



联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations

Organisation des Nations
Unies pour l'alimentation
et l'agriculture

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная организация
Объединенных Наций

Organización de las
Naciones Unidas para la
Alimentación y la Agricultura

منظمة
الاغذية والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Eleventh Session
Rome, 4-8 April 2016
Comments from COSAVE countries regarding various CPM Agenda items
Agenda items 8.4.2; 11.1.3; 9.5; 8.3
Prepared by the COSAVE
English only

Proposal of COSAVE countries on Agenda item 8.4.2 *Proposal for a new implementation oversight body – IPPC Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (ICDC)* (Document CPM 2016/18)

COSAVE countries agreed to add the following comments:

1. COSAVE countries fully support the establishment of a new subsidiary body on the basis of Rule IX of the Rules of Procedure of the CPM. However, as stated at paragraph IX. 5, the source of financial resources should be identified in order to allow its proper functioning.

Rules of Procedure of the CPM

Rule IX

“5. The establishment of subsidiary bodies shall be subject to the availability of the necessary funds in the relevant chapter of the approved budget of the Organization. Before taking any decision involving expenditure in connection with the establishment of subsidiary bodies, the Commission shall have before it a report from the Director-General on the administrative and financial implications thereof.”

2. Secondly, the ICDC should be as inclusive as possible, in this sense, the official language should not be limited to only one. Acknowledging that translation is an important issue, COSAVE countries support to keep the right for the members to ask for translation into any of the FAO official languages as in other subsidiary bodies.
3. Also, similarly to the other subsidiary bodies, and considering paragraph IX. 3 of the CPM Rules of Procedure, COSAVE countries support that the selection for ICDC members should not be charged to the Bureau, but to the CPM.

Rules of Procedure of the CPM

Rule IX

“ 3. Membership in these subsidiary bodies shall consist of selected members of the Commission, or of individuals appointed in their personal capacity as respectively determined by the Commission. ”

4. Consequently, the Rules of Procedures of the annex 1 at the Document CPM 2016/18 should read as:

A. Rules of Procedure

Rule 1. Membership

2. The composition of the Committee is based on geographical representation, with one delegate from each FAO region and a minimum of three members from developing countries. Nominations for the ICDC may be formally submitted by Contracting Parties. ICDC members are selected by the CPM ~~Bureau and accountable to the CPM.~~

Rule 2. Alternate members

1. Seven alternates for the ICDC members, one coming from each FAO region, are selected by the ~~Bureau~~ CPM, in accordance with the selection procedure and requirements applied to members. Once confirmed, alternate members are valid for the same period of time and conditions as specified in Rule 1.

Proposal from COSAVE countries on Agenda item 11.1.3 – *Report on the activities relating to the International Year of Plant Health in 2020 (IYPH 2020) – Scope, Objectives and Structures for the International Year of Plant Health* (Document CPM 2016/34)

1. COSAVE countries thank the *Report on the activities relating to the International Year of Plant Health in 2020 (IYPH 2020)* and express full support to it.
2. However, after considering the proposed definition of Plant Health in the context of the international year, and in order to have a wider and clearer definition for the general public, they wish to propose the following modifications to the definition indicated in paragraph 6:

Plant health is usually considered the discipline that utilizes different actions, through official or legislative approaches, to control and prevent pests, weeds and disease causing organisms to spread into endangered agricultural areas, especially by ~~through~~ human interaction such as international trade.

Proposal from COSAVE countries on Agenda item 9.5 - *Adjustments to IPPC standard setting procedure* (Document CPM 2016/11)

1. COSAVE countries believe that adjustments to the IPPC standard setting procedure are necessary to keep it updated with Contracting Parties expectations.
2. Nevertheless, COSAVE countries support that some amendments still need to be done to the proposed changes presented in Attachment 1 before adoption by CPM.
3. Therefore, COSAVE countries wish to propose an additional set of changes in Attachment 1 of document CPM 2016/11 as follows:

Attachment 1: Proposed Changes to the IPPC Standard Setting Procedure

Step 1: Biannual call for topics

.....To indicate a global need for the proposed topic, submitters are encouraged to gain support from CPs and RPPOs in other regions.

