG reviewed the draft concept note and programme. They stressed the importance of showcasing a range of decision-support tools for systems approaches, taking a broad view of the concept of a systems approach (including approaches that may not be formally referred to as a systems approach), and providing practical examples of systems approaches with possible field trips. One participant suggested that participants could be invited to provide examples beforehand, which could be synthesized for discussion at the workshop.
- [43] The SPG proposed that the programme include the governance of systems approaches, to clarify the respective roles of industry and NPPOs and to emphasize that it is NPPOs that decide on the components of systems approaches. One participant also sought clarity on the distinction between the exercises on export and import situations.
- [44] The SPG discussed the possible length of the workshop and advocated for a fourth day (e.g. to incorporate more science into the programme).
- [45] The SPG raised concerns regarding funding sources and proposed the creation of an organizing committee. The SPG suggested that the workshop could be proposed at the Nineteenth Session of the CPM in 2025, in the hope of receiving additional funding contributions.
- [46] The SPG:
- (5) *suggested* that the bureau consider next steps for planning an IPPC workshop on systems approaches, including requesting support at CPM-19 (2025) for the creation of an organizing committee to provide coordination and support; and
 - (6) *noted* that Indonesia had offered to host the workshop.

6.5 Consideration of IPPC work on seaweed (submitted by the CPM chairperson)

- [47] The CPM chairperson presented the discussion paper.⁶ The paper raised the question of whether seaweed was within the scope of the IPPC, given that not all seaweed species were considered “true plants”. The paper noted the expected increase in the trade of seaweed (e.g. for use as a fertilizer). However, it also recognized that some importing countries required a phytosanitary certificate for the import of seaweed and yet there was little information on the relevant pests and treatments, making it difficult to draft a commodity standard on seaweed moved in trade.

⁵ 07_SPG_2024_Oct.

⁶ 23_SPG_2024_Oct.

[48] The SPG discussed the role and scope of the IPPC as it related to seaweed, the appropriate type of IPPC activities on this subject, and the potential usefulness of a CPM side session on seaweed in relation to the IPPC’s mission and objectives. Suggestions and comments from SPG participants included the following:

- The Scope section of ISPM 5 says that “within the context of the IPPC and its ISPMs, all references to plants should be understood to continue to include algae and fungi, consistent with the International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants”. So, if seaweed are considered to be algae, then they are within the scope of the IPPC, despite some species not being in the plant kingdom.
- Requirements for phytosanitary certificates should be based on science, so a first step may be to ask those countries that require a phytosanitary certificate for seaweed what they consider the risks to be.
- Useful sources of information on pests could include the Aquaculture component of the CABI Compendium. It might also be worth exploring whether there are relevant fishery standards developed by FAO.
- Some seaweeds may be infested by pests or carry contaminating pests, whereas others may be pests in themselves. There is a need to determine which seaweed species are relevant to plant health.
- Trade in seaweed is increasing.
- It may be worth revising the IPPC publication *Aquatic plants: their uses and risks – A review of the global status of aquatic plants*, published in 2012, which referred to seaweeds.

[49] The SPG recognized that they did not need to consider the need for a commodity standard on seaweed, as contracting parties could submit a proposal through the usual call for topics process, if they had sufficient supporting information.

[50] The SPG:

- (7) *recommended* that the bureau consider the next steps regarding IPPC work on seaweed; and
- (8) *noted* that it may be useful to have a CPM side session on seaweed in relation to the IPPC’s mission and objectives but 2025 may be too early for this.

7. Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030

7.1 Update on DAI 1 (Making trade safe by harmonizing electronic data exchange) and the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution

[51] The secretariat presented a paper on the development-agenda item (DAI) “Harmonization of Electronic Data Exchange” and the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution.⁷ The paper highlighted issues related to governance, finance, operations, country implementation, international cooperation, and communication.

[52] Anne-Christelle OTT and Evgeniya KOROLEVA, economists with the FAO Investment Centre and the FAO Trade and Markets Division, respectively, then presented the preliminary results of a study on the cost–benefits of the IPPC ePhyto Solution and its impact on global trade. The objective of the first study was to quantify the costs and benefits of switching from paper to digital phytosanitary certificates. The study had focused on four countries – Egypt, Serbia, Uzbekistan and Ukraine – and on selected groups of commodities, mostly fresh fruits. Exporter companies had been interviewed for each country. The results showed that the saving per exporter by using electronic phytosanitary certificates (ePhytos) was USD 4.5–83 per certificate. There were also some savings in printing costs for governments and on the value of greenhouse gas emissions. The aim of the second study was to assess the impact of the IPPC ePhyto Solution on global agrifood trade. The analysis was conducted using the gravity model of trade (a common model used in economics) and was based on bilateral exports of commodities requiring

⁷ 18_SPG_2024_Oct.

phytosanitary certification that are part of the World Trade Organization “agrifood” definition. Empirical results indicated that, on average, an exporter needed to bilaterally exchange a minimum of 57 ePhytos (or fewer for more perishable commodities) before it began to benefit from the use of ePhytos in terms of increased exports. The presenters explained that savings resulted, for example, from there being fewer delays with electronic certificates than with paper certificates and that the more countries used ePhytos, the greater the benefits would be for all.

- [53] **Discussion about the cost–benefit and global-impact studies.** The SPG noted that it would be interesting to extend the analysis to the impact on goods such as used machinery and wood that were outside the agrifood definition.
- [54] The presenters confirmed that not all costs and benefits had been included in the analysis. Savings accruing from there being fewer counterfeit certificates, for example, had not been included. The results had shown some increased costs for governments with the use of ePhytos, related to adjusting or updating the system, but the amount had been small. There had been no evidence of exporters having to install software to use ePhytos.
- [55] One SPG participant suggested that the results of the two studies be shared with the CPM, either as a summary paper or presentation.
- [56] The SPG noted that one obstacle to bilateral trade using ePhytos was if the consignment needed to pass through a transit country.
- [57] The SPG chairperson asked the secretariat to circulate the presentation from this agenda item.
- [58] **Letters to NPPOs about financial contributions.** The secretariat confirmed that letters would soon be sent to those NPPOs that used the IPPC ePhyto Solution about the financial contributions expected for 2025. It was noted that the contributions were not mandatory.
- [59] **Forwarding ePhytos to third parties.** One SPG participant expressed concern about allowing commercial digital platforms to retrieve ePhytos, which was mentioned in the paper for this agenda item, as this could undermine one of the advantages of ePhytos – reducing counterfeit certificates. The participant suggested that NPPOs could provide ePhytos to companies rather than third parties having direct access to the system. The secretariat explained that the ePhyto Steering Group had approved the idea but legal advice was still pending and the proposal had not yet been approved by the bureau. The SPG chairperson commented that the decision should be for the CPM to take, not the steering group.
- [60] **Transparency.** The SPG noted the need for better communication about changes to the IPPC ePhyto Solution. The secretariat confirmed that steering group reports would be published on the IPP.
- [61] **Use of ePhyto infrastructure by other bodies.** One SPG participant asked for an update on discussions with the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat and the WOAHP about them sharing the ePhyto infrastructure. The secretariat confirmed that there was a new project funded by the Standards and Trade Facility on electronic veterinary certification in Latin America and the Caribbean, but it had not yet been decided whether the ePhyto Hub would be used for this. Another SPG participant recalled that, when the IPPC ePhyto Solution was first introduced, contracting parties had been promised that their data would not be shared with anyone, so CPM needed to be involved in deciding about sharing infrastructure. The SPG chairperson commented that this was something for the bureau to discuss.
- [62] The SPG:
- (9) *welcomed* the preliminary results of the study presented by the FAO Investment Centre on trade ePhyto impacts; and
 - (10) *noted* the update on ePhyto implementation.

7.2 Update on DAI 2 (Easing market access through commodity-specific plant-health standards) and the IPPC Technical Panel on Commodity Standards

[63] The secretariat presented an update on the DAI “Commodity- and Pathway-Specific ISPMs” and the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS).⁸ The paper outlined the potential benefits of commodity-specific ISPMs, the key principles underlying this new type of standard, and the progress to date in developing annexes to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*). One of these was expected to be presented for adoption to CPM-19 (2024) and the rest had not yet been drafted. The secretariat thanked the European Union, France, Canada and New Zealand for financial support for this DAI, Japan for hosting the first face-to-face TPCS meeting and Australia for their financial contribution to host the second one.

[64] **Future commodity standards.** One SPG participant suggested that, in the next batch of commodity standards to be developed, it would be worth including one on plants for planting (e.g. seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris* (2023-008)). The SPG noted that, when developing more difficult or trade-sensitive commodity standards, it would be all the more important to remind contracting parties of the benefits and core principles of commodity standards, including that these standards would not affect sovereign rights.

[65] **Membership of the TPCS.** The SPG noted that most of the panel members would finish their terms in 2027. The SPG chairperson explained that this was because it was a new panel and all members started at the same time; however, it was expected that some members would leave before their term expired, which should ensure some continuity within the panel.

[66] **Development of commodity standards.** The SPG considered ways of speeding up the development of commodity standards. The SPG noted that it should be easier to develop multiple standards once the first one was adopted, and the introduction of a standardized submission form should help ensure that the necessary information was available to the TPCS. Additional suggestions were that proposals for commodity standards could be submitted outside of the biennial Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation (as with phytosanitary treatments) and submitters could perhaps submit a draft commodity standard that other contracting parties could comment upon. The SPG noted that a continuous call for topics and ways of expediting the development of standards would be considered later in the agenda (agenda item 11.1 (Status of the Task Force on Topics) and agenda item 11.2 (Expediting the development of standards)).

[67] The SPG:

- (11) *noted* that there are intended to be two face-to-face meetings of the TPCS in 2025, to help expedite the development of specific commodity-standard annexes to ISPM 46;
- (12) *noted* that a side session is planned for CPM-19 (2025), pending a bureau decision on this; and
- (13) *noted* that a call for TPCS members would be opened in the first quarter of 2025.

7.3 Update on DAI 3 (Managing e-commerce and postal and courier pathways)

[68] The IC lead for e-commerce, Thorwald GUEZE (Kingdom of the Netherlands), presented an update paper on the DAI “Management of E-commerce and Postal and Courier Pathways”.⁹ The paper highlighted the ongoing IPPC Observatory survey on e-commerce, the translation of the IPPC guide to e-commerce into Spanish, the launch of an infographic video on e-commerce, and a range of events and new stories focusing on e-commerce. The IC lead explained that, because of the low response rate to the e-commerce survey, the deadline for it would be extended to the end of November.

[69] The SPG discussed the paper and recognized the risk of “survey fatigue” if too many surveys were launched. The SPG noted the request from the IC lead to improve the survey’s low response rate through wider circulation of the survey among contracting parties and the support of both NPPOs and RPPOs.

⁸ 22_SPG_2024_Oct.

⁹ 08_SPG_2024_Oct.

It was suggested that RPPOs could support contracting parties in the distribution of surveys and survey reminders.

[70] The SPG chairperson suggested improving the survey by demonstrating its value to participants. In response, the SPG suggested the need for better awareness-raising and promotion of surveys such as these to underscore their importance.

[71] In relation to e-commerce itself, the SPG noted that although contracting parties had successfully established agreements with e-commerce platforms, an increasing challenge was e-commerce through social-media platforms.

[72] The SPG:

(14) *noted* the update on the DAI for management of e-commerce and postal and courier pathways; and

(15) *encouraged* all contracting parties to complete the e-commerce survey.

7.4 Update on DAI 4 (Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities)

[73] The secretariat presented an update paper on the DAI “Developing Guidance on the Use of Third-Party Entities”.¹⁰ The paper outlined the progress in development of the IPPC guides *Authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2018-040) and *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2021-009), with the start of development being delayed because of funding constraints. No funding was available for the former guide and only partial funding for the latter guide. The paper also highlighted the investment prospectus for the DAI, which had been approved by the bureau in June 2024.

[74] In response to questions from the SPG, the secretariat confirmed that the estimated cost of developing an IPPC guide was USD 80 000–120 000 and Canada had provided USD 40 000. The SPG chairperson suggested perhaps a consultant could be provided as an in-kind contribution.

[75] The SPG:

(16) *noted* the update on the DAI for guidance on the use of third-party entities; and

(17) *encouraged* contracting parties to consider potential sources of funds to initiate the development of the IPPC guide on authorization of third-party entities.

7.5 Update on DAI 5 (Strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems)

[76] The chairperson of the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS) Steering Group, Panagiota MYLONA (European Commission), presented an update paper from the steering group, covering the first seven months of the group.¹¹ This included four possible governance options for consideration; a process for integrating emerging pests of global concern into POARS; criteria to be used to determine those emerging pests; a review of national reporting obligations; a review of resource mobilization; and a proposed timeline of activities for 2024–2030.

[77] The SPG reviewed the timeline for POARS activities (2024–2030) proposed in the paper and provided recommendations to ensure efficient progress and timely implementation.

[78] **Governance models and resource options.** Of the proposed governance models, a POARS Steering Group or an IC Subgroup on POARS were generally well-received. The SPG noted the challenges surrounding resource mobilization and the uncertainty about costs and discussed the need for the development of a financial model to determine the viability of centralizing or integrating systems within POARS. The SPG discussed the potential flexibility of the governance models proposed and the potential incorporation of the APP and other IPPC projects under the Steering Group or IC subgroup options.

¹⁰ 09_SPG_2024_Oct.

¹¹ 10_SPG_2024_Oct.

[79] The SPG emphasized the essential nature of the work on POARS and the clear need both for consistent monitoring to detect outbreaks of emerging pests and for contracting parties to report such outbreaks to fulfil their national reporting obligations. The SPG highlighted the key role RPPOs play in identifying regional pest concerns and their contributions to project planning. In response, the SPG chairperson reiterated the need to recognize RPPOs as vital partners in the IPPC community. The SPG proposed that the governance models and resource options be further considered within the mid-term review of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030.

