



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Strategic Planning Group

Rome, Italy

27 – 29 October 2025

IPPC Secretariat

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2026



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution- 4.0 International licence (CC BY 4.0: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode.en>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If a translation or adaptation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation [or adaptation] was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation [or adaptation]. The original [Language] edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Any dispute arising under this licence that cannot be settled amicably shall be referred to arbitration in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL). The parties shall be bound by any arbitration award rendered as a result of such arbitration as the final adjudication of such a dispute.

Third-party materials. This Creative Commons licence CC BY 4.0 does not apply to non-FAO copyright materials included in this publication. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

FAO photographs. FAO photographs that may appear in this work are not subject to the above-mentioned Creative Commons licence. Queries for the use of any FAO photographs should be submitted to: photo-library@fao.org.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and print copies can be purchased through the distributors listed there. For general enquiries about FAO publications please contact: publications@fao.org. Queries regarding rights and licensing of publications should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting	6
2.	Meeting arrangements	6
2.1	Adoption of the agenda	6
2.2	Election of the rapporteur.....	6
3.	Administrative matters	6
4.	Update from the CPM Bureau	6
5.	Update from Regional Workshops	7
6.	Stocktake report for each of the DAIs from the 2020-2030 IPPC Strategic Framework	8
6.1	Update on DAI 1 Making trade safe by harmonizing electronic data exchange.....	8
6.2	Update on DAI 2 - Easing market access through commodity-specific plant health standards and the IPPC Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)	8
6.3.	Update on DAI 3 - Management of e-commerce and postal and courier pathways....	9
6.4.	Update on DAI 4 - Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities.....	9
6.5	Update on DAI 5 Strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems	10
6.6	Update on DAI 6 - Assessing and managing climate change impacts on plant health and the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues	11
6.7	Update on DAI 7 Establishing global phytosanitary research coordination and the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination.....	11
6.8	Update on DAI 8 Establishing a diagnostic laboratory network.....	12
6.9	IPPC Observatory - Final review and evaluation of the SF DAIs.....	13
	Breakout session: IPPC Strategic Framework, what comes next?	13
7.	Topics submitted for discussion by SPG (participants and accompanied papers).....	13
7.1	Raising the profile of plant health for national plant protection organisations – the IPP’s role.....	13
8.	ePhyto solution	14
8.1	Implementation status update.....	14
8.2	ePhyto - Governance and functionality	14
8.3	Presenting the ePhyto experience and a sustainability proposal (Ecuador)	15
8.4	How to incorporate national certification system into the ePhyto hub for safe trade facilitation: case of Cameroon electronic phytosanitary certificate system (Cameroon)	16
8.5	ePhyto change management and governance (United Kingdom)	16
9.	Rethinking ISPMs.....	17
9.1	Rethinking ISPMs: The SC perspective.....	17
9.2	Rethinking ISPMs: The IC perspective.....	17
9.3	Rethinking ISPMs, what is the essence of the experienced problems? (The Netherlands)	17
9.4	Rethinking ISPMs: Statements from COSAVE countries (CPM-19 (2025)).....	18
9.5	Rethinking ISPMs, concept planning and steps forward (Greece).....	18
9.6	Rethinking ISPMs: Advancing Plain Language for Global Accessibility of ISPMs (New Zealand).....	18
9.7	Rethinking ISPMs Priorities and next steps (USA)	18

9.8	Rethinking ISPMs: observations from the UK (United Kingdom).....	19
9.9	Rethinking ISPMs: Towards Fit-for-Purpose, Accessible Standards (Australia)	19
9.10	Rethinking ISPMs-Views from the EPPO region (EPPO).....	19
9.11	Rethinking ISPMs: Enhancing Relevance and Accessibility for the Pacific Region (PPPO)	20
9.12	Rethinking ISPMs: The perspectives of the Asian region (APPPC)	20
9.13	Views and recommendations of IPPC regional workshops on rethinking ISPMs	20
9.14	General discussion	21
Breakout session: Rethinking ISPMs		21
10.	Updates from other CPM Focus Groups	21
10.1	Update on the CPM Focus Group on the “Safe provisions of food and other humanitarian aid” – action plan	21
10.2	Update on the CPM Focus Group on Plant Health in the context of One Health	22
10.3	Update on the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers	22
11.	IPPC standards and implementation topics	22
11.1	ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) pest interception data presentations.	22
11.2	Proposed improvements to ISPM 3 (Indonesia).....	23
11.3	Proposal commodity standard on seaweed (Indonesia).....	23
11.4	Reduction and replacement of Methyl Bromide as phytosanitary treatment in Pakistan (Pakistan).....	24
11.5	IPPC Observatory - Third IPPC General Survey (concept note).....	24
11.6	IPPC Plant Health Campus and Mentimeter	24
12.	Africa Phytosanitary Programme	25
12.1	Update on the APP implementation	25
12.2	An in-flight adjustment to sustain the impact APP (AU-IAPSC).....	25
13.	International Day of Plant Health 2026-2028.....	26
13.1	Future topics for the IDPH	27
14.	Preparations for CPM-20 (2026).....	27
14.1	CPM report, how soon can we meet? (EU)	27
14.2	Successes and challenges in implementing the IPPC	27
14.3	Side sessions	27
15.	Any Other Business.....	27
16.	Meeting feedback and discussion on format and possible themes for future SPG meetings.	27
17.	Next Meeting.....	27
18.	Close of the Meeting	28
Appendix 1: Adopted agenda		29
Appendix 2: Summary of the group’s deliberations from the breakout session - IPPC Strategic Framework, what comes next?		32
Appendix 3: Summary of the Mentimeter survey on ePhyto		36
Appendix 4: Summary of the group’s deliberations from the breakout session – Rethinking ISPMs		37

Appendix 5: Summary of the Mentimeter survey on Plant Health Campus	42
Appendix 6: Summary of the group’s deliberations from the breakout session – Challenges and opportunities for implementation of ISPMs	43
Appendix 7: Summary of the Mentimeter survey on IDPH - Summary of Suggested Sub-Topics for IDPH 2026.....	49
Appendix 8: Summary of the SPG meeting survey results	51

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The Chairperson of the Strategic Planning Group (SPG), Dris BARIK (CPM Bureau member for Near East region) welcomed the large group of meeting participants including the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Deputy Director-General Beth BECHDOL and new IPPC Secretary Enrico PEROTTI.
- [2] DDG BECHDOL was pleased the SPG would engage in deep dive discussions covering important strategic areas within the work plan of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). She warmly welcomed the group and said the new IPPC Secretary was joining the FAO family. She would closely monitor the SPG discussions, providing as much support as possible. She said FAO was a large place and it could be challenging to navigate the organization, which included the technical divisions as well as the field offices and pointed out that she was here to help with that. She added that significant issues on the horizon included a meeting of the FAO Finance Committee, which would take place the following week. The FAO Programme Committee, now chaired by Canada, had just held an informal briefing and was very supportive of the IPPC, the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CODEX) and the Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP).
- [3] IPPC Secretary PEROTTI thanked DDG BECHDOL for her kind words and remarked the IPPC needed to thrive, not just survive. He expressed his appreciation to the SPG meeting participants, who helped build the IPPC family. The IPPC has been making a difference since its creation in 1951, when it came to technical excellence and consensus building. He said he'd used the tools of the IPPC when he worked in Australia, which helped develop trade and instill trust with other nations. The IPPC's work developing standards and building capacity was protecting environments and strengthening food security across the globe. He said the IPPC's legacy needed to be reinforced during a time of increasing movement of people and goods around the globe. Biosecurity was not an isolated technical concern but rather a central ingredient to food security.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Adoption of the agenda

- [4] The SPG adopted the agenda (Appendix 1).

2.2 Election of the rapporteur

- [5] The SPG elected John EIVERS (Ireland) and Saliou NIASSY (African Union InterAfrican Phytosanitary Council (AU-IAPSC)) as rapporteurs.

3. Administrative matters

- [6] The documents list,¹ the participants list,² and a link to local information had been posted on the [International Phytosanitary Portal \(IPP\)](#) before the meeting. To help facilitate the meeting the SPG chairperson explained he would rotate the chairperson's role to different bureau members to facilitate discussion.

4. Update from the CPM Bureau

- [7] The CPM Chairperson Samuel BISHOP (Europe) relayed that the bureau had met the previous week and welcomed the new IPPC Secretary PEROTTI. At the time, he said the bureau introduced the new secretary to the role of the IPPC bureau.

¹ 02_SPG_2025_Oct

² 03_SPG_2025_Oct

- [8] The CPM Chairperson announced CPM-20 (2026) was just scheduled for 9-13 March 2026 at FAO headquarters in Rome, Italy. It was being held earlier than usual and papers needed to be submitted as early as possible. He said the bureau was making plans to hold an innovation fair featuring a successes and challenges event during CPM-20 in the atrium at FAO headquarters.
- [9] He reported that the Finance Committee (FC) had also met during the previous week and discussed increasing transparency regarding funding. The FC had also asked FAO to change its current practice of renewing funding for the multi-donor trust funds (MDTFs) from every year to every three years, which meant budgeting would be more flexible and easily managed.
- [10] The SPG:
- (1) noted the update from the CPM Bureau.

5. Update from Regional Workshops

- [11] The secretariat presented a paper³ on the IPPC regional workshops (RWs). The seven RWs discussed funding support for the workshops, OCS training, the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH), draft standards and implementation subjects of interest such as e-commerce, the Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP), the ePhyto Solution, the IPPC Plant Health Campus, and risks associated with regional pests.
- [12] Surveys were held to measure RW quality, relevance, and overall effectiveness. The next step was to conduct a debriefing with secretariat staff to capture lessons learned and best practices, publish RW reports, begin preparation for the next cycle of workshops, and encourage budgeting for RWs to ensure sustainable delivery.
- [13] One participant asked about the cost of attending the workshops. Another participant said holding the workshop had been a major project and some countries had complained they weren't invited or their region do not have a RW or couldn't afford to attend. One participant asked if scheduling the workshops could be more flexible to encourage attendance and was told they had to be held in August or September to be timely with the draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) commenting period.
- [14] A participant said regions needed to prioritize discussions held at RW to get through the agenda and maximize time. They also encouraged the IPPC secretariat to find savings when it came to organizing the workshops as a way to fund greater participation. Another participant asked if the RWs had to be kept to three days as reviewing ISPMs was important and took a significant amount of time. They were told the schedule was flexible, and it was up to the regions to determine how much time was needed and noting that the Bureau had previously encouraged a four-day RWs.
- [15] The CPM Chairperson said the bureau had discussed RWs and determined that regions could ask the IPPC secretariat for support if they needed it. He also encouraged participants to read the paper on the IPP on RWs.
- [16] The SPG:
- (2) *noted* the update on regional workshops;
 - (3) *encouraged* the relevant parties (RPPOs, FAO Regional and Subregional Offices, IPPC secretariat) to collaborate to organize and find appropriate financing solutions for regional workshops;
 - (4) *recommended* adapting the agenda according to the priorities of each region, while maintaining international priorities.

³ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95066/>

6. Stocktake report for each of the DAIs from the 2020-2030 IPPC Strategic Framework

6.1 Update on DAI 1 Making trade safe by harmonizing electronic data exchange

- [17] The SPG chairperson said agenda item 6.1 was being skipped and would be addressed during discussions on agenda item 8.1 on ePhyto later in the meeting.

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

- [18] The secretariat presented a paper⁴ on the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 which includes eight development-agenda items (DAIs), including the development of commodity and pathway-specific ISPMs. The intent was to have concise lists of commodities, their associated pests and phytosanitary measures to help mitigate and manage the pest risks.
- [19] It was highlighted that the development, adoption and implementation of commodity standards would not alter sovereign rights and fundamental obligations under the IPPC. Moreover, as agreed by the CPM, the regulation of pests would remain based on pest risk analysis and be subject to technical justification. Obligations would not be imposed on importing countries and the list of pests and phytosanitary measures in each specific commodity standard was not exhaustive. The DAI was being implemented for commodity-specific ISPMs and was led by the secretariat's Standard Setting Unit (SSU).
- [20] The first annex to ISMP 46 (*International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit*) was adopted by CPM-19. Moreover, a total of five draft commodity standards are under development by the IPPC Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) with two drafts commodity standards on Taro (*Colocasia esculenta*) and *Musa* spp. having gone through first consultation.
- [21] With the current volume of work, the new projection was that by 2030 there would be seven adopted annexes to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*). The call for topics was ongoing, but only those highlighted in the paper were currently incorporated in the Standards Committee (SC) and therefore in the SSU work plan. The secretariat acknowledged the financial contributions from Australia, Canada, the European Union, France, Japan and New Zealand.
- [22] One meeting participant suggested that the experiences on the recently adopted mango commodity standard could be used to help demonstrate the strategic importance of these standards. The secretariat said a side session on commodity standards would be held at CPM-20, which might clarify issues for contracting parties (CPs).
- [23] Another participant pointed out commodity standards was on the SC November meeting agenda, which would discuss how commodities and their associated pests were included in the work plan. They said it was important the technical panel on commodity standards make the criteria for selecting new commodities easily available.
- [24] The SPG emphasised the need to reflect on the core principles of ISPM 46; i.e. that is to help developing countries to start trade more quickly by providing a starting for those discussions. In this context it is important that the purpose and strategic value of commodity standards is communicated more effectively.
- [25] The SPG:
- (5) *provide* strategic comments on the update on the development-agenda item on commodity standards;

⁴ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95095/>

- (6) *encouraged* NPPOs and RPPOs to submit information material through the call for the development of the commodity standard for *International movement of Malus domestica fruit for consumption* (2023-024), with 31 October 2025 as the deadline.

