

1. Opening of the session

- [1] The Director of the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division, Yurdi YASMI, welcomed participants to the Nineteenth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM).¹
- [2] The CPM observed a one-minute silence in remembrance of Augustin Mañe Ela ANDEME (Head of the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of Equatorial Guinea) and other members of the IPPC community who had passed away since the previous CPM meeting.
- [3] The FAO Director-General, QU Dongyu, emphasized the contribution of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) community to the achievement of the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals and the FAO's "four betters". He highlighted the unique roles of the CPM and IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as "the secretariat") in setting international standards for plant health and providing implementation and capacity-development support. He also referred to the importance of plant health in the context of One Health. The director-general urged stakeholders to invest in plant health, develop and implement science-based phytosanitary measures, strengthen regional and international cooperation, and harness digital tools and innovation. He concluded by encouraging participants to reaffirm their dedication to plant health as a global priority.
- [4] Beth BECHDOL, FAO Deputy Director-General and Officer-in-Charge of the IPPC Secretariat, recognized the dedication and commitment of the IPPC community. She noted that 2025 was halfway through implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030, and highlighted the standards being presented for adoption at CPM-19 (2025), as well as initiatives such as the forthcoming IPPC Plant Health Campus, the IPPC ePhyto Solution and the Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP). She emphasized the link between plant health and food security, stressed the need for flexible, innovative and adaptive ways of working, and urged governments, international organizations, the private sector, and civil and scientific communities to continue their collective efforts to protect plant health.

2. Keynote address

- [5] Emmanuelle SOUBEYRAN, Director of the World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH), gave a keynote address focusing on the interdependence of human, animal, plant and environmental health. She emphasized the importance of working under the umbrella of the One Health approach and outlined four key areas where WOAH would welcome collaboration towards a more resilient future – biodiversity, climate change and health system resilience, biosecurity and disease prevention, and antimicrobial resistance (AMR). The WOAH director referred to the quadripartite partnership's One Health Joint Plan of Action, which emphasized that plant health is an important pillar supporting food systems, disease control, environmental stability, economic resilience and social well-being. However, she highlighted the need to look beyond traditional sectors and disciplines and to challenge conventional perspectives to drive innovation and ensure that no critical expertise is lost. Noting that a broader perspective strengthens the ability to manage diseases and pests more effectively, she remarked on the value of collaboration and constructive dialogue between WOAH, the Codex Alimentarius Commission and the CPM, as standard setting bodies facing common challenges. She finished by commending the CPM's greater engagement with One Health and confirmed that WOAH stood ready to work alongside the IPPC community in this regard.

3. Adoption of the agenda

- [6] The CPM agreed to consider agenda item 21.1 (Report from the IPPC regional workshops) under agenda item 15 (Collaboration with regional plant protection organizations) and information papers on interceptions of live insects in wood packaging material and a concept note for an IPPC systems

¹ List of participants: [insert link](#)

approach workshop under agenda item 23 (Any other business). Agenda item 17 (Science session) was scheduled to be considered on the Thursday afternoon.²

[7] The CPM:

(1) *adopted* the agenda as modified (Appendix 1) and *noted* the list of documents (Appendix 2).

3.1 European Union statement of competence

[8] The CPM:

(2) *noted* the Declaration of Competences and Voting Rights submitted by the European Union and its 27 member states.³

4. Election of the rapporteur

[9] The CPM:

(3) *elected* both John EIVERS (Ireland) and Faith NDUNGE (Kenya) as rapporteurs.

5. Report from the CPM bureau on credentials

[10] The CPM chairperson explained that, in consistent with advice from the FAO Legal Office, the CPM Bureau (hereafter referred to as “the bureau”) had formally taken on the role, function and authority of the role of the Credentials Committee instead of a separate Credentials Committee being formed.⁴ He reported that the Credentials Committee had reviewed all of the credentials received.

[11] By the fourth day of the session, the Credentials Committee had received 130 submissions of credentials, and had accepted a total number of 129 contracting parties. The contracting party whose credentials were not accepted was notified accordingly by the Credentials Committee.

[12] The CPM:

(4) *noted* the report from the Credentials Committee, who had endorsed a list of 129 valid credentials, which was sufficient to constitute a quorum of a majority of CPM members (93 members).

6. Report from the CPM Chairperson

[13] The CPM chairperson presented his report.⁵ He highlighted the progress made in the past year and noted the need to plan for and identify the CPM’s strategic direction from 2030 onwards. Looking ahead, he referred to possible developments in improving the utility of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) and commented on IPPC engagement within the One Health framework, and with the private sector.

[14] One contracting party queried the expansion of the APP into other regions and the programme’s long-term sustainability. The CPM chairperson indicated that the APP was designed to serve as a model within the African context before possible implementation in other regions.

[15] The CPM:

(5) *noted* the report from the CPM chairperson.

7. Report from the IPPC Secretariat

[16] The IPPC Secretariat officer-in-charge presented the 2024 annual report of the secretariat, highlighting activities in the following areas of work: the CPM and its subsidiary bodies, CPM focus groups and steering groups, standard setting, implementation and capacity development, communications and

² CPM 2025/INF/01.

³ CPM 2025/CRP/01.

⁴ CPM Bureau 2023/10, agenda item 5; CPM Bureau 2024/06, agenda item 14.3.

⁵ CPM 2025/04.

advocacy, and the APP.⁶ She also highlighted the success of the IPPC ePhyto Solution, and thanked the contracting parties that had contributed to the IPPC Multidonor Trust Fund (MDTF) during 2024.

[17] One organization highlighted the importance of celebrating the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH), by showcasing the numerous successes of the IPPC.

[18] The CPM chairperson encouraged written suggestions for the IDPH theme through the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) or through the CPM Bureau via the secretariat.

[19] The CPM:

(6) *noted* the report from the IPPC Secretariat.

8. Report from the Strategic Planning Group

[20] The chairperson of the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) presented a summary report, which highlighted the most significant issues discussed by the SPG at its meeting in October 2024.⁶ These included: an environmental scan of the IPPC to identify strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and challenges; One Health, antimicrobial resistance (AMR) and plant health; a review of the format of ISPMs; progress on the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 development-agenda items (DAIs); pest outbreak alert and response systems (POARS); an update on the APP; and preparations for CPM-19 (2025).

Is it time to rethink ISPMs?

[21] A representative from New Zealand presented a paper exploring issues with ISPMs around low readability and translatability, and provided suggestions on how this situation could be improved with new, modern and flexible approaches.⁷ An earlier version of the paper had been discussed at the 2024 SPG meeting, and the recommendations to the CPM had subsequently been revised.

[22] Contracting parties agreed on the importance of ISPMs being clear, translatable and implementable. Some CPs provided support for the proposal of a Standard Setting Procedure (a core requirements document), which would be developed alongside the ISPMs to support implementation.

[23] Some CPs raised concerns regarding the process for "rethinking" ISPMs, including the involvement of other standard setting bodies, the resource implications associated with the proposal, the removal of guidance from ISPMs, and the necessary involvement of IPPC subsidiary bodies.

[24] Given the range of views, the CPM chairperson suggested that interested CPs participate in a Friends of the Chair meeting, which took place outside of the session. This resulted in broad and extensive discussions by many CPs and observers, who agreed for the topic to proceed for discussion at the SPG 2025 meeting.