[80] **Exploration of the need for a subsidiary body.** The SPG queried the presentation of a subsidiary body as two of the governance models in the paper. The SPG recalled concerns expressed at CPM-16 (2022) over the need to form a subsidiary body and suggested that the POARS Steering Group revisit non-subsidiary options. The vice-chairperson of the POARS Steering Group clarified that the terms of reference for the POARS Steering Group did include consideration of a subsidiary body and acknowledged the need to evaluate various governance models. The SPG emphasized the importance of comparing costs with and without a subsidiary body and stressed the need for a holistic alert and response system for pest outbreaks, leveraging existing resources for mobilization, collaboration, preparedness and knowledge management.

[81] **Determining resource capacity and IPPC scope.** The SPG highlighted the need to consider the role of the IPPC Secretariat in leadership and capacity building during crises arising from emerging pests. The SPG also questioned the feasibility of maintaining an emergency-response structure that would be needed infrequently. The SPG chairperson recognized the need to consider the scope of the IPPC and future engagement activities, including whether the IPPC could or should pivot to a “boots on the ground” type of convention, and highlighted the need to consider the resource implications.

[82] The SPG:

(18) *noted* the progress on POARS activities; and

(19) *suggested* that the POARS Steering Group continue to explore those governance options not involving a subsidiary body (i.e. a POARS Steering Group or an IC Subgroup on POARS).

7.6 Update on DAI 6 (Assessing and managing climate-change impacts on plant health) and the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues

[83] The bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues, Samuel BISHOP (United Kingdom), presented an update paper on the focus group and the DAI “Assessment and Management of Climate-Change Impacts on Plant Health”.¹² This covered the membership of the focus group and progress with the group’s 2022–2024 action plan, including a summary of their first face-to-face meeting, which had been held on 7–10 October 2024 in Brazil.

[84] The SPG chairperson thanked the focus group for their contributions, and also the *EPPO bulletin* for publishing and promoting the work of the focus group. The SPG noted that the focus group’s mandate had been extended to 2026.

[85] The SPG:

(20) *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues.

7.7 Update on DAI 7 (Establishing global phytosanitary research coordination) and the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination

[86] The bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination, Mamoru MATSUI (Asia), presented a verbal update on the focus group and the DAI “Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination”. The focus group had been established by CPM-17 (2023) and its terms of reference had been approved by CPM-18 (2024). The call for experts had been opened at the end of May 2024 and had been extended because of insufficient nominations. Seven nominations

¹² 11_SPG_2024_Oct.

had been received, all of whom had been selected by the bureau. The bureau representative explained that no nominations had been received from the Latin America and Caribbean region or the Near East region, but the respective bureau members were actively seeking nominations. The first meeting of the focus group would take place in virtual mode in December 2024.

[87] The SPG chairperson encouraged the regions without a member on the focus group to nominate a member.

[88] The SPG:

(21) *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination.

7.8 Update on DAI 8 (Establishing a diagnostic laboratory network)

[89] The bureau representative for the CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking, Jan Hendrik VENTER (Africa), and the secretariat presented a verbal update on the focus group and the DAI “Diagnostic Laboratory Networking”. They reported that an international consultant had been selected to conduct a gap analysis on existing diagnostic laboratory networking, but administrative delays had meant that the appointee had not yet started. The secretariat expected to open a call for members in the second quarter of 2025, with the first face-to-face meeting being held by October 2025. As a result of the delays, CPM-19 (2025) would be asked to extend the mandate of the focus group by one year to 2027.

[90] The SPG:

(22) *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking.

7.9 IPPC Observatory – mid-term monitoring and evaluation of the strategic framework in 2025

[91] The secretariat gave an overview of the mid-term monitoring and evaluation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 scheduled to be conducted in 2025.¹³ The aim of the review was to assess the progress made, identify key achievements, and address challenges in implementing the eight DAIs. The paper presented outlined the terms of reference for the review (including the key objectives), the proposed approach and timeline and the estimated resource requirements.

[92] The SPG shared and discussed its views regarding the mid-term monitoring and evaluation of the DAIs, the proposed terms of reference and the budget.

[93] The SPG discussed the possibility that a paper summarizing the achievements and challenges of all eight DAIs could perhaps be shared at CPM-19 (2025). The secretariat confirmed that final deliverables, including analysis and data reports, would not be available by CPM-19 (2025) and would instead be ready by CPM-20 (2026).

[94] The SPG raised the question of where the most value could be gained from monitoring and evaluation to inform the next iteration of the strategic framework. The SPG recognized that a review may be premature for those DAIs in the early stages of implementation and that no resources had yet been allocated for the review. A less formal, softer review was proposed (e.g. focusing on lessons learned, resource mobilization for priority activities and how the strategic framework was launched), with a full review in 2027.

[95] The SPG recognized that new areas of interest, such as One Health, AMR and the APP were not addressed in the current strategic framework, which had been developed before these issues gained prominence. A reframing of the DAI on third-party authorization within the wider context of public–private partnerships was also suggested.

¹³ 12_SPG_2024_Oct.

[96] In a wider context, one SPG participant suggested that the scope of the IPPC Observatory could be broadened to include external factors, assessing the global impact of IPPC work and considering the state of plant health worldwide.

[97] The SPG:

- (23) *noted* the update on the implementation of the IPPC Observatory workplan for 2022–2024;
- (24) *recognized* the need to mobilize resources for planned priority activities;
- (25) *noted* that the bureau would discuss the mid-term review of the strategic framework further; and
- (26) *noted* that this paper, or a modified version of it, could be shared at CPM-19 (2025), where there would be opportunity for further discussion about the issues raised in this agenda item.

7.10 Breakout session – Preliminary discussions on the next iteration of the strategic framework

[98] The SPG was invited to discuss, in groups, the following questions relating to the next iteration of the IPPC strategic framework:

- Does the strategic framework continue to be relevant mid-way through the period it covers?
- Regarding progress in implementing the strategic framework, does the strategic framework need to be refreshed or updated, has it been useful in guiding our work and what topics have emerged that we have not foreseen?
- Which development-agenda items have been really important or gained strong momentum?
- What is the focus of the remaining five years?
- How should implementation be evaluated? What review methodology and approach should be used?

[99] Upon reconvening together, one participant from each group gave a summary of their group's deliberations (Appendix 5). The SPG chairperson summarized the common themes that had emerged, which included:

- ongoing funding constraints;
- whether ten years is too long for a strategic framework;
- the comparative value of having a fixed strategic framework and milestones versus a more flexible framework;
- whether the existing strategic framework needed to be refreshed;
- how to incorporate new issues that had arisen since the current strategic framework was adopted (e.g. the APP, One Health);
- whether to continue with all topics; and
- whether to incorporate the vision of the new IPPC secretary once appointed.

[100] The SPG noted that the reason some of the DAIs had made little progress was because the CPM had decided on a staged implementation, recognizing that it was not feasible to do everything at once. The SPG also noted that the new IPPC secretary would be appointed to deliver the current strategic framework, which had been adopted by the CPM, but rather than being a constraint this could be an advantage given the short initial tenure of the position.

[101] The SPG:

- (27) *invited* the bureau to consider the comments made at this meeting about the mid-term review of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030.

8. Updates from other CPM focus groups

8.1 Update on the CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid

[102] The bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid, Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH (Australia), gave a verbal update on the activities of the focus group, which included several key meetings, and the development of work following the outcomes of CPM-18 (2024). The focus group had held its first in-person meeting in Barbados, 7–11 October 2024, to address the issue of phytosanitary risks posed by the provision of humanitarian aid. Held alongside the Caribbean Week of Agriculture, the meeting had been collaboratively organized by the secretariat and had received support from the Caribbean Plant Health Directors, the RPPO for the Caribbean and the NPPO of Barbados. The bureau representative referred to the Thirty-Sixth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPO), in which awareness of the focus group had been raised and the issue of regional support discussed.

[103] Building on the outcomes of CPM-18 (2024), the focus group had addressed comments from the IPPC community regarding the draft specification for a potential ISPM, which would provide guidance for managing the risk of plant pests being introduced through humanitarian aid. The draft specification would be presented at CPM-19 (2025). The focus group had also discussed the need to develop strong networks (including collaboration with WOAHA, the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat and the World Food Programme, as well as within FAO) and to address the possible role of RPPOs in preparedness and response to emergency situations. Finally, the focus group discussed the development of webinars, which were expected to be delivered in February 2025 as part of their updated terms of reference and extended mandate until 2026. The bureau had discussed the next steps for the draft specification for a potential ISPM, including the delivery of the draft specification to the SC in November for their review ahead of CPM-19 (2025).

[104] The SPG:

- (28) *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid; and
- (29) *expressed* appreciation for the financial contribution of Australia towards the work of the focus group.

9. One Health and antimicrobial resistance

[105] The CPM chairperson presented a brief report on the Eighth World One Health Congress, which had taken place in September 2024, and a related proposal to develop a CPM recommendation on best practices to limit the development of AMR through the use of antimicrobials in crop protection.¹⁴

[106] The CPM chairperson suggested that the CPM recommendation could draw on the discussion paper¹⁵ submitted under agenda item 6.1 of this meeting and could proceed in advance of the CPM Focus Group on Plant Health in the Context of One Health, as the subject matter was primarily AMR rather than One Health.

[107] **CPM recommendation.** The SPG discussed the merit of the proposal presented by the CPM chairperson, and the best route for the development of the CPM recommendation. They noted that it should be developed carefully to allow support for it to develop among contracting parties and to consider any potential delays if assigned to the focus group. Suggestions for its development included a possible broadening of the scope to include fungicides as well as antibiotics and the need for close cooperation with relevant FAO teams.

¹⁴ 13_SPG_2024_Oct.

¹⁵ 04_SPG_2024_Oct.

- [108] The SPG chairperson noted the strong support from the SPG for development of the CPM recommendation, and stressed the need for careful, inclusive development (along with further evidence) to demonstrate the relevance of AMR to public health and the work of the IPPC community.
- [109] **Coordination of broader One Health elements.** The SPG considered related issues that should be considered by the CPM Focus Group on Plant Health in the Context of One Health. They emphasized the need for coordination with genetics, animal-health and public-health teams, and the secretariat highlighted the success of the side event on plant health and One Health that had been organized by the secretariat at the Twenty-Ninth Session of the FAO Committee on Agriculture. The SPG also raised concerns about the need for AMR monitoring in Africa and proposed the development of further diagnostic protocols to avoid antimicrobials being used incorrectly as a result of misdiagnosis.
- [110] **Terms of reference for the focus group.** The SPG discussed the focus group's terms of reference and raised some concerns over their scope. The CPM chairperson clarified that the focus group's terms of reference were intended to guide broader recommendations on how plant health contributes to One Health. He stressed that the focus group was not limited to the one issue of AMR and could develop a broader CPM recommendation related to plant health in the context of One Health.
- [111] The SPG chairperson thanked the members for their contributions and emphasized the important work of the IPPC community in raising awareness of this topic globally.
- [112] The SPG:
- (30) *suggested*, in principle, the proposal that a CPM recommendation be developed on best practices to limit the development of AMR through the use of antimicrobials in crop protection, but *suggested* that the scope of the CPM recommendation be considered further;
 - (31) *noted* that the CPM Focus Group on Plant Health in the Context of One Health could consider a broader CPM recommendation related to plant health in the context of One Health, as this is within their terms of reference; and
 - (32) *suggested* that the paper presented in this agenda item, together with the paper presented in agenda item 6.1 (or modified versions of them), be shared with the CPM Focus Group on Plant Health in the Context of One Health.

10. Breakout session – How to raise the profile of plant health and mobilize resources

- [113] This item was removed from the agenda (see agenda item 2.1).

11. IPPC standards and implementation topics

11.1 Status of the Task Force on Topics

Changes to submission forms and criteria

- [114] The chairperson of the Task Force on Topics (TFT) presented some proposed changes to the submission form used for the Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation and the criteria for the justification and prioritization of proposed topics, together with a draft submission form for IPPC Observatory topics for studies and surveys.¹⁶
- [115] **Submission form for the Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation.** The SPG noted that only contracting parties and RPPOs could submit proposals for topics, but submissions could be supported by contracting parties, RPPOs or other organizations. The SPG therefore suggested that the first section of the form (Submitted by country or organization) refer to “RPPO” instead of “organization”. The SPG noted that, in the context of supporting a submission, “organization” referred to organizations such as the International Atomic Energy Agency that support a particular type of standard.

¹⁶ 20_SPG_2024_Oct.

- [116] The SPG raised the need for clarity on how a submission should be prepared if the proposal was for the development of a standard and associated implementation material: should this all go in one form or in two separate forms?
- [117] The SPG noted that there was some overlap between the sections on “Summary of proposal” and “Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics”.
- [118] The SPG chairperson advised participants with detailed comments to submit them after the meeting.
- [119] **Submission form for IPPC Observatory topics.** The SPG noted that, in contrast to the form for the Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation, the form for IPPC Observatory topics gave no maximum limit to the number of words permitted in each section. The SPG suggested that the two forms should have the same word-count limits.
- [120] The SPG also noted that it would be helpful to include a date on each form to facilitate version control.

