



***REPORT***

Rome, Italy  
11 June 2013

# **CPM Bureau Meeting June 2013**



**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations**

## CONTENTS

Commission on Phytosanitary Measures Bureau Meeting.....	3
1. Opening of the Meeting, Yukio Yokoi, Secretary.....	3
2. Adoption of the Agenda .....	3
3. Housekeeping.....	3
3.1 Documents list.....	3
3.1 Participants list .....	3
4. Report of the last meeting .....	3
5. Updates on CPM Work Programme.....	3
5.1 National Reporting Obligations.....	3
5.2 Standard Setting.....	4
5.3 International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP).....	5
5.4 Cooperation and Partnerships .....	5
5.5 Registration of ISPM 15 Symbol.....	7
5.6 ePhyto .....	7
5.7 IRSS 7	
5.8 Implementation consideration .....	8
5.9 Capacity Development.....	8
5.10 Recommendations .....	9
6. Operational Review.....	10
6.1 Review of Operational Plans/Budgets .....	10
6.2 Communications.....	11
6.3 Resource Mobilization.....	11
6.4 Dispute Settlement.....	12
6.5 Revision of Convention .....	13
6.6 Preparation of October Bureau/ SPG Agenda .....	13
6.7 Organization of CPM-9 .....	14
6.8 Dates of Meetings in 2013-2014.....	14
7. Update within Secretariat and FAO .....	14
8. Other Business.....	15
9. Next Bureau meeting.....	15

## LIST OF APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1 – Provisional Agenda.....	16
APPENDIX 2 - Participants List.....	19
APPENDIX 3 – Documents List.....	21
APPENDIX 4 – ToRs and RoPs for NRO Advisory Group .....	22
APPENDIX 5 – Update from Standards Setting Group.....	24
APPENDIX 6 - Capacity Development updates for the Bureau (June 2013) .....	27
APPENDIX 7 - Bureau Position Paper .....	30

## COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES BUREAU MEETING

11 June 2013

FAO, Rome, Italy

### 1. Opening of the Meeting, Yukio Yokoi, Secretary

- [1] The Bureau meeting began with opening comments from the Secretary. The Secretary was pleased to inform the Bureau that Afghanistan has become the 179th contracting party, demonstrating another great step for IPPC membership. The week following the Bureau meeting, the FAO Conference will be taking place with discussions on management issues for 2014, and other possible structural changes. Mohammad Katbeh Bader, the Near East representative, is not able to attend but the Secretariat is speaking with the Near East Representatives regarding their immediate concerns and preferences. The Rules of Procedure for CPM are currently undergoing final legal review before being submitted to the Director General for final approval.

### 2. Adoption of the Agenda

- [2] The agenda (Appendix 1) was adopted with the inclusion of a request to discuss the potential to go electronic for CPM9 under the topic of “Other Business.”

### 3. Housekeeping

- [3] Housekeeping issues were addressed and John Greifer was selected as Rapporteur.

#### 3.1 Documents list

The Bureau *reviewed* the documents list (Appendix 2).

#### 3.1 Participants list

The Bureau *reviewed* the participants list (Appendix 3).

### 4. Report of the last meeting

- [4] The Bureau Chair then reviewed the action points from the April Bureau meeting Increased focus on national reporting obligations, the creation of the ePhyto Steering group, ISPM 15 implementation developments, the Grain Standard (put off for the November Standards Committee (SC) meeting), criteria for side sessions, the questionnaire on Dispute Settlement, the possibility of receiving funding for questionnaires for translations, donor participation, and enhanced involvement of the World Customs Organization (WCO) with the IPPC were items of particular interest. Near East Bureau membership was also discussed and several efforts have been made to seek representation in upcoming key meetings.

### 5. Updates on CPM Work Programme

#### 5.1 National Reporting Obligations

##### 5.1.1 Status of National Reporting Obligations and Update of Review Process

- [5] The Secretariat presented a paper<sup>1</sup> discussing the current status of National Reporting Obligations (NRO). Aside from the lead officer, there are two temporary employees, one intern and one volunteer,

---

<sup>1</sup> Bureau 2013/Jun\_04

working on this topic. Current efforts include updating contact points and working to determine what is being reported to the WTO that is not being reported to the IPPC, and determining which contracting parties are submitting these reports.

### 5.1.2 Terms of Reference

- [6] The Bureau worked on terms of reference (TORs)<sup>2</sup> for the new Advisory Group established by CPM to support and direct future work related to members' fulfilling their information exchange responsibilities. The Secretariat emphasized the need to improve
- [7] contracting party compliance in this area. Some Bureau members emphasized the need for a future work program in this area to be member driven and to reflect members' actual and practical needs. The revised TORs will be shared with and checked by the Bureau one more time before they are finalized for SPG endorsement in October and subsequent approval by CPM-9.
- [8] The Secretariat noted that contracting parties are responsible for updating their reports. During the upcoming WTO SPS Committee meeting, the Secretariat intends to inform members that some of the information currently on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) is inaccurate, and members need to update their reports to be consistent with their reporting obligations.
- [9] Once it is established, the NRO Advisory Group will work with the Secretariat to review the IPPC NRO programme and develop a revised stepwise work plan aimed at improving members' capacity to meet their NROs under the IPPC. (For the revised Terms of Reference for the NROAG see Appendix 4).
- [10] The Bureau:
- *designated* Lucien Konan Kouame as the Bureau representative responsible for National Reporting Obligations, and
  - *requested* an update on the state of NRO at CPM9 (2014).

## 5.2 Standard Setting

### 5.2.1 Update from Standard Setting Group

- [11] The Secretariat presented an update regarding the activities of the Standard Setting Group since CPM-8 (2013), which can be found in Appendix 5. Regarding the *International movement of grain* (2008-007), which is a complex topic, the SC had insufficient time at the 2013 May meeting to arrange for the discussions requested by CPM on a redrafted specification. This will now be a major issue for the 2013 November SC and experts in strategic matters will be invited to participate in this meeting.
- [12] The Secretariat also mentioned concerns regarding lack of availability of some nominated experts and stewards to participate in the activities that they had been selected for (e.g. SC, technical panels, expert working groups), even though they had signed a statement of commitment. The issue was discussed in the 2012 October SPG and the SPG had proposed that a questionnaire be sent to National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) and relevant experts to identify their constraints. According the 2012 November SC request, the Secretariat had prepared a draft questionnaire with input from the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT), the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) and the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG). This questionnaire was presented to the 2013 May SC meeting and the SC requested the Secretariat to present a revised questionnaire to the TC-RPPOs for further discussion, prior to using it.
- [13] The Bureau:

---

<sup>2</sup> Bureau 2013/Jun\_05

- *noted* the difficulty in dealing with commodity based standards (such as the *International movement of grain*), and
- *noted* the problems related to maintaining and attracting experts to the work on standard setting.

### **5.3 International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP)**

#### **5.3.1 Update on Information Management system**

- [14] The Secretariat presented a paper<sup>3</sup> to provide an update on the Information management system. The Secretariat has increased activity and attention to social media outlets and has updated the Wikipedia IPPC page. The Secretariat hopes that the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) will receive more regular updates from contracting parties and RPPOs. The Information Exchange team noted that the transition to Drupal software should enhance the quality and responsiveness of the website, and that feedback from the Bureau is welcome and encouraged
- [15] The Bureau:
- *requested* that the Information Exchange team apply a link to the Phytosanitary Resources Page on the homepage of the IPP.

### **5.4 Cooperation and Partnerships**

- [16] The Secretariat informed the Bureau that they hosted with FAO the Inter Agency Liaison Working Group on Invasive Alien Species (IALG-IAS) on 28 February – 1 March 2013. The report from this meeting was finalized and is now posted on the CBD's website ([http://www.cbd.int/invasive /lg](http://www.cbd.int/invasive/lg)). The IALG-IAS reviewed its Terms of Reference during the meeting, and the revised Terms of reference and modus operandi are included in the 2013 February IALG-IAS meeting report as Appendix 3. Participants in the IALG-IAS meeting had agreed that the mandate and purpose of the IALG-IAS should be broadened, allowing all organizations in the group to share roles and responsibilities in the issues of IAS. The IALG-IAS emphasized the importance of working together and taking advantage of synergies to avoid unnecessary duplications.