[25] The CPM:

(7) *noted* the report from the SPG;

(8) *considered* that improving the clarity and utility of ISPMs will be a core part of the 2025 SPG meeting agenda;

(9) *invited* all participants (SPG members and all contracting parties) to provide papers on viewpoints for consideration to the SPG;

(10) *welcomed* the inclusion of papers for consideration by the IC and SC, to support the 2025 SPG meeting;

(11) *welcomed* suggestions on the topic by IPPC regional workshop participants; and

(12) *agreed* for the CPM Bureau to decide how to work with the outcomes of, and advice from, the 2025 SPG meeting, and the next steps to be presented at CPM-20 (2026).

⁶ CPM 2025/05.

9. Report from CPM subsidiary bodies

9.1 Report from the Standards Committee

[26] The SC chairperson presented the report of the SC's activities during 2024.⁷ Key achievements included the adoption of three diagnostic protocols (DPs) by the SC on behalf of the CPM, the submission of 12 draft standards and two specifications for consultation, and the recommendation of two draft standards for CPM-19 (2025) adoption. The SC had also drafted adjustments to the standard setting process, supported the delivery of the 2024 IPPC regional workshops, continued to collaborate with the IC, explored mechanisms to address technical issues that are not objections to draft ISPMs submitted for adoption, and provided oversight of all four IPPC technical panels.

[27] The CPM:

(13) *noted* the report on the activities of the SC in 2024; and

(14) thanked contracting parties and members of the SC, both past and present, for their support of the standard setting process.

9.1.1 List of topics for IPPC standards

[28] The SC chairperson presented a paper on changes to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*.⁸ This listed the modifications to subjects (glossary terms, DPs and phytosanitary treatments (PTs)) that had been made by the SC. It also outlined the amendments to the list recommended by the SC to the CPM.

[29] The CPM noted a request to clarify whether the international movement of *Citrus* fruit would be included in a standard and the type of *Citrus* species to be included.

[30] The SC chairperson acknowledged the CPM-18 (2024) decision to include *Citrus* fruit as a priority 1 topic in the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) work programme and the development of the standard. She affirmed the TPCS's aim to address all *Citrus* fruit but indicated that the TPCS may begin with sweet orange (*Citrus sinensis*) if the broader approach proves unfeasible.

[31] The CPM:

(15) *noted* the adjustments to subjects made by the SC in the *List of topics for IPPC standards* (as presented in CPM 2025/08);

(16) *removed* the topics *Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade* (2006-010), *Pest risk management for quarantine pests* (2014-001) and *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards* (2020-001) from the *List of topics for IPPC standards*;

(17) *assigned* priority 1 for the topic *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM* (2023-037);

(18) *noted* the changed title and scope of the subject 2023-028 from “International movement of fresh banana (*Musa paradisiaca*) fruit” to “International movement of fresh *Musa* spp. fruit”;

(19) *noted* the changed title and scope of the subject 2006-028 from “Tephritidae: identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques” to “Tephritidae: molecular identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance to genus”;

(20) *adopted* the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, with the above adjustments; and

(21) *requested* that the secretariat update the list of topics database on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) according to the decisions made by CPM-19 (2025).

9.1.2 Adjustments to the IPPC standard setting process – changes to the consultation period and notification period for diagnostic protocols

[32] The SC chairperson presented adjustments to the standard setting process for DPs that had been approved by the SC in 2024: namely, a change to the date for the January DP notification period and an

⁷ CPM 2025/07_Rev1.

⁸ CPM 2025/08.

additional consultation period, for DPs only, in January–May.⁹ She explained that these changes did not affect the Standard Setting Procedure itself but only the process, and is therefore under the remit of the SC.

[33] The CPM:

(22) *noted* the changes to the DP consultation (twice per year) and the DP notification periods dates, and the corresponding revisions to the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting*.

9.1.3 Technical issues that are not formal objections regarding draft ISPMs presented for adoption by the CPM

[34] Further to the request from CPM-18 (2024),¹⁰ the SC chairperson presented the outcome of SC discussions about mechanisms to address technical issues that are not formal objections regarding draft ISPMs submitted for adoption.¹¹ The SC had concluded that the current process for objections was adequate, as it already accommodated a means to submit proposed improvements. Moreover, that there was a need to better communicate the process and adjust the objection templates to better indicate the way objections can be dealt with.

[35] One organization sought clarification on whether the process of objections allows for the submission of improvements to the text. To this point, the SC chairperson confirmed this ability by contracting parties and regions.

9.2 Report from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee

[36] The IC vice-chairperson presented an overview of implementation and capacity development activities during 2024,¹² with further details being provided under other agenda items. Among their activities, the IC and its subgroup and teams had progressed the four DAIs for which the IC provided oversight, conducted two IPPC Observatory surveys, and supported phytosanitary capacity evaluations (PCEs) and certification of new PCE facilitators. They had developed one IPPC guide and two e-learning courses, prepared a set of training materials on *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *cubense* TR4 (Fusarium TR4), progressed translations of IPPC guides and e-learning courses, and approved revisions to the Procedure for Developing IPPC Guides and Training Materials. In addition, the IC had endorsed the development of a communications plan and a proposal to update the Phytosanitary Systems pages of the IPP.

[37] The CPM praised the essential work of the IC and its subgroups, and the use of many guides and training materials across regions.

[38] The CPM raised concerns regarding underfunded implementation activities and highlighted the need for long-term funding and the sustained allocation of resources. A further concern was noted regarding the associated costs and resources required with the creation of three regular-funded positions that could affect the implementation of other IC activities, including the IPPC ePhyto Solution.

[39] The CPM noted the advocacy for a harmonized verification system of ePhyto signatures to avoid the use of third-party providers. To this point, the CPM chairperson confirmed that this issue would be considered within the secretariat and the ePhyto governing body.

[40] The CPM:

(1) *noted* the work of the IC in 2024;

⁹ CPM 2025/09.

¹⁰ CPM 18 (2024), agenda item 10.

¹¹ CPM 2025/10.

¹² CPM 2025/11.

- (2) *noted* the activities of the IC Subgroup on the IPPC Observatory and the activities of the IC teams on e-commerce, Fusarium TR4, authorization of third-party entities, IPPC guides and training materials, national reporting obligations (NROs), PCE, projects, and contributed resources;
- (3) *recognized* that implementation and capacity development activities are underfunded;
- (4) *requested* the establishment of three additional regular-funded positions for the Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU) in order for the team to deliver its core mandate, as recommended in the 2015 IPPC Secretariat enhancement evaluation;
- (5) *requested* that the IPPC Secretary, in conjunction with the advice and guidance of the Financial Committee, consider the proposed provision of adequate financial resources for core and priority IPPC activities that are not funded or underfunded – USD 50 000 per year for NROs, USD 50 000 per year for PCE, USD 50 000 per year for POARS global coordination of Fusarium TR4, and USD 50 000 per year for the overall functioning of the IPPC Observatory as well as for the development of guides and training materials (see also agenda items 12.5 and 14.3);
- (6) *encouraged* contracting parties to consider the donation of resources through funds to the IPPC Multidonor Trust Fund or in-kind contributions to support the progress of the above-mentioned activities;
- (7) *encouraged* the promotion of the IPPC Plant Health Campus to enhance awareness of the available IPPC implementation and capacity development materials;
- (8) *encouraged* contracting parties to submit implementation topics during the 2025 call for topics;
- (9) *encouraged* the IPPC regional workshop organizing committees to devote dedicated sessions at the 2025 IPPC regional workshops to identify implementation issues and gather feedback from contracting parties;
- (10) *thanked* the experts and proofreaders involved in the development and translation of IPPC guides and training materials (as presented in Appendix X) for their outstanding contributions