Relevance of Task Force on Topics

- [121] The SC chairperson presented a paper, prepared by herself and the IC chairperson, offering some reflections on the relevance of the TFT and potential ways to streamline the process of adding topics to the IPPC work programme.¹⁷ The paper proposed that the TFT be disestablished and the biennial call for topics be replaced with an ongoing call for all types of topics, including implementation material. The SC chairperson explained that the latter would make it easier to address issues that arose between calls and to update commodity standards. The paper proposed that, every September, the submissions would be collated by the secretariat and forwarded to the SC and IC as appropriate, who would make their recommendations to the CPM.
- [122] In answer to questions, the SC chairperson confirmed that the disestablishment of the TFT would save time, but it was difficult to give a precise estimate.
- [123] The secretariat added that, if the SC also referred the initial assessment of diagnostic protocols and commodity standards to the relevant technical panels (as it did for the ongoing call for phytosanitary treatments), then that would also lessen the burden on the SC.
- [124] One SPG participant suggested that consideration be given to combining the work programme of the SC and the IC into one joint work programme, with the IFU team lead, the Standard Setting Unit team lead, the SC chairperson and the IC chairperson liaising to improve the alignment of topics for standards and implementation material. The SC chairperson suggested that, alternatively, the SC–IC work area on the IPP could be used to collaborate.
- [125] The SPG:
- (33) *suggested* that the submission form for the Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation be amended to clarify the role of RPPOs in submitting or supporting proposals and what is meant by an “organization” in this context;
 - (34) *supported* the suggestion that a paper be prepared, proposing the disestablishment of the TFT and the amendment of the criteria for evaluating submissions, and submitted for decision by CPM-19 (2025);
 - (35) *suggested* that the TFT, or if necessary the secretariat, review the other submission forms, notably those for draft specifications;
 - (36) *suggested* that the IPPC Observatory form for submission of topics for survey or study be amended to give a word-count limit for sections of the form;
 - (37) *supported* the proposal to have an open call for topics, removing the current biennial cycle; and

¹⁷ 16_SPG_2024_Oct.

- (38) *supported* the proposal that topics submitted during the currently scheduled 2025 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation be submitted directly to both the SC and the IC for their review and prioritization.

11.2 Breakout session – Expediting the development of standards

[126] The SPG participants broke into five groups to discuss how to improve the efficiency of standard setting. Upon reconvening together, one participant from each group gave a summary of their group's deliberations (Appendix 6).

[127] The chairperson summarized the common themes that had emerged, which included:

- the need for requirements in standards to be clearer (and perhaps avoiding the use of “should” and “may” to avoid confusion about the distinction between levels of obligation);
- the need for clarity in the text of standards;
- the suggestion to have fewer standards (e.g. by combining some standards) and to group them into categories (e.g. conceptual standards, commodity standards);
- recognition that fewer rounds of consultation would speed up the development of standards but be less transparent;
- the possibility of using artificial intelligence (e.g. to combine expert working group discussion papers);
- the benefits of disestablishing the TFT; and
- the idea of having joint expert working groups, with each such group developing both the standard and the corresponding implementation material.

[128] The SPG noted the value in trying some of these ideas, as the process could easily revert to the current process if they did not work.

[129] The SPG:

- (39) *suggested* that the bureau champion for the SC, together with the SC chairperson and the IC chairperson, prepare a paper to submit to the CPM on possible ways to expedite the development of standards.

11.3 Discussion of COSAVE proposals on technical issues with ISPMs for adoption that are not objections

[130] A representative from Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE), Diego QUIROGA, presented an update paper on possible mechanisms to address technical issues that are raised about draft ISPMs submitted for adoption but that are not objections.¹⁸ The issue had been raised at CPM-18 (2024), at which the CPM asked the SC to explore such mechanisms.¹⁹ The SC had discussed the matter at their May 2024 meeting and had set up a small working group, which had formed a proposal for consideration by the SC at its November 2024 meeting. Under the proposal, contracting parties and RPPOs would submit comments in the form of information papers or conference room papers, and a Friends of the Chair meeting could be convened at the CPM meeting, if necessary.

[131] The SC chairperson emphasized that the proposal of the small working group had yet to be discussed by the SC, but any comments from the SPG would be helpful for the SC's discussions.

[132] **Clarification of the proposed procedure.** The SPG noted that, although the paper implied that the SC would consider the need for a Friends of the Chair meeting if an unresolved issue was referred back to it by the CPM, this was outside the scope of the SC. Mr QUIROGA confirmed that the intended meaning

¹⁸ 21_SPG_2024_Oct.

¹⁹ CPM-18 (2024), agenda item 10.

of the text was that if an issue was not resolved by the CPM it would be referred to the SC for consideration at their November meeting, who would then forward their recommendation to the CPM.

[133] The SC chairperson clarified that the small working group were proposing that the current objection procedure be used for these “soft objections”. If an issue could not be resolved on the floor of the CPM session, the CPM chairperson could call a Friends of the Chair meeting; if the issue was still not resolved, then the contracting party submitting the objection would have to decide whether to sustain its objection to the adoption of the standard, in which case the standard would be returned to the SC for review.

[134] **Precedents.** The SPG noted three examples of draft standards where technical issues that were not objections had been raised when the draft was presented to the CPM for adoption: two in 2022 and the revision of ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) in 2024. Mr QUIROGA explained that, in the latter case, the draft submitted to the CPM for adoption was very different to that submitted for second consultation, but contracting parties had had no opportunity to suggest technical improvements to it.

[135] The SPG noted that objections to standards were rare.

[136] **Using the existing procedure.** One SPG participant commented that contracting parties commonly desired technical improvements to draft standards being presented for adoption, but these were usually not sufficient to lodge an objection. The participant explained that, if the concern was sufficiently strong, the contracting party could submit an objection under the current procedure and therefore there was no need for a new procedure.

[137] Mr QUIROGA clarified that the issue was not about stopping adoption but about improving the draft before adoption. The SC chairperson reiterated that the small SC working group were proposing that the current objection procedure be used, not a new one, but there was a need for better communication about how the procedure could be used (e.g. to explain that, if a contracting party’s objection was not upheld, that contracting party could choose either to sustain its objection or withdraw it).

[138] **Modifying the current procedure.** The SPG considered whether the procedure should be modified to require objections to be accompanied by “a technical justification *or an explanation*” (as in the proposed procedure for CPM recommendations in agenda item 12), rather than just “a technical justification”, but they acknowledged that this could lead to more objections. An alternative suggestion was to refer to “suggestion for improvement” rather than “objection” in the heading of the form used for submitting objections.

[139] The SPG recognized the need to avoid evening drafting sessions at CPM meetings, as this would be without interpretation and may not allow adequate consideration of the text. However, the SPG also noted that it was important to avoid contracting parties lodging objections for minor aspects and slowing down the adoption process.

[140] The SPG recognized that one problem with resolving issues through Friends of the Chair meetings was that they were not open to all contracting parties.

[141] **Mechanisms to support the current procedure.** The secretariat reported that the SC had discussed various aspects related to this issue at their May 2024 meeting.²⁰ These included the fact that draft standards going for adoption were available in English as appendices to the SC November report, in advance of the CPM papers. This, together with the earlier deadline for objections (three, rather than two, weeks before the CPM meeting) gave extra time for contracting parties to resolve any concerns. The secretariat also pointed out that, in the case of ISPM 4, the SC had delayed recommending the draft to the CPM until they had resolved an outstanding technical issue.

[142] One SPG participant highlighted the importance of reminding SC members about their role in regional communication. This role included reporting back to the member’s region so that contracting parties

²⁰ SC 2024-05, agenda item 11.

could consider draft standards well in advance of the CPM meeting. The SPG noted, however, that there was no opportunity for contracting parties to respond.

[143] The SPG chairperson suggested that the steward could give advice on whether objections could be addressed as a textual change to the draft standard. The secretariat confirmed that the SC had considered whether the SC-7 could address “soft objections”, but they had concluded that there was insufficient time because of translation deadlines.

[144] The SPG:

(40) *suggested* that the SC be invited to consider the comments made at this SPG meeting regarding possible courses of action and mechanisms to address technical issues.

11.4 Breakout session – Pest outbreak alert and response systems

[145] The vice-chairperson of the POARS Steering Group introduced the breakout session, including an explanation of the proposed criteria for determining “emerging pests” referred to earlier in the meeting (agenda item 7.5).²¹ The SPG participants then broke into five groups, each with a specific assigned pest, to test the criteria. Upon reconvening together, one participant from each group reported back to the SPG (Appendix 7). The SPG then discussed the outcome of the exercise.

[146] The vice-chairperson of the POARS Steering Group offered some additional reflections, which included:

- the value and importance of guidance materials for application of the criteria, including guidance on the terminology used within the criteria;
- the geographical extent of pest spread, and whether the criteria should focus on countries or areas;
- whether social impacts should be removed;
- whether a criterion should be added on the management of pests; and
- the intent of the steering group to move POARS work away from theoretical discussions and into practice.

[147] The SPG chairperson commented that further steps were needed to clarify the purpose of POARS, aligning its practical concepts with the IPPC community’s goals.

[148] The SPG further discussed the challenges in forecasting pest emergencies and stressed the need to understand how previous outbreaks may help to refine future responses to emerging threats. They also emphasized the need to anticipate potentially devastating pests and track their rate of spread, and they urged the steering group to consider including criteria within POARS to account for this to facilitate more adaptive responses. The SPG discussed regional differences in pest emergence frequency, with examples from Africa showing an increase in spread rates. Trade (especially involving wood packaging) was also highlighted as a potential contributor to more frequent outbreaks, and the Asian long-horned beetle’s disruptive impact in the United States of America was cited as an example.

[149] In response to a question from the SPG, the SPG chairperson commented that he saw no need for the proposed criteria for emerging pests to be approved by the CPM, but the bureau may discuss them.

[150] The SPG:

(41) *recommended* that the POARS Steering Group review the proposed criteria for determining “emerging pests” in the light of the comments made at this meeting; and

(42) *noted* that the bureau may discuss the proposed criteria for determining “emerging pests”.

²¹ 17_SPG_2024_Oct.

11.5 Improvements to phytosanitary capacity evaluation

- [151] The secretariat presented an update paper on improvements to phytosanitary capacity evaluation (PCE) according to the key results areas of the PCE strategy for 2020–2030.²² The paper highlighted the different modalities for conducting a PCE, recent and upcoming PCEs, communication activities, the introduction of terms and conditions for using the PCE online system, and the establishment of a procedure for the certification of new PCE facilitators. It also shared findings from the PCE desk study completed in 2024 and highlighted the activities undertaken or planned to address the study’s recommendations. The secretariat highlighted the lack of a dedicated budget for maintaining the PCE system or conducting PCEs.
- [152] Florence MUNGUTI, from the NPPO of Kenya, provided an overview of Kenya’s experience of PCE. The NPPO of Kenya had conducted its first PCE, with support from the IPPC Secretariat, in 2002. This had enabled the NPPO to identify several aspects of the national phytosanitary system that needed improving, including diagnostics, pest risk analysis and surveillance. The NPPO had then obtained funding from the European Union and other donors to build two diagnostic laboratories and pay for laboratory equipment, staff training and accreditation of its plant-health laboratories. This had enhanced the NPPO’s diagnostic capability. The NPPO had conducted a second PCE in 2018. This had entailed a more detailed analysis of Kenya’s national phytosanitary system and had resulted in national phytosanitary policies and draft phytosanitary regulations (the latter being in the advanced stages of the legal process as at October 2024). In 2023, the NPPO had conducted a third PCE with support from the European Union-funded project on “Strengthening Food Control and Phytosanitary Capacities and Governance” (GCP/GLO/949/EC). This had identified further areas on which to focus, including surveillance, eradication, import control, infrastructure and awareness amongst policymakers. The NPPO had digitalized import and export processes, created a pest risk analysis and surveillance unit, created a directorate for laboratory services to enhance the coordination of laboratory services, and created a research unit within the NPPO. This had resulted in enhanced collaboration with key partners and better management of emerging pests, with activities including a horizon-scanning workshop and a *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *cubense* Tropical Race 4 (Fusarium TR4) simulation exercise. Ms MUNGUTI reported that Kenya was also one of the pilot countries for the APP.
- [153] Saliou NIASSY, Coordinator of the African Union Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC), provided an overview of the Plant Health Strategy for Africa. The strategy was a 15-year plan, aimed at building a robust plant-health system. It was centred around seven strategic areas – involving improving legislation, strengthening phytosanitary capacity, enhancing harmonization and assisting NPPOs – but the overall aim was to enhance food security and improve livelihoods and trade. Mr NIASSY explained that, to implement the strategy, IAPSC was exploring how best to connect with its member states. Given the scale of the strategy, IAPSC had also decided to focus for the first five years on those parts of the strategy that would be easiest to achieve. The plan for the next ten years was under discussion. Mr NIASSY finished by reflecting on the challenges of being an RPPO representing more than 50 countries with diverse levels of development.
- [154] In answer to a question about how to use resources more effectively, Mr NIASSY gave one example and one suggestion: provide personnel with online training first, to be followed by in-person training only if the online training is successful; and mutualize resources so that experts share their expertise (e.g. taxonomists training other people).
- [155] The SPG:
- (43) noted the advancements in PCE activities according to the PCE strategy 2020–2030; and
 - (44) noted the progress made in addressing the recommendations from the desk study on PCE and the future steps as detailed in the roadmap presented.

²² 19_SPG_2024_Oct.