#### **5.4.1 Update**

- [17] In noting that FAO's general guidance to the IPPC has been to go and look for partnerships, the IPPC Secretariat emphasized the importance of clarifying its relationships and, specifically, to determine whether a relationship is categorized as a liaison relationship, a cooperative relationship, or a partnership. The Secretariat provided a paper<sup>4</sup> with a comprehensive review of its relationships.
- [18] The Secretariat noted the value in developing a procedure for creating new relationships and is currently referencing the FAO strategic framework for the establishment of partnerships. For FAO, there are 3 potential legal documents/procedures for establishing liaisons/ cooperative activities/partnerships:
- (1) memoranda
  - (2) partnership agreements
  - (3) exchange of letters
- [19] It was recognized that managing relationships can be time and resource consuming. Hence, there is a need to define, prioritize, and structure the various relationships that CPM wishes to pursue with other relevant international organizations. SPG will be requested to discuss the question of which international organizations are of the greatest strategic interest to CPM.

- [20] The Bureau:

---

<sup>3</sup> Bureau 2013/Jun\_06

<sup>4</sup> Bureau 2013/Jun\_07

- *requested* the Secretariat to prepare a draft policy on partnerships which defines the criteria, different levels of commitments, benefits, and mechanisms for different types of collaborative relationships.
- *requested* that the Secretariat make a draft revised table to present at the next Bureau meeting defining terms of all IPPC relationship/partnership agreements. This chart should clearly define which relationships require an MoU to formalize an agreement, when an MOU is not needed, and when the Secretariat utilizes other mechanisms to establish the type of agreement,
- *advised* the Secretariat to present the document to the SPG, and show the SPG the process for establishing partnerships, cooperative relationships or liaisons,
- *noted* the SPG primary role would be to advise on the highest priority organizations for collaborative purposes from a strategic standpoint.
- *noted* that as partnerships fully share risks, resources, and responsibilities, the Secretariat should continue to utilize the three FAO legal characterizations, and
- *requested* that the IPPC Coordinator organize a meeting with IAEA to explore the potentials of that relationship.

#### **5.4.2 Roles and Functions of RPPOs within their relationship in the Commission**

[21] The Secretariat presented a paper<sup>5</sup> to discuss the clarification of the roles of the RPPOs in the IPPC framework. The paper aims to clarify when RPPOs are considered observers and when are they granted the right to represent a region. It is also necessary to clarify the role of the RPPOs at CPM, outside of CPM, during the TC, in meetings of IPPC bodies, in other technical meetings, and other strategic meetings. There was also a lengthy discussion on the status of RPPOs with the Convention as it was pointed out that there are a couple of inactive or non-participatory RPPOs. Two criteria for the withdrawal of recognition under the convention were proposed: if the organization no longer exists as an RPPO or if it has been inactive for an extended period in CPM and all related IPPC activities. A request for clarification will be sent and if there is no response within 60 days, their recognition will be considered automatically withdrawn.

[22] The Bureau:

- *encouraged* RPPOs to work together collectively to raise the level of participation in IPPC activity
- *supported* the contention that the principle source of communication should be with the RPPOs, but in specific circumstances where resources are in question, the communication can occur through the RECs.
- *noted* that regional standards do not have the same status as ISPMs.
- *requested* the Secretariat to write a withdrawal of recognition clause into the Manual, Part 8, Partners
- *requested* the Secretary to write to the Andean community saying that he is concerned with their lack of participation in CPM activities and as a result, they are at risk of losing their status as an IPPC recognized RPPO.
- *noted* that there are discussions ongoing about CAHFSA and the potential for it to become a new RPPO, and
- *requested* the Secretary to send a letter to all RPPO representatives noting that there will be two criteria for the withdrawal of recognition under the convention: if the organization no longer exists as an RPPO or if it has been inactive for an extended period. The draft will be reviewed during the October Bureau meeting before going to CPM-9.

---

<sup>5</sup> Bureau 2013/Jun\_08

## 5.5 Registration of ISPM 15 Symbol

### 5.5.1 Update of CPM-8 (2013) follow up activities

#### 5.5.2 ISPM 15 Financial implication over five years

[23] The legal office provided an update on the ISPM 15 Symbol registration. A letter is in the process of being drafted for the purpose of communicating to senior levels of contracting parties the urgency and importance of both initial ISPM 15 symbol registration and renewal. Also, the Legal Office reported that first time registration is needed for 74 countries. Renewals are needed for the other 103 countries (177 total, EC not included). The FAO legal office is moving forward with countries to complete these registration procedures with resources set aside from the IPPC budget as agreed at CPM-8. FAO Legal is working to register countries currently registered with Madrid system as well as non-members such as Hong Kong. Non-member countries will also be registered with the understanding that costs incurred by the IPPC Secretariat must be reimbursed. Efforts will also be taken to encourage countries to reimburse FAO/IPPC for these costs. Longer term funding options will be explored by the SPG.

[24] The Bureau:

- *proposed* that all countries interested in initial registration receive a brief notification that the process has commenced and they will receive an invoice for services rendered.

## 5.6 ePhyto

### 5.6.1 Update on ePhyto Activities

[25] The e-Phyto Hub Feasibility Study has been proposed and accepted. An initial teleconference will be taking place on Monday, June 17 for the ePhyto steering group to organize the initial work and plan a face-to-face meeting. Bryant Christie Inc. has been chosen for the e-Phyto Feasibility Study as they are neutral and possess a wide knowledge and interest in international trade and phytosanitary certification. Steering committee nominations include representation from all regions except the Near East.

[26] The Bureau:

- *requested* that the steering committee discuss the possibility of arranging more workshops for the ePhyto Hub, and
- *requested* that the Secretariat continue to keep the Bureau informed of the status of this issue.

## 5.7 IRSS

### 5.7.1 Study of indicators measuring implementation

[27] The IRSS officer presented a paper anticipating the next phase of the IRSS project, IRSS 2.0. The paper recommends that if a strong focus group can be utilized, implementation can be approached in a more holistic manner to identify any additional elements needed and enhancing resources for IRSS 2.0. The Bureau felt that the proposed approach is reasonable, and there is a need to think about what exactly falls under the IRSS. The Bureau believes that analysis of emerging issues can come under the IRSS program. The PCE element of this study occurs at an operational level, demonstrating the success or failure of implementation and the impact that implementation has made. The IRSS officer proposed a focus group of experts to review current IRSS procedures. The Bureau was asked to provide comments by 15 July 2013.

[28] The Bureau:

- *requested* the Secretariat to produce a paper defining all the issues with Implementation and IRSS for comment by 15 July, with a final copy prepared for presentation to the SPG in October.

## 5.8 Implementation consideration

### 5.8.1 Implementation

- [29] Several discussion papers (CPM 2013/INF/13 and two other papers prepared by New Zealand) were presented, exploring the implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs, emphasizing the importance of establishing a common vision, guiding principles, the process of establishing an implementation programme, the elements of such an implementation programme, the elements of a work area, the implications for already existing bodies, and other related considerations. The Bureau also reviewed a new IRSS proposal for developing indicators which would support an implementation program by demonstrating that IPPC obligations or objectives have been achieved or fulfilled.
- [30] As many of the ISPMs are conceptual and implemented in different countries with different systems, measuring the success of implementation under one list of criteria is challenging. There needs to be an agreement on terminology and a strong effort to measure implementation under common issues that apply to all geographic regions. It is also in the IPPC's interest to provide a baseline of the status of a pest before implementing a standard so the world can see that the IPPC standards are actually improving phytosanitary conditions and increasing the opportunities for safe trade among its contracting parties. Essentially, there are two parts to the initiative, how good has implementation been and has it made a difference.

