

## **EU WRITTEN STATEMENTS**

### **AGENDA ITEM 9.2 – Report from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) (CPM 2025/11)**

The European Union and its 27 Member States acknowledge the important work carried out by the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) and its Subgroups in 2024.

We would like to highlight our ongoing concern that implementation and capacity development activities remain underfunded. Sustainable funding is essential to ensure the long-term success of key IPPC initiatives.

In this regard, we support the request to allocate resources from the Multi-Donor Trust Fund to the amount of USD 50.000 per year for each of the following activities:

- NROs,
- PCE,
- POARS,
- Global Coordination of Fusarium TR4 and
- IPPC Observatory and the development of guides and training materials.

The EU and its Member States remain committed to supporting the IPPC, and we urge the CPM to take the necessary steps to secure long-term funding for these essential activities.

**AGENDA ITEM 9.3****PROPOSED CHANGES OF THE SUBMISSION FORMS AND THE CRITERIA FOR THE JUSTIFICATION AND PRIORITIZATION OF PROPOSED TOPICS (CPM 2025/13)**

Mr. Chair, the EU and its Member States thank the Task Force on Topics and the IPPC Secretariat for the revised submission forms for topics for standards and implementation. We, however, have two suggestions for amending Annex 1:

- The entry “SUBMITTED BY COUNTRY or REGIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION” should be change to „SUBMITTED BY CONTRACTING PARTY or REGIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION”, to ensure consistency within the form and
- for clarity purpose, we request that the text “*as described in article I.1*” in point 2 of the table under section 5.1 is retained.

**AGENDA ITEM 11.2 Revised procedure for the adoption of CPM recommendations  
(CPM 2025/18)**

The EU and its MS support the proposed modifications to the procedure for adopting CPM Recommendations. The EU is suggesting a minor adjustment to the sequencing of the procedure in order to better reflect its application and enhance clarity. Our proposal is to shift point 9, currently in the procedure, to before point 8 and to make slight amendments to the text in the new point 8 to improve clarity.

- 8 Contracting Parties may submit objections on draft CPM Recommendations to the IPCC Secretariat no later than three weeks before the start of the CPM session. If any CP does not support the adoption of the draft CPM Recommendation, the CP may submit a formal written objection. The scope for an objection to a draft CPM Recommendation is broader than for an objection to a draft ISPM due to the nature of the guidance contained in a CPM Recommendation. As some content of CPM Recommendations may not be technical in nature, an objection may be accompanied by either a technical justification or an alternative explanation, and suggestions for improvement of the draft CPM Recommendation which are likely to be acceptable to other CPs. and be submitted to the IPCC Secretariat no later than three weeks before the CPM session. Concerned CPs should make every effort to seek agreement before the CPM session. The objection will be added to the CPM agenda and the CPM will be asked to decide on a way forward.*
- 9 If all CPs support the adoption of the draft CPM Recommendation, the CPM should adopt it without discussion.*

**AGENDA ITEM 12.1: ePhyto Implementation Update****(CPM 2025/20)**

Mr chairman,

The EU and its 27 Member States thank the IPPC Secretariat for the update. ePhyto is a huge IPPC success story, with a potential to become even bigger if well managed. The EU has and continues to support the development, maintenance and upgrade of the ePhyto system and solution. However, the EU has 3 major remarks:

- 1) ePhytos are documents exchanged between NPPOs and should not be forwarded to third-party digital entities via the hub. This is not in line with the SPS agreement, and it was never discussed and agreed by IPPC contracting parties. NPPOs with need to forward ePhytos to third-party digital entities could do so outside of the hub.
- 2) It is unclear how the review of the SDA would affect the funding of the ePhyto solution
- 3) Finally, we urge the Bureau to establish a clear governance body for the ePhyto solution by next year (2026).

**AGENDA ITEM 12.8****Diagnostic Laboratory Networking****(CPM 2025/18)**

The EU and its 27 Member States thank the IPPC Secretariat for the update on this very important DAI. Considering the factors that have constituted the reasons why the FG has not been created one year after its ToR was adopted by CPM-18 and that it will take some more time before the FG is constituted and its work effectively commence, it seems very unlikely that the FG would complete its tasks within the tentative timeline proposed.

The EU and its Member States therefore deem it necessary that the mandate of the FG is extended to CPM-22 (2028) to give the FG sufficient time to deliver on its tasks.

