



联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations

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

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная организация
Объединенных Наций

Organización de las
Naciones Unidas para la
Alimentación y la Agricultura

منظمة
الغذية والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Tenth Session

Rome, 16-20 March 2015

Statements from the European Union and its 28 Member States regarding
various CPM-10 Agenda items

By agenda item:

- 9.2 Implementation Programme on Surveillance and the Implementation,
Review and Support System (IRSS)
- 9.3 ePhyto - update
- 11.1 CDC Evaluation - update
- 15.2 Proposal for a CPM Recommendation on Sea Containers

Prepared by the EU

English only

CPM-10 (2015)
STATEMENTS FROM THE EUROPEAN UNION
AND ITS 28 MEMBER STATES
REGARDING THE FOLLOWING CPM AGENDA ITEMS

- 9.2. Implementation Programme on Surveillance and the Implementation, Review and Support System (IRSS)
- 9.3. ePhyto - update
- 11.1. CDC Evaluation - update
- 15.2. Proposal for a CPM Recommendation on Sea Containers - Rationale for developing and adopting a CPM Recommendation on Sea Containers

EU AND ITS 28 MEMBER STATES POSITION FOR CPM10

9.2. Implementation Programme on Surveillance and the Implementation, Review and Support System (IRSS) (Document CPM 2015/23)

The EU and its 28 Member States support the development of a strategic implementation programme for the area of surveillance as was decided by CPM9. We believe that the proposal that is presented to CPM10 in Annex 1 of CPM2015/23 is a good starting point to show the structure and global content of such a programme. However we think that more work needs to be done, so therefore at this stage we cannot approve the work plan. We believe that the proposal does not clearly indicate what activities will take place under this programme. Furthermore, clarification is needed how the IRSS contributes to or is integrated within this implementation programme. Also we believe that the cross cutting nature of the implementation programme is not clear yet, so more clarity is needed on how the different work areas of the IPPC are connected to this implementation programme.

Therefore we propose to change the bullet points 2 and 3 under point 12 of the document CPM2015/23 into the following:

- *Request* the Secretariat to form an expert working group to develop a revised strategic work plan for the implementation programme on surveillance and associated activities and to appoint a steward as a lead for this expert group;
- *Request* the Secretariat to draft specifications for this expert group in order to focus their work on the methodology of surveillance and management, rather than on pest reporting or advocacy activities;
- *Agree* that this expert group should liaise and coordinate its work with the CDC and the Standards Committee (who work on the revision of ISPM6);
- *Request* the Secretariat to report on the outcome of this expert group to the Bureau and the SPG with a view of adoption of the revised strategic work plan at CPM11 in 2016.

EU AND ITS 28 MEMBER STATES POSITION FOR CPM10

9.3. ePhyto - update (Document CPM 2015/26)

The EU and its 28 Member States acknowledge the work of the ePhyto Steering Group and supports the global harmonisation of ePhyto including the exchange of electronic phytosanitary certificates. The development of a hub could be an important tool in achieving this harmonisation. These developments should facilitate the exchange and production of phytosanitary certificates according to ISPM 12 with special attention to the issuance of phytosanitary certificates for re-export. The EU and its 28 Member States therefore support the STDF proposal and the further work of the ePhyto Steering Group.

The ePhyto Steering group is encouraged to participate in the management of the STDF project if approved, further development of harmonisation of ePhyto, assisting countries in setting up an ePhyto system and awareness raising.

The EU and its 28 Member States propose to change the text of the recommendations under point 28 of the document CPM 2015/26. We suggest to delete the last sub indent of the indent 7 (Proposing a management structure for the hub) under point 28 in the document CPM 2015/26 and to make a new indent 9 stating:

“invite the Bureau to consider how to further develop administrative and legal aspects, a management structure for the hub, a cost recovery system for the use of the hub and report to the CPM 11.”