### 5.8.2 Recommendations

- [31] A key focus of the discussion regarded taking a different perspective and approach to working on the topic of implementation; a holistic and integrated approach. This approach would include elements and support from all primary sections of the IPPC Secretariat: standard setting, capacity development, dispute settlement, and national reporting obligations. It was emphasized that the standard setting, capacity development, and NRO elements of the IPPC will operate as distinct programs, but will seek on an ongoing basis to work in a complimentary and collaborative fashion to ensure all CPM and Secretariat outputs, services, and products reflect the best expertise and resources available from and through the various sections of the Secretariat staff. It was believed that this paper is very important and a specific presentation would be helpful for the SPG.
- [32] The Secretariat also informed the Bureau that the 2013 May SC had requested a small group to develop a draft paper on the future development of a framework for standards. The Secretariat was now trying to organize in September 2013 a task force to develop an IPPC framework for standards (according CPM-7 (2012) Decision 15 on improving the standard setting process – Appendix 4 of CPM-7 (2012 report) as some funding had been secured. This work may help to discuss the strategic issues mentioned above and could be presented to the next SPG.
- [33] The Bureau:
- *requested* a redraft of the New Zealand paper by the Bureau member representing the South West Pacific region for presentation to the SPG in October, 2013 with a clear model for this proposed implementation program.

## 5.9 Capacity Development

### 5.9.1 CDC Update

- [34] See report from Appendix 6 providing the updates from the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) and the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the CDC in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia 27-31 May 2013. Some of the highlights and decisions follow:
- [35] The CDC discussed the approach for selecting participants for future PCE facilitation training and training-of-trainer activities under specific projects. The selection process for the forthcoming training for PCE facilitators under project STDF 402 will include an interview, questionnaire, and psychological evaluation. The Bureau expressed some surprise at this but was assured it was necessary.



- [36] A representative from the STDF Secretariat attended the May 2013 CDC meeting as an observer. During the discussions, he expressed interest in having the STDF fund a project on the implementation of ePhyto and indicated that development and pilot-testing of a toolkit related to e-certification is considered an innovative approach to facilitate safe trade in agricultural commodities.
- [37] The CDC has been asked to present a list of potential candidates to perform the evaluation of the CDC work plan and progress. The results from this evaluation will be presented at CPM-10 for review.
- [38] The CDC plans to meet twice in 2013, at least once outside Italy. The second meeting for 2013 is being proposed for Bari, Italy on 25-29 November 2013; this will include a field visit to a facility for dielectric heating treatment.

### 5.9.2 Selection of CDC alternate members

- [39] The Bureau was presented with information on a candidate for alternate to the CDC for the Europe region.
- [40] The Secretariat presented the Regional IPPC Workshop Draft Agenda. All workshops organizers have been asked to consider several points listed by the Secretariat as possible topics to be covered during the workshops. They need to discuss with the Secretariat which points pertain to their regional needs.
- [41] The Bureau:
- *selected* Ms. Karin Nordin as an alternate to the CDC for the Europe region, and continues to wait for nominations for alternate members from Africa, the Near East, and North America,
  - *agreed* to extend the existence of the CDC for one more year, asserting that the CDC will now report results from extended activities to CPM-10, spring 2015.
  - *requested* the Secretariat to provide several names of candidates and the terms of reference for the CDC evaluation.

### 5.10 Recommendations

- [42] The IRSS presented an update related to the issue of IRSS recommendations. As of the Bureau meeting, the Secretariat had only received comments from China, USA, and Canada regarding aquatic plants, although the comments from the EU had gone through a different route and not been taken into account. This highlights the issue that the process for providing comments is not being utilized to its fullest potential. In response to a question concerning the use of the Online Comment System for providing comments on IRSS recommendations, the Secretariat considered that option, but was concerned that the recommendations could have been confused with a proposed standard.
- [43] The process for receiving and processing recommendations was discussed and revised.
- [44] Going forward, recommendations will be issued with the rest of the papers prepared for CPM. The proposed process is for review by contracting parties to begin in June, with the closing of the period for comments being the beginning of September. The SPG will clear the recommendations at the October meeting. In addition, whoever proposes a recommendation will be required to prepare the draft.
- [45] The Bureau:
- *requested* that the revised recommendation process timeline occur as follows:
    - 1 June opening for contracting parties to comment on recommendations,
    - 1 September closing date for comments to the Secretariat,
    - Secretariat draft prepared for SPG review,
    - final draft completed by the end of December
    - submitted to the subsequent CPM for consideration.

### **5.10.1 Aquatic Plants and internet trade**

- [46] There were no substantive conflicts or issues presented by the comments received. Regarding comments on the need for a definition for the term *aquatic plants*, the Bureau agreed that IPPC covers aquatic plants, and noted that the TPG under the direction of the SC is the body to work on any possible definition. If IPPC members wish to have this term defined, they could make a submission in response to the biennial call for topics for IPPC standards. Any proposal for a new term and definition in ISPM 5: *Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms* (1994-001) should then follow the standard setting procedures.
- [47] The Bureau was also informed that, following the SC's request, the TPG had considered a revision of the scope of ISPM 5 to state that "Within the context of the IPPC and its ISPMs, all references to plants should be understood to extend to algae and fungi, consistent with the International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants". This modification is part of the Draft amendments to ISPM 5: *Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms* (1994-001) approved for member consultation by the 2013 May SC.
- [48] The Secretariat will revise the recommendations for Bureau review with final comments due back to him by July 31. These will then be prepared for SPG review.
- [49] The Bureau:
- *agreed* that the IPPC covers aquatic plants
  - *noted* that the SPG will provide a final review and check of the recommendations before being submitted to CPM for adoption.

## **6. Operational Review**

### **6.1 Review of Operational Plans/Budgets**

#### **6.1.1 Rules of Procedure for IPPC Trust Fund**

- [50] The IPPC Secretariat presented a report on the financial situation for the current year. At the time of this Bureau meeting, Secretariat funds are in surplus, and they are projected to end the year with a small surplus. The Secretariat noted that it had a high degree of confidence in these projections as the greatest expenses for the Secretariat occur within the first four months of the year.
- [51] The Bureau:
- *requested* the Secretariat to prepare a short paper editing the current financial guidelines and scope for the CPM Rules of Procedure,
  - *requested* the Secretariat to maintain a table of the budget that will be monitored quarterly.
  - *requested* the Secretariat to produce guidelines for the multi-donor trust fund that will be edited and circulated to the Bureau.

#### **6.1.2 Report of Finance Committee Meeting**

- [52] The Chair of the Finance Committee provided a report of the June Finance Committee meeting to the Bureau. There was a consensus that the current financial reporting format is acceptable, although it will be improved with a chart showing a financial comparison over time: the previous year's results, the current year and the future projection. In addition, future efforts in the area of IPPC finances will include a wish list for funding proposals and a list of potential donors.
- [53] The Bureau:
- *noted* the report of the Finance Committee, and

- *recommended* a process for better recognition of donor contributions, potentially through a news item on the IPPC website.

### **6.1.3 Follow up actions from CPM-8**

[54] The Secretariat reviewed key decisions emanating from CPM8 (2013). There was some concern expressed regarding the role of RPPOs in IPPC-related activities, specifically in the SPG, although it was noted that members of RPPOs could participate if they were deemed to be representing contracting parties. Some of the highlights included the adoption of the new 7-4-7 rule for Bureau chairmanship, new rules of procedure for the CPM and SPG, the decision to move forward with an ISPM for sea containers, and the inclusion of the regional IPPC workshops. The Bureau also discussed whether or not people are reading the Bureau updates and if they appreciate receiving them. It was reported that during capacity development activities participants have reported that they are useful.