9.2.1 List of implementation and capacity development topics

[41] The IC vice-chairperson presented an update on the status of the topics in the *List of topics for implementation and capacity development* and highlighted the need for sustainable funding for the development of IPPC guides and training materials.¹³

[42] The CPM noted the intervention from a contracting party to include a further recommendation that aligns the development of ISPMs and implementation materials to the workplans of the IPPC subsidiary bodies. A further intervention was noted by the CPM on the need to adapt and develop training materials and guides that ensure accessibility for all learners, particularly those with diverse learning needs and schedules.

[43] The CPM:

- (11) *approved* the *List of implementation and capacity development topics*;
- (12) *requested* the creation of a regular-budget position placed within the IFU to develop guides and training materials, as per the recommendations in the 2015 IPPC Secretariat enhancement evaluation (and as stated in agenda item 9.2);
- (13) *noted* the importance of the timely development of guides and training materials in parallel with ISPMs, as raised by the SPG 2024 meeting; and
- (14) *requested* the SSU, the IFU, the SC and IC to engage in enhanced efforts to align their work programmes to support the timely development of implementation materials for ISPMs.
- (15) *thanked* the experts and proofreaders involved in the development and translation of IPPC guides and training materials (as presented in Appendix X) for their outstanding contributions.

¹³ CPM 2025/12.

9.3 This agenda item is in Part 2 of the report.

10. Adoption of international standards for phytosanitary measures

- [44] The secretariat introduced the papers for this agenda item, which presented the draft ISPMs proposed by the SC for adoption by the CPM and outlined the DPs adopted by the SC on behalf of the CPM and activities related to translation of adopted standards.¹⁴ The paper also invited the CPM to revoke three PTs for irradiation of different *Anastrepha* species, as they were now covered by a PT for irradiation for the genus *Anastrepha*.
- [45] The secretariat informed the CPM that the deadline for objections specified in the Standard Setting Procedure was three weeks before CPM-19 (2025), namely 24 February 2025, but by that date no objections had been received.¹⁵
- [46] In addition, the secretariat reported that no objections had been received by the end of the 45-day DP notification period for the draft DP for *Heterobasidion annosum sensu lato* (2021-015) and was therefore adopted in March 2025.¹⁶
- [47] The CPM welcomed the adoption of the first commodity standard on mangoes and expressed support for the development of further commodity standards, emphasizing the IPPC's role as a standard-setting organization.
- [48] The CPM recognized the need from some contracting parties to implement the new standard effectively, particularly for African countries, noting the importance of capacity building, technical assistance and potential partnerships with the private sector.
- [49] The CPM:
- (16) *adopted* CS 1 (International movement of fresh *Mangifera indica* fruit) (2021-011), as presented in CPM 2025/15_01, as Annex 1 to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*);
 - (17) *noted* that, once the draft PTs cited in CS 1 (International movement of fresh *Mangifera indica* fruit) (2021-011) have been adopted, these citations will be updated and the citation and reference to Zhao *et al.* (2023) will be removed, as ink amendments;
 - (18) *adopted* Annex 1 (Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risk associated with the movement of wood) (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*) as presented in CPM 2025/15_02;
 - (19) *noted* the adoption of the following three DPs (annexes to ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*)) by the SC on behalf of the CPM in 2024:
 - revision of DP 9 (*Genus Anastrepha*) (2021-002),
 - revision of DP 25 (*Xylella fastidiosa*) (2021-003), and
 - revision of DP 27 (*Ips* spp.) (2021-004);
 - (20) *noted* the adoption of DP 34 (*Heterobasidion annosum sensu lato*) (2021-015) (annex to ISPM 27) by the SC on behalf of the CPM in 2025;
 - (21) *thanked* the experts of the groups who drafted the adopted standards and their contracting parties or international organizations (Appendix X) for their active contribution to the development of these standards;
 - (22) *revoked* PT 1 (Irradiation treatment for *Anastrepha ludens*), PT 2 (Irradiation treatment for *Anastrepha obliqua*) and PT 3 (Irradiation treatment for *Anastrepha serpentina*), noting coverage by PT 39 (Irradiation treatment for the genus *Anastrepha*);

¹⁴ CPM 2025/15.

¹⁵ CPM 2025/INF/19.

¹⁶ CPM 2025/INF/29.

- (23) *noted* that translations of CPM recommendations adopted from 2024 onwards would be subject to language review using the same procedure used for ISPMs;
- (24) *thanked* contracting parties and RPPOs involved in the language review groups, as well as FAO Translation Services, for their efforts and hard work to improve the language versions of ISPMs and relevant annexes, and CPM recommendations;
- (25) *acknowledged* the contributions of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols members who left in 2024 or the first quarter of 2025:
- Vessela MAVRODIEVA (United States of America), and
 - Julie PATTEMORE (Australia);
- (26) *acknowledged* the contributions of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards members who left in 2024 or the first quarter of 2025:
- Martin DAMUS (Canada), and
 - Hideki TANIGUCHI (Japan);
- (27) *acknowledged* the contributions of the Technical Panel for the Glossary member whose membership expired at the end of 2023:
- Rajesh RAMARATHNAM (Canada); and
- (28) *acknowledged* the contributions of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments steward who left in 2024:
- David OPATOWSKI (Israel).

[*Note (to be deleted upon adoption of report): decision acknowledging SC members who left in 2024 and the first quarter of 2025 is under agenda item 22 for consistency with decision acknowledging IC members.*]

10.1 Ink amendments to adopted ISPMs

[50] The secretariat presented a paper on proposed ink amendments to adopted ISPMs arising from consistency reviews.¹⁷

[51] The CPM noted the request to ensure that ink amendments are translated in all FAO languages.

[52] The CPM:

- (29) *noted* the ink amendments to the definition of the glossary (ISPM 5) term “area of low pest prevalence” (Attachment 1 of CPM 2025/16, in English) to avoid redundancy;
- (30) *noted* the ink amendments to the definition of the glossary (ISPM 5) term “IPPC” (Attachment 1 of CPM 2025/16, in English) for consistency with other abbreviations in ISPM 5;
- (31) *noted* the ink amendments to the definition of the glossary (ISPM 5) term “treatment schedule” (Attachment 1 of CPM 2025/16, in English) to be in line with the definition of “treatment” in ISPM 5;
- (32) *agreed* that, once the secretariat had applied the ink amendments, the previous versions of the standards would be replaced by the newly implemented versions;
- (33) *noted* that, once the draft PTs cited in the draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit* (2021-011) have been adopted, these citations would be updated and the citation and reference to Zhao *et al.* (2023) would be removed, as ink amendments; and
- (34) *noted* that the ink amendments would be implemented into all FAO language versions of the standards concerned, as resources permitted.