12. Procedure for adoption of CPM recommendations

- [156] The CPM chairperson presented a paper proposing a modification to the existing procedure for adopting CPM recommendations,²³ which the bureau had discussed before it was submitted to the SPG. The modification brought greater consistency with the approach used for adopting ISPMs, in which objections were required in writing before the relevant CPM meeting at which draft ISPMs were presented for adoption. The CPM chairperson emphasized that it was not intended that draft CPM recommendations be submitted to a second round of consultation unless an objection was lodged. He explained that he had included a review by the SC in the proposed procedure to give contracting parties more confidence in the draft text and hence reduce the number of objections lodged. He also clarified that, unlike ISPMs, the proposal was that a “technical justification *or explanation*” would be required for objections, because not all CPM recommendations were of a technical nature.
- [157] **Time frame for objections.** The SPG noted that the time frame for objections in the procedure was consistent with that for ISPM adoption and was a balance between allowing sufficient time to post the papers, consider them, and resolve objections afterwards.
- [158] **Review by the SC.** The SPG questioned the value of the SC reviewing draft CPM recommendations, as the language used in CPM recommendations was different to that in ISPMs (as CPM recommendations do not specify requirements) and the SC already had a heavy workload. The SPG also recognized that the review of CPM recommendations by the SC could blur the distinction between ISPMs and CPM recommendations in terms of the hierarchy of ISPMs, CPM recommendations, and IPPC guides and training materials.
- [159] **Second consultations.** The SC chairperson suggested that the proposed procedure be amended to clarify which body decided whether a draft CPM recommendation was submitted to a second round of consultation and the criteria for that decision. She referred to the procedure for phytosanitary treatments, where the SC may recommend them for adoption by the CPM after the first consultation if no significant or major technical comments were made during the first consultation. The CPM chairperson suggested that text could be added to allow for decision by either the bureau or the CPM. The SPG chairperson suggested that the proponent of the draft CPM recommendation could also be consulted.
- [160] **Topic proposals.** At the end of his initial presentation, the CPM chairperson queried whether an initial draft of the proposed CPM recommendation and the rationale or justification for its need *should* be presented to the CPM when a topic was being proposed or *could* be presented. The SPG supported the use of “should”, as a draft text and a rationale would be helpful and the current procedure for adoption of CPM recommendations used “should”.
- [161] **Presenting the proposal to CPM-19 (2025).** The SPG chairperson confirmed that, to take effect, the proposed modification to the procedure would need to be presented to the CPM for adoption. The secretariat suggested that a reference to the current procedure, which was adopted by CPM-12 (2017), be included in the paper presented to the CPM. The SPG also suggested that the paper present the current procedure with the proposed changes clearly indicated. The CPM chairperson confirmed that he would modify the paper to incorporate the feedback at this meeting.
- [162] The SPG:
- (45) *welcomed* the proposed modifications to the procedure for adopting CPM recommendations and *recommended* that the proposal be amended as discussed at this meeting.

13. Establishment of regional communications networks and draft principle

- [163] An RPPO representative gave an overview of the discussion among RPPOs at the Thirty-Sixth TC-RPPO, held on 1–4 October 2024 in Panama, regarding the establishment of the IPPC regional communications networks approved by CPM-18 (2024). Despite RPPOs expressing broad support for the terms of reference for the regional communications networks, they had also voiced concerns about

²³ 14_SPG_2024_Oct.

how the implementation of the networks may impact existing workflows, workloads and the interaction of RPPOs with public outreach (which was normally handled by NPPOs).

[164] The SPG recognized the importance of an effective communications network but suggested that, instead of being prescriptive about the operation of regional communication networks, RPPOs should be encouraged to leverage and adapt their existing regional networks (with some standardization) to contribute to a broader, global communication framework.

[165] The SPG recognized the longstanding goal of recognizing RPPOs as an integral part of the global plant-health community and noted how many RPPOs are eager to utilize their networks to collaborate with, and serve, the IPPC community.

[166] The secretariat confirmed that they would circulate the terms of reference for the regional communications network to SPG participants, encouraging participants to gather feedback and share with their respective RPPOs.

[167] The SPG:

(46) *noted* that the bureau would be considering the next steps at their December meeting.

14. Update on the Africa Phytosanitary Programme

[168] The secretariat gave an update paper on the APP.²⁴ This included the progress made by countries in Phase 1 of the programme, the selection of countries for Phase 2, the governance of the programme, technical support provided to countries, budgetary and planning issues, and communication and advocacy activities.

[169] The SPG discussed the paper and made recommendations on the APP plans moving forward. The SPG praised the programme's impact, despite funding challenges. They emphasized the need for complementary initiatives and advocated for a strong, collaborative technical base. The secretariat confirmed that all APP survey and diagnostic protocols were available on the IPP.

[170] The SPG recognized the funding from the European Union and (potentially) from another contracting party and highlighted the need to leverage support through complementary activities. The secretariat confirmed that funds would be directed to support APP's growth from pilot to subsequent phases, expanding capacity across more countries. The secretariat also highlighted the variation in capacity and infrastructure across Africa with regard to this programme. The secretariat stressed that country readiness was a critical factor in the APP's success, with internal capacity building within countries and the transfer of knowledge from more developed countries to neighbouring countries, and from pilot- to second-phase countries, an essential foundation for this.

[171] The SPG raised the question of having contingency plans within each country through the support of CABI. To this point, the secretariat confirmed that CABI was part of the APP's technical working group and was supporting the development of a response plan for some priority pests in particular countries.

[172] The SPG sought clarity on two aspects of the APP: the specific functions of the APP governance bodies and the APP's official position within FAO. The secretariat confirmed that the APP would remain within the IPPC Secretariat for the time being.

[173] The SPG:

(47) *noted* the update on the APP; and

(48) *welcomed* the funding from the European Union towards the APP.

²⁴ 15_SPG_Oct_2024.

15. Breakout session – Discussion on the theme of the next and future International Days of Plant Health

- [174] The SPG participants broke into two groups to discuss the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH). Participants were invited to consider the following: possible themes for future years of IDPH; linking the IDPH with other international days; and how the IPPC community could establish a role in the decision-making process and long-term arrangements for the IDPH, given that themes were decided by FAO.
- [175] Upon reconvening together, one participant from each group gave a summary of their group's deliberations (Appendix 8).
- [176] The SPG proposed an IPPC “champion” for the IDPH, who could publicly promote the convention and the work of the IPPC community in a similar way to the promotion of World Food Day by the FAO director-general. The SPG also discussed potential alignments with other international days and events, including World Food Day and the World Food Forum annual flagship event.
- [177] The SPG recognized the importance of considering the target audience when choosing a theme (e.g. whether it is directed at NPPO personnel such as inspectors or at the general public) and prioritizing key messaging and audience mobilization. The SPG suggested that the IPPC Communications Strategy 2023–2030 be referred to for useful ideas in this regard.
- [178] The SPG chairperson agreed to review the suggestions proposed by the SPG and to provide a shortlist to the bureau ahead of their December meeting.
- [179] The SPG:
- (49) *noted* that United Nations international days such as the IDPH are observed in perpetuity.
 - (50) *suggested* possible themes for the IDPH as discussed at this meeting (Appendix 8); and
 - (51) *suggested* that a “champion” be selected to promote the IDPH.

16. The International Plant Health Conference

16.1 Review of the first International Plant Health Conference

- [180] The secretariat presented an overview of the first International Plant Health Conference, which had been held in the United Kingdom over three days in September 2022. The conference had been co-organized by the secretariat and the NPPO of the United Kingdom and had attracted over 500 attendees from 74 countries plus webcast viewers. One outcome had been a suggestion that the conference be held every four years.
- [181] The secretariat outlined the key aspects of organizing the conference, including the composition and operation of the organization committee, the conference programme (including lunchtime side events, poster sessions and an evening reception), the procurement process (including letters of agreement between FAO and the host country), the use of a specialist logistics company (to liaise with the conference venue, organize catering and interpretation, provide a conference app and website, etc.) and travel arrangements for those funded by FAO. A conference report had also been published after the conference. The 2022 conference had cost USD 800 000, supported by donors from five countries, with non-financial contributions in addition to this.
- [182] The secretariat explained that, if a four-year cycle of conferences were to be followed, the next conference would be in 2026, preferably in September to avoid clashes with other IPPC events. The secretariat offered the following advice to those organizing future conferences:
- Start planning well in advance (identify host country, establish organizing committee and subgroups, open a call for speakers, consider gender and regional representation, etc.).
 - Engage early with finance and procurement teams and consider having a letter of agreement.

- Choose a venue that is big enough and has rooms for side meetings, in a location with good access to transport and hotels. Make an early site visit and ensure that costs are defined and it is clear what is included.
- Ensure that dietary requirements are met, with food labelled and perhaps a menu on the conference app in advance.
- Extend the conference to four or five days, rather than three, to allow more time for discussion between sessions.
- Make travel arrangements for those participants supported by FAO. Engage with Foreign Affairs departments to ensure that participants will be able to obtain visas.
- Ideally, seek support from the FAO regional office or country office.
- Prepare communications from an early stage. Develop key messages, core question-and-answer scripts and talking points for external speakers.
- Involve non-governmental actors working in the plant-health arena.
- Do not underestimate the staff resources needed from the host government (although, for the staff concerned, it can be an immensely rewarding experience).

[183] **Funding the conference.** In response to questions from the SPG, the SPG chairperson – who was from the host country of the 2022 conference – confirmed that the cost given for the 2022 conference did not include staff time. He emphasized the need for donor partners as well as the host country but confirmed that no country had yet offered to host the second conference. The secretariat and the SPG chairperson confirmed that the 2022 conference fee had been intentionally low so that people were not prevented from attending on grounds of cost but also to comply with FAO rules about charging conference fees for FAO conferences (which had to supersede any national rules). The SPG chairperson confirmed that FAO rules did not permit the use of corporate sponsors for FAO conferences, but an organization such as the Standards and Trade Development Facility would be an acceptable donor.

[184] **Preparations for the next conference.** The SPG chairperson suggested that it would be helpful to start preparing for the next conference, including building a list of potential donor organizations. He also encouraged countries to contact the secretariat if they were potentially interested in hosting the second conference.

[185] The SPG:

- (52) *noted* the necessity of early planning for the next International Plant Health Conference; and
- (53) *suggested* that the secretariat seek expressions of interest in hosting the second International Plant Health Conference.

16.2 Breakout session – Discussion on the next International Plant Health Conference

[186] This session was cancelled because of time constraints and the discussion was absorbed into agenda item 16.1.

17. Preparations for CPM-19 (2025)

17.1 Keynote speakers

[187] The CPM chairperson reported that, at its meeting the previous week, the bureau had agreed to ask the FAO Deputy Director-General Beth BECHDOL to suggest a potential keynote speaker to give an address about One Health at CPM-19 (2025). The secretariat reported, however, that the deputy director-general office had subsequently advised that this would not be possible.

[188] The SPG:

- (54) *suggested* that Emmanuelle SOUBEYRAN, the newly appointed director-general of WOA, be invited to deliver the keynote address at CPM-19 (2025).

17.2 Side sessions

- [189] The CPM chairperson reported that, to date, the bureau had identified three potential themes for side sessions – commodity standards, contingency planning in the context of global initiatives for emerging pests, and seaweed – with a science session on One Health.
- [190] **Further themes.** Further suggestions made by the SPG for side sessions were (in no particular order): the APP; Fusarium TR 4, as a follow-up to the side session in 2024; experiences of using artificial intelligence in plant health (but not for CPM-19 (2025)); and systems approaches (to build on the science session in 2024). The SPG considered a side session on e-commerce but noted that there had been one at CPM-18 (2024).
- [191] The CPM chairperson confirmed that the SPG had omitted “Successes and challenges of implementing the IPPC” from the agenda for CPM-19 (2025) and had included the mid-term review of the strategic framework instead. One SPG participant suggested that the latter could be a side session, to allow the item on “Successes and challenges of implementing the IPPC” to be retained.
- [192] **Commodity standards.** The SPG recognized the potential difficulty of having a side session on commodity standards at CPM-19 (2025), as it could be perceived as undermining the adoption process and there was no guarantee that the CPM would adopt the mango standard that was scheduled to be presented for adoption at that meeting. The SPG therefore suggested that the side session in 2025 could focus on ISPM 46, with a follow-up side session on the mango standard (if adopted) at CPM-20 (2026).
- [193] **Number of side sessions.** The SPG chairperson suggested that the bureau could consider having more side sessions than previously.
- [194] The secretariat commented that, in addition to the side sessions, an NPPO orientation session would be held on the first day of the CPM meeting.
- [195] The SPG:
- (55) *noted* that the bureau would consider the suggestions for side sessions made at this meeting and that further suggestions could be submitted to bureau members after this meeting.

18. Any other business

- [196] The SPG highlighted a paper presented at the SPG meeting in 2012, which identified a possible Implementation Review & Support System project on the world’s top-ranked regulated pests.²⁵ The SPG noted that the paper could be of relevance to the POARS Steering Group.
- [197] The CPM chairperson suggested this paper be reviewed to confirm its relevance.
- [198] The SPG:
- (56) *suggested* that the 2012 SPG paper on “IRSS pest categorization / listing” be reviewed for potential relevance to the work of the POARS Steering Group.

19. Meeting feedback and discussion on format and possible themes for future SPG meetings

- [199] The SPG chairperson invited participants to comment on the format and possible themes for future SPG meetings.
- [200] The SPG praised the smaller group format, noting the ease in network facilitation, creativity and collective brainstorming. A preference for interactive discussions was also expressed as being helpful for fostering relaxed and creative exchanges. The SPG proposed that clearer guidance be provided for breakout sessions to support group discussion and that the agenda be smaller to allow for comprehensive

²⁵ SPG 2012/12.

discussions of agenda items. Further suggestions included a rotation within breakout groups to introduce fresh perspectives.

[201] The SPG suggested that the deadline for submission of SPG discussion papers be adjusted so that it did not coincide with a holiday season.

[202] The SPG discussed logistical improvements, such as securing FAO rooms conducive to plenary and breakout sessions (including having multiple rooms, adequate audiovisual facilities, and less restrictive opening hours). The consideration of alternative, cost-effective venues outside of Rome was proposed, particularly for representatives from under-represented regions such as Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean. A suggestion was also made to provide SPG newcomers with guidance material on the operation and governance of the SPG and other IPPC bodies. The adjustment of IPPC budget allocations was also discussed to support greater regional participation.