[55] The Bureau:

- *encouraged* the use of social media involvement for awareness raising purposes in each of the regions,
- *proposed* that a list of action points be delivered to all contracting parties at the end of each CPM so that deadlines are respected and strong focus,
- *requested* that a list of key items be circulated to all contracting parties before the upcoming CPM, to encourage preparation and focus at CPM, and,
- *proposed* that the rules of procedure for the SPG be reviewed

## **6.2 Communications**

### **6.2.1 Update**

[56] The Secretariat reported that it has made steps to finalize the communications work plan, following the approval of the new communications strategy at CPM-8. As a part of this effort, the Secretariat is working actively with USDA APHIS, which has provided solid support, to develop a communications needs assessment. A professional firm contracted by USDA APHIS will conduct the needs assessment and determine which materials should be distributed to which audiences in developing and developed regions. A small, virtual support group will also be established once the IPPC has its work plan established, and this group will work to improve global awareness. The IPPC plans to have a dedicated staff resource under contract in very near future and will continue to work with the FAO communications unit to promote the IPPC.

[57] The Bureau:

- *noted* the update on IPPC Secretariat communications efforts
- *requested* the Secretariat to continue its active efforts with APHIS and looked forward to receiving the results of the IPPC communications needs assessment and the names of the members of the support group.

## **6.3 Resource Mobilization**

### **6.3.1 Update**

[58] The Secretariat provided an update on the implementation of the IPPC resource mobilization strategy. As a part of this effort, the Secretariat asked Bureau members to provide a list of brief examples of successes and failures of phytosanitary actions from their respective regions to aid in the creation of a brochure. This brochure will be used to encourage non-traditional donors to increase their involvement with the IPPC as they will be able to see best practices and areas in need of funding for improvement. An additional significant issue discussed by the Bureau regarded the possibility of partnering with a donor for the development of a specific standard.

- [59] The Secretariat has been requested to develop a parallel resource mobilization plan that will coincide directly with the standards to show the impacts of standard implementation. The Secretariat was requested to provide a chart which can define donors and their geographical region to demonstrate where there is the greatest need. From here, contact with the representative will occur to establish resources. The Secretariat plans to present a draft implementation plan for Resource Mobilization, complete with an action plan for 2013 and a request for the creation of a webpage that can be updated when contributions to the IPPC are received.
- [60] The IPPC reiterated that it is receiving adequate funding but is having extreme difficulty in hiring staff due to FAO regulations and the current employment freeze. To sustain the Secretariat, the IPPC requires a long term succession plan to begin.
- [61] This contribution table is posted and will be updated for 2012, 2013. It will continue to be updated and posted regularly with report from each contact point.
- [62] The Bureau discussed possible topics for IPPC standards to be used as a flagship for Resource Mobilization (such as *Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood* (2008-008), and the *Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood* (2006-029)) and agreed that the chair of the Financial Committee would also consult with the SC on this issue.
- [63] The Bureau:
- *recommended* that the Secretary and Coordinator begin considering a process of resource mobilization focusing on ensuring sufficient staffing resources to support any new or existing projects to be funded,
  - *requested* the circulation of the preliminary Financial Report for 2013 and 2014 budget for review before presentation at the SPG,
  - *requested* each Bureau member to compose the list of successes and failures of phytosanitary actions in their region by mid-July to be included in the donors brochure, and
  - *requested* that letters of appreciation be sent from the Secretariat to donors once the money is received.
  - *noted* that there could be potential conflict between IPPC matters and FAO oversight, and that this could be resolved through continued dialogue within FAO about the complex responsibilities of the IPPC that can be fulfilled with adequate staff resources.
  - *agreed* that the chair of the Financial Committee would consult with the SC to decide on possible topics for IPPC standards to be used as a flagship for Resource Mobilization

## 6.4 Dispute Settlement

### 6.4.1 Updates

- [64] The Information Exchange officer provided the Bureau with an update on the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement. The Secretariat is currently waiting for responses to the
- [65] survey on SBDS which is due at the end of June. Following the closure of the response period, the SBDS will conduct a virtual meeting in July to discuss the Survey results. The Bureau was asked to remind their respective regions that the IPPC Dispute Settlement process a lower cost option for resolving disputes on trade.
- [66] The Bureau:
- *noted* the request to remind their respective regions to complete the survey distributed by the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement.

## 6.5 Revision of Convention

[67] The Secretariat tabled a paper outlining a process for analyzing the merits and steps for launching a revision of the Convention. It was noted that this consideration has mainly arisen in the context of past discussions (and frustrations) related to establishing a long term sustainable funding base for the IPPC. The Bureau cautious about the concept because of the complexity and enormity involved in re-opening and re-negotiating a treaty. The Bureau asked the Secretariat to refocus on specific problems that need to be addressed rather than begin with a “revision” as an answer to some non-specified shortcoming in the current text.

[68] Also, the mechanism for revision and ratification at the national level and duration of the process must be considered in detail. FAO Legal was requested to provide a flow chart on the revision processes, outlining the risks and benefits of a revised convention. The Bureau considered that it may be possible that specific amendments could be negotiated; depending on the strategic rationale and need and CPM views, without re-opening the entire Convention. This idea of revising the Convention will be discussed further with the SPG for more in-depth strategic consideration. The Bureau also considered that if any amendment included a financial instrument such as assessed contributions, there could be considerable difficulties getting in-country agreement.

[69] The Bureau:

- *requested* that issues regarding the Revision of the Convention be brought to SPG with an initial assessment. This would be a comprehensive review of our current issues and mechanisms by which such issues can be resolved.
- *requested* that the SPG assess the strategic need to explore a new Convention or amendments, and
- *requested* the Secretary to develop a discussion document for the SPG.

## 6.6 Preparation of October Bureau/ SPG Agenda

[70] The Bureau discussed the upcoming SPG meeting and recommended items for the agenda. The Bureau also decided on the chair for the meeting. The proposed agenda items for the upcoming meetings are listed below with a priority of 1 to 3, 1 being the highest:

- (1) Implementation Priority 1
- (2) University courses for Phytosanitary Measures Priority 2
- (3) Addressing current issues with the convention - Priority 1
- (4) NRO update – Priority 3
- (5) ePhyto update – Priority 3
- (6) ISPM 15 Update – Priority 3
- (7) Communications Needs Assessment update– Priority 3
- (8) Strategic Framework for Standards - Priority 1
- (9) IRSS update – Priority 3
- (10) Engaging experts in standard setting- Priority 1
- (11) Recommendations-2 - Priority 1
- (12) Process for adopting Recommendations - Priority 2
- (13) Guidelines for the trust fund - Priority 2
- (14) Article 14 Body Implications – Priority 3
- (15) IRSS pest Categorization / listing– Priority 3

[71] The Bureau:

- *confirmed* that the Chair for the October 2013 SPG will be the vice-chair of CPM, Francisco Gutierrez, the Latin American region representative.

## 6.7 Organization of CPM-9

[72] The Bureau discussed the organization of CPM-9, focusing specifically on the ability to provide opportunities for the greatest amount of technical education and interaction with a minimum of time demand. There is a continuing concern on the part of the Bureau that the number and extent of activities taking place during CPM week is too extreme and diminishes the quality of the CPM experience. The Bureau noted concerns expressed about the number of “Friends of the Chair” meetings and that these were not seen as democratic given the lack of interpretation. Bureau members were requested to consider potential ministerial candidates for the opening of the next session.

[73] The Bureau:

- *agreed* to eliminate evening sessions and removed the extra session reserved for Friday evening,
- *agreed* to have 8 interpreted sessions at CPM-9, starting on Monday afternoon, and continuing Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday afternoon and capacity development training sessions will take place on Monday and Friday morning.
- *agreed* that the science session for CPM9 would cover new developments in PRA; new inspection technologies; and, experiences in ePhyto.
- *agreed* that the FAO process for side sessions will continue to be followed (no direct industry activity), and this year the Bureau will be more engaged in the process of determining side sessions. First priority will be given to side sessions related to the development of capacities of members as this is an opportune time to communicate and train contracting parties,
- *requested* that an updated list of each member of subsidiary bodies with their status and place in their term be circulated throughout the Bureau
- *requested* that Bureau members from regions with a larger number of developing countries research the possibility of having a rapporteur from developing countries in CPM-9, *suggested* that the Secretariat investigate the potential of having a rapporteur with experience as well as a rapporteur in training, and
- *agreed* that the incoming chair should give a brief presentation to the CPM on the final day of CPM to indicate what they would like CPM to achieve and to emphasize that their role begins on the last day of the CPM.