¹⁷ CPM 2025/16.

11. CPM recommendations

11.1 CPM recommendations in the work programme

[53] The CPM considered the development of draft CPM recommendations and whether any new proposals for CPM recommendations needed to be added to the work programme.¹⁸ They noted that one suggestion for a new CPM recommendation would be considered under agenda item 13.3 (One Health).

[54] No further proposals for new CPM recommendations were proposed under this agenda item.

11.2 Revised procedure for the adoption of CPM recommendations

[55] The CPM chairperson presented a paper prepared by Canada, proposing to modify the procedure for the adoption of CPM recommendations.¹⁹ The modified procedure, which had also been presented to the SPG in October 2024, aimed to avoid unnecessary discussions on draft CPM recommendations during CPM meetings and would bring greater consistency with the approach used for adopting ISPMs, in which objections were required in writing before the relevant CPM meeting.

[56] The CPM considered minor amendments to the proposed procedure, to clarify the stage at which a draft CPM recommendation could be sent to a second round of consultation,²⁰ and a reordering of modified steps in the CPM recommendation adoption process for clarity and application.²¹

[57] The CPM:

(35) *adopted* the proposed modifications to the procedure for adopting CPM recommendations as modified at this meeting.

12. Implementation of IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 – including a mid-term review

IPPC Observatory

[58] The secretariat presented a report on the activities of the IPPC Observatory in 2024 and the planned activities for 2025, which also introduced the observatory's plans for a mid-term review of the implementation of the DAIs.²² The secretariat acknowledged the contribution of USD 90 000 from the Republic of Korea towards the third general IPPC survey, which supports the global IPPC community.

[59] The CPM noted the request by some contracting parties to pay careful attention to the development of the revised IPPC Strategic Framework, recognizing the resource limitations that exist within the IPPC.

[60] The CPM also acknowledged the concern that, the proposed terms of reference, offering a thorough theoretical methodology for the mid-term review of DAIs, especially for the ones that are at early-stage of implementation, may be unsuitable. This could lead to missing valuable practical lessons learned. CPM noted the request for a more flexible terms of reference for the mid-term review, for a more adaptable approach to diverse initiatives.

[61] The CPM:

(36) *noted* the status of activities from the IPPC Observatory 2022–2024 workplan as presented in Appendix 1, including progress made with the IPPC Observatory Study on E-commerce and the IPPC Observatory Study on Antimicrobial Resistance;

(37) *noted* the IPPC Observatory 2025 workplan as presented in Appendix 2;

¹⁸ CPM 2025/17.

¹⁹ CPM 2025/18.

²⁰ CPM 2025/INF/21.

²¹ CPM 2025/CRP_04.

²² CPM 2025/19.

- (38) *discussed and agreed* on the mid-term monitoring and evaluation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 DAIs, to be undertaken prior to initiating work on the development of the next IPPC Strategic Framework (ideally in 2027), with a revised terms of reference provided to CPM-20 (2026);
- (39) *recalled* and reaffirmed the CPM-17 (2023) decision requesting the secretariat to consider establishing a new position of programme manager to coordinate, monitor, report and mobilize funds, and requested the Financial Committee to review this decision and provide their guidance;
- (40) *thanked* all countries that responded to IPPC Observatory surveys on antibiotics and on fungicide use for their contributions for better understanding of antimicrobial use in plant health and the extent to which the CPM recommendation on internet trade has been implemented;
- (41) *noted* the proposed content of an IPPC Observatory investment prospectus, which will be published on the International Phytosanitary portal;
- (42) *acknowledged* the financial contributions from the Governments of Canada and the Republic of Korea to support the IPPC Observatory activities.

12.1 Harmonization of electronic data exchange

Study of cost–benefits of electronic phytosanitary certificates

- [62] The secretariat presented the results of a study by the FAO Investment Centre and the FAO Markets and Trade Division. The study had quantified the cost–benefits of switching from paper to digital phytosanitary certificates, assessed the impact of the IPPC ePhyto Solution on global agrifood trade, and identified regional and global scenarios of ePhyto adoption and use. The secretariat also confirmed the production of the FAO and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) publication on “*Investing in Trade Facilitation: The case of ePhyto*”.
- [63] The CPM noted the many cost-benefit successes related to the IPPC ePhyto Solution; however, challenges were raised, including additional security requirements, and the potential unauthorized third-party access to information via the ePhyto Hub.
- [64] The CPM chairperson acknowledged these concerns, and due to a lack of consensus, the decision point related to the adoption of third-party services was removed.
- [65] The CPM also recognized the request for a clear ePhyto governance framework by 2026, and to clarify the impact of the service delivery agreement review on ePhyto funding.

ePhyto implementation update

- [66] The secretariat and a representative from the UN International Computing Centre presented an update on ePhyto (electronic phytosanitary certificate) activities in the framework of the ePhyto Strategic Implementation Plan for 2024–2030.²³ Activities included the creation of an ePhyto MDTF to support the IPPC ePhyto Solution, work to explore the possibility of forwarding ePhytos to third-party digital platforms that manage and centralize the electronic transfer of trade-related documents.
- [67] The CPM discussed the success of the implementation of the IPPC ePhyto Solution among contracting parties and praised its usefulness in international trade.
- [68] The CPM recognized the need for a sustainable funding mechanism for the IPPC ePhyto Solution, and for a dedicated secretariat programme officer to ensure stability and growth.
- [69] The CPM noted the recognition of the IPPC ePhyto Africa Initiative as a key resource in the region, and recognized calls for further financial and technical support. The future development of the ePhyto system, including import requirements and new features, was discussed.

²³ CPM 2025/20.

Funding of the IPPC ePhyto Solution

- [70] A member of the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding of the IPPC ePhyto Solution presented a paper outlining the alternative fee structures that the focus group had explored for the IPPC ePhyto Solution following the request to do so by CPM-18 (2024).²⁴
- [71] The CPM noted the proposal for IPPC ePhyto Solution to seek predictable funding through FAO regular programme budget, and to avoid reliance on (unsustainable) in-kind contributions.
- [72] The CPM also noted the proposal for the financial model to be adjusted to reflect the actual usage and the economic realities of CPs. To this point, the CPM chairperson commented that contributions to the ePhyto solution are voluntary in nature.
- [73] The CPM discussed need to establish a dedicated governance group which the bureau will consider in June 2025, which would take on requests of this nature. The CPM chairperson confirmed that the bureau is acting as the temporary governance body, ahead of a review of an appropriate governance model for the ePhyto Solution.
- [74] The CPM noted the issue raised to include a mechanism that can distinguish between commercial and non-commercial ePhyto exchanges.
- [75] The CPM welcomed the contribution from contracting parties towards the implementation of the IPPC ePhyto Solution.²⁵
- [76] The CPM:
- (43) *noted* the successful implementation of the IPPC ePhyto Solution thus far;
 - (44) *encouraged* contracting parties that had not yet registered to the IPPC ePhyto Hub to do so;
 - (45) *agreed* to promote the use of the IPPC ePhyto Solution;
 - (46) *encouraged* contracting parties to continue to raise the need for ePhyto funding at relevant FAO meetings, including during the mid-term review of the FAO strategic framework;
 - (47) *encouraged* all contracting parties to continue to provide support to the IPPC ePhyto Solution through the ePhyto MDTF;
 - (48) *agreed* to remove usage fees for both United Nations least developed countries and World Bank low-income countries, starting in 2026;
 - (49) *agreed* to continue the current weighting in the funding model of two-thirds base fee and one-third usage fee, as per the CPM-18 (2024) agreed funding model;
 - (50) *agreed* to continue using the World Bank development classification to differentiate the development levels of countries, as per the CPM-18 (2024) agreed funding model;
 - (51) *agreed* to continue counting both sending and receiving ePhytos when calculating exchanges;
 - (52) *agreed* to continue to include non-commercial ePhyto exchanges when calculating exchanges;
 - (53) *agreed* to amend the Procedures for the IPPC ePhyto Solution Funding Model as necessary to reflect these decisions; and
 - (54) acknowledged the contribution of the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding of the IPPC ePhyto Solution and thanked the focus group members (Appendix X) for their work.