EU AND ITS 28 MEMBER STATES POSITION FOR CPM10

11.1. CDC Evaluation - update (Document CPM 2015/25)

The EU and its 28 Member States regret that the review of the CDC was not completed before CPM10. We believe it is important for a review to be undertaken before CPM can be asked to decide on the future structure of the CDC as either a technical committee or another type of body of the CPM. The EU and its 28 Member States would also like to hear the opinion of the legal service of FAO in this regard. The issue of the future structure of the CDC is also related to the outcome of the Secretariat Enhancement Study.

Therefore we would support the option to extend the current mandate of the CDC for one year and have different person produce an evaluation report for consideration at the Bureau meeting in June 2015. The Bureau should then present the outcome of this report along with the enhancement evaluation report to CPM 11 in 2016 for a decision.

EU AND ITS 28 MEMBER STATES POSITION FOR CPM10

15.2. Proposal for a CPM Recommendation on Sea Containers - Rationale for developing and adopting a CPM Recommendation on Sea Containers (Document CPM 2015/15)

The EU and its 28 Member States would like to propose the introduction of some changes into the current IPPC Secretariat version, as follows:

CPM Recommendation on Sea Containers

Background

Surveys carried out in some countries have indicated that sea containers (also known as Cargo Transport Units - CTUs) to a varying degree may carry contamination, in particular in the form of interior and exterior presence of seeds, snails, slugs, soil, spiders and other biosecurity risk items that may pose a pest risk.

The packing of sea containers with cargo is the most likely stage in the sea container supply chain at which contamination can occur. Operators' procedures for cleanliness and cleaning of sea containers, and for handling of containers and cargo, need therefore to take into account the risk of contamination at the packing stage.

To that end, the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the International Labour Organization (ILO) and United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), with the support from the IPPC Expert Working Group on Sea Containers, have revised their joint Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units to incorporate several elements of phytosanitary importance such as the references to sea container cleaning in chapter 8, annex 5 and, in particular, annex 6, Minimizing the risk of contamination, ~~are noted~~. This was recognized and appreciated by CPM in 2014.

The present recommendation proposes actions to be taken by NPPOs, the IPPC Secretariat and other Conventions.

Recommendation

Sea containers moved internationally should be as clean as possible, in order to minimize the movement of pests.

Thus the CPM:

Encourages ~~Urges~~ **NPPOs**

- *to recognise* the risk of pests and regulated articles that can be moved with sea containers
- *to communicate* to those involved in packing of sea containers or in the

movement of sea containers in and out of their country information about the risk of pest movement with sea containers,

- *to support* the implementation of the relevant parts of the ILO/IMO/UNECE Code of Practice Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units (International Maritime Organization (IMO), International Labour Organization (ILO) and United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)),
- *to gather* information on pest movement via the sea containers themselves, rather than with the cargo moved within sea containers, this pathway and to share such information, when and if, serious trends arise, and
- *to analyse the possible pest risk and, where justified and practical, take proportionate action* to mitigate risk.

Explanation to CPM by EU and its 28 Member States to its proposal for text amendments:

To Background, paragraph 3:

EU and its 28 Member States suggest “are noted” be *deleted*, as it does not fit grammatically and is superfluous.

To Recommendation, chapeau, 4th line:

EU and its 28 Member States suggest *reverting* from “Urges” back to the original word “**Encourages**” (as proposed by the Drafting Group). We believe the current knowledge of pest risk associated with sea containers does not justify such strong wording as “urges”.

To Recommendation, second to last bullet point:

In the second to last bullet point (not appearing in the draft of the Drafting Group), EU and its 28 Member States suggest *inserting* a sentence to remind NPPOs that, when surveys are carried out, a clear distinction should be made between the sea container pathway and the cargo pathway, so that any consequential action shall be directed towards the real problem.

To Recommendation, last bullet point:

In the last bullet point (not appearing in the draft of the Drafting Group), EU and its 28 Member States suggest *inserting* wording to underline the fundamental IPPC principle that any pest risk should be analysed in order to select and justify actions, and that those should be proportionate to the risk.