## 6.8 Dates of Meetings in 2013-2014

[74] The Secretariat reviewed upcoming meeting dates, noting that those dates have been posted on the IPP.

[75] The Bureau:

- *requested* that the list of meetings be circulated with the most significant meetings highlighted.

## 7. Update within Secretariat and FAO

[76] The Secretariat noted significant concerns with being forced to get involved in issues for which it is not directly involved under the new strategic objective framework. The Secretariat seeks to emphasize that the IPPC work programme is owned by contracting parties and that funds must be protected for future programmes. In addition, the Secretariat lamented the lack of a suitable human resources programme within FAO and that the sustainability of the Secretariat staff is in jeopardy for the long term without a proper plan in place for staffing continuity.

[77] The Bureau:

- *acknowledged* the need for staff retention and succession planning and *requested* the Secretariat to begin succession planning activity and to engage FAO management in these discussions.

## 8. Other Business

[78] The Secretariat requested guidance on how the TPPT could review treatment guidelines or other material related to providing guidance on PTs prior to the final approval by the CDC as well as guidance on CDC's involvement in the development of standards.

[79] The Bureau:

- *provided* their suggestions on how the IPPC Secretariat should move forward on this issue in a Position Paper which can be found in Appendix 7.
- *noted* that CDC members are all representatives of contracting parties and so have the opportunity to participate in the standard setting process through their NPPOs.

## 9. Next Bureau meeting

[80] The next meeting of the CPM Bureau will take place in an evening dinner on Monday, October 7 and continue on the morning of Tuesday, October 8.

**APPENDIX 1 – Provisional Agenda****Bureau Meeting****June 2013****FAO, Rome, Italy****(Tuesday 0830)****PROVISIONAL AGENDA**

<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Document No</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
1. Opening of the meeting	--	YOKOI
2. Adoption of the agenda	Bureau_2013_June_01	ASHBY
3. Housekeeping		
Documents list Participants list Local information	Bureau_2013_June_02 Bureau_2013_June_03	FEDCHOCK
4. Report of last meeting	<a href="#">..\2013-04 meeting\Report\Report_Bureau_2013April_Templated_Final_16_05_2013.docx</a>	ASHBY
5. Updates on CPM Work Programme		
5.1 National Reporting Obligations		
5.1.1 Status of National Reporting Obligations and Update of Review Process	Bureau_2013_June_04	Nowell
5.1.2 Terms of Reference	Bureau_2013_June_05	
5.2 Standard Setting		
5.2.1 Update from Standard Setting Group	Oral Report	GERMAIN
5.3 International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP)		
5.3.1 Update on information management system	Bureau_2013_June_06	FEDCHOCK
5.4 Cooperation and Partnerships		
5.4.1 Update	Bureau_2013_June_07	FEDCHOCK/PERALTA
5.4.2 Roles and status of RPPOs	Bureau_2013_June_08	PERALTA
5.5 ISPM15 mark registration		



Agenda item	Document No	Presenter
5.5.1 Update of CPM-8 (2013) follow up activities	Bureau_2013_June_09	YOKOI
5.5.2 ISPM 15 Financial implication over five years	IPPC-FC_2013_June_13	YOKOI
5.6 ePhyto		
5.6.1 Update on ePhyto activities	Bureau_2013_June_10	FEDCHOCK
5.7 IRSS		
5.7.1 Study of indicators on measuring implementation	Bureau_2013_June_11	SOSA
5.8 Implementation consideration		
5.8.1 Implementation (CPM-8 (2013) follow up, including of possible broader roles of IRSS 2.2) and links to the framework for standards	Bureau_2013_June_12	THOMSON/SOSA / GERMAIN
5.8.2 Recommendations	Bureau_2013_June_13	SOSA
5.9 Capacity Development		
5.9.1 CDC Update	Oral Report	PERALTA
5.9.2 Selection of CDC alternate members		PERALTA
5.10 Recommendations		
5.10.1 Aquatic plants and internet trade	Bureau_2013_June_14	SOSA
6.1 Review of Operational Plans / Budgets		FEDCHOCK
6.1.1 Rules of Procedure for IPPC Trust Fund (specifically - the approval of the budget)	Bureau_2013_June_15	ASHBY
6.1.2 Report of Finance Committee meeting	Oral Report	YIM
6.1.3 Follow up actions from CPM-8 (2013)	Bureau_2013_June_16	FEDCHOCK
6.2 Communication		
6.2.1 Update	Bureau_2013_June_17	FEDCHOCK
6.3 Resource Mobilization	Bureau_2013_June_18	FEDCHOCK
6.3.1 Update		
6.4 Dispute settlement		
6.4.1 Updates	Oral report	NOWELL
6.5 Revision of Convention	Bureau_2013_June_19	YOKOI
6.6 Preparation of October Bureau/ SPG Agenda <i>Agree Bureau Agenda</i> <i>Agree SPG Agenda</i> Review of report of 13th SPG Outstanding action items Chair for next SPG Deadlines		ASHBY

Agenda item	Document No	Presenter
6.7 Organization of CPM-9 (2014) Possible draft ISPMS Number of interpretation sessions Length / Schedule Ministerial participation Scientific topics Side events and evening sessions (decision process, criteria, zero evening sessions) Procedure for CPM Recommendations Report and ISPMS as links Nominations to subsidiary bodies Rapporteur from developing countries Arrangement of Chair hand-over	Discussion	ASHBY
6.8 Dates of meetings for 2013-2014		FEDCHOCK
7. Update within Secretariat and FAO		
<i>FAO reform and the CPM work programme (including review of Article XIV bodies)</i>  Staffing	Bureau_2013_June_20	YOKOI
	Bureau_2013_June_21	FEDCHOCK
8. Other business		
SC, TP and CDC requests		FEDCHOCK
9. Next meeting		ASHBY

**APPENDIX 2 - Participants List****Commission on Phytosanitary Measures****Bureau Meeting****Participants List****11 June 2012****(FAO CANADA Room)***A (√) indicates attendance at the meeting***CPM-8 (2013) Bureau members**

Member of the Bureau / Chair	<b>Mr Steve ASHBY</b> Food and Environment Research Agency, DEFRA Plant Health Policy Programme Sand Hutton - York UK YO41 1LZ Tel: (+44) 0 1904 465633	<a href="mailto:steve.ashby@Fera.gsi.gov.uk">steve.ashby@Fera.gsi.gov.uk</a>	3 <sup>rd</sup> term / 2 years	2014	Europe/ United Kingdom
Member of the Bureau	<b>Mr. Mohammad KATBEH BADER</b> Director of Phytosanitary Department Ministry of Agriculture P.O. Box 11732 662, Amman JORDAN Tel: (+962) 6 568 6151/795 895 691 Fax: (+962) 6 568 6310	<a href="mailto:katbehbader@moa.gov.jo">katbehbader@moa.gov.jo</a>	3 <sup>rd</sup> term / 2 years	2014	Near East/ Jordan
Member of the Bureau	<b>Ms. Kyu-Ock YIM</b> Export Management Division Department of Plant Quarantine Animal, Plant and Fisheries Quarantine and Inspection Agency MIFFAF 433-1 Anyang- 6 dong Manan-gu, Anyang City (430-016) Gyunggi-do Tel: (+82) 31 420-7665 Fax: (+82) 31 420-7605	<a href="mailto:kovim@korea.kr">kovim@korea.kr</a>	2 <sup>st</sup> term / 2 years	2014	Asia/ Republic of Korea
Member of the Bureau	<b>Mr Peter THOMSON</b> Director - Plants, Food & Environment, Ministry for Primary Industries 25 The Terrace, Pastoral House PO Box 2526, Wellington Tel: (+64) 4 894 0353 Mbl: (+64) 29 894 0353	<a href="mailto:peter.thomson@mpi.govt.nz">peter.thomson@mpi.govt.nz</a>			South West Pacific / New Zealand