12.2 Commodity- and pathway-specific ISPMs

- [77] The secretariat presented an update on the DAI on “Commodity- and Pathway-Specific ISPMs”.²⁶ This outlined the eight commodity standards under the IPPC work programme in the framework of ISPM

²⁴ CPM 2025/21.

²⁵ CPM 2025/CRP/13

²⁶ CPM 2025/22.

46, and the tentative timeline for their future progress. CPM-19 (2025) saw the adoption of the first specific commodity standard: International movement of fresh *Mangifera indica* fruit.

[78] The CPM welcomed the contribution of NZD 50 000 from New Zealand to support the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS), with the intention to support and host the next technical panel meeting, and the contribution of CAD 60 000 from Canada to support the work of the TPCS.

[79] The CPM noted the written interventions with regard to ensuring that the TPCS follows the priority order of subjects to be developed, the need to provide the procedures for updated approved annexes, and the need to provide clarity on assessing the technical justification for the inclusion of regulated pests in these standards, and document accessibility.²⁷

[80] The CPM also noted the concern raised regarding the listing of all known pests, including pathogens on commodities like mangoes that could lead to unjustified restrictive trade measures by other countries based on human consumption risks, rather than plant health.

[81] The SC Chairperson and secretariat agreed to address these concerns in future meetings, welcoming suggestions from the SC and TPCS.

[82] The CPM:

(55) *noted* the update on the DAI on commodity standards; and

(56) *thanked* Australia, Canada, the European Union, France, Japan and New Zealand for providing financial or in-kind contributions to support this DAI to date.

12.3 Management of e-commerce and postal and courier pathways

[83] The secretariat presented an update on the DAI on “Management of E-commerce and Postal and Courier Pathways”.²⁸ This highlighted the production of an infographic video and a guide on e-commerce, various IPPC and external events, and the launch of an IPPC Observatory survey on e-commerce.

[84] The CPM recognized the contributions of the IC team and secretariat to the work of the DAI, and notably the staff in-kind contribution from Canada.

[85] The CPM noted the in-kind contribution of the Republic of Tanzania in their pledge to support translation of the guide on e-commerce into Kiswahili.

[86] The CPM:

(57) *noted* the update on the DAI on e-commerce;

(58) *noted* the preliminary results of the IPPC Observatory on e-commerce; and

(59) *thanked* Canada for their in-kind staff contribution and financial support of the e-commerce DAI.

12.4 Enabling the use of third-party entities

[87] The secretariat presented an update on the DAI on “Developing Guidance for the Use of Third-Party Entities”, the plans for which included the development of two IPPC guides: one on authorization and use of third-party entities and the other on audit in a phytosanitary context.⁵ Specifications for both guides had been approved but funding constraints meant that it had not been possible to start drafting either guide.

[88] The CPM noted a call for further resources for the harmonized development of both guides.

²⁷ CPM 2025/CRP/06.

²⁸ CPM 2025/23.

[89] The CPM also noted the contributions of Australia for the amount of AUD 75 000, and Canada for the amount of CAD 65 000 in their pledge to support the completion of both guides.

[90] The CPM:

- (60) *noted* the update on the DAI on developing guidance on the use of third-party entities;
- (61) *thanked* Canada for its financial contribution to the DAI on developing guidance on the use of third-party entities; and
- (62) *encouraged* contracting parties to contribute the funds needed to develop both the IPPC guide *Authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2018-040) and the IPPC guide *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2021-009).

12.5 Strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems

[91] The secretariat and the chairperson of the POARS Steering Group presented an update on the corresponding DAI.²⁹ This outlined the progress made by the steering group, including consideration of criteria for identifying emerging pests, oversight of pest reporting, the planned timeline of POARS activities, options for POARS governance, the possible integration of the APP into POARS, and funding.

[92] The CPM:

- (63) *noted* the progress made on the development of criteria for identifying emerging pests, the POARS procedure, and mapping of POARS functions and activities with the IC, other IPPC bodies and the APP;
- (64) *approved* the option of the POARS Steering Group as the long-term governance body for POARS activities, with the mandate to report directly to the bureau and be managed by the secretariat IFU;
- (65) *requested* that the current POARS Steering Group propose updated terms of reference for the long-term POARS Steering Group and *requested* that the bureau review and approve the terms of reference on behalf of the CPM;
- (66) *noted* the revised timeline for POARS implementation, including key milestones for 2024–2030, as detailed in CPM 2025/25;
- (67) *agreed* to include updates on emerging pest situations and POARS-related activities as a standing CPM agenda item and *noted* the upcoming call for emerging pests to be launched in response to the CPM-16 (2022) request;
- (68) *noted* the analysis on national reporting obligations and the benefits of keeping pest reporting under the IC for streamlined management and oversight;
- (69) *requested* that the IPPC secretary, in conjunction with the advice and guidance of the Financial Committee, consider the proposed provision of USD 50 000 from the IPPC regular-programme budget and the IPPC Multidonor Trust Fund to address the operational needs of POARS and ensure the effective piloting and implementation of its system, as requested by the IC; and
- (70) *requested* that the secretariat establish a trust fund to address issues related to global emerging pests and emergencies, in line with the decision made at CPM-14 (2019).

12.6 Assessment and management of climate-change impacts on plant health

[93] A member of the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues presented an update on the group's progress.³⁰ The group's activities had included participating in a wide range of events, publishing a scientific article and a technical resource, holding a webinar series, providing comments on the draft specification on *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM* (2023-037),

²⁹ CPM 2025/25.

³⁰ CPM 2025/26.

creating a new web page on the IPP, and updating its action plan following the extension of its mandate until CPM-20 (2026).

[94] Some contracting parties discussed the possible extension of the focus group's mandate.

[95] The CPM:

- (71) *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change on Phytosanitary Issues;
- (72) *approved* the 2025–2026 workplan of the focus group as presented in Appendix 1 of CPM 2025/26;
- (73) *thanked* Canada, Ireland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for their financial support for this DAI;
- (74) *thanked* Brazil for hosting the in-person meeting of the focus group; and
- (75) *agreed* to re-confirm the extension of the mandate of the focus group until next year (2026) and *agreed* to review further extensions at CPM-20 (2026).