**AGENDA ITEM 13.3: Report on One Health congress, AMR recommendation and consideration of future IPPC work on seaweed (CPM 2025/33)**

Mr. Chair,

The EU and its 27 Member States would like to warmly thank the IPPC Secretariat, former IPPC Secretary Osama El-Lissy and CPM Bureau members who attended the Congress for their efforts to promote the role of plant health within the One Health framework.

As indicated in our previous intervention, a strong communication towards the importance of Plant Health into One Health could only be efficient if a good understanding of all the interconnexions and interdependencies between plant health and the other health pillars is obtained

Taking into account the time limit of the Focus group mandate, the proposal to delegate to their members the development of a recommendation on AMR raises concerns on the ability of this Focus group to dedicate sufficient time to its initial approved tasks and raises concerns on whether this is a good idea to indicate in a very early stage a specific strategical direction to this Focus group.

When establishing this focus group, it seemed quite clear that the role of plant health in the one health concept is not easily visualized, even for the phytosanitary community, hindering thus the IPPC community and the IPPC Secretariat to efficiently leverage plant health. Therefore, the objective of establishing this focus group was twofold: enabling the IPPC community to understand the linkages between plant health and the other health pillars and setting up a clear communication strategy with that respect for the future.

Even though AMR seems to be one of the areas where the One Health approach would apply to Plant Health, the two IPPC observatory surveys conducted so far have been limited to antibiotic and antifungal use in plant protection. No data is yet available on antimicrobial resistance.

Although the IPPC community is encouraged to interact more with other Sister organizations with FAO in the context of One Health which we very much welcome, the EU and its Member States wonder if engaging the Focus Group to develop a recommendation for AMR is not a step further than the current knowledge and evidence available to the IPPC community at this time.

This will also imply reshuffling the workload and work content of the Focus Group which only started to work a few months ago.

As regards the inclusion of seaweeds in the scope of the IPPC, the EU and its Member States would welcome more time to analyze this point.

**AGENDA ITEM 14.3****Update on the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation  
(CPM 2025/36)**

The EU and its 27 Member States acknowledge the significant progress made in the implementation of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation, as outlined in the CPM document 2025/36. We recognize the PCE as a key mechanism under the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030, which is vital for enhancing national phytosanitary systems and strengthening global plant health governance.

We commend the completion of eleven PCEs in African Union countries under the “Strengthening Food Control and Phytosanitary Capacities and Governance” project, as well as the successful PCE processes in Nigeria and Namibia. We support ongoing efforts to integrate PCE outcomes into national frameworks to enhance plant health management and facilitate safe trade.

We also appreciate the Secretariat’s intensified communication efforts in 2024, which have improved transparency and raised awareness of the transformative impact of the PCE. The promotion of best practices through news dissemination and spotlight stories is a positive step toward broader stakeholder engagement.

Furthermore, we welcome the updates from the Desk study and the ongoing improvements to the PCE software and platform. A reliable, effective, and user-friendly system is crucial, and we express our willingness to contribute technical expertise in digitalization to enhance the tool’s functionalities, particularly in developing new modules such as the environmental module and implementation follow-up tool.

The EU acknowledges the request for a USD 50,000 allocation from the IPPC regular programme budget and the Multi-Donor Trust Fund to maintain the PCE system.

We also highlight the alignment of PCE activities with broader policy objectives, including biodiversity protection and climate-resilient agriculture.

Finally, the EU and its Member States reaffirm our commitment to supporting the PCE process and working collaboratively with the IPPC, donor agencies, and partner countries to strengthen global phytosanitary systems.

**AGENDA ITEM 16.2****THE AFRICA PHYTOSANITARY PROGRAMME (APP) PROGRESS UPDATE  
(CPM 2025/38)**

The EU and its 27 Member States thank the secretariat for the update on the APP. Special thanks go to the former secretary, Dr Osama El-Lissy for his vision for the programme.

The EU and its Member states consider the APP an important programme, to which we provide financial support.

However, several uncertainties surround the APP, with the main ones being the lack of a stable governance structure and clear financial plan going forward. This programme draws a lot from the resources of the IPPC secretariat.

We therefore request that the Bureau, together with the secretariat, identifies options for a stable governance and that a decision is made in 2025 for the APP governance body, and a clear financial plan for the programme to be presented to CPM-20