Member of the Bureau	<b>Mr. John GREIFER</b> Assistant Deputy Administrator Plant Protection and Quarentine Animal Plant Health Inspection Service U.S. Department of Agriculture RM 1128 South Building, USDA 1400 Independence Ave. Washington DC 20250 Tel.: (+1) 202 799-7159 Fax: (+1) 202 690-0472	<a href="mailto:john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov">john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov</a>	2 <sup>st</sup> term / 2 years	2014	North America/ USA
Member of the Bureau	<b>M Lucien Konan KOUAME'</b> Direction de la Protection des Végétaux, du Controle et de la Qualité Point de contact de la CIPV - Ministère de l'agriculture B.P. V. 94 , Abidjan Tel: (+225) 07903754 Fax: (+225) 20 212032	<a href="mailto:lucien.kouame@aviso.ci">lucien.kouame@aviso.ci</a>	1 <sup>st</sup> term / 2 years	2014	Africa/ Côte d'Ivoire
Member of the Bureau	<b>Mr. Francisco GUTIERREZ</b> Director of Plant Health Plant Health Department Belize Agricultural Health Authority Central Farm, Cayo District Tel: (+501) 824-4899 Mbl: (+501) 604-0319 Fax: (+501) 824-3773	<a href="mailto:frankpest@yahoo.com">frankpest@yahoo.com</a>	3 <sup>nd</sup> term / 2 years	2014	Latin America and Caribbean/ Belize

**IPPC Secretariat**

IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr. Yukio YOKOI</b> Secretary to the IPPC  <b>Mr. Craig FEDCHOCK</b> Coordinator  <b>Mr. David NOWELL</b> Information Exchange  <b>Ms. Celine Germain</b> Standards Setting  <b>Ms. Ana PERALTA</b> Implementation Officer  <b>Mr Orlando SOSA</b> IRSS  <b>Ms Francesca FITZGERALD</b> Note-taker	<a href="mailto:yukoi.yokoi@fao.org">yukoi.yokoi@fao.org</a>  <a href="mailto:craig.fedchock@fao.org">craig.fedchock@fao.org</a>  <a href="mailto:dave.nowell@fao.org">dave.nowell@fao.org</a>  <a href="mailto:celine.germain@fao.org">celine.germain@fao.org</a>  <a href="mailto:Ana.Peralta@fao.org">Ana.Peralta@fao.org</a>  <a href="mailto:orlando.sosa@fao.org">orlando.sosa@fao.org</a>  <a href="mailto:Francesca.CrozierFitzgerald@fao.org">Francesca.CrozierFitzgerald@fao.org</a>			
---------------------	--	--	--	--	--

**APPENDIX 3 – Documents List****Commission on Phytosanitary Measures:****Bureau meeting****Documents list***(Updated: 6 June 2013)*

<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>AGENDA NO.</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>POSTED</b>
Bureau 2013/Jun_01	1	Provisional Agenda	2013-06-06
Bureau 2013/Jun_02	2	Documents list	2013-06-06
Bureau 2013/Jun_03	3	Participants list	2013-06-06
Bureau 2013/Jun_04	5.1.1	Status of National Reporting Obligations and Update of Review Process	2013-06-06
Bureau 2013/Jun_05	5.1.2	Terms of Reference	2013-06-06
Oral Report	5.2.1	Update from Standard Setting Group	
Bureau 2013/Jun_06	5.3.1	Update on information management system	2013-06-06
TBD	5.4.1	Update on Cooperation and Partnerships	2013-06-06
TBD	5.4.2	Roles and status of RPPOs	2013-06-06
Bureau 2013/Jun_09	5.5.1	Update of CPM-8 (2013) follow up activities	2013-06-06
IPPC-FC_2013_June_13	5.5.2	ISPM15 Financial implication over five years	2013-06-06
Bureau 2013/Jun_10	5.6.1	Update on ePhyto activities	2013-06-06
Oral Report	5.7.1	Study of indicators on measuring implementation	2013-06-06
Bureau 2013/Jun_12	5.8.1	Implementation (CPM-8 2013) follow up, including of possible broader roles of IRSS 2.2) and links to the framework for standards	2013-06-06
Bureau 2013/Jun_13	5.8.2	Recommendations	2013-06-06
Oral Report	5.9.1	CDC Update	
Oral Report	5.9.2	Selection of CDC alternate members	
Bureau 2013/Jun_14	5.10.1	Aquatic plants and internet trade	2013-06-06
Bureau 2013/Jun_15	6.1.1	Rules of procedures for IPPC Trust Fund (specially- the approval of the budget)	2013-06-06
Oral Report	6.1.2	Report of Finance Committee meeting	
Oral	6.1.3	Follow up actions from CPM-8 (2013)	2013-06-06
Bureau 2013/Jun_17	6.2.1	Communication Update	2013-06-06
Bureau 2013/Jun_19	6.3.1	Resource Mobilization Update	2013-06-06
Oral Report	6.4.1	Dispute Settlements Update	
Bureau 2013/Jun_20	6.5	Revision of Convention	2013-06-06
Bureau 2013/Jun_21	7	FAO reform and the CPM work programme (including review of Article XIV bodies)	2013-06-06
Bureau 2013/Jun_22	7	Staffing	2013-06-06

## APPENDIX 4 – ToRs and RoPs for NRO Advisory Group

### Background

The Eighth Session of CPM (2013)<sup>6</sup> agreed to establish an IPPC national reporting obligations (NRO) advisory group to provide assistance to the IPPC Secretariat with the review the IPPC NRO programme and development of a revised stepwise work plan aimed at improving members' capacity to meet their NROs under the IPPC.

### Objectives

The NROAG will work with to the IPPC Secretariat with the objectives of:

- developing a revised NRO work program for presentation to CPM-10 (2015), including a suggested prioritized and stepwise approach, and
- to specifically working with the Secretariat and contracting parties to ensure increased reporting of pests and lists of regulated pests.

### Tasks

1. NROAG will work with the Secretariat to review of the existing IPPC NRO programme, including:
  - a. identify barriers and issues which have been the cause of limited reporting in the past, particularly the limitations inherent in developing comprehensive regulated pest lists;
  - b. in the review background documents and papers submitted by contracting parties (CPs) (e.g. IRSS surveys and conclusions) to ensure consideration of CPs' views, experiences, and evolving needs as they relate to pest reporting and developing regulated pest lists;
  - c. provide a report on status of NRO to CPM-9.
2. NROAG with the Secretariat to revise the IPPC NRO programme to facilitate CPs to meet their NROs by:
  - a) revising the legal basis for the mechanisms of reporting, including through Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs), and possible role of the IPPC Secretariat in ensuring the accuracy of data on the IPP – location, format and quality of data;
  - b) revising appendix XV of ICPM-8 report on NRO provisions in the convention, including all ISPMs adopted since 2002 – this review should identify gaps and possible improvements for existing ISPMs and the IPPC;
  - c) analyse the value of fulfilling obligations and purpose of the convention, including, whether it is appropriate to prioritize the provision of reporting data as determined by the IPPC;
  - d) identifying the underlying competencies and functions required of an NPPO in order for it to effectively fulfil its reporting obligation under the Convention;
  - e) determining how data is provided and relevant timeframes;
  - f) determining value added services the IPPC Secretariat could provide in addition to those already being developed for reporting, including being more proactive;
  - g) reviewing existing and establishing new mechanisms so that contracting parties can readily provide the same or similar information to other international organizations, such

---

<sup>6</sup> Relevant CPM papers include: CPM 2013/INF/16 and CPM 2013/CRP/11

- as the WTO and RPPOs and with them to ensure consistency of reporting and reduce duplication;
- h) advise the most appropriate way for CPs to consistently meet their national reporting obligations;
  - i) advise the most appropriate way of strengthening the role of RPPOs in ensuring contracting parties meet their national reporting obligations; and
  - j) advise the most appropriate way of communicating the reported information to stakeholders, other than NPPOs and RPPOs.
3. After the review of the current NRO work programme, NROAG will work with the Secretariat and contracting parties to ensure increased reporting of pests and lists of regulated pests.
  4. NROAG will provide advice on a NRO outreach work plan, as a component of the NRO programme, with a view to improving meeting the IPPC NRO by CPs.
  5. NROAG will work with the Secretariat in the development of the NRO report and draft workplan, including priorities and stepwise actions with timeframes, for SPG review in 2014 and subsequent consideration at CPM-10 consideration in 2015. The report will specifically address:
    - a. the benefits of meeting NROs;
    - b. the challenges which have been limiting factors in the implementation of the IPPC NRO provisions and identify areas that possibly need revision if and when the IPPC is next reviewed;
    - c. CP needs for improving pest and regulated pest lists reporting; and
    - d. Possible solutions, with alternatives, to assisting countries meet their NROs, with specific reference to pest and regulated pest listing.
  6. CPM include list of non-active members
  7. Secretariat to follow up on WTO notifications if not reported through IPP.
  8. Consider nature of sanctions or further action required.