6.3. Update on DAI 3 - Management of e-commerce and postal and courier pathways

- [26] The secretariat presented a paper⁵ on the management of e-commerce and the postal and courier pathways, which is one of the eight DAIs in the Strategic Framework. The IPPC's work on e-commerce is under the oversight of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) with input from the SC and coordinated by the Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU). A dedicated IC team was established in 2021 to guide the work on e-commerce. E-commerce activities had been carried out with in-kind and financial contributions provided by Canada.
- [27] The SPG said e-commerce presented a significant biosecurity risk and the outcomes on the observatory study highlighted the need to strengthen interagency collaboration and enhance technical support to NPPOs e on navigating this evolving landscape. While major e-commerce platforms (e.g., Amazon) have established internal monitoring systems to improve compliance, the emergence of smaller and specialized platforms remains a significant regulatory challenge due to their high volume and lower levels of oversight. In this context, one participant noted that in certain regions, such as Europe, stringent regulations are already in place to prohibit the distribution of specific high-risk items through courier services.
- [28] Some SPG participants emphasized that the phytosanitary community should consider establishing ongoing partnerships with e-commerce platforms to keep pace with rapidly shifting consumer behaviors. The CPM Chairperson recalled some previous engagements between CPM representatives and industry leaders, suggesting that these relationships be further institutionalized.
- [29] Furthermore, the potential role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) was identified as a potential transformative tool for risk mitigation. It was noted that AI-driven technologies could be utilized to “scrape” and monitor digital platforms in real-time to identify and flag products that pose specific phytosanitary risks before they enter international trade channels.
- [30] The SPG:
- (7) *noted* the update on the IPPC development agenda on e-commerce;
 - (8) *reviewed* the set of recommendations from the draft IPPC Observatory Study on E-commerce report; and
 - (9) *thanked* Canada for their in-kind staff contribution and financial support of the e-commerce development agenda.

6.4. Update on DAI 4 - Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities

- [31] The secretariat presented a paper⁶ regarding the main activities under this DAI, which were the development of two IPPC guides: *Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions* (2018-040), and *Audit in the phytosanitary context* (2021-009). The secretariat noted that until recently progress on the development of these guides was delayed due to funding constraints.
- [32] Following the departure of an in-kind staffer from Canada, who had been working on the guides, the IC determined that the Guide for Audits in the Phytosanitary Context has been identified as the immediate priority; work on the Guide on Authorization of Third-party Entities will subsequently initiate once an initial draft of the Audit guide is secured.. As requested by the IC, the secretariat will launch a call mid-November 2025 for experts for the Working Group to develop the audit guide and requested the SPG

⁵ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95067/>

⁶ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95098/>

participants to promote the call. Work on this guide will begin early next year after work has been completed on another guide on risk-based inspection.

[33] The CPM chairman said it might be prudent when developing guides to wait for few years before drafting so that we have more experiences to share and thus produce guides that are more impactful. He noted that this would give CPs time to gather lessons learned from implementation of ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*) which was published in 2022, providing the secretariat with case studies for inclusion in the guide. However, another participant noted that CPs sometimes reported that they needed support to implement standards and delaying the development of guides would deny them that support. Another participant said making guidelines available in languages other than English was important to the CPs.

[34] The SPG:

- (10) *noted* the update on the IPPC DAI Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities; and
- (11) *agreed* to promote the call for experts for the two working groups for the two guides to ensure a wide representation.

6.5 Update on DAI 5 Strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems

[35] The Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS) Chair Panagiota MYLONA (European Commission) presented a paper⁷ on the key outcomes from the work of the POARS Steering Group (SG) since CPM-19. The POARS SG had made significant progress in operationalizing the POARS framework, including finalizing the pilot pest assessments and establishing key workflows. The paper summarized these achievements and informed the SPG of the decisions requested by the POARS SG to the bureau. The paper asked the SPG for strategic guidance on the long-term implementation of POARS and its integration within the Strategic Framework.

[36] In early 2025, the secretariat launched a call for the nomination of potential emerging pests of global concern to pilot the POARS framework. The call invited NPPOs and RPPOs to submit potential emerging pests for assessment. The response was successful, resulting in 27 submissions for the POARS SG to evaluate. The POARS SG finalized the assessment during its September 2025 meeting. The SG had moved from the pilot assessment phase to active implementation, initiating several key operational activities representing the first concrete outputs of the system. These included global pest alerts and the establishment of expert working groups on emerging pests. The current SG plans to ensure the system was fully operational and ready for a seamless handover to the new SG.

[37] The secretariat added that CPM-19 had requested that the POARS SG propose updated terms of reference (ToR) and during the previous week asked the bureau to review and approve on behalf of CPM. The bureau had asked the secretariat to open an e-decision to approve the revised ToR for the new POARS SG, having revised its ToR in line with a new template for secretariat ToRs. The secretariat added the bureau had decided to establish an expert working group focused on *Rhizoctonia theobromae*, an emerging pest identified by POARS.

[38] Another participant asked if an expert working group would be established for every serious pest POARS identified or would pests be grouped together. The secretariat responded that only one expert group was going to be established at this time, dealing with one pest. Groups would work for approximately two years, based on the TR4 experience. Expert groups could be formed in future based on particular commodities rather than individual pests. One participant said their country needed help controlling pests and they had asked their RPPO for assistance in the past. The CPM chairperson clarified the bureau had not approved the draft ToR contained in the paper. In fact, the bureau decided to open an e-decision to approve a revised ToR based on ideas from the bureau and the SPG. Another participant commended the SG for establishing a way to assess pests under POARS.

⁷ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95096/>

[39] The SPG:

- (12) *provided* strategic guidance on the long-term implementation of POARS and its role in achieving the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030;
- (13) *provided* advice to deepen the strategic alignment between POARS and regional implementation programs, such as the APP;
- (14) *supported* a proposal for a potential side session at CPM-20 and provided input on its strategic direction; and
- (15) *provided* feedback on the planned next steps for the current Steering Group to ensure a successful transition to the long-term governance structure.

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

[40] The Secretariat presented the paper⁸ outlining the progress made by the Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues (FG-CCPI) against its CPM-approved work plan. It was noted that significant progress had been achieved, particularly in raising awareness and providing technical inputs to various IPPC subsidiary bodies.

[41] Key achievements reported included the development of a dedicated landing page for climate change resources on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) and the successful delivery of climate-related presentations during the 2025 IPPC Regional Workshops and other international meetings. The FG-CCPI is currently developing technical resources to facilitate the integration of climate change considerations into pest risk analysis (PRA). Furthermore, a webinar hosted in October 2025 attracted 500 participants, and the group is finalizing several factsheets regarding the impacts of climate change on specific pests.

[42] The CPM Chairperson commended the Focus Group, noting that its delivery had exceeded expectations. However, it was emphasized that as the IPPC moves toward a "business-as-usual" phase for climate change activities, the work would need to be mainstreamed into the core activities of the Secretariat and subsidiary bodies. The Chairperson also noted the need to balance resource allocation, as other CPM focus groups require support.

[43] During the ensuing discussion, a participant suggested that the secretariat provide an annual report to the CPM to track the ongoing progress and mainstreaming of the IPPC's work on climate change.

[44] The SPG:

- (16) *recommended* a strategic direction forward for the IPPC's work on climate change; and
- (17) *provided* guidance on the most strategic approach for raising awareness at CPM-20, including a side session as part of the innovation fair.

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

[45] The secretariat presented a paper⁹ on the Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research and Coordination (FG-GPRC). The group had met virtually 13 times and would meet in person for the first time in Rome in November. The main objective of the group was to carry out a scoping study to examine the existing international and regional phytosanitary research structures and policies.

⁸ 39_SPG_2025_Oct

⁹ 41_SPG_2025_Oct

- [46] The membership of the focus group was supposed to be geographically balanced. However, currently, there was no representative from the Latin America and/or the Caribbean. The bureau had been tasked finding a representative from the region.
- [47] A participant said research was being conducted on pests by different organizations. He asked what the focus group's next step would be after the survey. The secretariat responded that it would analyze the survey results, to identify existing global research gaps. This assessment will serve as the basis for developing targeted strategies to address those deficiencies and streamline international efforts. A further inquiry was made regarding whether the Focus Group's scope included examining the relationship between research coordination and research funding. The Secretariat acknowledged the inherent difficulty in decoupling these two elements, noting that identifying sustainable funding mechanisms would likely be integrated into the group's broader considerations for enhancing research cooperation.
- [48] The SPG:
- (18) *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination.

6.8 Update on DAI 8 Establishing a diagnostic laboratory network

- [49] Nolan AFRICANDER (South Africa) presented the findings of a study¹⁰ commissioned to examine the current global status and feasibility of establishing diagnostic laboratory networks (DLNs). The report underscored that Contracting Parties (CPs) face an escalating risk of pest incursions, and robust diagnostic capabilities remain fundamental to the early detection and accurate identification of regulated pests.
- [50] The presentation highlighted that many countries have successfully established regional and global networks to pool technical resources and expertise. Based on interviews conducted with international experts, the report emphasized that future DLNs should be designed to complement existing structures rather than create competition. Such a collaborative approach ensures the optimization of resources and strengthens the global phytosanitary infrastructure against emerging pest threats.
- [51] The presentation emphasized that long-term financial sustainability is a critical prerequisite for the successful establishment and functional maintenance of these networks. It was noted that robust, centralized systems for data management and information sharing are essential to ensure the seamless exchange of diagnostic data among Contracting Parties. He recommended learning from existing models, assessing institutional capacity, creating governance structures, assessing legal frameworks, examining institution requirements, looking at capacity within countries and regions, and building training programmes, data management systems and communications strategies.
- [52] During the discussion, a participant highlighted that the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) continues to maintain a robust work program centered on diagnostics. It was suggested that the IPPC community and other regions could benefit significantly from the lessons learned and best practices established by EPPO.
- [53] Another intervention focused on the African context, inquiring whether the study had considered existing regional networks, such as the Central and West African Virus Epidemiology (WAVE). It was emphasized that while regional models exist, significant barriers to the successful establishment and scaling of diagnostic networks remain, most notably the persistent limitations in human resources and sustainable funding.
- [54] The SPG:
- (19) *reviewed* the consultant's report presented in this paper;
- (20) *provided* comments and feedback on its findings and recommendations;

¹⁰ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95061/>

- (21) *provided* strategic direction for the work of the Focus Group on Diagnostic Laboratory Networking; and
- (22) *considered* funding options and financial contributions for the work of the focus group.

6.9 IPPC Observatory - Final review and evaluation of the SF DAIs

- [55] The secretariat presented a paper¹¹ on the final review and evaluation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 DAIs, which was part of the mandate for the IPPC Observatory. The exercise was meant to be aimed at mid-term assessing and evaluating the achievements and challenges in implementing the eight DAIs.
- [56] However, the secretariat said the work had not begun because of funding constraints. Nevertheless, the ToR for the review and evaluation was last year presented to the SPG, the bureau and CPM-19, which all acknowledged the importance of the task. The CPM had advised the secretariat to conduct the exercise as a final review and evaluation in 2027, as the next framework was being prepared. The secretariat presented the revised terms of reference to the CPM Bureau in June 2025, which noted the revisions. The final review established a tiered approach so that the assessment could be adapted to DAIs at varying levels of maturity—from concept to advanced implementation. With the revisions made to the ToR, SPG was told the cost of the exercise was estimated to be between USD 60 000 and USD 70 000.
- [57] The SPG discussed whether the review and evaluation should be conducted by an outside consulting expert or by the secretariat itself. The secretariat responded saying a monitoring and evaluation expert would be hired to conduct the technical aspect of the work, which would be overseen by the IPPC Observatory. Another proposal was to involve the FAO Evaluation Office to the final review and evaluation.
- [58] The SPG:
 - (23) *reviewed* and *discussed* the revised terms of reference for the final review and evaluation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 DAI in line with the CPM-19 (2025) recommendation.

Breakout session: IPPC Strategic Framework, what comes next?

- [59] The SPG participants broke into five groups to discuss the IPPC strategic framework, what comes next (Appendix 02).

7. Topics submitted for discussion by SPG (participants and accompanied papers)

7.1 Raising the profile of plant health for national plant protection organisations – the IPP's role

- [60] Gregory WOLFF (Canada) presented a paper¹² on IPPC communications and how proactively obtaining information on the communications needs of NPPOs could help raise the profile of plant health in their countries and regions. The presenter added that being part of the FAO was a strength that could enhance the perceived authoritativeness of IPPC communications and enhance the impact of the IPPC's messaging. Therefore, communications might benefit from a balanced approach, such as linking the value of forests to plant protection needs. In addition, since the target recipients of communications might not have a specific interest in plants, plant protection, or biology, the communications approach must find a way to capture their attention.
- [61] The SPG emphasized that CPs collaborate more effectively to elevate the global visibility of biosecurity and the facilitation of safe trade. The SPG acknowledged the inherent challenges in communicating

¹¹ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95068/>

¹² <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95005/>

technical phytosanitary concepts to broader audiences and stressed the need for a more dynamic advocacy strategy.

[62] Participants highlighted the increasing importance of multimedia content, specifically recommending the prioritization of video material to enhance engagement. The discussion noted that the "power of social media" should be fully harnessed, with CPs encouraged to amplify the IPPC's global reach by cross-sharing official communication materials on their respective national and regional platforms. Furthermore, it was suggested that communication strategies need to better connect with people and inform how plant health relates to their lives, also the need to target the younger generation by utilizing emerging and high-traffic digital platforms, such as TikTok. This approach aims to foster long-term awareness of plant health among future stakeholders.

[63] The IPPC secretariat expressed its appreciation for the SPG's strategic input, noting that these insights would inform the ongoing refinement of the IPPC's communication strategy and outreach initiatives.

[64] The SPG:

(24) *noted* the paper from Canada and suggestions made by SPG members.

8. ePhyto solution

8.1 Implementation status update

[65] The secretariat presented a paper¹³ on the implementation of the IPPC ePhyto Solution, one of the IPPC's priority programmes. The ePhyto Steering Group (ESG) had successfully established the ePhyto HUB as the international system for the exchange of electronic phytosanitary certificate information; completed the establishment of the generic ePhyto national system for the production, sending, and receiving electronic phytosanitary certificate information; and supported CPs in implementing the ePhyto HUB and the generic ePhyto national system. The secretariat had also revised the ePhyto work plan and team structure to ensure the successful implementation of activities and objectives. The secretariat reported that it had held a side session on ePhyto at the 2025 World Trade Organization Public Forum.