Rationale: RPPO represent an important support to submitters proposing topics.

Step 2: Annual review of the List of topics for IPPC standards

Annually the SC reviews the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and recommends changes (including deletions, or changes in priority) to the CPM. ~~In exceptional circumstances the SC may recommend addition to the List of topics for IPPC standards.~~

Rationale: There are no reasons to grant right to the SC to recommend addition to the List of topics for IPPC standards. The SC already reviews and recommends changes on the LOT to the CPM, however addition to LOT should remain limited to Contracting Parties and CPM.

Step 3: Development of a specification

Once the SC approves the draft specification for consultation, the IPPC Secretariat makes it publicly available. The IPPC Secretariat solicits comments through the IPPC Online Comment System (OCS) from CPs, RPPOs and as decided by the SC from relevant international organizations, ~~national plant protection services of non-CPs,~~ and other entities ~~as decided by the SC.~~ The length of the consultation for draft specifications is 60 days. The IPPC contact point or information point submits comments to the IPPC Secretariat using the OCS.

Step 5: First consultation

Once the SC approves the draft ISPM for the first consultation, the IPPC Secretariat makes it publicly available. The IPPC Secretariat solicits comments through the IPPC Online Comment System (OCS) from CPs, RPPOs and as decided by the SC from relevant international organizations, ~~national plant protection services of non-CPs,~~ and other entities ~~as decided by the SC.~~ The length of the first consultation for draft ISPMs is 90 days. The IPPC contact point or information point submits comments to the IPPC Secretariat using the OCS. The IPPC Secretariat compiles the comments received, makes them publicly available and submits them to the steward for consideration.

Proposal of COSAVE countries on Agenda item 8.3 *Concept of a commodity standard – Report of the working Group and recommendations from the SPG and SC (Document CPM 2016/17 Rev.2)*

COSAVE countries agreed to propose the following set of recommendations for CPM 2016/17 Rev.2:

44. The CPM is invited to:

1) *Note* the considerations by the WG, SPG and SC and the CDC in relation to the concept of commodity standards.

2) *Agree* that the development of commodity standards is no more relevant, feasible or higher priority than any other standards or implementation tools and that there is nothing in the current standard setting procedure that prevents CPs from proposing topics for standards that harmonize the management of phytosanitary risks on a particular commodity or group of commodities.

3) *Agree* that a standard need not be tagged as a particular type, such as a commodity standard, but rather focus on defining requirements or guidance for harmonization that are appropriate to the effective management of phytosanitary risks that the standard is intended to achieve and which is defined in its scope.

4) *Consider* whether a combined call for topics for standards and tools for implementation should be made, which would be reviewed with input from the SC and CDC, or its successor. If agreed, request the SC and CDC to review and adapt the current process to allow the call to be made, including any changes to the assessment criteria needed.

5) *Agree* that any submission in response to a call for topics and tools should clearly define the problem needing resolution in sufficient detail to determine how it fits into the Framework of Standards and Implementation and the cost/benefit of the development of the standard or tool.

~~6) *Agree* the expansion of the Framework of Standards and Implementation to accommodate the definition and application of layers for the management of phytosanitary risks associated with conveyances and on commodity pathways.~~

~~7) *Request* that the IPPC Secretariat, in collaboration with the SC and CDC, develop guidance on these layers of standards and their requirements for presentation to CPM-12 (2017).~~

1. For COSAVE countries, bullets 6 and 7 deal with *Framework for Standards* issue and should be moved to be addressed at agenda item 8.3 - Document CPM2016/20.