### **Membership**

NROAG participants shall be from contracting parties and should have extensive working knowledge of the IPPC, its objectives, its reporting obligations, and ISPMs.

The NROAG will consist of:

- One expert from each of the seven FAO regions (Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, Near East, North America, and Southwest Pacific).
- Members from other bodies: One (1) Bureau member, CDC Chair, SBDS Chair, and SC Chair.
- Experts will be coopted as necessary for specific tasks.

The IPPC Secretariat will consider funding assistance for participants from developing countries with extra-budgetary resources.

The NROAG will work virtually and a physical NROAG meeting is subject to the IPPC Secretariat receiving extra-budgetary funds.

The role of the Advisory Group will be re-considered once the revised NRO programme is finalized.

## APPENDIX 5 – Update from Standards Setting Group

### **1 – Outputs of May 2013 SC / SC-7 meeting**

(2013 May SC Report posted on the IPP – 2013 May SC-7 Report being finalized and to be posted soon on the IPP)

- **Sea Containers:**

The Standards Committee (SC) in May had a detailed discussion on the sea containers issue and decided to circulate a preliminary version of the draft standard for comments on the broad concepts and practicability of the proposals rather than for detailed comments. This will be part of the member consultation beginning in July. As requested by CPM, the SC agreed the terms for a short survey on the pests found with sea containers and it is being finalized by a small group of SC members. It is expected to launch this survey in September 2013 and NPPOs will be asked to get involved in this and collect data on the scale of the problem.

- **Grain:**

The SC had insufficient time to arrange the discussions requested by CPM on a redrafted specification on the International movement of grain (2008-007)- this will now be a major issue for the November SC and we will arrange for the participation of experts in strategic matters. You will recall that CPM-8 (2013) *requested* contracting parties to submit comments on strategic issues to their regional SC members. As there were only a few responses the SC requested that the deadline be extended. Contracting parties were invited to submit their strategic comments on this issue to the IPPC Secretariat IPPC@fao.org no later than 31 August 2013.

- **2013 consultations periods:**

The SC agreed to send the following 3 draft standards for the Substantial Concerns Comment Period (SCCP), 1 June to 30 September (Comments through the OCS):

- Appendix to ISPM 12 on Electronic certification, information on standard XML schemes and exchange mechanisms (2006-003), Priority 1
- Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak (for inclusion as Annex 1 of ISPM 26) (2009-007), Priority 3
- Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031), Priority 1

The SC agreed to send the following 8 draft standards for country consultation, 1 July to 30 November (Comments through the OCS):

- Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood (2006-029), Priority 1
- Preliminary draft: Minimizing pest movement by sea containers (2008-001), Priority 1
- Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004), Priority 1
- Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management (2005-010), Priority 2
- Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)
- Draft Annex to ISPM 27:2006 – Potato spindle tuber viroid (2006-022), Priority 1
- Draft Annex to ISPM 27:2006 – *Xanthomonas citri* subsp. *citri* (2004-011), Priority 1
- Draft Annex to ISPM 28:2007: Irradiation for *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* BEARDSLEY, *Planococcus liliacinus* (COCKERELL) and *Planococcus minor* (MASKELL) (HEMIPTERA: PSEUDOCOCCIDAE)

The SC also agreed to send the following 3 draft specifications for member consultation, 1 June to 30 July (Comments through the OCS):

- Revision of ISPM 4 - Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (2009-002), Priority 2



- Revision of ISPM 8 - Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005), Priority 3
- Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood (2008-008), Priority 1

- **Criteria to help determine whether a formal objection is technically justified**

According CPM-8 (2013) request, the SC clarified the flow chart for the Process for determining if a formal objection is technically justified for draft ISPMs. The criteria approved by CPM-8 (2013) and the flowcharts will be incorporated the Procedure Manual for Standard Setting.

- **Update on the new standard setting process: CPM-7 (2012)**

The SC considered several issues related to the implementation of the new process:

- The SC approved the two 45-day notification periods for diagnostic protocols (DPs) for contracting parties to review the SC-approved DPs and possibly submit formal objections, as 1 July (ending 15 August) and 15 December (ending 30 January).
- The SC agreed to implement the regional review process allowing stewards to seek regional input after they have done an initial review of all comments made during the SCCP.
- The SC considered several proposals from the Secretariat and assigned SC leads and small SC groups on several issues as described in the report.
- Particularly the SC requested a small group (Mr John HEDLEY (lead), Ms Jane CHARD, Ms Marie-Claude FOREST, Mr MOTOI SAKAMURA) to develop (before 31 July 2013) a draft paper on the future development of a Framework for standards, and to produce a concept note on the nature of a standard.

## **2 – Experts working groups (EWG) and Technical Panels (TP) meetings:**

- The Technical Panel for the Glossary met in February 2013 in Rome.
- An EWG meeting held in Finland from 27 May to 31 May 2013 developed a draft ISPM on International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004) which will be submitted to the SC for their review.
- Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols in June 2013
- Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments in July 2013
- EWG on the International movement of seed (2009-003) is planned to take place at the beginning of July 2013 (the Netherlands).

➔ Issue of engaging experts

## **3 - Call for topics:**

The IPPC Secretariat has issued a call for new topics for IPPC standards. IPPC members are encouraged to follow the guidance provided on the IPP <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1111210> and submit their proposals prior to the close date, which is 31 August 2013.

## **4 - Expert Consultation on Draft Diagnostic Protocols:**

The IPPC Secretariat has set up an Expert Consultation on Draft Diagnostic Protocols and is seeking experts' inputs on various draft diagnostic protocols (DPs) at early stage of development. Technical experts are invited to review diagnostic protocols and provide their input directly to the DP drafting groups through the IPP. More information on this is available on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1111204> ).

## **5 - Expert Consultation on Cold Treatments (ECCT)**

It is planned for the first week of December 2013 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. It is hoped the ECCT will provide a forum for discussion of issues related to the development and use of cold treatments and allow participants to build confidence in the experimental design and science supporting cold

treatments, help establish mutual understanding of related issues and provide a platform for initiating future synergies among cold treatment developers.

**6 – Calls for experts:**

- Nominations are being solicited by the Secretariat for authors of IPPC diagnostic protocols (DP) for *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* (2004-016) – due by 14 June 2013.
- We intend to issue another call for experts in July 2013 (TPG English, TPPT, EWGs)

## APPENDIX 6 - Capacity Development updates for the Bureau (June 2013)

### 2nd Meeting of the Capacity Development Committee

#### Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 27-31 May 2013.

The May 2013 CDC meeting took place in Kuala Lumpur with excellent local organization, including a field visit that sparked positive discussions on the role of national-level policies in strengthening NPPOs. One observer each from the STDF and CPM Bureau participated in the meeting.