[203] The SPG chairperson noted the recommendations made by the SPG and proposed that these be discussed by the bureau.

[204] The SPG:

(57) *offered* the suggestions made at this meeting for consideration by the bureau and secretariat when planning future SPG meetings.

20. Next meeting

[205] The next meeting of the SPG is tentatively scheduled for 27–29 October 2025.

21. Close of the meeting

[206] The SPG chairperson thanked all participants and closed the meeting.

Appendix 1: Agenda

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER / IPPC Secretariat support
1.	Opening of the Meeting		IPPC Secretary / SPG CHAIRPERSON
2.	Meeting Arrangements		SPG CHAIRPERSON
2.1.	Adoption of the Agenda	01_SPG_2024_Oct	
2.2.	Election of the Rapporteur	--	
3.	Administrative Matters		DENG
3.1.	Document list	02_SPG_2024_Oct	
3.2.	Participant list	03_SPG_2024_Oct	
3.3.	Local Information	Link to local information	
4.	Update from the CPM bureau		WOLFF
5.	Breakout session – Environmental scan of the IPPC to identify strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and challenges		
6.	Topics submitted for discussion by SPG Participants and accompanied by papers		
6.1	Antimicrobial resistance in plant health (submitted by US, UK, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia)	04_SPG_2024_Oct	GRAY
6.2	One health and AMR	13_SPG_2024_Oct	WOLFF/ BRUNEL
6.3	Is it time to rethink ISPMs (submitted by New Zealand)	05_SPG_2024_Oct	THOMSON
6.4	Development of international standards and guidance (submitted by the UK)	06_SPG_2024_Oct	MACLEOD
6.5	Concept note for an IPPC workshop on systems approaches (submitted by Canada)	07_SPG_2024_Oct	WOLFF
6.6	Consideration of IPPC work on seaweed moved in trade (submitted by the CPM chairperson)	23_SPG_2024_Oct	WOLFF
7.	Implementation of the 2020-2030 IPPC Strategic Framework		
7.1	Update on DAI 1 <i>Making trade safe by harmonizing electronic data exchange</i> and the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding of the IPPC ePhyto Solution	18_SPG_2024_Oct	VIVIAN-SMITH / MENON
7.2	Update on DAI 2 - <i>Easing market access through commodity-specific plant health standards</i> and the IPPC Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)	22_SPG_2024_Oct	MOREIRA
7.3	Update on DAI 3 - <i>Management of e-commerce and postal and courier pathways</i>	08_SPG_2024_Oct	GEUZE
7.4	Update on DAI 4 - <i>Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities</i>	09_SPG_2024_Oct	BRUNEL
7.5	Update on DAI 5 <i>Strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems</i>	10_SPG_2024_Oct	MYLONA / BELTRAN
7.6	Update on DAI 6 - <i>Assessing and managing climate change impacts on plant health</i> and the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues	11_SPG_2024_Oct	BISHOP / FRIO
7.7	Update on DAI 7 <i>Establishing global phytosanitary research coordination</i> and the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination	--	MATSUI / DENG

	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER / IPPC Secretariat support
7.8	Update on DAI 8 <i>Establishing a diagnostic laboratory network</i>	--	VENTER / MOREIRA
7.9	IPPC Observatory - Midterm monitoring and evaluation of the SF in 2025	12_SPG_2024_Oct	BRUNEL/MADAMINOVA
7.10	Breakout session - Preliminary discussions on the next iteration of the Strategic Framework (SF) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - confirming continued relevance of SF mid way through, - progress implementing, does it need to be refreshed/updated, has it been useful in guiding our work and what topics have emerged that we have not foreseen, - what SDAs have been really important/gained strong momentum, - what is the focus of the remaining 5 years? - How to evaluate - review methodology and approach? 		
8.	Updates from other CPM Focus Groups		
8.1	Update on the CPM Focus Group on the "Safe provisions of food and other humanitarian aid"	-	VIVIAN-SMITH
9.	IPPC standards and implementation topics		
9.1	Status of the Task Force on Topics (TFT) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed changes of the submission forms and the criteria for the justification and prioritization of proposed topics - TFT reflection and relevance 	20_SPG_2024_Oct 16_SPG_2024_Oct	TFT chairperson (QUIROGA) SC / IC chairperson
9.2	Breakout session – Expediting the development of standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How to improve the efficiency of standards setting 		
9.3	Discussion of Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE) proposals on technical issues with ISPMs for adoption that are not objections	21_SPG_2024_Oct	QUIROGA
9.4	Breakout session POARS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Criteria for emerging pests 	17_SPG_2024_Oct	BRUNEL / BELTRAN
9.5	Improvements to the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PCE experiences shared (COMESA country and AU-IAPSC) 	19_SPG_2024_Oct	BRUNEL/NIASSY/MUNG UTI
10.	Procedure for adoption of CPM recommendations		
11.	Establishment of the regional communications network and draft principle <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation from the TC-RPPOs on regional communications - Review of the TORs 	--	TC-RPPO MEMBER
12.	Update on the Africa Phytosanitary Programme		
13.	Breakout session - Discussion on the theme of the next and future IDPH <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Linking with other international days - 2025 theme plant health in the context of One Health - Future years themes - Establishing longterm IDPH arrangements 		
14.	The International Plant Health Conference		
14.1	Review of the first International Plant Health Conference (IPHC)		BISHOP / DENG

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER / IPPC Secretariat support
14.2	Breakout session - Discussion on the next International Plant Health Conference - Location / duration - Themes		
15.	Preparations for CPM-19 (2025)		
15.1	Keynote speakers	--	WOLFF / DENG
15.2	Side sessions	--	WOLFF / DENG
16.	Any Other Business		SPG CHAIRPERSON
17.	Meeting feedback and discussion on format and possible themes for future SPG meetings	--	SPG CHAIRPERSON / ALL
18.	Next Meeting		SPG CHAIRPERSON
19.	Close of the Meeting		SPG CHAIRPERSON

Appendix 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
01_SPG_2024_Oct	2.2	Agenda	2024-09-18 2024-10-11 2024-10-25
02_SPG_2024_Oct	3.1	Documents List	2024-10-11 2024-10-21 2024-10-25
03_SPG_2024_Oct	3.2	Participants List	2024-10-21 2024-10-24
04_SPG_2024_Oct	6.1	Antimicrobial resistance in plant health	2024-10-11
05_SPG_2024_Oct	6.2	Is it time to rethink ISPMs?	2024-10-11
06_SPG_2024_Oct	6.3	Development of international standards and guidance	2024-10-11
07_SPG_2024_Oct	6.4	Concept note for an IPPC workshop on systems approaches	2024-10-11
08_SPG_2024_Oct	7.3	Update on DAI 3 <i>Management of e-commerce and postal and courier pathways</i>	2024-10-11
09_SPG_2024_Oct	7.4	Update on DAI 4 - <i>Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities</i>	2024-10-11
10_SPG_2024_Oct	7.5	Update on DAI 5 <i>Strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems</i>	2024-10-11
11_SPG_2024_Oct	7.6	Update on DAI 6 - <i>Assessing and managing climate change impacts on plant health</i> and the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues	2024-10-11
12_SPG_2024_Oct	7.9	IPPC Observatory - Midterm monitoring and evaluation of the SF in 2025	2024-10-11
13_SPG_2024_Oct	9	One Health and AMR	2024-10-11
14_SPG_2024_Oct	12	Procedure for adoption of CPM recommendations	2024-10-11
15_SPG_2024_Oct	14	Update on the Africa Phytosanitary Programme	2024-10-11
16_SPG_2024_Oct	11.1	TFT reflection and relevance	2024-10-11
17_SPG_2024_Oct	11.4	Breakout session on POARS	2024-10-14
18_SPG_2024_Oct	7.1	Update on DAI 1 <i>Making trade safe by harmonizing electronic data exchange</i> and the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding of the IPPC ePhyto Solution	2024-10-17
19_SPG_2024_Oct	11.5	Improvements to the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE)	2024-10-17
20_SPG_2024_Oct	11.1	Proposed changes of the submission forms and the criteria for the justification and prioritization of proposed topics	2024-10-21

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
21_SPG_2024_Oct	11.3	Discussion of Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE) proposals on technical issues with ISPMs for adoption that are not objections	2024-10-21
22_SPG_2024_Oct	7.2	Update on DAI 2 - <i>Easing market access through commodity-specific plant health standards</i> and the IPPC Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)	2024-10-24
23_SPG_2024_Oct	6.5	Consideration of IPPC work on seaweed moved in trade	2024-10-25

Appendix 3: Participants list

	Region/ Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓.	CPM Bureau North America - CPM Chairperson	Mr Gregory WOLFF Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A0Y9 CANADA	greg.wolff@canada.ca
✓.	CPM Bureau Europe - CPM Vice-chair and SPG Chairperson	Mr Samuel BISHOP Head of International Plant Health Policy Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs UNITED KINGDOM	sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk
✓.	CPM Bureau Africa	Mr Jan Hendrik VENTER Director Plant Health Department of Agriculture Land Reform and Rural Development SOUTH AFRICA	ianhendrikv@dalrrd.gov.za
✓.	CPM Bureau 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
✓.	CPM Bureau Latin America and Caribbean	Mr Diego QUIROGA Director Nacional de Protección Vegetal SENASA ARGENTINA	dquiroga@senasa.gob.ar
✓.	CPM Bureau South West Pacific	Ms Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH Chief Plant Protection Officer Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forest AUSTRALIA	gabrielle.vivian-smith@aff.gov.au
✓.	CPM Bureau Near East	Mr Dris BARIK Division de la Protection des Végétaux (DPV) ; Direction de la Protection du Patrimoine Animal et Végétal (DPPAV) ; Office National de Sécurité Sanitaire des Produits Alimentaires (ONSSA) - Rabat. MOROCCO	dris.barik@onssa.gov.ma barikdris@gmail.com
✓.	NETHERLANDS	Mr Marco TRAA Senior Staff Officer Phytosanitary Affairs Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality	m.j.w.traa@minlnv.nl
✓.	NETHERLANDS	Mr Thorwald GEUZE Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority of The Netherlands NPPO The Netherlands Catharijnesingel 59 3511 GG Utrecht PO Box 43006 3540 AA Utrecht	NL_IPPC_Contact_Point@nvwa.nl t.geuze@nvwa.nl
✓.	DENMARK	Mr Henry Damsgaard LANNG Chief Plant Health Officer Plants & Biosecurity Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries of Denmark	PlanterOgBiosikkerhed@lbst.dk hendla@lbst.dk

		The Danish Agricultural Agency Nyropsgade 30, DK-1780 Copenhagen	
✓•	UNITED KINGDOM	Mr Matthew EVERATT Plant Health International and Preparedness Specialist Risk and Horizon Scanning Team Plant and Animal Health DEFRA	Matthew.Everatt@defra.gov.uk
✓•	UNITED KINGDOM	Mr Alan MACLEOD Pest Risk Analyst Risk and Horizon Scanning Team Food, Biosecurity and Trade Directorate Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) Room 11G19, Biotech Campus, Sand Hutton, York, YO41 1LZ	alan.macleod@defra.gov.uk
✓•	EC	Mr Leonard SHUMBE Policy officer Plant Health Unit -G1 DG SANTE	Leonard.SHUMBE@ec.europa.eu
✓•	SPAIN	Ms Ana Maria VARGAS Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food of Spain <i>Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación</i> <i>S.G. de Sanidad e Higiene Vegetal y Forestal</i>	avargasv@mapa.es
✓•	JAPAN	Ms Masumi YAMAMOTO Deputy Director, International Affairs Office Plant Protection Division, Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8950,	masumi_yamamoto440@maff.go.jp
✓•	KENYA	Ms Florence MUNGUTI Deputy Director KEPHIS Headquarters P. O. Box 49592-00100 Nairobi	fmunguti@kephis.org , munguti.florence@gmail.com
✓•	AFRICAN UNION	Mr Saliou NIASSY Coordinator of the Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (AU-IAPSC) P.O Box 4170, Yaoundé – Cameroon	NiassyS@africa-union.org , saliou.niassy@up.ac.za
✓•	USA	Ms Michelle GRAY PPQ IPMSP International Phytosanitary Standards Coordinator International Phytosanitary Management and Standards Programs USDA-APHIS-Plant Protection and Quarantine	michelle.l.gray@usda.gov
✓•	USA	Ms Jessica MAHALINGAPPA PPQ International Phytosanitary Management and Standards Programs (IPMSP) Associate Deputy Administrator	
✓•	MALTA	Mr Dennis SCIBERRAS Director Plant Protection Directorate Rural Affairs Department	dennis.sciberras@gov.mt
✓•	NEW ZEALAND	Mr Peter THOMSON Chief Biosecurity Officer	Peter.Thomson@mpi.govt.nz

		Biosecurity New Zealand - Tiakitanga Pūtaiao Aotearoa Ministry for Primary Industries - Manatū Ahu Matua Charles Fergusson Building 38-42 Bowen Street PO Box 2526 Wellington 6140	
✓•	COOK ISLANDS	Ms. Temarama ANGUNA Head of Ministry - Agriculture Ministry of Agriculture Ministry of Agriculture Arorangi, Rarotonga, PO Box 96	temarama.anguna@cookislands.gov.ck
✓•	AUSTRALIA	Ms Sophie PETERSON Director Pacific Engagement and International Plant Health Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry	sophie.peterson@aff.gov.au
✓•	POLAND	Ms Agnieszka SAHAJDAK Main Inspectorate of Plant Health and Seed Inspection Service	A.Sahajdak@piorin.gov.pl
✓•	POLAND	Ms Sylwia JURKIEWICZ Director Centralne Laboratorium Main Inspectorate of Plant Health and Seed Inspection Service	S.Jurkiewicz@piorin.gov.pl
✓•	EC	Dr. Panagiota MYLONA Policy Officer DG Health and Food Safety Directorate G Unit G1 - Plant Health B-1049 Brussels/Belgium	panagiota.mylona@ec.europa.eu
✓•	EPPO	Mr Nico HORN Director-General/ Directeur Général European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO/OEPP) 21 boulevard Richard Lenoir 75011 PARIS FRANCE	nico.horn@epo.int
✓•	RUSSIAN FED	Ms. Victoria BOCHAROVA Representative of the Ministry of Agriculture of the Russian Federation in the Italian Republic, Alternate Permanent Representative of the Russian Mission to FAO and other Rome based Agencies	intervniikr@gmail.com