[66] A dedicated MDTF for ePhyto had been established following a CPM request, with a total available amount of USD 1.5 million. During CPM-19, it was agreed that each country would provide a voluntary annual contribution to support the implementation of the ePhyto work plan, for a total target of approximately USD 1.2 million. However, the secretariat said funding was a challenge and more work needed to be done to attract donors.

[67] The SPG noted that more CPs needed to be involved in the ePhyto Steering Group as not all members were actively engaged. One participant noted that ePhyto was critical for trade and market access, and more countries in Africa needed to implement the solution.

[68] The SPG participants engaged in a Mentimeter survey on ePhyto. The results are contained in Appendix 03.

[69] The SPG:

(25) *noted* the IPPC ePhyto Solution was in an unsustainable financial situation;

(26) *noted* the roadmap on IPPC ePhyto Solution activities;

(27) *discussed* options to improve the funding model and ePhyto governance.

8.2 ePhyto - Governance and functionality

[70] Peter THOMSON (New Zealand) presented a paper¹⁴ saying New Zealand had been a strong and long-standing supporter of ePhyto. He commended the ePhyto steering group, the secretariat and donors for

¹³ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95073/>

¹⁴ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95006/>

the progress made in establishing the IPPC ePhyto Solution, piloting its use, developing the web-based generic ePhyto national system (GeNS), and supporting implementation in developing countries. New Zealand was successfully exchanging certificates using the HUB.

- [71] For several years the ePhyto Steering Group (ESG) had guided CPM to explore, adopt and implement ePhyto. As ePhyto was now in implementation mode, CPs needed confidence that financial, operational, and assurance controls were in place, that change decisions were carefully considered before being approved, and that strategies for the future of ePhyto were being explored. He had confidence in the United Nations International Computing Center for day-to-day operational hosting, management, and delivery of ePhyto, but acknowledged that an enhanced governance may be required.
- [72] The SPG discussed the challenge of correct additional declarations required on phytosanitary certificates and suggested a new functionality that could be integrated into ePhyto that importing countries could keep up to date. However, one participant said while it would be advantageous to have an online system for additional declarations, it might be challenging to achieve given the complexity and format of additional declarations in some countries. The SPG recognized the urgent need to strengthen the governance framework of the ePhyto Solution, noting that an increasing number of CPs now depend on the system as a core component of their national import and export infrastructures. As the solution becomes further embedded in global trade, the transition toward a more formal and permanent oversight structure was deemed essential.
- [73] During the discussions it was suggested that a new Terms of Reference (ToR) be developed to explore various governance models. Participants proposed that such models should strike a balance between high-level oversight and technical expertise. Potential configurations could include members of the CPM Bureau to provide strategic alignment, supplemented by professional and technical experts from the Secretariat and the wider ePhyto community to provide operational insight.
- [74] The SPG emphasized that this proposed governance structure should be empowered to oversee functionality enhancements and financial management. Such a mechanism would ensure that strategic decisions regarding system upgrades and resource allocation are evidence-based, transparent, and optimized to deliver maximum value with the available resources.
- [75] The SPG:
 - (28) *discussed* the need for high level governance of the ePhyto solution and make appropriate recommendations to CPM-20 (2026);
 - (29) discussed the value of adding functionality to ePhyto allowing importing countries to publish additional declarations for easier exporting country access.

8.3 Presenting the ePhyto experience and a sustainability proposal (Ecuador)

- [76] Larry Mauricio RIVERA (Ecuador) presented a PowerPoint saying ePhyto had revolutionized international trade by ensuring secure and rapid electronic exchange of phytosanitary certificates between countries, providing speed, safety and cost savings. Currently, Ecuador's NPPO only charged the fee for physical/traditional phytosanitary certification, not the value-added service of the ePhyto electronic exchange. There was a critical need to establish a sustainable funding mechanism to cover the recurring costs of the ePhyto HUB. NPPOs faced budgetary and administrative constraints in making direct international payments to the IPPC. By using ePhyto, Ecuador was saving a significant amount of time, going from 72 hours to just one hour to generate a certificate. In the case of flowers and bananas, the savings to the private sector were between USD 5 and 6 million a year. Previously, the NPPO needed 50 people for physical certification and now only required one.
- [77] One participant asked how much the IPPC spent each year on the generic ePhyto system for each country. He was told 30 countries were using the generic system and others were testing it. The cost for countries varied depending on how much they used it but the IPPC would try to determine the average cost. The SPG chairperson said Ecuador's application of ePhyto was novel because the country used a third party between the NPPO and the private sector, which oversaw fee collection. Another participant

said they collected fees directly without using a third party but the fees didn't cover the cost of maintaining the system. However, the cost saving from not using a paper system were significant, particularly for industry.

[78] The SPG:

(30) *noted* the experience of Ecuador on the sustainability of the ePhyto solution.

8.4 How to incorporate national certification system into the ePhyto hub for safe trade facilitation: case of Cameroon electronic phytosanitary certificate system (Cameroon)

[79] Charles Shey NYING (Cameroon) delivered a presentation¹⁵ highlighting the transformative impact of electronic phytosanitary certification on national trade. He noted that prior to the adoption of digital systems, World Bank Group assessments indicated that Cameroon's international trade attractiveness was hindered by administrative procedures that were both time-consuming and costly.

[80] To address these challenges, Cameroon implemented the IPPC Generic ePhyto National System (GeNS) and established a connection to the ePhyto Hub. As of the reporting date, Cameroon has successfully issued over 14,300 electronic phytosanitary certificates and received approximately 3,800. The presentation underscored that Cameroon now serves as a regional model for the successful adoption of ePhyto, demonstrating that the system is technically robust, flexible, and scalable. The speaker emphasized that the ePhyto Solution is a key driver for modernizing phytosanitary trade and strongly encouraged Contracting Parties that have not yet joined the digital transition to initiate their participation.

[81] A participant asked how Cameroon was collecting fees given it wasn't using a third-party entity such as Ecuador. Moreover, he asked how Cameroon was maintaining the system. The presenter said each time the country collected a payment, which went to the national treasury, a percentage went toward maintenance. The CPM chairman commented that certificates had to be generated by NPPO public officers, and that third parties shouldn't have access to the ePhyto system.

[82] The SPG:

(31) *noted* the paper from contracting party and thanked it for its contribution.

8.5 ePhyto change management and governance (United Kingdom)

[83] CPM chairman Samuel BISHOP (Europe) referenced a paper¹⁶ from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on the issue and made brief comments. He said the United Kingdom had been a vocal, and financial, supporter of ePhyto and the project had been a major success. The United Kingdom believed now was the appropriate time to review the current ePhyto governance arrangements and was supportive of the New Zealand proposal which outlined a new governance process. However, the secretariat already had too many working groups and that involving the bureau might be less burdensome. He added that change management concerned the United Kingdom and that a mix of technical and policy personnel were required to ensure both policy and information technology worked together.

[84] The SPG:

(32) *thanked* and acknowledge all who have been involved in getting ePhyto to the stage it is at today; and

(33) *reviewed* the current ePhyto governance arrangements and make recommendations to CPM-20 (2026) on possible alternatives.

¹⁵ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95007/>

¹⁶ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95062/>

9. Rethinking ISPMs

- [85] Given the large number of papers submitted under this topic, the SPG agreed to keep presentations short. Discussion on the papers was held until the end of the presentations.

9.1 Rethinking ISPMs: The SC perspective

- [86] The secretariat presented a paper¹⁷ which recalled how New Zealand had presented discussion papers at the SPG meeting in 2024, and again at CPM-19, concerning the low readability, low translatability, accessibility, clarity and flexibility of ISPMs. The papers highlighted the negative consequences these issues could have on implementation and then proposed possible solutions.
- [87] It was pointed out that the SC supported the use of plain language to enhance accessibility and understandability but stressed the importance of defining what “plain language” meant. Language should be clear, concise and have a consistent flow while maintaining technical precision.
- [88] The SC believed there was a need for enhanced editorial support allowing copy editors to review draft texts approved by SC to increase clarity and consistency. Further, there was a need to engage plain-language experts to support the standard setting process. Flexible IPSM models should be developed to tailored structures for different types of ISPMs. At the same time obligation terminology should be clarified to provide a plain-language explanation of key model verbs either in the front or end matter of ISPMs or on the IPP Adopted Standards page, with a link to the ISPM itself. Finally, the editorial review process should be revised to explore new mechanisms for editorial review of standard drafts, including keeping editorial review in the hands of copy editors and plain-language experts, limiting editorial comments to the second round of consultation while including a disclaimer in the OCS inviting editorial comments only when they affected text comprehension.

9.2 Rethinking ISPMs: The IC perspective

- [89] The secretariat presented a paper¹⁸ which said IC contributed to the practical implementation of ISPMs by supporting CPs through tools, guides, training, and collaborative initiatives. The IC believed ISPMs should be written as clearly as possible, and implementation should be straightforward. It had been suggested that ISPMs contain too much guidance text. ISPMs should only contain core requirements and the remainder should be contained in guidance materials developed in conjunction with the ISPM. Moreover, to develop guidance material with a significant added value, there should be some experience with the implementation of the ISPM, as not all implementation issues could be identified until an ISPM was put into practice.
- [90] However, funding constraints represented an impediment for the development of guidance material. If the concurrent development of ISPMs and guidance material remained a priority to the community, the IC recommended a structured pilot involving one or two upcoming draft ISPMs. The pilot would apply plain language and visual formatting to the ISPM, develop and test associated guide content concurrently, use the IPPC Observatory and regional workshops to gather feedback and include a post-implementation review by CPs and RPPOs. The IC also encouraged the bureau to consider seeking donor support for this pilot.

9.3 Rethinking ISPMs, what is the essence of the experienced problems? (The Netherlands)

- [91] Marco TRAA (Kingdom of the Netherlands) presented a paper¹⁹ which said some CPs had raised concerns regarding the process for “rethinking” ISPMs and then possible negative consequences such as diluting the scientific quality of ISPMs. ISPMs were the IPPC’s core business and caution and due diligence were paramount. It was important to determine the exact root causes of the problems being

¹⁷ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95063/>

¹⁸ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95010/>

¹⁹ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95011/>

experienced. The presenter asked if concerns were about complex language or the lack of visual tools. He asked whether the root cause of the problems was in fact the use of ISPM's by phytosanitary inspectors in the field. The presenter proposed researching the issues to get a better understanding of the underlying challenges. This could be done through a written survey, supplemented with a series of focused online interviews for further clarification and depth. A designated working group or focus group could also help.

9.4 Rethinking ISPMs: Statements from COSAVE countries (CPM-19 (2025))

- [92] The CPM Chairperson presented a paper²⁰ on behalf of the Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE) saying that the organization agreed that standards should be easy to read and easy to follow and plain language might facilitate better understanding. However, the use of specialized phytosanitary terms was necessary in ISPMs and the quality of technical language in ISPMs should not be affected by excessive simplification. COSAVE also agreed that the low translatability of the ISPMs might lead to some CPs to translate them themselves. COSAVE suggested inserting explicit plain language principles into the IPPC Style Guide and test them using the Flesch-Kincaid readability test, although this might provide different results depending on the language. COSAVE didn't agree with establishing a technical panel to revise all adopted ISPMs as it would be time-consuming and expensive.

9.5 Rethinking ISPMs, concept planning and steps forward (Greece)

- [93] Ioannidou STAVROULA (Greece) presented a paper²¹ that said ISPMs were at the core of the implementation work undertaken by the Convention. It was important that ISPMs maintain their role and status in the IPPC community. It was equally important that ISPMs were understood and implemented by the entire community and any changes reflected the needs of CPs. The need to remove guidance material from ISPMs had been put forward to improve their clarity and implementation. Greece said the SPG should consider working on the readability and accessibility of ISPMs to enhance understanding and initiate a survey as a first step to identify the needs of the IPPC community. In addition, a plain language editor could help in drafting text for standards and the need to look at a sustainable funding model for the IC and producing more guidance material. The presenter also said discussions on the revision of the standards in the form of a DAI for the next strategic framework should continue.

9.6 Rethinking ISPMs: Advancing Plain Language for Global Accessibility of ISPMs (New Zealand)

- [94] Peter THOMSON (New Zealand) presented a paper²² that said his country had reflected on the feedback received at CPM-19 about rethinking ISPMs. He proposed a change to how ISPMs were written and suggested that the IPPC formally adopt plain-language principles as part of the standard setting process, and outline actions for integrating these principles into the revision and development of ISPMs. Guidance documents should also adhere to the same principles. He said the proposed plain-language approach aligned broadly with the goals of the IPPC to harmonize international trade and support implementation, capacity development, and international cooperation. He suggested well-resourced countries be encouraged to contribute technical expertise, plain-language editing, and translation support to revise ISPMs. He did not think an expert working group would be required to revise ISPMs, but the SC and technical experts would need to lead and steward the revisions. In addition, he suggested that all topics starting from 2027 onwards should be developed in a plain-language style.

9.7 Rethinking ISPMs Priorities and next steps (USA)

- [95] Michelle GRAY (United States of America) presented a paper²³ saying the United States believed that clearer ISPMs and associated guidance would make it easier for countries to align national regulations

²⁰ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95012/>

²¹ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95013/>

²² <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95072/>

²³ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95014/>

with international standards, and it would make them accessible to all CPs regardless of their primary language or level of expertise. The United States said focusing on the core requirements in ISPMs combined with the use of plain language wherever possible would make it easier to translate ISPMs. However, plain language should not be used in place of the necessary technical and legal language. The USA said visual tools could increase the accessibility of information. If contracting parties agree to rewriting ISPMs, manuals and guides for these ISPMs should be in place before the rewriting process began. In addition, ISPMs and guidance documents needed to be better connected on the IPP.

9.8 Rethinking ISPMs: observations from the UK (United Kingdom)

- [96] Samuel BISHOP (UK) presented a paper²⁴ saying that removing complex guidance material from ISPMs and instead focusing on obligations and the justification for them would improve the quality and value of the standards. However, it would not be possible or desirable to remove all guidance from ISPMs as some guidance was needed to help support comprehension of the text. It was also time to take a fresh look at ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*). One of the biggest challenges faced with drafting ISPMs was the inability to use some words in their “normal” way. For example, the word “field” had a narrow definition in ISPM 5 which prevented it from being used in the way most people would generally understand it. The presenter said the IPPC community could consider not including appendices in ISPMs; not having examples in parentheses (e.g. something, another thing); replacing guidance removed from ISPMs as PDF documents saved on the IPP with a link to the ISPM and vice versa; and reviewing how the SC and IC could work together to ensure that standards and supporting guidance material were developed concurrently.