The following themes were addressed (further detail will be available in the meeting report), many with implications for Bureau consideration:

#### **1. Single windows/Customs Union/trade facilitations approaches**

- Side event at CPM-8 on single window approaches was successful, with broad participation and interest in this emerging issue.
- Next steps: The CDC agreed to wait for the results of upcoming STDF studies on trade facilitation and the Bali WTO ministerial, and to then consider whether to plan activities to address this issue further at CPM-9. These options will be discussed at the November 2013 meeting of the CDC.

#### **2. Training sessions on IPPC Participation**

- Feedback: Participants gave positive feedback on the training sessions held at CPM-8 and demonstrated increased understanding of IPPC issues after the sessions. Suggestions for future improvements included:
  - timing to allow for less rushed participation
  - offering these sessions as an opportunity to facilitate mentoring relationships and to encourage active participation from contracting parties in all levels of development
- Next steps: The CDC noted that new participants join the phytosanitary community on an ongoing basis and that these trainings and additional materials/events would be valuable to share on an ongoing basis. The CDC committed to contribute to further development of materials on IPPC participation.
- Regional preparatory workshops: The CDC discussed the idea of regional preparatory workshops for CPM. Coordination at the regional level could allow for more time to discuss issues related to CPM participation than is feasible during the week of CPM itself. Regional preparatory workshops could also strengthen the depth of understanding and position on the issues in order to make most effective use of plenary time at CPM. The CDC expressed interest in this approach.

#### **3. Capacity Development links with the IRSS project**

- Further analysis of survey results: The CDC agreed that at its next meeting it would revisit the IRSS reports on past surveys. This would be to reflect further on options to support implementation of these ISPMs through capacity development activities, adding value to the efforts made by contracting parties to participate in the surveys.
- CDC support to IRSS activities: The CDC committed to contribute to IRSS activities through a range of actions including encouraging use of the helpdesk and providing input on IRSS concept notes.

#### **4. STDF Project 350: Global Phytosanitary Manuals, Standard Operating Procedures and Training Kits Project**

The CDC, as the steering committee for this project, discussed progress on the range of products in development. The CDC also advised on general project management issues such

as identifying relevant input materials, developing plans for product review, exploring partnerships opportunities for translation, and planning pilot-testing and feedback mechanisms:

#### **5. Dielectric heating treatment**

- The CDC decided that a very brief flyer to summarize basic information on the treatment would provide valuable, simple information on this newly adopted treatment, and agreed on content to be addressed in this document.
- A basic manual on application of the treatment was reviewed, and further input would be requested selected experts on this topic.
- The CDC agreed that an advanced manual on dielectric heating this would be finalized and made available on the phytosanitary resources page (not as a product developed under the auspices of the IPPC).

#### **6. Market access manual**

- The draft manual was used in a recent workshop hosted by the Republic of Korea.
- The CDC discussed the value of the manual and developed a plan to complement it with additional materials.
- CDC members were encouraged to explore opportunities to use the manual and gather additional feedback to continue to build on these materials.

#### **7. Selection and support of participants for facilitation and training activities**

- Selection: The CDC discussed approaches to selecting participants for future PCE facilitation trainings and training-of-trainer activities, keeping in mind that these activities were investments in human resources and that wise selection of individuals would be essential to the activities' success. The CDC agreed to consider both technical experience and competencies as well as personality traits associated successful facilitators and trainers in the selection of participants.
- Funding: The group agreed that criteria would be set for providing funding for participants in these activities. This criteria would differ from the funding criteria that the IPPC Secretariat usually uses in order to offer stronger support for participants from middle-income countries.

#### **8. Phytosanitary resources page**

- The CDC discussed the value of the page and discussed options to continue to improve it.
- An additional call for technical resources for incorporation into the phytosanitary resources page is planned.
- The phytosanitary capacity development roster of consultants (<http://www.phytosanitary.info/consultants>) launched in April 2013. An announcement to inform relevant partner organizations about the roster is planned.

#### **9. Status on alternate members.**

- A nomination for an alternate member for the European region was received. Her CV and related documents are presented for Bureau consideration.
- Nominations are still needed for alternate members from Africa, Near East and North America. According to the CDC rules of procedure nominees would be reviewed by the Bureau and selected based on technical expertise.

#### **10. CDC input on draft standards**

- The CDC recalled that this interest had been raised in order to have an opportunity to highlight significant capacity development challenges related to the implementation of draft ISPMs, and for the CDC to plan work on emerging issues. The potential relevance of CDC input on whether capacity development issues could influence the priority and selection of topics on the standard setting work programme was mentioned.

- On the other hand, CDC members agreed to encourage the SC/TP members to add their relevant expertise to the capacity development roster of consultants.

#### **11. CDC operational plan and CDC evaluation**

- The CDC developed an operational plan for the Secretariat and CDC to implement collaboratively.
- The CDC agreed to continue to present simple summaries of its work to the CPM while maintaining a more detailed and dynamic versions of documents for use by the CDC and Secretariat.
- The CDC considered that an external evaluation of IPPC capacity development activities since the adoption of the IPPC capacity development strategy in 2010 would be valuable. The CDC suggested that, given the short time frame of the two-year initial period of the CDC, that it would make sense for this evaluation would to take place after the CDC's full term (April 2014).
- The Secretariat agreed to discuss timeline of external evaluation of capacity development activities with the Bureau at its June 2013 meeting.

#### **12. E-cert**

- The CDC discussed progress on discussions of this issue at CPM-8, noting that capacity development activities would play a key role in enabling implementation of future agreements on this emerging issue.
- The representative from the STDF indicated that development and pilot-testing of a toolkit related to e-certification could be an interesting project proposal for the STDF because e-certification is considered an innovative approach to facilitate safe trade in agricultural commodities.

#### **13. Update and highlights of IPPC projects**

- The Secretariat highlighted several projects that have been particularly successful (see the CDC meeting report for details).
- The Secretariat suggested that *Bactrocera invadens* would be best coordinated on a continent-wide level and that this is an urgent issue in which the FAO DG has expressed interest.
- Interest in replicating the Central African project on IPPC implementation and participation in other regions was expressed.

#### **14. Update on Regional IPPC workshops**

- The Secretariat updated the CDC on progress to organize the 2013 regional workshops. Efforts have been made to strengthen roles and responsibilities of workshop organizers and participants and a broad range of IPPC-related issues that may be addressed (with each region having the options to select the topics relevant to them).
- The group discussed options to evaluate the impact of regional IPPC workshops. The CDC noted that because of the significant shifts in the approach to the workshops in 2013 year it would be sensible to evaluate the workshops in a few years, after experience is gained in the new approach to workshops. The CDC suggested that this information be transmitted to the Bureau.

## **APPENDIX 7 - Bureau Position Paper**

The bureau believes that any material such as technical manuals produced through the IPPC should be of a quality that meets the needs of all contracting parties. This should be the case whether the manual is formally adopted by CPM or not. Manuals and other material with technical content should be produced and reviewed with the assistance of relevant subject matter experts. The experts should provide feedback during drafting and prior to final publication to ensure that there are no technical or scientific errors.

These experts could be selected from outside of the IPPC framework but should also include some of the experts from within the IPPC who were involved in development of the relevant standards, protocols or treatments that the manual is supporting. For example in the case of a treatment manual, experts from the TPPT are likely to have relevant expertise so some of these experts should be included in reviewing drafts prior to publication.

The use of experts from within technical panels or expert working groups for this review work is not a formal function of the panel or working group. We are not suggesting that panels or working groups should conduct a formal review or provide any formal sign-off on these supporting materials. We do not want additional formal processes to delay timely publication of these materials. We simply suggest that it would be most appropriate for some of the individual experts from these groups to be included in the review and feedback process.

Experts must recognise that these manuals are not primarily technical or scientific documents, but rather are produced to assist in building the capacity of contracting parties. They will be written in an entirely different style to the standards and protocols that the IPPC formally adopt. If experts after providing feedback have any unresolved concerns with the technical content of any materials produced they should address these through normal channels (e.g. firstly to the CDC and then if necessary to the Secretariat).