~~8) *Agree* that a small working group undertakes a desk study based on drafting a specification for a standard as a pilot to inform an analysis of the outcomes, benefits and challenges of developing a commodity specific standard. Develop the terms of reference for the group.~~

~~9) *Consider* at CPM-12 (2017) whether the benefits of commodity standards outweigh the challenges of developing them, using information generated by the small working group and subsequent considerations by relevant CPM bodies.~~

2. Considering the recommendation for agreement upon bullets 2 and 3, COSAVE countries do not agree on the establishment of a working group to undertake a desk study on drafting a specification

for standard as a pilot to inform an analysis of the outcomes, benefits and challenges of developing a commodity specific standard. Once a commodity-specific standard “is no more relevant, feasible or higher priority than any other standards ...” there are no reasons to the CPM spend its resources specifically on further studies.

~~10) Request the Bureau to consider, at an appropriate time, the resource implications in relation to the development and updating of commodity standards as well as to building capacity for their implementation and to consider possible mechanisms for funding by donors (e.g. using commodity standards as a pilot for “sponsorship of standards”).~~

3. Considering the recommendation for agreement upon bullets 2 and 3, COSAVE countries do not agree with the request on bullet 10. Although funding is always sensitive for the Convention and donations should be encouraged, COSAVE countries have concern with sponsorship of activities such as development of standards, once it might result on inversion of interests, from general to particular.

11) *Encourage* CPs to provide phytosanitary resources relevant to the management of pests associated with commodities or groups of commodities for possible inclusion in the phytosanitary resources web page in response to specific calls for resources.

12) *Request* the Bureau, in consultation with SC and CDC, to urgently establish a mechanism to deal with emerging issues that require global action.

4. Before adoption of the recommendation 12) COSAVE countries need clarification on “emerging issues”, and consequences of a development of “global action”. For COSAVE countries, there are enough guidelines on adopted ISPMs to help Contracting Parties to deal with emerging issues. Nonetheless, COSAVE countries support that there is room to strengthen communication and cooperation among Contracting Countries.

Rationale: The right to send comments should be limited to the Contracting Parties because they are the ones that have obligations under the IPPC. Eventual comments sent from non-Contracting Parties may be considered, however they should not be dealt as if they come from Contracting Parties.

The steward reviews the comments, prepares responses to the comments, revises the draft ISPM and submits them to the IPPC Secretariat. These are made available to the SC and Contracting Parties. Taking the comments into account, the SC-7 or TP (for draft DPs or draft PTs) revises the draft ISPM and recommends it to the SC.

Rationale: To grant transparency on the procedure.

Step 6: Second consultation

Once the SC-7 or TP recommends the draft ISPM to the SC, the IPPC Secretariat ~~Once the SC or SC-7 approves the draft ISPM for the second consultation, the IPPC Secretariat~~ solicits comments through the IPPC Online Comment System (OCS) from CPs, RPPOs and as decided by the SC from relevant international organizations, ~~national plant protection services of non-CPs,~~ and other entities as decided by the SC. The length of the second consultation is 90 days. The IPPC contact point or information point submits the comments to the IPPC Secretariat using the OCS. The IPPC Secretariat compiles the comments received, makes them publicly available and submits them to the steward for consideration.

Rationale: The SC or SC7 are not able to approve drafts ISPM for the second consultation because they meet after the beginning of the consultation period.

The right to send comments should be kept limited to the Contracting Parties because they have obligations under the IPPC. Eventual comments sent from non-Contracting Parties may be considered, however they should not be dealt as if they come from Contracting Parties.

Step 7: Adoption

If a CP does not support the adoption of the draft ISPM, the CP may submit an objection⁵. An objection must be accompanied by technical justification and, as appropriate, suggestions for improvement of the draft ISPM and submitted to the IPPC Secretariat no later than 3 weeks prior to the CPM meeting. CPs should make every effort to reach agreement before CPM. The objection will be added to the CPM agenda and the CPM will decide on a way forward.

Rationale: there might be cases where suggestions for improvement of the draft ISPM are not feasible.