9.9 Rethinking ISPMs: Towards Fit-for-Purpose, Accessible Standards (Australia)

- [97] Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH (Australia) presented a paper²⁵ saying the current structure of ISPMs was fragmented, with related standards dispersed across documents and organized numerically rather than functionally. This disjointed approach, combined with complex language and differences in interpretation, had created significant barriers to implementation. Countries that aligned their measures with ISPMs were generally better positioned to access international markets, underscoring the importance of ensuring the standards were clear, practical and accessible for implementation. The SC could approve underlying concepts and obligations of standards, instead of endorsing exact wording. This would allow editors to refine the language for clarity without compromising technical or scientific integrity. Introducing formal readability assessments during the drafting process would ensure that ISPMs were not only scientifically sound but also accessible to a wide range of users. The distinction between requirements and guidance within ISPMs also needed to be clarified. Separating standards from implementation guidelines would reduce complexity and make the documents more user-friendly. Reforming the IPPC Style Guide was also essential to support these changes.

9.10 Rethinking ISPMs-Views from the EPPO region (EPPO)

- [98] Olga TIKKA (EPPO) presented a paper²⁶ saying a diverse range of views existed in her region on what needed to be changed about ISPMs and how these changes should be made. A gap in the understanding of the issues faced by CPs was also an issue. The EPPO emphasized that efforts to improve clarity, ease understanding, or restructure and simplify ISPMs must be carefully considered to ensure technical depth and credibility was not lost. It was essential to proceed prudently and with a clear understanding of the issues surrounding ISPMs. During the recent regional workshop, extensive dialogue highlighted various perspectives on improving ISPMs. While there was some interest in making standards easier to read and implement, there was also a clear understanding that these standards were the result of many years of expert work. The EPPO advocated making ISPMs clearer through targeted language improvements,

²⁴ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95015/>

²⁵ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95016/>

²⁶ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95017/>

such as crafting accessible summaries and straightforward introductions, without altering the core technical content.

9.11 Rethinking ISPMs: Enhancing Relevance and Accessibility for the Pacific Region (PPPO)

- [99] Temarama ANGUNA (Cook Islands) presented a paper²⁷ which said the PPPO was deeply committed to the goals of the IPPC. However, to fully realize these goals it was essential that ISPMs were written in a way that was readable and translatable with requirements that were clear and could be practically implemented. The PPPO's regional context highlighted the urgent need to "rethink ISPMs" to make them inclusive, accessible, and responsive to the realities faced by NPPOs of small island countries. While important for managing plant health risks, ISPMs often reflected assumptions about infrastructure, capacity, and trade volume that were more applicable to well-resourced or high-volume trading countries. The presenter added that ISPMs were overly prescriptive, inflexible and impractical to implement in resource-constrained settings. Pacific NPPOs often struggled with how to apply ISPMs in specific scenarios, particularly when national legislation, or operational contexts differed from those assumed in the standards. To remain relevant and implementable, ISPMs must evolve to reflect the diverse capacities and contexts of all IPPC CPs.

9.12 Rethinking ISPMs: The perspectives of the Asian region (APPPC)

- [100] Natsumi YAMADA (Japan) presented a paper²⁸ which said the Asian region was a diverse group of countries, which included both highly developed economies and developing nations. From the Asian perspective, enhancing the effectiveness and clarity of ISPMs required a combination of structural reform to documents and practical implementation support. ISPMs were not flexible enough to accommodate rapidly evolving methodologies, technologies and pest threats. For example, the Asian region was experiencing shifts in pest distribution and behaviour due to climate change, which complicated surveillance and pest risk analysis. She said other presenters had focused on improving the design of ISPMs but did not address how the improvements could be implemented effectively. Even improved ISPMs would still require investment in translation, training, infrastructure, and operational capacity within the region. From the perspective of the Asia region, enhancing the effectiveness and clarity of ISPMs required a combination of structural reform to documents and practical implementation support. This included plain-language reform; the adoption of a tiered structure with core requirements presented upfront followed by detailed guidance; and the incorporation of diagrams, flowcharts, and digital decision trees to illustrate processes. Revision of ISPMs should be prioritized and focused on those already under review and development and should be implemented as part of the normal review process.

9.13 Views and recommendations of IPPC regional workshops on rethinking ISPMs

- [101] The secretariat presented a paper²⁹ which said seven regional workshops were convened between August and September 2025. Participants were encouraged to share perspectives, experiences, and recommendations on the readability, usability, and structure of ISPMs, with the outcomes compiled for consideration by the SPG. While views varied, several common themes emerged. Many regions supported the application of plain-language drafting principles, the separation of requirements from guidance, and the exploration of digital and layered formats to enhance usability. At the same time, caution was expressed about large-scale retroactive revisions of existing ISPMs and the risk of oversimplifying technical content. The secretariat said the results of these discussions provided the SPG with a consolidated overview of regional perspectives, which could inform deliberations and guidance to CPM-20 on the way forward.

²⁷ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95018/>

²⁸ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95019/>

²⁹ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95069/>

9.14 General discussion

[102] The SPG said rethinking the ISPMs was an important initiative and had brought detailed thinking to the issue but there was still work to be done. However, there was broad consensus that the ISPMs needed to be written in plain language, and the IPPC needed to conduct a survey to understand the depth and breadth of the challenges. One participant said it was important that any revision of ISPMs ensured that credibility was maintained and CPs needed to move slowly. But issues such as adequately and appropriately funding for the IPPC secretariat and updating the IPPC Style Guide were critical.

[103] Another participant said the SC work plan provided an opportunity to move forward on the issue. The changes could be accomplished as part of the normal standard setting process. One participant suggested a first step could be taken during the drafting process of ISPM 26, although the adoption process should not be delayed. They added that rethinking ISPMs might lead to cost savings as the process could be streamlined, and money could be saved on translation. The SPG agreed CPM-20 provided an opportunity to consolidate thinking on this issue and present CPs with a consensus.

[104] The SPG:

- (34) *noted* and *discussed* the SC's and IC's position on rethinking ISPMs;
- (35) *thanked* and *considered* all papers received from CPs and RPPOs;
- (36) *recommended* the bureau prepare a paper for CPM-20 (2026) on initial steps regarding this topic with input from the IC and SC.

Breakout session: Rethinking ISPMs

[105] The SPG participants broke into five groups to discuss rethinking the ISPMs (Appendix 04).

10. Updates from other CPM Focus Groups

10.1 Update on the CPM Focus Group on the “Safe provisions of food and other humanitarian aid” – action plan

[106] The secretariat presented a paper³⁰ on the work of the Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and Humanitarian Aid (FGSA) which was established by the CPM in 2022. Following the extension of the FGSA's mandate, its ToR was reviewed and subsequently approved at CPM-18 (2024). As part of this extended mandate, several new tasks were identified, including the development of an action plan. The plan aimed to bring about an integrated and coordinated approach to tackling humanitarian aid regarding associated biosecurity issues including plant health, animal production, animal health and food safety. Development of the action plan had been discussed at a face-to-face meeting of the FGSA in Nairobi, Kenya in June 2025, where FG members and other stakeholders engaged in in-depth talks on the level and modalities of collaboration with partner organizations.

[107] The draft action plan was presented to the bureau at its October meeting, where it was decided that further work on the plan should be made to highlight more the activities that the IPPC could and is able to perform, when collaborating with the World Organization of Animal Health (WOAH), the Codex Alimentarius (CODEX), the World Food Programme (WFP) and FAO divisions which dealt with emergency aid. The SPG discussed the development of the action plan and the fact it had not been approved by the bureau, but noted that the Bureau had met just the week prior the SPG. The SPG agreed it was important to involve the three SPS sister agencies, ensuring their input was represented in the final document, as well as focusing more on the role of the IPPC within the broader context of the safe provision of humanitarian aid. The SPG also discussed the development of an ISPM on this issue which should also seek insights from WOAH, CODEX and WFP during the consultation period.

³⁰ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95064/>

10.2 Update on the CPM Focus Group on Plant Health in the context of One Health

- [108] The secretariat presented a paper³¹ on the work of the CPM Focus Group on Plant Health in the Context of One Health (FG-PHOH). The main objective of the focus group was to conduct a preliminary study aimed at understanding where plant health was situated within the One Health framework. The issue was discussed at CPM-19, particularly in the context of anti-microbial resistance (AMR) in plant health. The secretariat said the FG-PHOH had been meeting virtually each month and had been well attended. The FG-PHOH had begun work on the preliminary study by establishing a ToR for the study and by conducting a comprehensive desk and literature review, based on a comprehensive research matrix.
- [109] The SPG discussed the idea of working within the One Health context – which required working with the three sister agencies – across a broad range of issues which it said should be considered during the drafting process for the new strategic framework. For example, the SPG said the One Health approach could also apply to sea containers, which not only presented a plant health risk, but also presented risks to human and animal health. One participant said plant health had a low profile within One Health, which needed to be changed. Another participant said the efforts the IPPC was making to have its voice heard among the sister agencies was starting to show results, but the community needed to be more assertive.

10.3 Update on the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers

- [110] Thorwald GEUZE (Kingdom of the Netherlands) presented on CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers (FGSC). The purpose of the FGSC was to review relevant materials and recommendations and develop viable options that would contribute to the phytosanitary risk management of sea containers. After an October 2025 symposium in Copenhagen, the FGSC identified and agreed on several risk management actions that NPPO's could implement globally. However, a debate within the focus group about the need for an ISPM was ongoing. The presenter asked for advice on securing resources for a workshop. Based on the previous 2023 sea containers workshop, the estimated dollar amount required would be USD 150 000. The secretariat currently had USD 80 000 allocated for sea container-related activities.
- [111] The SPG noted that some regional stakeholders were preparing regional standards in the absence of an international standard. The presenter responded that the focus group was concerned about the regional proposal because global harmonization was a better option. However, another participant said a draft regional standard could move the issue forward.
- [112] The SPG:
- (37) *provided* advice in relation to the organization of and securing of required resources to support delivery of the 2026 sea container workshop.

11. IPPC standards and implementation topics

11.1 ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) pest interception data presentations.

- [113] The CPM Chairperson said he was presenting a paper on behalf of COSAVE on the issue of wood packaging regulations. He asked participants to read the paper and contact COSAVE if they had questions or concerns. The paper said preventing the introduction of pests remained a challenge, despite wide-scale adoption of ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) because of the use of poorly treated or noncompliant wood packaging. Information on pest risks associated with ISPM 15-compliant wood packaging was scarce and despite being ISPM 15-compliant, a proportion of wood packaging material might pose significant pest risks and might provide a pathway for the introduction of timber pests. COSAVE's paper said in its region, it had found that 68.8 percent of live

³¹ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95076/>

insect interceptions occurred in wood packaging material that had the regulatory mark of ISPM 15, meaning phytosanitary treatment had been carried out in the country of origin but was not effective.

[114] One participant said they joined a recent meeting of the French National Research Institute for Agriculture, Food and Environment (INRAE) in Paris where the COSAVE paper was discussed. INRAE had said that government oversight of wood packaging producers was critical for pest mitigation. EPPO said it had a group dedicated to forestry which had discussed the effectiveness of heat treatment and the group was currently collecting scientific research on wood treatment, which could provide inputs about the concerns raised by COSAVE. Another participant said their country was preparing a paper on dry wood insects, which raised a lot of questions. He said he would contact COSAVE and would like to examine its data.

[115] The SPG

(38) *noted* the update from the COSAVE and thanked it for its contribution.

11.2 Proposed improvements to ISPM 3 (Indonesia)

[116] Antarjo DIKIN (Indonesia) presented a paper³² saying sole reliance on synthetic pesticides to control pests in food crops resulted in pest resistance and environmental hazards. As an alternative, biological control using natural enemies offered alternative pest control strategies. However, biological control agents (BCAs) were frequently not available for largescale mitigation and often needed to be imported. The presenter proposed the IPPC provide additional technical advice in the form of an annex to ISPM 3 (Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms) as a way of ensuring safety and sustainability for BCA use when it came to plant health and use in agro-industries.

[117] Indonesia added that ISPM 3 was important for the support of food security, food safety and biodiversity. However, the ISPM was recognized as being very technical and scientific and Indonesia said it would benefit from the inclusion of practical guidance in the form of an annex. The annex could elaborate on the importation of BCAs, identification of purified BCAs, organism testing and contingency plans for the potential escape of organisms.

[118] The SPG welcomed the discussion on BCAs and stressed the need to both ensure agents could not escape and the requirement they be monitored post-release. One participant said EPPO had put forward a proposed revision of ISPM 3 to ensure it was fit-for-purpose. It might be prudent to allow the SC to examine the proposed revision. The secretariat confirmed it had received EPPO's proposal which would be considered at the SC's November meeting before making a recommendation to CPM.

[119] The SPG:

(39) *noted* the update from the CP and thanked it for its contribution;

11.3 Proposal commodity standard on seaweed (Indonesia)

[120] Antarjo DIKIN (Indonesia) presented a paper³³ on seaweed saying the commodity was a popular food in many regions throughout the globe, adding Indonesia was a major producer and exporter of seaweed. However, the global expansion of seaweed aquaculture and the increasing transboundary movement of seaweed posed a potential risk for novel pathogen emergence. As such, Indonesia proposed the IPPC secretariat consider preparing an annex on seaweed to accompany ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*). Phytosanitary certification for seaweed would safeguard biosecurity by preventing the introduction and spread of pests and pathogens through seaweed trade while also ensuring compliance with international food safety and quality standards.

[121] One participant said at issue was the fact there was no known list of pests associated with seaweed. Another participant commented that an open call for topics for commodity standards was imminent, but

³² <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95020/>

³³ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95021/>

this paper was very broad and the IPPC needed to know which seaweed was being identified for assessment. They added that some seaweeds were invasive species and might meet the definition of a plant pest themselves. The CPM chairman remarked that not all seaweeds were plants as some likely fell into the chromista kingdom and therefore didn't fall under the IPPC's remit.