12.7 Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination

[96] The bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination presented an update on the focus group, which had met for the first time in December 2024.³¹ The focus group had designed a brief questionnaire for relevant research networks and would be compiling lists of networks and planning the initiation of a scoping study.

[97] The CPM:

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

12.8 Diagnostic laboratory networking

[98] The secretariat and the bureau "champion" on this development agenda item (DAI) on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking presented an update on the formation of the CPM Focus Group on Laboratory Diagnostic Networking and the associated DAI.³² They explained that, as the start of this DAI and the work of the focus group had been delayed, it was expected that a one-year extension of the focus group would be needed to ensure that all tasks were delivered ensuring the expected quality.

[99] The CPM noted the written intervention by some contracting parties, which proposed to extend the focus group's mandate by two years to allow for a proper completion of the tasks.

[100] The CPM also noted the financial support provided by Canada and the in-kind contribution of staff provided by South Africa.

[101] The CPM:

- (77) *noted* the update on the DAI on diagnostic laboratory networking; and
- (78) *extended* the term of the CPM Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking by two years until CPM-22 (2028).

13. Update from other CPM focus groups

13.1 Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid

Report from the Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid

[102] The chairperson of the CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid presented an update on the activities of the focus group.³³ The focus group had addressed consultation

³¹ CPM 2025/27.

³² CPM 2025/28.

³³ CPM 2025/29.

comments on the draft specification on provision of humanitarian aid (see later in this agenda item), drafted a concept note for a webinar and discussed the potential role of RPPOs in supporting the implementation of the safe provision of humanitarian aid. The delivery of the remaining tasks of the focus group were underway, including the formulation of an action plan in collaboration with partner organizations.

[103] The CPM praised the work of the focus group and showed its support to the work on an IPPC international standard on the provision of humanitarian aid.

Draft specification for ISPM on Safe provision of humanitarian aid in the phytosanitary context (2021-020)

[104] The vice-chairperson of the focus group, in her capacity as both focus group vice-chairperson and SC representative to the focus group, presented the draft specification on *Safe provision of humanitarian aid in the phytosanitary context* (2021-020), together with a covering paper from the SC.³⁴ In accordance with the decisions of CPM-18 (2024),³⁵ the focus group had addressed consultation comments on the draft specification, which had subsequently been revised by the SC.

[105] The CPM welcomed the work of the draft specification and its usefulness in mitigating risks related to humanitarian aid, and considered some proposed amendments to the draft specification and incorporated these into the decision points.³⁶

[106] Concerns among contracting parties were noted with regard to maintaining a limited scope of the specification, ensuring its focus remains on the IPPC mandate and phytosanitary risks, and noted proposals that the requirement for food aid should never be stricter than those for trade movements of such products.

[107] The CPM considered a further intervention, proposing that aid agencies, such as the United Nations World Food Programme, be invited as a full member to the expert working group. The secretariat noted that the invitation can be made; however, their participation as full members would be at the discretion of the agency itself.

[108] The CPM:

- (79) *noted* the work of the CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid to date;
- (80) *invited* the focus group to modify the gap-analysis diagram of the disaster-relief pathway as discussed at this meeting (Appendix 1 to CPM 2025/29, in English only);
- (81) *thanked* Australia, Barbados, the Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency, and the Caribbean Plant Health Directors for their direct support for the work of this focus group;
- (82) *agreed* to proceed with the development of an ISPM on the safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid; and
- (83) *approved* the draft specification on Safe provision of humanitarian aid in the phytosanitary context (2021-020), as modified at this meeting³⁷, and *added* this topic to the List of topics for IPPC standards with priority 1.

13.2 Sea containers

[109] Two members of the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers presented an update on the activities of the focus group.³⁸ Activities had included an international symposium on optimizing sea container design to minimize pest risk, continued assessment of regulatory and non-regulatory measures and industry-

³⁴ CPM 2025/30, CPM 202530_01.

³⁵ CPM-18 (2024), agenda item 13.1.

³⁶ CPM 2025/INF/21, CPM 2025/CRP 02.

³⁷ CRP 2025/CRP/11.

³⁸ CPM 2025/31.

led activities including continued input to the revision of the Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units (CTU Code) to include container cleanliness advice and best practices, and further development of the “custodial responsibility” concept. Monitoring surveys carried out in several states in 2024 were reported, and the results will be provided to the focus group and the secretariat.

[110] The CPM chairperson noted the two new co-chairs and vice-chairs of the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers and praised the important collaborative work carried out by focus group members and industry partners.

[111] The CPM:

(84) *noted* the 2024 update from the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers.

13.3 One Health

Latest developments on One Health

[112] The secretariat presented an update on activities to promote plant health in the One Health framework. Activities had included the establishment by CPM-18 (2024) of the CPM Focus Group on Plant Health in the Context of One Health,³⁹ the subsequent call for nominations, participation in the Eighth World One Health Congress (see later in this agenda item), a side session on plant health at a meeting of the FAO Committee on Agriculture, and a presentation to the Group of 77 and China.

[113] The CPM expressed strong support for the One Health approach and the recently developed focus group, recognizing the interconnectedness of plant, animal and human health.

[114] The CPM noted contracting party concerns for balanced One Health recommendations, which incorporate agricultural production sensitivities.

Report on One Health congress, antimicrobial resistance recommendation and consideration of future IPPC work on seaweed

[115] The CPM chairperson and a member of the bureau presented a report on the Eighth World One Health Congress and related matters.⁴⁰ The CPM chairperson had given a keynote opening plenary address on plant health, written by the former IPPC secretary, and a bureau member had led a dedicated plant-health session. Building on the success of IPPC participation in the congress, and recognizing the strong concerns expressed at the congress about AMR, the Chair invited the CPM to consider the merit of developing a CPM recommendation on best practices to limit the development of AMR through the use of antimicrobials in crop protection. Following comments made by a delegate in the margins of the congress, and related discussions at the 2024 meeting of the SPG, the CPM chairperson also invited CPM to consider whether the movement of pests through trade in seaweed is within the scope of the IPPC and merited future work.

[116] The CPM shared its concerns regarding the development of a specific CPM recommendation on AMR, citing focus group capacity, the lack of clarity of the role of plant health in One Health, and the recommendation’s strategic direction and potential narrow scope.

[117] Given the range of views, the CPM chairperson suggested that interested CPs participate in a Friends of the Chair meeting, which took place outside of the session. This resulted in broad discussions on the work of the IPPC under the One Health Framework, the consideration of a CPM recommendation on AMR, prioritization of tasks, and briefly touched on the issue of seaweed.

[118] The CPM:

(85) *noted* the efforts undertaken by the secretariat to promote the role of plant health within the One Health framework, recognizing the success of these efforts;

³⁹ CPM 2025/32.

⁴⁰ CPM 2025/33.

- (86) *noted* the progress made by the CPM Focus Group on Plant Health in the Context of One Health;
- (87) *requested* that the focus group prioritize tasks that will lead to delivery of task 10 in the approved terms of reference⁴¹ for the focus group, which relates to the consideration of a formal CPM recommendation;
- (88) *requested* the focus group to present to the 2025 SPG meeting their advice on the potential value and content of a CPM recommendation on AMR and *provide* an outline of its content; and
- (89) *agreed* to reinstate the position of CPM-9 (2014) on whether to work on the movement of pests through trade in seaweed could, in principle, be within the scope of the IPPC.