IPPC Secretariat

✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Arop DENG	arop.deng@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Avetik NERSISYAN	avetik.nersisyan@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 KOUMBA	descartes.koumba@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Camilo BELTRAN MONTOYA	camilo.beltranmontoya@fao.org

✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Rokhila MADAMINOVA	rokhila.madaminova@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Dominique MENON	dominique.menon@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Anita TIBASAAGA	anita.tibasaaga@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Mutya FRIO	mutya.frio@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr John GILMORE	john.gilmore@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
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Emma GIBBS	emma.gibbs@fao.org
✓	FAO, DDGB	Mr Don SYME	don.syme@fao.org

Appendix 4: Summary of the group's deliberations from the breakout session - Environmental scan of the IPPC to identify strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats

Group 1

Session Title:
Environmental scan of the IPPC to identify strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and challenges
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Budget allocation within IPPC - Use of Artificial Intelligence and the need for human components in plant health - Politicizing Phytosanitary Measures - Potential to link IPPC's work to broader, high-interest topics <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IPPC has an established community and diverse partnerships, which can be leveraged for influence. - IPPC's role in promoting science-based approaches is strong, positioning it as a credible authority. - Social media and IPPC as the "source of truth" provide a basis for positioning IPPC as the main source for accurate information. <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Budget Allocation: - IPPC's positioning within NSP. - Current IPPC community reach may be overextended, leading to strained resources and high costs. - Human resource limitations hold back the realization of all IPPC's ambitions. - Politicizing Phytosanitary Measures: - Lack of pest-free country postings potentially reduce transparency. <p>Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensuring IPPC remains focused and sustainable with limited human and financial resources. - Handling misinformation on pests and disease spread remains a challenge, especially on public platforms.
Final summary / recommendations
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible reallocation of resources to prioritize emerging needs. - Artificial Intelligence could help with efficiency in data measurement and combining it with the human component could provide an advantage. - Publishing data on pest-free countries can increase visibility and transparency, having a certification/ accreditation from the IPPC through diagnostic labs, how this could be unfolded without making it complicated for countries. - Potential to link IPPC's work to broader, high-interest topics like social impact on rural areas, potentially enhancing engagement, use of IPPC Observatory to collect these data and evidence.

Group 2

Session Title:
Environmental scan of the IPPC to identify strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and challenges
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From regional or country perspective, private-public partnership – to involve public sector to IPPC work, we can raise awareness on IPPC work - PPP can help mobilize more expertise and more work if we do more fi- for-practice - Weakness – very strong cultural differences in acceptance, e.g. standards or authorizing third-party entities, people felt their jobs are threatened; we have to be very careful in addressing it - Risk in level of involvement of private sector in IPPC activities, there needs to be boundaries or set out rules to their involvement - We cannot do without private sector, like APP and ePhyto, PCE – major beneficiaries are private sector that create jobs, making trade or is involved in developing solutions like pesticides; due diligence is important but should respond to a number of criteria before being involved in IPPC e.g. financial status, shareholders, or no hidden agenda that go against IPPC principles - We have to look at it realistically; if you make a partnership each party must benefit; we have to go back to IPPC core mandate and objective; e.g. ePhyto good results and story but do we get funding for it? What is the issue? What is missing is monitoring and evaluation. Take into consideration the role of IPPC Secretariat. Come up with clear plan like reviewing the Strategic Framework and look at it realistically - APP difficulties is funding; but good PPP based on principles and due diligence + M&E could help to support member states in developing PH systems ; e.g. surveillance of key pests, PPP can support this but if project ends like APP, systems stop - IPPC needs more than APP to raise awareness to the world - FAO challenge is same as IPPC – resource mobilization, more competition across UN, voluntary funding coming in that are already earmarked; interlinking with One Health and projects with member countries supporting agrifood systems and positioning IPPC within it; must be strategic because of limited resources; FAO evaluations show that we need more core budget; FAO member countries ask to see impact and demonstrate outcomes not just outputs - Important to show the benefit e.g. digital replacing paper certificates; also to show what are the benefits to the industry and thus sustain the ePhyto system - Many of the IPPC products are perceived by industry are a burden - Annual biocontrol industry meeting – one of the topics was harmonizing phytosanitary innovation; possible to enter into partnership in terms of how to register pest control products; on the other hand our growers need this - Resources may not necessarily have to come directly to IPPC but impact on CPs is direct so a PPP can ease the burden of work on the secretariat; e.g. APP – IPPC can implement but countries/CPs can continue the systems, creating an enabling environment; E.g FAW, FAO gave many grants to countries, task forces were provided with supplies
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PPP's are essential for IPPC given the involvement of the private sector in IPPCs work, but should be subject to due diligence and should fit well with country priorities. - To support resource mobilization, Monitoring and Evaluation is important to show impact and outcomes to donors (including countries or contracting parties), and thus help IPPC position itself within the programming and funding mechanism for FAO

Group 3

Session Title:
Environmental scan of the IPPC to identify strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and challenges
Discussion points
<p>Challenge/weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resource mobilization - Not communicating enough about IPPC successes. - How to engage contracting parties to be more involved in the IPPC's work. Countries' response to IPPC surveys is low. - The IPPC has many work streams and limited funding for them. - Limited awareness about the IPPC among contracting parties e.g. small island states - Incomplete and outdated information on the IPP regarding National Reporting Obligations. - Limited understanding of the IPPC's global mandate and status, even within FAO. - Competing priorities at the IPPC; there's too much work and many regional priorities, with limited resources. - Confusion between IPPC and IPCC. How do we create demand for the IPPC and its work? <p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aligning the IPPC strategic framework with FAO's strategic framework - Liaising with FAO's Investment Center and resource mobilization division - Engaging young people on the issue of plant health, e.g. through the education system in countries - Exploiting the use of social media for mass mobilization about plant health - Explore opportunities for linking missions or events of the FAO Director-General with the work of the IPPC e.g. his visit to the small island states/ Pacific. - Increase visibility and communication about the IPPC ePhyto Solution. - The IPPC developed a Prospectus for the Development Agenda Items of the strategic framework but needs an investment plan. <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The IPPC has 185 contracting parties. - Committed community members, Bureau, SPG, IC, SC. - The IPPC ePhyto Solution is a major achievement and innovation. Plant health owns the ePhyto better than animal health. - The IPPC has an important global mandate and message- protecting plants and trade from the impact of pests, and has a huge impact on ensuring food security. - The existence of the IPPC strategic framework is an important milestone.
Final summary / recommendations
<p>Recommendations (including points above)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IPPC should continue advocating for the inclusion of plant health in the One Health framework. - IPPC should consider developing an investment plan. - Encourage contracting parties to provide information through their National Reporting Obligations (NROs) and update the IPP accordingly. NB. The IPPC Secretariat does not have any funding for NROs currently. - IPPC needs to use more technology solutions to speed up business and administrative processes. IPPC needs to catch up with technological usage and reduce the number of years it takes to develop a standard. - IPPC should explore working with other plant protection product manufacturers on AMR issues in plant health

Group 4

Session Title:
Environmental scan of the IPPC to identify strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and challenges
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tariffs - Free trade agreements (FTA) - plant health fast track with economic pressures to ignore the Standards can be a problem. - Tariffs are not a reason to restrict trade between countries with a FTA. - How can IPPC support SPS rules? - IPPC needs to raise the profile and promote the role of the IPPC. The profile of IPPC is not always high enough to have an impact on SPS issues . - IPPC is under the NSP in FAO, while CODEX is a Directorate and IPPC is sub-Directorate. Difficult to find the IPPC on the FAO website. Have FAO raise the IPPC profile in FAO. - Climate Change, false information. Don't include Climate change in ISPMs. Climate is a contributing factor to pest risk. CC is a slow enough process that you don't need to change ISPM. CC could be used as a guideline, because it is not that easy to predict and could support resilience. Climate refugees and what do they bring with rapid migration. Almost works with One Health and the Safe Food Aid. Emergency situations. IPPC could work more with WOAHA , CODEX. - Economic inflation, getting more difficult to participate in IPPC activities. Expand or contract resources.
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prioritize IPPC resources, expand or contract them. - Problem could misuse tariffs that can lead to avoid SPS measures. Higher tariffs could lead to new pest pathways as a result of seeking new markets sources without strong SPS. New markets difficult, dodge regulations. Regional FTA . There are some risks - develop commodity standards to develop a basis and safety of commodities. Definitely can raise the profile of IPPC in FAO, currently it is under NSP. - There is no standard for CC and is not recommended to have one based on CC. Safe Food Aid associated with pests, Increased global conflict, more migration = rapid migration. - Inflation impacts NPPO budget cuts that can influence funding and participation due to cost-cutting measures. Fewer people to work on matters people hours reduced.

Group 5

Session Title:
Environmental scan of the IPPC to identify strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and challenges
Discussion points
External factors to affect the IPPC plant health community - challenges <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Climate change related to plant health (temp rising, less rain in parts and more rain in other areas) – movement of pests into different areas.- Then the impact of the pest response – use of more chemicals – increase in fungicides. other human impacts. Fungal infections in humans- Conflicts and wars- Movement of trade- Covid pandemic – with the One Health agenda item we can push the message of importance of plant health here- Working with external organizations / high level ministers / ambassadors
Opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none">- One health debate and working more closely with animal health counterparts- Voluntary support from NPPOs and other organizations- Call for topics to the IPPC to raise any new areas of challenge
Internal factors to affect the IPPC plant health community – challenges <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Capacity in the secretariat and also the NPPOs have varying levels of capacities- Budget / funding- Regional work (RPPOs – which can also be an opportunity to enhance work in the region)- National priorities
Opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none">- New FG on GPRC is an opportunity to assess the current research and hopefully enhance research- POARS steering group opportunity to discuss as a community – focusing on prevention- Develop more IPPC governance training for incoming members
Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Resilience of national systems- ISPMs and guides- Coordination of activities- Governance structure of the IPPC

Appendix 5: Summary of the group's deliberations from the breakout session - Preliminary discussions on the next iteration of the strategic framework

Group 1

Session Title:
Preliminary discussions on the next iteration of the Strategic Framework (SF)
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A strategy to be adaptable – enable environment changes: to provide a consistent framework. Considerations on whether to make a review of the Strategic Framework (SF) and to check the enabling environment and how they changed and impacted the SF (e.g. COVID-19, horizon of “One Health” and the “APP). - Suggestion to align with the FAO Strategic Framework (SF), however one queried the real benefits for IPPC on this. One mentioned that it could give us higher visibility, although other stressed that the IPPC SF should be to align the needs of the IPPC contracting parties. - One recalled that the IPPC SF was to highlight opportunities, but not the final end. - Relevance of DAIs: It was suggested that some of the DAIs could be removed, such as “the use of third-party entities”; and perhaps also, the “research coordination”, as not all contracting parties are convinced on the tangible outcomes. Suggestions on including “one health” and perhaps “sea containers”. - Progress on implementing: opportunity to implement amendments to the IPPC SF 2020-2030: It was suggested in asking the CPM Bureau in June 2025 to propose amendments to the IPPC SF and then present it to the SPG 2025 and then to the CPM-20 (2026) for adoption. - Funding: One of the biggest impediments is the lack of proper funding. It was recalled about the development of the DAIs investment prospectus and therefore, the need to have a real plan on resource mobilization. - In terms of the DAIs and speed or pace: Some suggested that, rather than a SF that is may be too solid or too long (one decade), an action plan for every 4-5 years, or a priority areas of work, could be better to provide opportunities for flexibility. Other suggested that some of the “goals” or “DAIs” to keep it open so it is possible to adjust to any new factors that may arise (see Codex Action Plan 2020-2025 with the open goals).
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rather than a ten-year Strategic Framework (SF) that it is too solid or too long (one decade), an action plan for every 4-5 years, or a priority areas of work, could be better to provide opportunities for flexibility. - Some of the “goals” or “DAIs” to keep it open so it is possible to adjust to any new factors that may arise (see Codex Action Plan 2020-2025 with the “open goals”). - Consider also the iteration of the next review of the FAO Strategic Framework. - It was suggested in asking the CPM Bureau in June 2025 to propose amendments to the IPPC SF 2020-2030, noting that some DAIs may not be relevant anymore, and then present it to the SPG 2025 and then to the CPM-20 (2026) for adoption.