[122] The SPG:

(40) *encouraged* contracting parties to submit proposed topics through the IPPC's call for topics.

11.4 Reduction and replacement of Methyl Bromide as phytosanitary treatment in Pakistan (Pakistan)

[123] Muhammad ISHFAQUE (Pakistan) presented a paper on methyl bromide saying it had been widely used as a pest control treatment for many decades. Most uses of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure were for the treatment of durable commodities, such as grains, cereals and dried foodstuffs, wood packaging materials, wood and logs. Under the Montreal Protocol methyl bromide had been phased out except for quarantine and pre-shipment uses. In 2025 the Pakistani government had significantly reduced the use of the gas by amending legislation and implementing other measures, and had moved to use alternatives such as cold treatment, hot water treatment and the use of aluminum phosphide. Pakistan recommended a systems approach to reduce the use of methyl bromide for pest risk management.

[124] One participant said it might be prudent to undertake a cost benefit analysis examining alternatives to methyl bromide, particularly when it came to treating fruits and vegetables. Another participant said using alternatives such as heat treatment was appropriate for small consignments.

11.5 IPPC Observatory - Third IPPC General Survey (concept note)

[125] The secretariat presented a paper³⁴ saying that IPPC general surveys were designed to inquire about the way NPPOs were implementing ISPMs. The results were used to guide the IPPC's future development, adoption and implementation of ISPMs. General surveys were conducted in 2012 and 2016. In 2019 the IPPC Observatory conducted a comparative analysis of these surveys, which concluded that the methodologies used were insufficient to capture the evolving implementation realities over time and the IPPC recommended a redesign of the survey for the Third General Survey. By narrowing the objectives and aligning the scope of the survey with the Convention, and identifying the relevant ISPMs for incorporation, the third survey would be designed to promote standardization, simplify the process, encourage greater participation, reduce response burdens, and generate insights that supported standard setting, implementation and capacity development.

[126] The SPG congratulated the secretariat for its work on redesigning the survey and said it looked forward to seeing the results as they would reveal the way in which the Convention was being implemented. CPs said they were eager to take part in the survey and asked if additional questions could be added that might provide additional, associated information about the strength of the Convention and the challenges it faced. For example, one participant said CPs could be asked about what IPPC outputs they valued the most and what were the most challenging issues they faced. The additional information would help the IPPC and CPs as they prepared to draft the next strategic framework. The SC would provide input to the concept paper and planned to prepare the survey at its meeting in November.

11.6 IPPC Plant Health Campus and Mentimeter

[127] The secretariat and the FAO elearning Academy presented a paper³⁵ which said IPPC Plant Health Campus was a comprehensive online platform provided in English, and French, offering free access to 15 e-learning courses and more than 20 practical guides on plant health topics and technical information. The e-learning courses and the campus platform is currently being translated to Spanish and will be available early 2026. Hosted by the FAO elearning Academy and funded by the EU, the campus was

³⁴ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95083/>

³⁵ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95093/>

designed to strengthen phytosanitary capacity, targeting NPPO staff, phytosanitary capacity evaluation facilitators, university students and other stakeholders and partners. Some universities are working with the FAO elearning Academy to include campus courses in their masters' programmes. The elearning Academy also acknowledged the launch of the IPPC online simulation tool, *Pest Emergency Simulation: Prevent, Prepare and Respond*.

- [128] One SPG participant said the launch of the campus was welcomed. He said in the Asian region the campus was assisting NPPOs facilitate and expand their training programmes. For example, he said NPPOs needed to conduct more training on ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*) and the campus could help. He said it was important that inspectors be competent in their roles as they had to sign phytosanitary certificates, which only they could do. The campus was upgrading the competency of inspectors, which was critical. Another participant said she was pleased by the development of the campus, which would benefit countries across the world. She said the EPPO region was pleased to have contributed in-kind translation work and wanted to continue being supportive. A participant said the campus was helpful to CPs, particularly in Africa. He said training on ISPMs was critical and the campus had filled a gap, particularly for inspectors.
- [129] The SPG participants also engaged in a Mentimeter survey on the campus. The summary of results are contained in Appendix 05. The goal of this Mentimeter survey was to gather SPG members' insights on their perceptions and usage of the IPPC Plant Health Campus. They provided useful feedback to guide the type of learning content, communication, visibility, outreach and user experience.
- [130] The SPG participants broke into five groups to discuss challenges and opportunities for implementation of ISPMs (Appendix 06).

12. Africa Phytosanitary Programme

12.1 Update on the APP implementation

- [131] The secretariat presented a paper³⁶ and referenced a slide deck on the Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP), which was designed to empower phytosanitary officers at NPPOs and relevant national stakeholders, with modern science and advanced digital tools to boost their capacity to detect, respond to and recover from outbreaks of plant pests that have regulatory, economic and environmental consequences. The IPPC was implementing the APP in collaboration with the FAO and the African Union. The secretariat said Phase 2 of the APP was launched in June 2025, with a train-the-trainer workshop in South Africa. At the time nine new countries joined the programme, bringing the total to 20. The APP GIS HUB had been updated to include the nine new countries. The APP had received recent funding allocations from the United Kingdom and the European Commission, while FAO was poised to decide on a major contribution. The secretariat also created a MDTF for contributions from donors and contracting parties, which was currently empty.

- [132] The SPG:

(41) *provided* recommendations for the effective implementation of Africa Phytosanitary Programme.

12.2 An in-flight adjustment to sustain the impact APP (AU-IAPSC)

- [133] Saliou NIASSY (African Union) urged participants to read his paper on in-flight adjustments to the APP and continued with a brief slide deck. He said Africa had experienced a lot of pest outbreaks in recent decades and the APP had been a timely initiative as it covered 20 countries and developed important protocols for dealing with pest outbreaks. But he said two major issues needed to be addressed. One was the choice of countries involved in the APP, which favoured countries which possessed capacity and political stability rather than countries which had similar problems and policies. He said this issue needed in-flight correction as the programme had already progressed significantly. The second issue was the choice of pests the APP was focused on. He said the programme was largely focused on a limited

³⁶ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95101/>

number of pests such as fall armyworm, which affected cereal crops, but the programme might focus more on pests such fruit flies which affected cash crops such as fruits and vegetables.

[134] He added the APP was guided by field data from surveys, but this data should also be used to develop risk maps. He said the challenges faced were widespread, and it was important that training being provided in participating countries was shared more broadly with other countries. He suggested the APP produce a periodic newsletter covering the challenges and solutions it was working on. The newsletter could be translated into various African languages and distributed around the continent. Holding webinars would also be helpful. He stressed the importance of data collection and the possibility of linking the APP with the private sector.

[135] The SPG discussed the APP and ownership of the data generated by the programme, which needed to be secured. However, the secretariat currently had access to the data for training and verification purposes. The SPG also discussed the APP's training schedule and the distribution of tablets used for surveillance activities. More tablets were needed to provide capacity for participating countries. The SPG also discussed increasing the number of countries taking part in the APP and how a mobile training applications could be beneficial. One participant said it was important to expand into Indian Ocean countries which would require greater resources. The secretariat added it was critical that the African Union become even more involved in the programme and elevate it. Individual countries also needed to take ownership.

[136] The SPG:

(42) *noted the* presentation from AU-IAPSC on in-flight adjustments required to sustain the impact of APP.

13. International Day of Plant Health 2026-2028

[137] The secretariat presented a paper³⁷ on preparations being made the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH), which was held on 12 May each year and organized by FAO and other organizations to raise awareness about plant health among the public and scientific community. The 2025 campaign surrounding IDPH and associated content had gained more than 1 billion internet impressions through media coverage, web stories, social media, podcasts and other content items. More than 187 million unique users had been reached.

[138] The theme for 2026 would be about food security and the working title was "Plant biosecurity and the future of food". The secretariat was also planning the event over multiple years as it took many months to book in dignitaries to attend high-level events. Multiple year planning also reduced the burden of finding social media influencers each year. Regional and local influencers were important to reach target audiences such as young people. The bureau had suggested issuing a call for expressions of interest to NPPOs and RPPOs to organize high-level events over the next three years. The call would include the background, theme, administrative, logistical, financial and communications requirements. Last year, the main event was held in El Salvador, the first time it was held outside FAO headquarters. The secretariat said a major event could cost about USD 100 000.

[139] One participant noted that Japan was planning to hold a Plant Expo in 2027 with the theme of green infrastructure and proposed collaborating with FAO as it would be a good opportunity to promote plant health and invited SPG participants to attend. One participant asked why a country needed to host the main IDPH event and was told the FAO DG wanted to use the event to elevate the status of plant health and the Four Betters and believed this could be best achieved at the regional level. Another participant asked about the use of influencers, and the secretariat responded that using local and regional influencers was an efficient way of generating interest in local events. The secretariat added the FAO DG was the face of FAO and wanted to use his platform to promote plant health at the regional level and that he

³⁷ <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/95077/>

would likely attend. The secretariat also said all the communication materials for the IDPH would be created by FAO and then shared with countries hosting events.

[140] The SPG:

- (43) *Provided* their feedback on the multi-year planning and hosting/co-organizing arrangements for IDPH 2026 to 2028.

13.1 Future topics for the IDPH

[141] The SPG participants engaged in a Mentimeter survey on planning for IDPH. The results are contained in Appendix 07.

14. Preparations for CPM-20 (2026)

14.1 CPM report, how soon can we meet? (EU)

[142] Leonard SHUMBE (European Union) presented a paper which said on the last day of each CPM, the draft report was made available for CPs to verify before the report. This verification process usually led to corrections and changes in the report before adoption. However, it took at least two months after the CPM session for the final report to be published. He said the EU believed one factor contributing to delay was the translation of the report into FAO languages.

[143] The SPG said the suggestions were welcome as delays in publishing the report had been problematic. The secretariat added that it appreciated the suggestions from the EU on the report publication and agreed it needed to improve processes and would endeavor to do so. Another participant said the report should be loaded onto the IPPC website alongside the CPM papers, making it easier to locate.

[144] The SPG:

- (44) *discussed* the proposed options detailed in the paper;
- (45) *encouraged* the secretariat to consider making use of the suitable option(s) starting from CPM-20.

14.2 Successes and challenges in implementing the IPPC

[145] The CPM chairman reminded participants that the bureau was planning to hold an innovation fair featuring a successes and challenges event and a poster session during CPM-20 in the atrium at FAO headquarters.

14.3 Side sessions

[146] A participant requested that the side session on sea containers be held after the topic had been discussed in the plenary. The secretariat said it would make its best efforts to make that happen. The side sessions at CPM-20 would be on sea containers and commodity standards, and a science session would be on safe humanitarian aid.

15. Any Other Business

[147] There was no other business.

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

[148] A meeting survey was conducted with the use of a QR code. The results are contained in Appendix 08.

17. Next Meeting

[149] The SPG noted that the date and venue for its next meeting remained to be determined. The Secretariat will communicate the finalized arrangements to participants in due course and post the details on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP).

18. Close of the Meeting

[150] The SPG Chairperson expressed his appreciation to all participants for their active engagement and valuable contributions throughout the meeting. He also extended his gratitude to the IPPC Secretariat for its efficient organization and sustained support for the meeting.

Appendix 1: Adopted agenda

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER / IPPC Secretariat support
1.	Opening of the Meeting		IPPC Secretary / SPG CHAIRPERSON
2.	Meeting Arrangements		
2.1.	Adoption of the Agenda	01_ SPG_2025_Oct	SPG CHAIRPERSON
2.2.	Election of the Rapporteur	--	SPG CHAIRPERSON
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1.	Document list	02_ SPG_2025_Oct	SENTINELLI
3.2.	Participant list	03_ SPG_2025_Oct	SENTINELLI
3.3.	Local Information	Link to local information	SENTINELLI
4.	Update from the CPM bureau	--	BISHOP
5.	Update from Regional Workshops	27_ SPG_2025_Oct	NERSISYAN
6.	Stocktake report for each of the DAIs from the 2020-2030 IPPC Strategic Framework		
6.1	Update on DAI 1 <i>Making trade safe by harmonizing electronic data exchange</i>	31_ SPG_2025_Oct	ANGUNA-KAMANA / DRIS / NUZZO / BRUNEL
6.2	Update on DAI 2 - <i>Easing market access through commodity-specific plant health standards</i> and the IPPC Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)	37_ SPG_2025_Oct	MOREIRA
6.3	Update on DAI 3 - <i>Management of e-commerce and postal and courier pathways</i>	28_ SPG_2025_Oct	MADAMINOVA / BRUNEL
6.4	Update on DAI 4 - <i>Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities</i>	40_ SPG_2025_Oct	PARMAR
6.5	Update on DAI 5 <i>Strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems</i>	38_ SPG_2025_Oct	MYLONA/BELTRAN
6.6	Update on DAI 6 - <i>Assessing and managing climate change impacts on plant health</i> and the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues	39_ SPG_2025_Oct	BELTRAN
6.7	Update on DAI 7 <i>Establishing global phytosanitary research coordination</i> and the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination	41_ SPG_2025_Oct	PANGANIBAN / CAPLEN
6.8	Update on DAI 8 <i>Establishing a diagnostic laboratory network</i> - Deficiencies and challenges in phytosanitary diagnosis in developing countries (Submitted by: Dominican Republic)	23_ SPG_2025_Oct 01_CRP_SPG_2025_Oct	AFRICANDER / MOREIRA / MARTINO
6.9	IPPC Observatory - Final review and evaluation of the SF DAIs	29_ SPG_2025_Oct	MADAMINOVA
Breakout session: IPPC Strategic Framework, what comes next?			
7.	Topics submitted for discussion by SPG Participants and accompanied by papers		