14. Implementation and capacity development

14.1 IPPC Plant Health Campus

[119] The secretariat introduced the IPPC Plant Health Campus – an e-learning platform being developed in collaboration with, and hosted by, the FAO elearning Academy.⁴² The new platform offers a portal to high-quality e-learning courses and IPPC guides, supporting national plant protection organization (NPPO) personnel and PCE facilitators to develop their skills.

[120] The CPM:

- (90) *noted* the activities to develop and launch the IPPC Plant Health Campus;
- (91) *acknowledged* the significant contributions of the European Union, Canada and the Republic of Korea, as well as project partners, the FAO elearning Academy and the Committee Linking Entrepreneurship-Agriculture-Development, to the development of the IPPC Plant Health Campus;
- (92) *encouraged* NPPOs to embed the IPPC Plant Health Campus into their national training programmes;
- (93) *encouraged* NPPOs, RPPOs, other international organizations and educational institutions to champion the awareness and use of the IPPC Plant Health Campus within their countries and regions;
- (94) *noted* the translation of most IPPC guides and e-learning courses to French, and requested that the IPPC secretary, in conjunction with the Financial Committee, consider the proposed provision of USD 50 000 to translate some materials to Spanish;
- (95) *encouraged* NPPOs, RPPOs and other international organizations to partner with the secretariat to translate all IPPC e-learning courses and guides to Arabic, Chinese, Spanish and Russian; and
- (96) *encouraged* NPPOs to support the continued development of the IPPC Plant Health Campus by sharing phytosanitary training materials that may be included on the platform.

14.2 Update on plant-health implementation and capacity development projects

[121] The secretariat presented an update on implementation and capacity development (ICD) projects.⁴³

[122] The CPM noted marked success by the secretariat in implementing ICD projects, utilising the project funds efficiently with quality and impactful outputs; the success by contracting parties who had implemented the phytosanitary capacity evaluations (PCE), highlighting its positive impact on their phytosanitary systems, and enhanced market access, in the attraction of funding and stakeholder collaboration.

⁴¹ CPM 2024/CRP/16.

⁴² CPM 2025/34.

⁴³ CPM 2025/35.

[123] The CPM recognized the request by some contracting parties to increase support for the implementation of PCEs in Africa.

[124] The CPM chairperson called for increased resources and encouraged countries to support more plant health implementation and capacity development related projects.

[125] The CPM:

(97) *noted* the deliverables of implementation and capacity development projects managed by the secretariat in 2024;

(98) *noted* the compliance of the implementation and capacity development projects with secretariat and IC procedures, and the increased transparency as presented in Appendix 1 to CPM 2025/35;

(99) *noted* the efforts to support countries in mobilizing resources to implement their priority activities;

(100) *noted* the efforts to develop three new implementation and capacity development projects:

- the IPPC ePhyto Africa Initiative,
- a project on strengthening phytosanitary capacities in selected Asian countries under the FAO-China South-South Cooperation Programme,
- a project to support IPPC Observatory activities; and

(101) *noted* that the theme of the IC 2025 open session (webinar) on implementation and capacity development projects would focus on the use of new and innovative technologies in plant health.

14.3 Update on phytosanitary capacity evaluation

[126] The secretariat presented an update on PCE activities.⁴⁴ This outlined recent PCEs conducted, upcoming PCEs, communication and advocacy activities, discussions about long-term sustainable funding, plans for an IT needs assessment of the PCE online system, the outcome of a desk study on the PCE process and online system, progress made in implementing the recommendations from the study, and the establishment of PCE certification boards.

[127] The CPM praised the progress on the PCE, including enhanced transparency, and highlighted its importance within the IPPC Strategic Framework in strengthening national phytosanitary systems and global plant health governance.

[128] Some contracting parties commended the completed PCE in Africa, and welcomed further tool improvement and requests for funding.

[129] The CPM noted the plans of contracting parties to conduct PCEs, and the request for PCE facilitator training across regions.

[130] The CPM:

(102) *noted* the advancements in PCE activities according to the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030;

(103) *noted* the progress made addressing the recommendations from the desk study on PCE and the planned next steps for improvement;

(104) *noted* the eight newly certified PCE facilitators and the list of facilitators previously certified; and

(105) *requested* that the IPPC secretary, in conjunction with the Financial Committee, consider the funding allocation requested by the IC of USD 50 000 from the IPPC regular-programme budget and the IPPC MDTF to maintain the PCE system.

⁴⁴ CPM 2025/36.

14.4 Update on coordination of *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. *cubense* TR4 action

[131] The secretariat presented an update on the progress made with coordination of action on Fusarium TR4.⁴⁵ In 2024, Fusarium TR4 activities focused on two courses and a simulation exercise, communication and awareness-raising activities, and presentations for knowledge sharing.

[132] The CPM praised IPPC's work on Fusarium TR4, and the fruitful collaborations held.

[133] The CPM recognized the strong need for increased financial and in-kind resources from contracting parties and the private sector, to ensure the sustainability of TR4-related activities.

[134] The CPM recognized Fusarium TR4 as a key IPPC pest issue, emphasizing the need to prioritize TR4 activities, resistant varieties, and public-private partnerships for effective management.

[135] The CPM:

(106) *noted* the update on activities for Fusarium TR4 global coordination;

(107) *noted* the pending activities towards global coordination on Fusarium TR4, as noted in Appendix 1 to CPM 2025/37;

(108) *recognized* the strategic importance of encouraging contracting parties and the private sector to contribute to financial or in-kind resources and partnerships (including public-private partnerships) to progress these remaining activities and ensure the sustainability of secretariat efforts; and

(109) *invited* the contributions of resources, as noted above.

15. Collaboration with regional plant protection organizations

15.1 Update from the Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations

[136] An RPPO representative presented a report on behalf of the chairperson of the Thirty-Sixth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPO).⁴⁶ The thirty-sixth TC-RPPO had been held in Panama City, Panama, from 1 to 4 October 2024.

[137] The CPM recognized the value of the TC-RPPO and OIRSA's guidance and emphasized the importance of regional collaboration and the promotion of synergies.

[138] Some contracting parties remarked on the varying levels of experience and competence across regions and how exchange visits help to strengthen relationships among RPPOs. The use of artificial intelligence was also proposed as a tool in providing regional support.

[139] The CPM further recognized the importance of plant health awareness raising and shared regional activities for support of the IPPC mission.

[140] The CPM chairperson reflected the importance of the issues discussed, as reflected in similar discussions at the bureau and SPG meetings.

[141] The CPM:

(110) *noted* the report from the thirty-sixth TC-RPPO.

⁴⁵ CPM 2025/37.

⁴⁶ CPM 2025/48.

16. Other emerging topics

16.1 Antimicrobial resistance

[142] The secretariat presented an update on their activities related to AMR.⁴⁷ Following the decisions of CPM-18 (2024),⁴⁸ the secretariat had extended the two surveys on antimicrobial use (AMU): one on antibiotics and the other on fungicides. The former had confirmed the results of the first survey on antibiotics, namely that the use of antibiotics in plant protection is relatively low. The survey on fungicides had confirmed the widespread use of fungicides in plant protection. The secretariat had considered the possible next steps, including closing the two surveys, launching an in-depth study on antimicrobial resistance if needed, and proposed that data on AMU and AMR be collected in future using the International FAO Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring (InFARM) platform.