Group 2

Session Title:
Preliminary discussions on the next iteration of the Strategic Framework (SF)
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is good opportunity to review SF either now or in 2 years. - In some DAs progress is made and it can stand alone in the work programme and does not need to be in SF. - There are some DAs that are not started. Do we need to replace them? - Some of the Lab Diagnostic network is not started due to administrative delays and obstacles. Lab network is also expensive. It is not clear where the funds will come from. - IPPC Community realized that it is difficult to take all at the same time - To determine where APP is the part of IPPC or should be in NSP and if countries are willing to continue to contribute if it goes out from IPPC. - There are many unfunded items to be considered - In some regions there are difficulties to find funds and appropriate expertise to respond to IPPC call for expertise - Confirming continuing development - CS DA is incorporated in the SC workplan thus it maybe does not need to stay in SF as this will be normal part of the standards setting. With no consequences if it is removed from SF. There is a need to indicate that it is - Authorisation on entity DA has standard was developed and all ISPM are referring to it. - In revised SF those which are achieved and reached to this stage there should be mechanisms to remove them from SF. - Climate change DA is done and if some issue arise new group can be established
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirming the need for review, but not now taking into account that new Secretary will be selected. - Prioritising items and match with available fundings - Monitoring and evaluation are important on all DAs thought the update paper to CPM - Progress implementing and it need to be refresh and update. It was useful for our work and topic such APP emerged, safe aid, once health. - Commodity Standard can be removed from SF as it is incorporate in the SC work programme - For future one it is important to describe DAs with more flexibility - Monitoring and update to be provided to CPM - Some DAs to be re-written to incorporate additional components e.g. incorporation of APP in ROARs - E-commerce has few things still to deliver. There is a survey to complete. Need to get attention to this topic and make countries to reply. There is a need to keep it and will not require substantive resources. More information sharing is needed among countries. - Focus for remaining 5 years should be on delivery of current DA. - Focus for next 10 years building awareness and lack of resources and resource mobilisation

Group 3

Session Title:
Preliminary discussions on the next iteration of the Strategic Framework (SF): confirming continued relevance of SF mid way through,
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SF was adopted during the COVID-19 pandemic. 8 DAIs were already part of the work, some of them are still in progress, some are stuck. Lacking important elements – MEL, without which how one can evaluate the progress. What FAO is doing with its SF – there is a clear monitoring framework, every 2 years. IPPC needs MEL framework. What happened to the action plans for 8 DAIs. Issues are arising that are not part of SF – AMR, OH. There should be capacity to react to the emerging trends in PH. - There is an implementation plan (action plan for each DAI)– which needs to be accounted against milestone. Need to understand where we stand – MEL. - DAIs are at different levels of implementation, need to understand if the DAIs (third party entities, were relevant to work on for 10 years?
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirming continued relevance of SF mid way through: - Many DAIs it is still relevant, work on some DAIs have not started, but maybe relevant. The DAIs implementation plan and progress should be evaluated to understand the relevance of the SF. - Regular IPPC work should be linked/reflected in the SF. - progress implementing, does it need to be refreshed/updated, has it been useful in guiding our work and what topics have emerged that we have not foreseen, - Progress should be measured against implementation plan milestone – with a MEL plan developed to understand what is the implementation progress for each DAI. - New emerging areas: OH, AMR, AI in plant health, PPP - what SFDAs have been really important/gained strong momentum, - Harmonization of electronic data exchange - Commodity and pathway specific international standards for phytosanitary measures - what is the focus of the remaining 5 years? - Harmonization of electronic data exchange - Commodity and pathway specific international standards for phytosanitary measures - Strengthening pest outbreak and response systems - Global phytosanitary research coordination - Management of e-commerce and courier mail pathways - DAIs that have not progressed: Diagnostic laboratory network; guidance on the use of third-party entities - Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities – will need to rethink if work on this DAI should continue. Do we need to work on it for 10 years? - How to evaluate - review methodology and approach? - There needs to be an opportunity to assess the implementation of the DAIs, and see if they are still relevant or not, and adjust the SF accordingly in an organized holistic way. Intermediate evaluation.

Group 4:

Session Title:
Preliminary discussions on the next iteration of the Strategic Framework (SF)
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirming continued relevance of SF mid-way through. - Confirmed continued relevance - Research network – may no longer be necessary due to research underway (e.g. Euphresco). Consider whether the new research networks are connected rather than creating a new network. - Noting the Climate Change Focus Group's work will end (having addressed all tasks), there is a thought to embed this into other areas e.g. PRA/POARS/Commodity and Pathway) to go with the modelling of new and emerging pests. - Commodity and pathway is gaining momentum - E-commerce and ePhyto may be useful (also noted awaiting responses to the E-commerce survey as limited responses received so far). - Progress implementing, does it need to be refreshed/updated, has it been useful in guiding our work and what topics have emerged that we have not foreseen, - Yes, it has been useful in addressing emerging topics such as One Health, APP, Safe Aid (potentially embedded into other areas, included into a refresh of Commodity and Pathway), Systems Approaches. These potentially divert resources from normal activities and the SF. - Noted that Climate Change is included in the SF but could be broadened. - Discussed broadening of DAIs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Broaden (Commodity and Pathway / POARS) · Merging of topics (e.g. climate change) · Reframe 3rd party -> PPPS · Rename and refocus - e-data exchange and e-phyto (keep e-phyto and focus on implementation to focus on momentum and all countries joining) - Future topics considered: AI – an enabling technology / possibly across multiple DAIs (include in existing) / noted the FAO better mention accelerators and Ais could be seen as an accelerator. - In relation to communication: Noted topic of a strategic investment plan has been raised – resource immobilization – strategic investment framework (raise of profile) - Gender and youth perspectives (not DAI but needs to be kept in mind) - What SDAIs have been really important/gained strong momentum, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · ePhyto solution · POARS (FAW TR4) · Commodity standards · Ecommerce · Climate change - What is the focus of the remaining 5 years? - Funding and resourcing. - A sequenced program, noting some DAIs are only just starting. - How to evaluate - review methodology and approach? - Formed evaluation as per the previous paper. - Consider continuous evaluation via observatory of activities/implementations. - Considering 2030 – 2040 or beyond – what could/should be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Climate changes · Digitization and AI (taking into consideration this will expand the ability to perform queries on data received e.g. APP) · Position of IPPC · Food security

- Environment / significant impacts
- Technologies
- Collaboration with industry captured under Public Private Partnerships
- Sea Container management

Final summary / recommendations

- The group noted importantly that some topics had not been able to progress as much as desired, due to the agreed staged approach to the Strategic Framework.
- The table group confirmed the continued relevance of the SF. It was considered that the research network maybe no longer be necessary due to research currently underway (e.g. Euphresco). Consider whether the new research networks are connected rather than creating a new network.
- It was agreed that SF had been useful in addressing emerging topics, such as One Health, APP, Safe Aid and Systems Approaches.
- A continuous evaluation via observatory of activities/implementations would be beneficial.
- A refresh could reorganize the DAIs perhaps for 2030-2040, however CPM time constraints would need to be considered.

Group 5

Session Title:
Next iteration of the SF
Discussion points
<p>Confirming continued relevance of SF mid-way through. Progress implementing, does it need to be refreshed/updated, has it been useful in guiding our work and what topics have emerged that we have not foreseen? Yes, there is a continued relevance to the SF in guiding the work.</p> <p>Big initiatives undertaken (new topics APP, One Health) that haven't been captured in the SF. Should these be paused until the next SF? The last two DAIs haven't gained the same traction as others.</p> <p>Delayed DAIs both on research so this isn't seen as a priority for the initial 5 years. However, some DAIs are already completed with recommendations made (e.g. 3rd parties, commodity standards)</p> <p>The SF helps to keep a shared vision on the most important issues and useful in guiding our work. Everyone understood what the priorities are e.g. commodities so they were worked on first.</p> <p>This SF tried to align to the FAO SF which is very important.</p> <p>Emerging topics can get the same attention and resources (if not more) than the SFDAIs. Which can take away focus and resources from the SF.</p> <p>Is it possible to amend the SF once adopted and some DAIs are closed? Could the completed DAIs be removed and new emerging topics inserted with a five-year plan?</p> <p>What SFDAIs have been really important/gained strong momentum,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · ePhyto · Commodity standards · Third party entities · Climate change · eCommerce <p>What is the focus of the remaining 5 years?</p> <p>The outcomes of the IPPC observatory can help direct the focus of the next 5 years</p> <p>How to obtain more engagement from stakeholders (more industry engagement). TR4 is a good example how the banana industry was engaged.</p> <p>How to evaluate - review methodology and approach?</p> <p>What comes next?</p> <p>An umbrella topic that can have emerging topics added as they come over the course of the SF. Or are SF closed once adopted?</p> <p>New topics: One Health, APP, AI and plant health</p> <p>Continuation of work on ePhyto, POARs, climate change</p>
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shorter framework - Amend the SF once adopted when some DAIs are completed and insert new emerging topics

Appendix 6: Summary of the group's deliberations from the breakout session - Expediting the development of standards

Group 1

Session Title:
Expediting the development of standards
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Language: Potential simplify the first version of the draft ISPM. Potential use of AI, revisit the way the Specifications are drafted. - Some mentioned that the ISPMs may have too many details and may restrict the use and implementation. It was noted that guidance should accompany the ISPM. - It was suggested to have the same drafting group to draft the first draft version of the ISPM and also draft the first draft of potential guidance. - It was queried about the audience of the ISPMs, but also the variety of capacity within the IPPC CPs - It was highlighted that it is a cultural change to adjust and simplify the words. - Some suggested that having a technical writer in the drafting group to actually draft the ISPM with the input of the EWGs or TPs may help this process. - Process: It needs to be flexible, and revisions for technical standards such as diagnostic protocols (DPs) and commodity standards (CS) should be open for CPs to provide information at any time and then the TP would assess it and then being presented to the CPM. - Some mentioned that the step on the consultation period of draft Specifications is one of the major bottlenecks and this step could be expedited and having dealt directly with the SC and no need for consultation period, but ensuring transparency. - Number of SC members: it was queried that perhaps it could be reduced. It was suggested that the nominations procedures for SC member be done by the Bureau, to ensure the right qualifications and skill sets for the SC. - Resources: interpretation during SC meeting – to consider revisiting this and perhaps allocate the costs and funds from interpretations to priority areas.
Final summary / recommendations
<p>Call for topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disestablishment of Task Force on Topics. <p>Language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential simplify the first version of the draft ISPM. - Consider having a technical writer in the drafting group to actually draft the ISPM with the input of the EWGs or TPs may help this process. - ISPMs and guidance: - It was suggested to have the same drafting group to draft the first draft version of the ISPM and also draft the first draft of potential guidance material, with the inclusion of a IC member, for example. - Process: - Revisions for technical standards such as diagnostic protocols (DPs) and commodity standards (CS) should be open for contracting parties (CPs) to provide information at any time and then the TP would assess it and then being presented to the CPM in a fast track manner (something similar to current process for DPs). - Remove the step on consultation period of draft Specifications, and fully delegate this to the SC, and attain the transparency. <p>SC membership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of SC members: to consider reducing the size (e.g. from 4 to 3 per each FAO region). - Nominations procedures for SC members: To adjust and have it assessed and selected by the Bureau, to ensure the right qualifications and skill sets for the SC. - Interpretation: suggested to revisit the interpretation needed for SC meetings, as it is a big part of the funds allocated to standard setting.

Group 2

Session Title:
Expediting the development of standards - How to improve the efficiency of standards setting
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Two rounds of country consultations- Draft the Topic and draft specification/ have a clear specification. Use AI to have an outline specification.- Secretariat - two per year - Limiting Factor- SC works in consensus, difficult to reach with the 25 members.- Current standard setting process is 4 years minimum.- Disestablish Task force for Topics (TFT)- SC members serve 5 years, not 3 years.- Discussion papers presented sooner. Use AI to help readability.- Have a collaboration tool/ common web editing site- Threshold for readability score? Fit for target audience.
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Draft the Topic and draft specification/ have a clear specification. Use AI to have an outline specification.- Discussion papers presented sooner. Use AI to help readability. Disestablish Task force for Topics (TFT)- Have a collaboration tool/ common web editing site- SC members serve 5 years, not 3 years.

Group 3

Session Title:
Expediting the development of standards
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Following a brief explanation of the Standard Setting Procedure (SSP), which lasts 7 years circa, the group members discussed several proposals that might expedite the development of standards. The proposals are summarized into two main approaches. - One round of consultation for draft ISPMs could be enough to recommend them to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) for adoption, if there are no major issues. This would reduce the time of development of a standard and it would allow a higher number of topics to go through the SSP. In case one round of consultation is not enough, it would be the Standards Committee (SC) to decide the way forward. - Reduce the number of SC members. - Consider the abolishment of the Standard Committee Working Group (SC-7). The group consider its abolishment as well as a proposal to incorporate the work of the SC-7 into the work of the Technical Panels. - Make the call for topics for standards and implementation ongoing rather than every two years. The group members discussed how this change could affect the procedure, in particular how to prioritize the topics, which could be submitted all the time. It was pointed out the lack of mechanisms to identify the topics with the highest priority and that a scientific approach should be pursued. It was noted that the urgency of certain topics is highlighted by the number of contracting parties (CPs) and Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) supporting those topics during the Call. In addition, it was noted the issue of certain topics that were included in the List of Topics (LOT) several years ago but never progressed, questioning their current relevance. - Merge SC and IC. This group members noted the proposal of merging SC and IC, therefore the process of developing and implementing standards into one. This proposal would save time as the development of the standard and the drafting of the relative implementation material would be done in parallel rather than consequentially. The implementation material would then be annexed to the standard, which would ensure harmonized implementation of said standard. - Consider the abolishment of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC). The group also considered a proposal of turning the IC into a technical panel for the implementation of standards. - Identify urgent topics and issue call for experts to submit proposals for standards on those topics to the SC, and CPM if needed. Following a proposal of implementing a "private sector approach", it was considered the case of developing proposals for standards to the SC by issuing a call for experts on a specific topic to draft a proposal, which will be then submitted to the SC for review and approval for consultation as well as to CPM, if needed. - Involvement of RPPOs into the SSP. It was proposed the involvement of RPPOs in the SSP by filtering the proposals for standards and being responsible for their development. This would save time and resource and would expedite the development of standards as regional standards take one to two years to make. It was also suggested that topics could be submitted to RPPOs for drafting and then send the draft standard to the SC for review and approval for consultation. However, it was noted that a proactive role from all RPPOs is required.
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The group discussed two main approaches to expedite the development of the standards. - The first approach is a "private sector approach" which would optimize the process by identifying urgent topics and issue call for experts to draft proposals for standards on those topics. The draft standards would then be submitted to the SC for review, discussion and approval for consultation and then to CPM, if needed. This approach takes into consideration the following proposals discussed: an ongoing call for topics, the reduction of consultation periods from two to one, the abolishment of the SC-7, the inclusion of implementation material into the standard itself (which could take place for example by merging the SC and IC), and the reduction of SC members. - The second approach entails the involvement of RPPOs in the SSP. The RPPOs would filter the proposals for standards and would be responsible for their development. The proposed standards would then be submitted to the SC for review and approval for consultation. This approach requires a proactive role from all RPPOs.