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER / IPPC Secretariat support
7.1	Strategic priorities and challenges in Iraq's phytosanitary framework: A forward-thinking approach. (Submitted by: Iraq)	04_ SPG_2025_Oct	ABBAS (TBC)
7.2	Raising the profile of plant health for national plant protection organisations – the IPP's role (Submitted by: Canada)	05_ SPG_2025_Oct	WOLFF
8.	IPPC ePhyto Solution		
8.1	Implementation status update - ePhyto mentimeter	31_ SPG_2025_Oct	BRUNEL/NUZZO
8.2	ePhyto - Governance and Functionality (Submitted by: New Zealand)	06_ SPG_2025_Oct	THOMSON
8.3	Presenting the ePhyto experience and a sustainability proposal. (Submitted by: Ecuador)	--	MAURICIO RIVERA JARA
8.4	How to incorporate national certification system into the ePhyto hub for safe trade facilitation: case of Cameroon electronic phytosanitary certificate system (Submitted by: Cameroon)	07_ SPG_2025_Oct	Charles Shey NYING
8.5	ePhyto change management and governance (Submitted by: UK)	24_ SPG_2025_Oct	BISHOP
9.	Rethinking ISPMs		
9.1	Rethinking ISPMs: The SC perspective	25_ SPG_2025_Oct	PETERSON
9.2	Rethinking ISPMs: The IC perspective	08_ SPG_2025_Oct	GEUZE
9.3	Rethinking ISPMs, what is the essence of the experienced problems? (Submitted by: The Netherlands)	09_ SPG_2025_Oct	TRAA
9.4	Rethinking ISPMs: Statements from COSAVE countries (Submitted to CPM-19 (2025))	10_ SPG_2025_Oct	BISHOP
9.5	Rethinking ISPMs, concept planning and steps forward (Submitted by: Greece)	11_ SPG_2025_Oct	STAVROULA
9.6	Rethinking ISPMs: Advancing Plain Language for Global Accessibility of ISPMs (Submitted by: New Zealand)	12_ SPG_2025_Oct	THOMSON
9.7	Rethinking ISPMs Priorities and next steps (Submitted by: USA)	13_ SPG_2025_Oct	GRAY
9.8	Rethinking ISPMs: observations from the UK (Submitted by: UK)	14_ SPG_2025_Oct	BISHOP
9.9	Rethinking ISPMs Towards Fit-for-Purpose, Accessible Standards (Submitted by: Australia)	15_ SPG_2025_Oct	VIVIAN-SMITH
9.10	Rethinking ISPMs-Views from the EPPO region (Submitted by: EPPO)	16_ SPG_2025_Oct	TIKKA
9.11	Rethinking ISPMs: Enhancing Relevance and Accessibility for the Pacific Region (Submitted by: PPPO)	17_ SPG_2025_Oct	ANGUNA-KAMANA
9.12	Rethinking ISPMs: The perspectives of the Asian region (Submitted by: APPPC)	18_ SPG_2025_Oct	YAMADA
9.13	Views and recommendations of IPPC regional workshops on rethinking ISPMs	30_ SPG_2025_Oct	NERSISYAN
Breakout session: Rethinking ISPMs			
10.	Updates from other CPM Focus Groups		

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER / IPPC Secretariat support
10.1	Update on the CPM Focus Group on the “Safe provisions of food and other humanitarian aid” – Action plan	26_ SPG_2025_Oct	PETERSON / ANGUNA-KAMANA / MOREIRA
10.2	Update on the CPM Focus Group on Plant Health in the context of One Health	33_ SPG_2025_Oct	GRAY / BRUNEL / MADAMINOVA
10.3	Update on the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers	--	STIRLING
11.	IPPC standards and implementation topics		
11.1	ISPM 15 (<i>Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade</i>) pest interception data presentations.	<u>CPM-19 INF paper</u>	BISHOP
11.2	Proposed improvements to ISPM 3 (Submitted by: Indonesia)	19_ SPG_2025_Oct	DIKIN
11.3	Proposal commodity standard on seaweed (Submitted by: Indonesia)	20_ SPG_2025_Oct	DIKIN
11.4	Reduction and replacement of Methyl Bromide as phytosanitary treatment in Pakistan (Submitted by: Pakistan)	21_ SPG_2025_Oct	Muhammad ISHFAQUE
11.5	IPPC Observatory - Third IPPC General Survey (concept note)	35_ SPG_2025_Oct	MADAMINOVA
11.6	IPPC Plant Health Campus and mentimeter	36_ SPG_2025_Oct	BRUNEL
Breakout session: Challenges and opportunities for implementation of ISPMs			
12.	Africa Phytosanitary Programme		
12.1	Update on the APP implementation	42_ SPG_2025_Oct	NERSISYAN
12.2	An in-flight adjustment to sustain the impact APP (Submitted by: AU-IAPSC)	32_ SPG_2025_Oct	NIASSY
13	International Day of Plant Health 2026		
13.1	Multi-year planning for the International Day of Plant Health 2026-2028	34_ SPG_2025_Oct	FRIO
13.2	Future topics for the IDPH	--	
14	Preparations for CPM-20 (2026)		
14.1	CPM report, how soon can we meet? (Submitted by: EU)	22_ SPG_2025_Oct	SHUMBE
14.2	Successes and Challenges in implementing the IPPC	--	BISHOP
14.3	Side sessions	--	BISHOP
15.	Any Other Business		SPG CHAIRPERSON
16.	Meeting feedback and discussion on format and possible themes for future SPG meetings	--	SPG CHAIRPERSON / ALL
17.	Next Meeting		SPG CHAIRPERSON
18.	Close of the Meeting		SPG CHAIRPERSON

Appendix 2: Summary of the group's deliberations from the breakout session - IPPC Strategic Framework, what comes next?

Group 1

Session Title:
IPPC Strategic Framework, what comes next?
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Too much work to start from scratch a totally new framework, we can use the current to amend and update. - Frequency of a framework – 5 years / 10 years? <p>Do we want it fixed or flexible to open it every 2 years for editing / changing?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flexible within a 5-year period. Who will lead? A steward for each topic to lead and be responsible for following. However it should not be on demand a consensus to change by the CPM. <p>Doing topics regionally or nationally?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ask the RPPOs for guidance – regional coordination is important. - Change management is important. Are there new things? Are old items redundant that can be removed. - IPPC Sec moves away from the core business which puts the SF and other core business at risk. - Do you put topics on the framework without any budget indications? If the budget isn't there, no implementation. <p>- How to develop the next SF? A dedicated SPG meeting and everyone had to bring topics and papers. The time is now – the next SPG (2026) to have topics come up</p>
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5-year flexible framework – potential changes every 2-years - Use the same iteration of the current framework as a baseline. Not starting from scratch. - Have a champion / steward for each topic. - Adopt the framework along with an implementation plan - Review of the SDGs to ensure we are aligned. - Next SPG (2026) to have a session on topics to be on the next SF.

Group 2:

Session Title:
What is next for the Strategic Framework?
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Throw out and start over - Keep a few things, ePhyto, Standards - Objectives required to continue and identify how to measure success - Consider if the Convention is still meeting our needs? small change would be ePhyto funding. Having some funds before initiating projects - A proper Focus Group should be considered. - Professional facilitator for strategic planning. Then a more dedicated group could work on the outcomes from the discussions. - Element of success. How do we measure? Topics at CPM tend to remain the same. Some new issues AI, one health, but most of the topics remain the same. - AI – How can we use it in Plant health. Identify potential risks and develop some guidance. - How do police AI? What will be the future as AI becomes more intelligent...How will we police that? - One Health...Important that IPPC framework aligns with FAO, WTO framework and linkages.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research how we can work together to address/resolve issues related to One Health. - Balance ambition with practicality - Plant health innovation (AI, drones). New stuff and how to implement. - There are a lot of innovations that are not necessarily known about. How do we make that happen - Organize into tiers of process and content
Final summary / recommendations
<p>Figure out how to do and promote innovation while ensuring plant health.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluate current strategic plan and identify what was done right and what could have been done better. - Funding???? - How do we best use IDPH to maximize and update the public on innovative plant health technologies. - Strategic communication needs to be better incorporated into the strategic framework. - Non-chemical interventions for pest control/management are important innovations.

Group 3

Session Title:
IPPC Strategic Framework, what comes next?
Discussion points
As a first step, the group identified factors; What do we know about what we did, not know back in 2020. (for the details, please see all the points on the next page)
Final summary / recommendations
<p>The group considered 10 factors more important and selected them as their recommendations for the next. (highlighted in yellow)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Future focused DAIs that is looking forward (not just 10yrs, but 20 or 30 yrs), utilizing horizon scanning - Implementation at global level - Needs to be written in a way and accountability -- to attract attention of decision makers/investors - Enabling technology -- citizen science, phone apps (windy) to tackle new disruptive events - Importance of collaborations -- e.g. one health, networks, recognize relevance and profile of plant health. Utilize other organizations' existing plans, policies, ... (eg Codex pesticide usage) - Resource planning -- to know where we will source, ownership, to ensure sustainable funding - Considering the FAO strategic plan -- engage with leads to ensure our next SF works in with this - Food security—central roles of plants and plant health as a pillar in one health - Communications -- fundamental element to raising profile of plant health leveraging industry, NGOs (especially for topics such as e-commerce, Sea containers) - Education -- global plant health courses (on science + risk + regulatory components)

Group 4

Session Title:

IPPC Strategic Framework, what comes next?
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Problem accessing information on the importing country legislation. Some countries do not have any information linked to NPPO page. The SF could have focus on this. Important to understand the impediments to fulfilling obligations such as <u>NROs</u>, where such information is presented. - Smart plant health – use of AI? Using new technologies to raise awareness? - Communication – how do we implement the recommendations from the comms strategy? Need to move from strategy to implementation. - One Health – need to be narrowed it down to see the priorities for IPPC community. - Should any DAI from the current SF be carried to the next one? E.g e-commerce? - How could IPPC work better with two sister organizations – Codex and WOA: one health, sea containers, audit, e-commerce etc... How and when should the three sisters collaborate. WTO could promote the collaboration
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthening NROs - Comms channels – need for innovation, use new tools to reach out to youth. - OH – what are PH priorities? - Collaboration with sister organizations on relevant areas, under WTO umbrella? - Shared resources and facilities with other areas – animal health, human health, food safety.

Group 5

Session Title:
IPPC Strategic Framework, what comes next? Following 2030
Group 5
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Last SPG thought that 10 yrs was too long, 5 was preferred – with a regular review. - Consider, do we put forward priorities (5 years, 10 years) short, medium and long? As there may be tasks and outcomes needed in the short/medium term. - We also need to consider if the current priorities need to continue. - Consider that we cannot just close at 10 years and open something new, what has been achieved needs to be considered. Look at what has been achieved to consider what can be operationalized in the next 10 years – Revision/continuation rather than completely new. - To consider the next Framework, planning may need to start a significant amount of time before hand (2/3 years?) for the next framework – if it is 5 years – how can we potentially shorten this planning period? - If 10 years, priorities may change along the way, with new issues arising – short term a bit more planning pressure, 10 years a bit more flexibility. - Has there been an evaluation of the existing framework? Rokhila's presentation outlined the preparation for the evaluation. Will this provide enough of an overview of the former strategic framework to consider what should be carried over/extended/achievements. - To determine 5 or 10 years need to look at how priorities have been progressed during the previous time (in 5 and 10 year marks) - Need to consider what the priorities are based on? - Items, such as pest response systems may be up and running, but may still be relevant for consideration during the priorities of the next Framework.

- If 10 years, consider including goals/outcomes for 5 years – midterm evaluations.
- If a 10year timeframe, then a mid-term evaluation could be planned to facilitate any changes/developments/budget changes etc.
- Consider for 10 years, this may be less flexible as there will be changing priorities and challenges over this period.
- Also need to consider priorities from a regional perspective as the timeframes around some priorities/projects will be dependent on capacity and resources.
- Noted that third party entities may be completed by the end of this period, however other priorities are longer term and will develop as to how they need to be incorporated into the next Framework.
- One constraint identified if no set budget from the IPPC to ensure the delivery of priorities within a set timeframe.

Final summary / recommendations

The group considered that it should not be a completely new framework but should be an iteration of the previous framework taking into consideration the previous achievements and takeaways.

- The group felt that a flexible framework would be preferred, also relevant noting how quickly things are developing and changing.
- Consider a longer-term flexible framework (e.g. 10 years) structured based on priorities, with a mid-way evaluation. This will allow for shorter term goals which will set a goal post from which parties progress for the next 5 years. Also, consideration of priorities or projects from a regional perspective as some parties may be able to deliver projects over varying timeframes due to capacity etc.
- Potentially consider the proposal for an adjustment of the timeframe (e.g. 8 years) if 4 years would be a better timeframe for an evaluation.
- Important to consider the ordering of priorities/projects as certain DAIs may impact/influence other projects.
- Should consider consolidating certain tasks to make best use of resources and consider where DAIs may align.
- Considered priorities for inclusion: One Health, Rethinking ISPMs, Laboratory Networks, ePhyto, potentially POARs and research coordination.

Appendix 3: Summary of the Mentimeter survey on ePhyto

Participants associated ePhyto with themes of **efficiency, security, innovation, trade facilitation, and cost/environmental savings**. They expressed a strong interest in receiving more information on **implementation guidance, system updates, benefits and statistics, country practices, and future developments**. The preferred communication channels were the **IPPC/ePhyto webpage**, followed by the **IPPC Newsletter** and **email**.

Respondents highlighted clear benefits of ePhyto, such as **time and cost savings, reduced delays, fraud prevention, and environmental advantages**, while noting challenges like **system outages** and uneven country uptake. The quality of current implementation was mostly rated as “delivering” or “developing.” Regarding ESG governance changes, feedback suggested generally positive expectations for improved communication and resource use.

Expectations for the IPPC Secretariat focused on **training materials, webinars, on-site training, user support, and country-to-country coordination**. Priority enhancements identified included **harmonization of additional declarations, mixed commodities support, and non-compliance notifications**. Views on funding model improvements varied, with suggestions ranging from **greater transparency, usage-based fees, industry cost-sharing, and blended funding, to maintaining stability** in the current model.