[143] The CPM noted the results of the two AMU surveys, and the need for practical, field-applicable solutions that allow traceability of chemical usage.

[144] The CPM recognized the request to gather future data on AMR, in addition to the data gathered on AMU. The secretariat informed the CPM that although current data collection is limited to AMU, future data collection through the FAO InFARM platform would include both AMU and AMR data.

[145] The CPM recognized the consideration to collaborate with existing WHO tools and the platform for collecting and analyzing AMR data, ensuring adequate data on resistance is gathered. The secretariat confirmed collaboration between the One Health quadripartite and the InFARM platform.

[146] The CPM:

(111) *noted* the final results of the IPPC Observatory surveys on antibiotics and fungicides used in plant protection;

(112) *agreed* that the data collected by the IPPC Observatory surveys on antibiotics and fungicides were sufficient to understand the use of antimicrobials in plant health and that these two surveys should be closed;

(113) *agreed* to integrate data collection on antimicrobial use (AMU) and antimicrobial resistance (AMR) in plant health into the FAO InFARM platform with the IPPC official contact points as the authorized contacts in countries, and asked the secretariat to report back to the CPM any information stemming from this integration; and

(114) *thanked* all countries that had responded to the IPPC Observatory surveys on antibiotic use and fungicide use for their contributions to a better understanding of the use of antimicrobials in plant health.

16.2 Africa Phytosanitary Programme

[147] The secretariat gave an update on the APP.⁴⁹ This outlined the progress made in the pilot-phase countries, the governance arrangements established, the technical support provided, staffing arrangements, the budgetary situation (including the establishment of an APP MDTF), and communication and advocacy activities.

[148] The CPM expressed strong support for the APP but noted concerns to secure sustainable funding for the programme, to accelerate the programme across the African continent, and to expand the programme (including best practices and lessons learned) across additional more global regions.

[149] Some CPs requested clarity on ensuring data availability and accessibility within the APP and called for further support and resources (financial and in-kind contributions). The APP MDTF was highlighted

⁴⁷ CPM 2025/49.

⁴⁸ CPM-18 (2024), agenda item 16.2.

⁴⁹ CPM 2025/38.

to support the development of further resources. The sharing of available training tools to NPPOs and RPPOs was proposed.

[150] The CPM noted the contribution of USD 1 200 000 by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and recognized the in-kind support proposed by Indonesia.

[151] The CPM noted the written intervention by some CPs regarding the importance of a governance model and requested the bureau to confirm the stable approach of the APP in 2025, to be presented at CPM-20 (2026).⁵⁰

[152] The CPM:

(115) *noted* the report;

(116) *encouraged* future donations from contracting parties on the need to intensify, nurture and accelerate the APP across wider regions, as originally intended;

(117) *encouraged* beneficiary countries to take ownership and consolidate resources at the national level, including local donors; and

(118) *thanked* the former IPPC Secretary, Osama EL-LISSY for their guidance and support in initiating the APP.

18. Emerging pest situations

[153] The secretariat invited contracting parties to share concerns about emerging pest situations.⁵¹ The paper alerted CPs to 21 nominated emerging pests and urged collaborative efforts in pest prevention, preparedness and response. The secretariat highlighted the launch of new tools, including the IPPC Monthly Pest Reporting Summaries and the pest alert section within POARS, and supported the inclusion of *Clavibacter nebraskensis* in the POARS pilot program. The secretariat acknowledged and encouraged ongoing pest reporting through national reporting obligations (NROs), aiming to foster international cooperation and informed action against emerging phytosanitary threats.

[154] The European Union expressed their strong support of the POARS programme and noted their financial contribution towards the implementation of the programme.

[155] The CPM:

(119) *noted* concerns raised regarding emerging pest situations;

(120) *noted* the 21 pests nominated by NPPOs, RPPOs, and the IPPC Secretariat in response to the call for emerging pests;

(121) *encouraged* contracting parties to collaborate in prevention, preparedness, and response efforts related to emerging pests;

(122) *acknowledged* the launch of the IPPC Monthly Pest Reporting Summaries;

(123) *noted* the establishment of the new IPPC Pest Alert section under POARS in the IPP;

(124) *noted* the first pest alert issued for *Clavibacter nebraskensis* and engage in discussions on relevant emerging pest situations to inform future actions and priorities;

(125) *noted* the concern raised by the FAO Subregional Office for Eastern Africa regarding this pest;

(126) *supported* the inclusion of this pest in the POARS pilot program for further risk assessment and resource mobilization; and

(127) *thanked* Contracting Parties that have actively submitted pest reports as part of their national reporting obligations (NROs) and those which participated in the call for emerging pests.

⁵⁰ CPM 2025/CRP/04.

⁵¹ CPM 2025/CRP/08.

19. Financial report and budget

19.1 IPPC Secretariat financial report 2024

[156] The secretariat presented its financial report, detailing the resources that were available in 2024 from the FAO regular-programme budget, extra-budgetary sources and in-kind (non-financial) sources.⁵²

[157] The CPM noted funding commitments for 2025 from various contracting parties, as well as the contributions already made by contracting parties.⁵³

[158] The CPM:

(128) *noted* the financial report of the IPPC Secretariat for 2024;

(129) *adopted* the financial report for 2024 of the IPPC Multidonor Trust Fund (Special Trust Fund of the IPPC) as presented in Table 3 of CPM 2025/51;

(130) *encouraged* contracting parties to contribute to the IPPC MDTF (Special Trust Fund of the IPPC), ePhyto MDTF, APP MDTF and IPPC projects, preferably on an ongoing basis; and

(131) *thanked* contracting parties that had contributed to the secretariat's programme of work in 2024.

19.2 2025 IPPC Secretariat workplan and budget

[159] The secretariat presented the workplan and budget of the secretariat for 2025, explaining that these were aligned with the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 and covered all parts of the secretariat and all types of funding.⁵⁴

[160] Some contracting parties thanked FAO for its intention to increase funding to the IPPC ePhyto Solution through the FAO regular programme budget, and urged the secretariat and bureau to continue advocating for sufficient funding.

[161] The CPM chairperson acknowledged the bureau's advocacy role in this regard and supported these efforts.

[162] The CPM:

(132) *approved* the workplan and budget of the IPPC Secretariat for 2025.

21. External cooperation

21.1 Report from the IPPC regional workshops

[163] The secretariat presented a report on the 2024 IPPC regional workshops.⁵⁵ The seven workshops had been held between August and September 2024, either in person or in hybrid mode, with the timing arranged to coincide with the consultation period for draft standards. The secretariat thanked the support and financial contributions of host countries.

[164] The CPM:

(133) *noted* the update from the 2024 IPPC regional workshops; and

(134) *thanked* the secretariat for arranging workshops and *thanked* for participants for their active contributions.

⁵² CPM 2025/51.

⁵³ CRP 2025/CRP/13.

⁵⁴ CPM 2025/50.

⁵⁵ CPM 2025/42.