Group 4

Session Title:
Expediting the development of standards: How do we decide what should be in a standard, how we make standards, how effective is a standard.
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ISPM Clarity and Focus - The current language of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) often lacks clarity, impacting consistent implementation. ISPMs would benefit from precise language, focusing primarily on explicit requirements rather than ambiguous terms such as "may" or "should." - Standard Requirements by Region or Country - Consideration should be given to whether requirements within ISPMs should be tailored to regional or national contexts. Clear, unambiguous requirements for each context would ensure consistent interpretation and application across regions. - Consultation Process and Topic Classification - Certain standards are more complex and may require multiple consultation periods for thorough review. Establishing a classification system for topics, guided by criteria developed by the Standards Committee (SC), would allow for standards to undergo one or two rounds of consultation based on their complexity. - Value of Multiple Consultation Periods - First and second consultation rounds contribute significantly to the refinement and quality of standards. This iterative process allows stakeholders to address potential gaps or ambiguities before standards are finalized. - Consensus-Building Mechanisms - A structured approach is necessary when regional discrepancies arise during consultations. Establishing clear criteria for reaching consensus would help manage disagreements and promote collaborative solutions. - Consolidation of ISPMs - Consideration should be given to the possibility of merging certain ISPMs to streamline the standards, enhancing usability and reducing redundancy.
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To enhance the clarity, applicability, and consensus around ISPMs, it is recommended that the Standards Committee: - Prioritize clear, directive language in ISPMs, emphasizing explicit requirements over conditional phrasing. - Define whether standards should be differentiated by region or country, ensuring contextual relevance. - Implement a topic classification framework to determine the necessary consultation rounds based on the complexity of each standard. - Establish criteria for consensus-building to manage regional discrepancies effectively. - Explore the consolidation of ISPMs to reduce complexity and improve accessibility, thereby strengthening the overall effectiveness of the standards.

Group 5

Session Title:
Expediting the development of standards
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted that Diagnostic Protocols and treatments only require one round of consultation, proposed that commodity standards could be further streamlined. It was thought that where consultation comments may be largely cosmetic, one round may be sufficient, however for complex ISPMs the standard 2 rounds will be required. - TFT: Noted this potentially adds additional tasks to the process, noting the option for a set amount of time for topics to be submitted and may provide an easier process for the SC to manage if the TFT process is removed, rather than having an influx towards the end of the submission period. - Also noted that Specifications require 1 round of consultation which was seen as essential. - Revised vs new standards: The number of standards requiring revision may increase as new standards come forwards, and there may be a place for digitalization to assist in the revision process. Such digitization of standards undergoing revision could allow for comparison and reduction in the potential for duplication with existing standards. Also noted the concept of streamlining the process of revisions with guidance material development/revision. - For smaller revisions 1 round of consultation may be appropriate. - Consider the use of tutorials/eLearning to compliment the standards. - The concept of linking standard setting and implementation should be considered for the future. The constraints also need to be considered around the mechanisms available for this approach, taking into account the use of technologies in this concept. - It was noted that in the consultation process sometimes it is not advised as to why comments may not have resulted in changes, therefore a comment may be resubmitted. Noted that these explanations can be provided in the comment responses. - Addressing consultation comments: Consider training for stewards to address the comments in further detail as to why comments may not have been incorporated to reduce resubmissions. Also, for SC members to further this information within the region. - AI: Can this be used in the revision process to identify terminologies and identify linkages with standards and other guidance materials. Also to provide assurance when information is transferred to guidance material, so this information is not lost. - AI: Could this be considered in relation to the translation of standards, to identify potential challenges in standards for consultation. - SC and IC collaboration: It was noted that there is benefit in the IC and SC representations in both forums, therefore further planning and consideration of the collaborative discussions during the SC and IC sessions would be beneficial to strengthen this linkage. - Regional workshops: It was noted that IPPC regional workshops are important in the consultation process, therefore this is an important forum to optimize within the consultation process. - Is there a need for further tutorial or instruction on the OCS process: There is a current tutorial available to make comments within the OCS, however countries can be encouraged to advise if further information is needed. - EWG: Noted the sometime limited time available to EWGs before a standard must go for consultation, and perhaps one in person week is not enough. This also highlighted the fact that further training for Stewards may be beneficial, and consideration of the inclusion of a member with experience in drafting standards may be useful. - Focus on the language: Clear and concise language to also assist with translation and comprehension. - Consider the focus of standards to streamline and potentially reduce the number.
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The discussions around expediting the development of standards focussed on the potential use of digitization and AI to strengthen the process, not only for development, but revision, translation, retention of information and minimizing the potential duplication of information. Also to assist in the translation process to identify areas of potential difficulty during consultation. - Consultation is a key step in the development process, therefore further advice and guidance on the OCS process may be valuable. Further training for Stewards to provide additional information when addressing comments may also reduce the potential for comments to be resubmitted if there is a lack of clarity around how these were or were not incorporated. Regional workshops were also recognized as a key forum to assist with the consultation process and thought should be given as to how to optimize these meetings for maximum benefit.

- The timeframes involved in the development process were also considered, and discussions from the previous day around the TFT were noted. One issue highlighted was the influx of submissions towards the end of the submission period, therefore an annual or open call may assist with this. Especially if the TFT is abolished and the SC and IC are tasked to review submissions. Additionally, the tight timeframes for EWGs were recognized, and these could be considered to assist in streamlining the development process, such as ensuring the inclusion of a member with experience in the drafting of standards.
- Collaboration between the SC and IC was noted as a key component to expedite the development process, also considering the possibility for the aligned development of standards and related guidance or implementation material.

Appendix 7: Summary of the group's deliberations from the breakout session – Pest outbreak alert and response systems

Group 1

Session Title:
POARS - Criteria for emerging pests
Discussion points
<p>Pest: <i>Nilaparvata lugens</i> (brown planthopper) (Hemiptera, Delphacidae) Exercise final from group 1: not added to the POARS emerging pest watch-list.</p> <p>General remarks by the group about the exercise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some pointed out that there is a need to add a criterion on the control measures available, hence some pests may be of concern but there are various control measures and phytosanitary measures available. - Criteria on “substantial economic impact”, according ISPM 11. One member mentioned that it can be subjective. - Criteria on “social impact”: the group suggested that food security be part of it this criterion. - One member queried on the real need to have a set of criteria points for the IPPC to start doing some work. It was explained that, the initial information is picked by the NROs pest reporting and horizon scan, and doing the exercise against a set criteria can justify priority and funding to be allocated to work on the particular pest and provide the necessary control and management options.
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To improve the current double negative outlined in the criteria number 2 - To avoid the use of the wording “substantial”, as it can be very subjective from the reader - To add some criteria whether the pest has management and control options, and therefore may imply in the final result (high impact but managed) - To consider elements on food security as part of the criteria on “social impact” - Participants will fill in the individual feedback evaluation form.

Group 2

Session Title:
POARS - Criteria for emerging pests
Discussion points
<p>Pest: <i>Tomato brown rugose fruit virus</i> (ToBRFV)</p> <p>Step 1: Initiation criteria</p> <p>Recent geographical spread The group considered the examples of Belgium and Netherlands (Kingdom of the) vs. Florida and Washington state.</p> <p>While Belgium and Netherlands (Kingdom of the), are neighboring countries, with similar climate, the climatic difference between Florida and the Washington state shows that ToBRFV can adapt to different climate types.</p> <p>Therefore, the criteria should not be limited to between countries only but addition of subcriteria would be valuable.</p> <p>The group agreed that ToBRFV meets the criteria.</p> <p>Current distribution The group found that the question with a double negative was not clear: instead of not widespread in endangered area, could say limited or absent or limited distribution.</p> <p>Uncertain as the question is not clear in its intent: it is about the current distribution of the virus compared to its potential distribution, referring to the extent of further vulnerable areas.</p> <p>The group agreed that it is uncertain that ToBRFV meets the criteria.</p> <p>Step 2: Current impact</p> <p>Economic impact The group agreed that ToBRFV meets the criteria, according to ISPM 11.</p> <p>Environmental impact The group agreed that ToBRFV does not meet the criteria as they are unsure about it.</p> <p>Social impact It was noted that social impact is a consequence of economic and environmental impact. It is therefore implicit if it has been said yes to either economic or environmental impact.</p> <p>It was considered the case of food security, which is primarily economic and then a social issue. Therefore, a question about social impact is informative but not needed.</p> <p>The group agreed that ToBRFV meets the criteria.</p> <p>Step 3: Risk evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High likelihood of introduction into new countries - The group agreed there is the likelihood that the pest can reach epidemic proportions. - It was noted that the term "epidemic" is not used in plant health and that it comes from One Health. - The group briefly discussed how the virus spreads and the pathways for plant products, such as seeds. Being a virus, the group pointed out that it can be spread by contact making its spread easier within a country rather than between countries. - The group agreed that ToBRFV meets the criteria. - Scale of impacts in new countries - The group discussed that it depends on tomato production but many countries produce tomatoes but, in principle, it does. <p>The group agreed that ToBRFV meets the criteria.</p>

Additional comments:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It was noted that in paragraph 18 the term “risk” should be replaced with “likelihood”; and - The last slide where the reviewer selects the classification should provide a summary of the responses as the reviewers had difficulty recalling what they had responded to each section. 	
Final summary / recommendations	
Criteria/pest	<i>Tomato brown rugose fruit virus (ToBRFV)</i>
Recent geographical Spread	Yes
Not widespread in endangered area	Uncertain
Economic Impact	Yes
Environmental Impact	No
Social Impact	Yes
Likelihood of Introduction	Yes
Scale of Impacts	Yes
Classification	Emerging Pest

Group 3

Session Title:
POARS - Criteria for emerging pests
Discussion points
<p>Pest: <i>Tuta absoluta</i> (tomato leafminer)</p> <p>Pest originates from North America – attacks all stages of tomato development. Host plant is tomato, can also be potato. Geographical spread – Africa, South America, Asia, Europe.</p> <p>Criterion 1: Recent geographical spread: Recent distribution – No</p> <p>Criterion 2: Current distribution: it is not widespread</p> <p>The rest of the criteria are not relevant. If both criteria are not fulfilled, then the pest is not emerging pest. Therefore, not for discussion under POARS.</p>
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From criteria – the aspect of emerging pest is missing; its expansion must be anticipated. - Endangered area – needs to be clarified. Does it mean the area that will be colonized, or the area where the pest is native and still can have impact. - How about migratory pests? Are they always emerging pests? - Economic impact equals social impact. - Pests are widespread have been in the area for long, but can have economic/environmental/social impacts. Can the concept of “emerging” can it be standby (locust), re-emerging?

Group 4:

Session Title:
POARS - Criteria for emerging pests
Discussion points
<p>Pest: <i>Agrilus planipennis</i> (emerald ash borer)</p> <p>3 steps recent pest outbreak, more than one country</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pest distribution, introduction /widely distributed - Economic, social and environmental impact - Risk evidence step (high risk ok spread and impact) <p>The group assesses the <i>Agrilus planipennis</i> (emerald ash borer) as an emerging pest according to the criteria</p> <p>Recent introduction: meet criteria 1 as it was introduced in 2005 so is not recent</p> <p>Has not moved on from Russia</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The assessment should consider the size of the country and the distance of spread rather than the number of countries. - Also consider human factor rather than biological factor

Group 5

Session Title:
POARS
Discussion points
<p>Pest: <i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i> (oriental fruit fly) (Diptera, Tephritidae)</p>
Final summary / recommendations
<p>General recommendations of the form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Difficult to test the criteria, initially could not submit the document. Good to include some additional criteria - Social question was challenging to answer for some countries - Number 17 does not have a selection to choose for the pest we were working with. Include an open text box.

Appendix 8: Summary of the group's deliberations from the breakout session – Discussion on the theme of the next and future International Days of Plant Health

Group 1

Session Title:
Discussion on the theme of the next and future IDPH
Discussion points
<p>Proposals for the IDPH theme included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plant Health is One Health - Plant Health and food security - Plant health for life - Without plant health, no One Health - Without plant health there's no animal health - Teaching future generations about Plant Health - No plants, no life - Plant health is everyone's health - Paving the way for a sustainable future- involving many other organizations - Artificial intelligence and plant health
Final summary/recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The IPPC needs a champion/public influencer for the International Day of Plant Health - Should ensure to include/feature prominently plant health in WFD and World Food Forum week

Group 2

Session Title:
Discussion on the theme of the next and future IDPH
Discussion points
<p>Proposed topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plant health and One Health - Healthy plants, healthy communities - Invasive species - Climate change - Healthy plants, healthy planet - Hungry pest campaign - IPM/responsible pest management - R&D to solve pest problem/plants for the future - Food for animals, humans - AMR - Food and fiber - Urban forests - Plants make the world a better day - No plants, no ... (fill in the blanks) commodities – chocolate, coffee, wine etc