Appendix 4: Summary of the group's deliberations from the breakout session – Rethinking ISPMs

Group 1

Session Title:
Rethinking ISPMs
Discussion points
<p>Is there a problem? Yes but it is a problem that can be solved?</p> <p>If so, what is it?</p> <p>Gaps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Language is difficult to understand and then difficult to translate into non-official languages - especially with new pest strains - general lack of understanding of the basic concepts of the standards - Ambiguous language. - It is difficult to reach higher levels (in governments) to make them understand the importance of standards. - Shorter sentences make it easier to read and understand. <p>How to address the problem?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include hyperlinks to educational videos in the guides / implementation material. - More visuals (tables, diagrams) summaries complimenting the detailed text - Have an explanatory video to go alongside each standard to give background and context. - Review the structure of ISPMs; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Executive summary - Reviewing the standard setting process - Hyperlink in ISPMs to the general terminology. <p>Who should address the problem?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CPs and NPPOs - Active participation by each region – improve regional engagement. <p>When to address the problem?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Start with the current work programme – - The next EWG should keep this in mind.
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Address the language first as a priority.

Group 2

Session Title:
Rethinking ISPMs – GROUP 2
Discussion points
<p>Is there a problem? If so, what is it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, several countries (e.g. during the Africa regional workshop) identified persistent issues with clarity and consistency in ISPMs. • Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ <i>Fusarium TR4</i> – confusion in terminology (e.g. cluster, bunch, etc). ◦ Lack of visuals to support understanding. • Key challenges: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Complex language and long sentences make standards difficult to interpret. ◦ Language differences create varying interpretations across countries. ◦ Unclear purpose of standards within NPPOs (policy, technical, inspection aspects not well distinguished). ◦ Different interpretations of “plain language” among stakeholders. • General comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Technical expertise doesn't justify overly complex language. ◦ However, plain language must not oversimplify technical content. ◦ A suggestion can be focusing on ISPM 5. ◦ Standards should include only essential information, avoiding overreliance on examples. ◦ The problem depends also on the kind of standards, because if we consider DPs they are typically not problematic as they are designed for an audience of trained diagnosticians. <p>How and who should address the problem?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link standards with implementation materials to ensure coherence. • Include good technical practices within standards (not only in guidance documents). • Define minimum requirements clearly in both standards and guidance. • Develop a new DAI <p>Short-term actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a simple landing page for each standard with all related materials (guidance, tools, etc.). <p>Pilot initiative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft a CPM paper proposing a plain language pilot with a standard under review (e.g. ISPM 26). • Compare plain language versions with the adopted one and gather CPM feedback. • If effective, propose next steps for broader implementation. <p>Responsibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau, with input from IC, SC, and SPG, to draft the CPM paper. • Plain language experts to support drafting of technical content • During country consultation, plain language principles should be applied. <p>When to address the problem?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ CPM-20 (March 9–13, 2026) – “Friends of the Chair” to present the approach for CPM approval. ◦ After CPM approval → begin collaboration with plain language experts.
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot-test plain language revisions on selected ISPMs. • Strengthen linkage between standards and their implementation materials. • Involve plain language experts in ISPM drafting and review. • Survey to explore the problem further

Group 3

Session Title:
Rethinking ISPMs
Discussion points
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there a problem <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, there is a problem. 2. If so, what is it <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The readability and accessibility of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) could be improved without compromising their technical accuracy. Current drafting often reflects highly academic or complex language and structure, making the text difficult to interpret for a broad range of users. There is also a general need to incorporate plain language to enhance understanding while preserving scientific precision. 3. How and who should address the problem <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Standards Committee (SC) should take the lead in addressing this issue, with collaboration from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) where relevant. Proposed actions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embedding a plain language expert during the drafting stage of standards developed by Expert Working Groups (EWGs). • Reviewing or modernizing the current guidance on drafting ISPMs to include clear language requirements and recommendations. • Developing an explanatory note or instruction outlining best practices for structuring ISPMs. • Asking the SC to explore improved ways of structuring and layering information in newly developed ISPMs to differentiate clearly between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Core requirements - Secondary requirements - Guidance elements • Taking a staged approach to implementation, beginning with new or revised ISPMs before extending changes to older standards. • Conducting a survey to identify key areas needing improvement, specifically to determine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Which ISPMs most require revision to improve understanding or interpretation; and - Which guidance materials would benefit from further clarification or simplification. 4. When to address the problem <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This problem should be addressed during the drafting stage
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acknowledge the need to enhance the readability and structure of ISPMs while maintaining their technical integrity. - Integrate plain English principles and structural clarity into the ISPM drafting and review process. - Engage a plain language expert in future EWGs to support consistency and accessibility. - Develop guidance or an explanatory note on best practices for structuring ISPMs. - Conduct a survey to identify which ISPMs and guidance materials most need improvement or clarification. - Adopt a staged approach, beginning with new ISPMs currently under development.

Group 4

Session Title:
Re-thinking ISPMs
Discussion points
<p>Is there a problem? YES</p> <p>If so, what is it? Readability, Combination of guidance material in ISPMs (opposing views that some believe that guidance and ISPMs should stay together while others believe they should be separated). It should be easier to find guidance- should guidance be an Annex to the ISPMs to reduce the difficulty in finding the relevant guidance. This could help overcome the issue of lack of funding for translations for guides, but it could make the overall development process of standards expensive.</p> <p>As guidance is not consulted so there may be difficulty in adding guidance in the annex? ISPM can be very big with guidance included, however this means the guidance would need to be consulted. However, as guidance is not binding, they don't need to be consulted but since the standards are binding so it goes through higher levels of review. It can be confusing as some ISPM titles start with "Guidance of...".</p> <p>Translation – some question of confidence on whether the translated standards have the same meaning as English, e.g. one person translates from English to Spanish and one person reviews it which is a lot easier and lot less rigor in comparison to the original document. However, noting that English language is complicated and has a lot of nuances which leaves room for interpretation. Also, variation in English across English speaking countries – so it means that when developing standards, sentence structures can get complicated to create statements that work for everyone. This is why it is likely translations are "easier", however there is no guarantee that the translation is exact/capturing the original intention. Perhaps the examples in ISPMs should be clearer as sometimes they are not helpful to explain the point that is being made. Some standards say "core requirement" vs "requirement". What is the difference? Are "core requirements" things that <u>must</u> be done and supported by "requirements"? Standards say what must be done – not how it should be done.</p> <p>How and who should address the problem? An expert copy editor and simple language expert. AI could be a solution in the future however, noting that currently greater training is needed. At this stage, AI cannot be relied on without expert input and review.</p> <p>When? when the expert working group are drafting it, they should keep in mind to make the standard clear and succinct. The chair then would need to make sure the members are proposing specific wording, ask is proposed wording critical (is it nice to have to a must have?). Agreement that we should start with any new standards and then when old ISPMs are reviewed.</p>
Final summary / recommendations
<p>Yes, there is a problem—primarily with readability and accessibility of guidance material in International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). Key issues discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration of guidance: There are generally different views on whether guidance should remain within ISPMs or be separated. Including it as an annex could make guidance easier to find and reduce translation costs but may make standard development more expensive and complex. In addition, we may not have implementation examples, i.e. case studies to include in the guidance. • Consultation and binding nature: Guidance is non-binding and usually not consulted, while standards are binding and require more review. Including guidance in ISPMs could blur this distinction. Confusion also arises because some ISPM titles begin with "Guidance on..." • Language and terminology: The use of "should" vs "must" create uncertainty. Use of "should" implies flexibility but legally can be interpreted as an obligation. • Translation concerns: Translations may lose meaning or nuance due to differences in language structure and variation across English-speaking countries, leading to inconsistent interpretation. • Examples and terminology clarity: Examples in ISPMs are often unclear, and terms like "core requirement" vs "requirement" are not well defined. • Proposed solutions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Involve expert copy editors and plain-language specialists to improve clarity. ○ AI could help in the future but currently needs expert oversight. ○ When drafting new standards, the expert working group and chair should ensure wording is clear, concise, and necessary. ○ Begin improvements with new ISPMs, then apply them when existing ones are reviewed.

Group 5

Session Title:
Rethinking ISPMs
Discussion points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Key need for improvement of readability. - Considered there is a need to further investigate the extent/specifics of the problem. - Plain wording will enhance implementation. - ISPMs need to be considered from a regional perspective, taking into consideration capacity and resources and geographical variables. - Implementation problems – could be improved by looking at this from a regional perspective, noting geographical variability. Not only capacity and resources, but environmental differences. Also with commodity-specific problems, noting the use/requirement of specific treatments (e.g. methyl bromide) where there is an inability for these to be met by some CPs.
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Is there a problem:</i> Yes, clarity of ISPMs which can result in variations of CPs implementing/interpreting information/requirements, e.g. geographical variability, results in differing requirements of CPs based on the minimum requirements. - Differences in pest risks can lead to differing recognition and interpretation of the requirements. Geographical variabilities and differing priorities of each country can also complicate implementation and lead to varied interpretations. - <i>How and who should address:</i> A deeper dive into the specific concerns of CPs associated with ISPMs. A survey would help to identify the specific concerns and areas where clarification is required. Clearer language, plain language is essential to assist in the understanding of ISPMs. The survey will assist in determining the priorities of areas for focus, where amended language and guidance will assist. - NPPOs are essential to identify specific points of concern. - Additionally, consideration of groupings of ISPMs based on content, rather than numbering, may assist in understanding and interpretation by ensuring that all related material is easily identified. - To assist in accessibility of information, consider the inclusion of experts from related ISPMs into the relevant ISPMs. - <i>When to address the problem:</i> To assist, results on specific identified areas of concern be presented to CPM for wider visibility and discussion

Appendix 5: Summary of the Mentimeter survey on Plant Health Campus

The SPG Mentimeter survey shows that the IPPC Plant Health Campus is broadly perceived as an **innovative, accessible, and valuable capacity-building platform**, offering relevant learning opportunities for NPPOs and other plant health stakeholders. Participants commonly described the Campus as *informative, user-friendly, helpful, engaging, and foundational*.

Most respondents first learned about the Campus through the **launch event**, the **IPPC website**, or **emails from the Secretariat**, and they primarily access it through the **IPPC website** or the **FAO eLearning Academy**. A small number indicated difficulty locating the Campus or had not used it yet.

Across responses, participants expressed a strong desire for **regular updates on new courses**, training pathways, translations, and usage statistics. They also requested clearer information on course content, practical relevance to NPPO functions, and general plant health knowledge. Users asked for short promotional descriptions and more social-media-ready communication to facilitate sharing within their networks.

A large majority agreed that the Campus is **meeting its goal of strengthening plant health capacity**, highlighting the usefulness of introductory modules, ease of navigation, NPPO-relevant content, and flexibility for self-paced learning. Suggested improvements focused on expanding **language availability**, ensuring **country-specific applicability**, and increasing clarity of learning objectives.

Key challenges limiting broader awareness include low visibility in some regions, **inactive national contact points**, difficulty navigating the IPPC homepage, limited outreach to universities and private sector stakeholders, and language barriers. Participants called for more proactive promotion, improved website pathways, national-level awareness efforts, and more consistent direct email communication. Several suggested linking promotions to the **International Day of Plant Health** to broaden reach.

Respondents identified the most valuable aspects of the Campus as its **free access**, high-quality and interactive course content, certification badges, support for countries without their own training programmes, and offline learning options. Nearly all participants said they would **recommend the Campus** to colleagues, underscoring its perceived impact and usefulness.

Appendix 6: Summary of the group's deliberations from the breakout session – Challenges and opportunities for implementation of ISPMs

Group 1

Session Title:
Challenges and opportunities for implementation of ISPMs
Discussion points
<p>What are the main challenges in implementing the IPPC and the ISPMs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poor understanding by NPPOs internally and the poor communication to external stakeholders - Poor understanding of the concepts of the ISPMs which leads to poor implementation - Time to change legislation in order to start implementing a standard - around 1-year to change legislation - The use of PTs – some countries don't have the facilities to use them - Industry / stakeholder uptake of new measures or treatments - Communications with third party holders - Some ISPMs are very good but they can be expensive to implement e.g. DP on potato tubers <p>E.g. of empty containers – including them as part of the phytosanitary certification system.</p> <p>PCE country: Industry wants to move faster than the NPPO processes. Solution was to have an NPPO officer as part of the loading process of the commodity.</p> <p>Fresh products need to go in less than 24 hours. Education / training of inspectors so they can quickly move consignments through the process.</p> <p>How to address the challenges?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encouraging CPs to accept the use of alternative phytosanitary measures - Encourage more active participation of ministries / policy makers and the stakeholders / industry in the consultation processes - Develop communication plans within NPPOs ahead of CPM decisions - Developing guidelines for setting up allowances of protection <p>Which are the opportunities to address these challenges?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholder meetings directly after the CPM sessions - Some flexibility in systems to allow better implementation - Education / training of quality control industry - Education / training of the IPPC Official Contact Points <p>Who can address the challenges?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NPPOs supported by local experts who understand the principles of ISPMs - IPPC Official Contact Points

Group 2

Session Title:
Challenges and opportunities for implementation of ISPMs

Discussion points
<p>What are the main challenges in implementing the IPPC and the ISPMs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of expertise among NPPO officers and inspectors to interpret and apply standards effectively. - Limited access to translations and materials in local languages (e.g., Greek stakeholders struggle with understanding the standards). - Declining national commitment to the SPS Agreement; some countries prioritize political or economic power over compliance. - IPPC's visibility and influence within government decision-making are decreasing e.g., ministers need reminders about obligations. - Slow and laborious standard-setting process, which struggles to keep pace with rapid global changes (emerging pests, technologies, and trade patterns). - Fragmented approach: ISPMs are often developed or applied individually rather than holistically. - Insufficient stakeholder dissemination, as information remains concentrated within official authorities. <p>How to address the challenges?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourage active and consistent participation of member countries during IPPC meetings and CPM sessions. - Re-establish IPPC help desks or information points to support implementation queries. - Discuss challenges with ISPM implementation during focused CPM sessions to promote peer learning - Mentoring programs between developed and developing countries to share expertise and strengthen implementation capacity. - Provide simplified operational guidance by transforming technical standards into practical, action-oriented manuals or checklists for field officers. - Integrate AI and digital tools into ISPM methodologies (e.g., for pest detection and diagnostics). - Enhance the IPPC website structure by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Grouping ISPMs into thematic areas (e.g., import/export, crop management, surveillance). o Providing linked implementation materials alongside each standard. o Using visual identifiers or icons (similar to FAO's SDG symbols) to make standards easily recognizable. <p>Which are the opportunities to address these challenges?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthen collaboration among IPPC Secretariat, CPM, NPPOs, RPPOs, and subsidiary bodies through coordinated initiatives. - Foster regional and inter-regional cooperation - Encourage joint capacity-building activities and shared resources to reduce duplication. <p>Who can address the challenges?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IPPC Secretariat - CPM - RPPOs - NPPOs - Collaborative approach among all levels to ensure coherence and continuity.
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Streamline the standard setting process to maintain relevance with emerging threats and technologies. - Promote the IPPC's importance in national policy dialogues and trade discussions. - Integrate AI and digital tools into pest detection, monitoring, and compliance verification. - Develop a digital, user-friendly ISPM portal with thematic organization and visual cues. - Expand partnerships between RPPOs and across regions to share best practices. - Group ISPMs and guidance materials by practical application (import/export/crop management) on IPP

Group 3

Session Title:
Challenges and opportunities for implementation of ISPMs

Discussion points
<p>What are the main challenges in implementing the IPPC and the ISPMs?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of resources 2. Lack of understanding and awareness of plant health, IPPC and ISPMs 3. Lack of expertise 4. Language barriers (other than official FAO languages) 5. Difficulties in implementing IPPC, ISPMs, and G&TM due to various governmental, organizational, and cultural differences
Final summary / recommendations
<p>How to address the challenges?</p> <p><u>1 Lack of resources & 2 Lack of understanding and awareness</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Raise awareness of the IPPC and ISPMs among policymakers, decision-makers, the private sector, and the general public by providing materials that explain the basic concepts and importance of plant health. - Utilize the IPPC Communication Strategy to support outreach efforts. - Conduct training for stakeholders to facilitate the effective implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs. <p><u>3 Lack of expertise & 4 Language barriers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote the exchange of human resources and experts among NPPOs, RPPOs, research institutes, and FAO to share technical knowledge and experience with support of the IPPC Secretariat. - Encourage NPPOs to develop tailored training courses in their own languages, with support from the IPPC community, especially for newly appointed staff. This will also help deepen NPPO officials' understanding of ISPMs. <p><u>5 Difficulties in implementation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourage engagement of NPPOs and countries in consultations on draft ISPMs and IPPC surveys. - Restructuring ISPMs facilitates easier implementation. The group noted the importance of the ongoing "Rethinking ISPMs" discussions. <p>Which are the opportunities to address these challenges?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CPM, SPG, Regional workshops, and other plant health related events - Africa Phytosanitary Programme - Use of the IPPC Plant Health Campus - Onboarding and training new staff - Every possible opportunity to promote plant health and emphasize the importance and value of the IPPC and ISPMs <p>Who can address the challenges?</p> <p>Everyone can contribute to solving these challenges, but particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IPPC Official Contact Points - RPPOs - Other organizations; Word Bank, CABI, STDF, stakeholders, universities

Group 4

Session Title:
Challenges and opportunities for implementation of ISPMs?
Discussion points
<p>What are the main challenges in implementing the IPPC and ISPMs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of awareness about certain ISPMs, for instance ISPM 32. Need to raise awareness about ISPMs. Issues with understanding the authority that could interpret ISPMs? Who is the authority? Differences in understanding, interpreting and implementing ISPMs among CPs – need for more harmonization. - National capacities and resources: challenge - Diagnostic capacities, equipment, PRA, particularly smaller countries may have these challenges. - Opportunity: more, better and targeted technical capacity building, developing more guides and training materials for ISPMs per the needs of the CPs. - Could be an opportunity and challenge -plain language in ISPMs – could make the ISPMs too rigid/ simplify to aid implementation. <p>How to address the challenges?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Utilising regional platforms for countries to exchange information, coordinate - > benefits harmonization. - Need to understand the audience and stakeholders – for targeted awareness raising on ISPMs. Engage with relevant stakeholders who participate in trade in plant and plant products – e.g. brokers? - Need for better outreach, and communications, and improve IPP to make it user friendly – make information more accessible to NPPOs. For instance: guides and training materials are hidden on IPP. <p>Which are the opportunities to address these challenges?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plain language in ISPMs – to improve interpretation of ISPMs and aid implementation and compliance. - Engaging with sister organizations – CODEX and WOAHA – for best practices in standard setting, improving implementation, compliance and harmonization. <p>Who can address the challenges?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IPPC community, CPs, RPPOs, TC-RPPOs – to address the issues.
Final summary / recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Targeted and informed actions to address issues, capacity building – by the whole IPPC community (information exchange, observatory surveys etc.) - Better outreach and communications, and information dissemination – more user friendly IPP. - Enhanced coordination and cooperation with WOAHA and CODEX, also at regional and national levels.

Group 5

Session Title:
Challenges and opportunities for implementation of ISPMs
Discussion points
<p>What are the main challenges in implementing the IPPC and the ISPMs?</p> <p>For some countries, it is difficult to have an NPPO due to the government structure. There may be something called NPPO, it may be taking on roles beyond the roles and responsibilities mentioned in the IPPC so they may also be dealing with chemicals, food safety so they also be dealing with CODEX. That is there are often variabilities across countries in how they implement the activities of the NPPOs. Issues with working in silos and lack of collaboration and coordination across government departments.</p> <p>Lack of resources (staff, funds, infrastructure) in countries, need for prioritization within governments means they may not be allocating enough resources to plant health. An example is also some countries not being able to attend CPM due to lack of funding.</p> <p>Not implementing all ISPMs, e.g. small countries will implement only the relevant ISPMs due to small scale of exports and imports.</p> <p>For some countries some ISPMs are difficult to implement due to understanding, e.g. ISPM 6 surveillance- cannot be implemented where there are no resources- need for GPS, trapping, etc.</p> <p>Lack of quarantine laboratories, trained staff</p> <p>Question was asked- how can a country verify that is implementing the ISPMs effectively?</p> <p>Difficulty in managing borders, e.g. a pest is in a neighbouring country and they may not be managing the pest or there are no effective controls at the border, that is there is a lack of regional cooperation.</p> <p>Regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) also depends on funds and so they can have challenges in supporting countries. Also, an example of Africa, there are several layers of authority and can result in break in coordination.</p> <p>Accessibility to country pest lists</p> <p>There are similarities within the topic today about implementation and the topic discussed yesterday on understanding ISPMs.</p> <p>How to address the challenges? Which are the opportunities to address these challenges?</p> <p>To encourage regional cooperation- Regional plant protection organizations need to take on greater lead. Where there are lack of resources, RPPOs (such as EPPO) support countries to undertake PRAs. This can support trade where there are lack of resources in countries.</p> <p>Creating awareness at the level of decision-makers of the importance of IPPC and ISPMs- particularly support for more funds and resources. Market better through One Health- sanitization and lobbying for plant health.</p> <p>Involving private sector- including when lobbying with governments for plant health, also working with local public to increase awareness of plant health. Awareness raising through various ways- such as radio, tv, partnering with the private sector- some countries can have local languages so this should be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Include local communities to increase buy-in- e.g. in surveillance</p> <p>Support for countries to increase awareness through International Plant Health Day.</p> <p>Transcribing some ISPMs to local languages/dialects. However there are issues that sometimes local public cannot read or do not read so here, visual tools are needed.</p> <p>There are a lot of benefits with guides, the IPPC Plant Health Campus and PCE. So, further awareness raising is needed for these tools.</p> <p>The guides need to become more accessible- ISPMs are easier to find but guides are not easy to find. Perhaps the two should be put on the same place on the IPP, perhaps link guidelines within the relevant ISPM.</p> <p>Who can address the challenges?</p> <p>How can we raise awareness of IPPC within the wider FAO so that when FAO work on the ground, they are aware of these issues?</p> <p>Invite ministers from countries to CPM, or other events to raise awareness within governments.</p> <p>IPPC and RPPOs need to support with training</p> <p>NPPO need to increase their staff capacity and work with private sector</p> <p>Private-Public Partnerships should be encouraged and supported</p>
Final summary / recommendations

Main Challenges

- **Government structure and coordination:**
 - Some countries struggle to establish a functional NPPO due to overlapping mandates (e.g. food safety, chemicals) and poor coordination between government departments.
 - Work often happens in **silos**, reducing collaboration.
- **Limited resources:**
 - Many NPPOs face **shortages of staff, funding, and infrastructure**.
 - Governments often give low priority to plant health.
 - Some countries cannot attend key meetings (e.g. CPM) due to lack of funds.
- **Partial implementation of ISPMs:**
 - Smaller or low-trade countries only apply ISPMs relevant to their needs.
 - Some ISPMs are **technically demanding** (e.g. surveillance under ISPM 6) and hard to apply without equipment or trained personnel.
- **Border and regional challenges:**
 - Weak border controls and lack of **regional cooperation** make pest management difficult.
 - RPPOs themselves face **funding and coordination issues**.
- **Technical and informational gaps:**
 - Lack of quarantine labs, trained inspectors, and access to accurate **pest lists**.
 - Difficulty verifying effective ISPM implementation.
 - ISPM **guides are hard to find**, unlike the standards themselves.

Opportunities and Solutions

- **Stronger regional cooperation:**
 - RPPOs should play a larger role in supporting countries, e.g. conducting **Pest Risk Analyses (PRAs)** and sharing resources.
 - Build Public-Private Partnerships between NPPOs and private sector
 - Training from RPPOs and IPPC
- **Raise awareness and political support:**
 - Increase understanding among **decision-makers** about the importance of plant health.
 - Promote IPPC and ISPMs through the **One Health approach**, media, and community engagement.
 - **Involve the private sector** and local communities in awareness and surveillance activities.
 - **Increase** awareness of PCE, IPPC Plant Health Campus, guides
- **Improve communication and accessibility:**
 - Translate key ISPMs and guides into **local languages** and use **visual tools** for non-literate audiences.
 - Make guides and ISPMs easier to find on the **IPPC website**, linking related materials.
- **Enhance global engagement:**
 - Encourage **FAO field offices and national ministries** to integrate IPPC principles in their work.
 - Invite **ministers and senior officials** to CPM and IPPC events to strengthen commitment and visibility.
 - International Plant Health Day

Appendix 7: Summary of the Mentimeter survey on IDPH - Summary of Suggested Sub-Topics for IDPH 2026

Theme: Biosecurity and the Future of Food

Across the Mentimeter inputs, participants proposed a wide and interconnected range of topics for the 2026 International Day of Plant Health (IDPH) global campaign and for the high-level Technical Session. Suggestions consistently emphasized the central role of **plant health**, **food security**, and **biosecurity** in safeguarding sustainable agriculture, trade, and global well-being.

1. Core Themes

- **Food Security:** One of the most frequently mentioned priorities. Contributors linked food security to plant health, climate change, pest management, and global supply chains.
- **Biosecurity:** Highlighted as essential to protect ecosystems, agriculture, and international trade. Ideas included “Biosecurity for food security,” “Biosecurity & CODEX,” and “One Biosecurity.”

2. Plant Health as a Cross-Cutting Issue

- Plant health was emphasized both as a standalone topic and as foundational to consumer safety, livestock health, and sustainable food systems.
- Several entries stressed the **IPPC’s role** in global biosecurity and its relevance to emerging threats.

3. Emerging Risks and Climate Change

- Climate change appeared as a recurring theme, with participants noting its impact on pest emergence, disease spread, and food system vulnerability.
- References to “emerging plant health threats” and “future-proofing plant health” underscore the need for preparedness and innovation.

4. Innovation & Technology

- Artificial intelligence (AI) was cited repeatedly (“AI for biosecurity,” “AI and plant health”) as a tool to improve surveillance, diagnostics, and rapid response.
- Biotechnology and e-commerce risks were flagged as emerging areas requiring regulatory attention and public awareness.

5. Trade, Movement & Safe Travel

- Participants pointed to risks linked to the movement of plants, planting materials, and international travellers.
- Calls for public engagement on passenger responsibility and safe travel reflect an interest in prevention-focused communication.

6. Public Awareness & Education

- Suggestions included:
 - “Citizen science”
 - “Science communication”
 - Youth engagement (“youth and plants”)
 - Simple messaging (e.g., “my favourite pest”)

These highlight the importance of inclusive, accessible outreach.

7. Cultural & Societal Dimensions

- Ideas such as **cultural security**, family farming, and “plants equal life” emphasize the broader human and cultural significance of plant health.
- Humorous or striking phrases (“no coffee no tea no choc”) suggest impactful public messaging opportunities.

Appendix 8: Summary of the SPG meeting survey results

The IPPC secretariat received a total of **26 respondents**.

Overall Satisfaction

- **Logistics:** Most participants rated logistics positively (majority 4–5 out of 5), but recurring issues were:
 - **Meeting room too small** and layout not ideal (lack of tables, microphones).
 - **Travel arrangements and communication** could be improved (e.g., arrival instructions, early notifications for permits).
- **Agenda:** Generally considered **clear and relevant**, but:
 - Too many topics; suggestions to focus on fewer, more strategic issues.
 - Some papers were seen as too procedural or CPM-oriented, not strategic.

Preparation & Materials

- **Discussion papers:** Mostly useful and clear, but:
 - Should be **shared earlier** (at least one week before) for better preparation.
 - Include **specific questions for discussion** and **templates for paper preparation**.
 - Translate documents into **FAO languages** for inclusivity.

Meeting Format & Breakout Sessions

- **Format:** Plenary and breakout sessions were generally effective.
- **Breakout sessions:** Valued for in-depth discussion, but:
 - Need more structure and clearer objectives.
 - Allocate time for reporting back and agreeing on collective outcomes.
 - Rotate members between groups to stimulate diverse discussions.

Participation & Representation

- Positive feedback on **regional representation**, but calls for:
 - More participants from underrepresented regions (e.g., Latin America, Africa).
 - Consider language inclusivity (not only English).

Most Valuable Aspects

- Open and interactive discussions on **strategic topics** (e.g., rethinking ISPMs, ePhyto).
- Networking and hearing diverse perspectives.
- Short presentations allowing more time for discussion.

Areas for Improvement

- Reduce time on updates; focus on strategic issues and actionable recommendations.
- Better room arrangements (larger space, U-shape seating).
- Clearer mandate and expectations for participants.
- Onboarding for new members and guidelines for paper preparation.