



***REPORT***

Rome, Italy  
16-19 June

# **CPM Bureau**

## **June, 2015**



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

## CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting .....	4
2.	Adoption of the Agenda .....	4
3.	Housekeeping .....	4
3.1	Documents list.....	4
3.2	Participants list.....	4
3.3	Local information.....	4
4.	Review of the Report of last meeting .....	4
4.1	Review of action items .....	4
5.	IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation.....	5
6.	Informatics.....	7
6.1	International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP).....	7
6.2	Online Comment System .....	8
6.3	ePhyto.....	8
7.	Resource Mobilization.....	10
7.1	Benefits of hosting CPM outside of Rome.....	10
7.2	Report on resource mobilization activities taken by Bureau members .....	10
7.3	International Year of Plant Health .....	11
8.	Communication .....	11
9.	Implementation.....	12
9.1	Implementation work plan .....	12
10.	Review of Operational Plans / Budgets .....	12
10.1	Report of Finance Committee meeting .....	12
10.2	Financial implications of CPM-10 decisions .....	13
10.3	ISPM 15 symbol registration.....	13
11.	Partnerships, Cooperation and Liaison.....	13
11.1	MOUs: WTO, WCO .....	13
11.2	Working Arrangements with IAEA-FAO Joint Division.....	15
11.3	Review of Organizations requesting liaison status.....	15
12.	Review of activities of the IPPC Secretariat.....	15
12.1	Standard Setting .....	15
12.2	National Reporting Obligations .....	16
12.3	Capacity Development .....	17
12.3.1	CDC Review .....	17
12.4	IRSS .....	18
12.5	Dispute settlement.....	18
13.	Preparation of October Bureau .....	19
13.1	Agree Bureau agenda items.....	19
13.2	Assignment of leads for topics .....	20
13.3	Deadlines.....	20
14.	Preparation of SPG Agenda.....	20

14.1	Agree SPG agenda .....	20
14.2	Review of report of 14th SPG and outcomes of CPM-10 (2015) IPPC in 20 years .....	21
14.3	Assignment of leads for topics .....	21
14.4	Chair for next SPG .....	21
14.5	Deadlines.....	21
15.	Organization of CPM-11 (2016).....	21
15.1	Possible draft ISPMS .....	21
15.2	Number of interpretation sessions.....	21
15.3	Discussions on concepts and implementation issues related to draft or adopted standards.....	22
15.4	Evening sessions .....	22
15.5	Agenda / length / schedule .....	22
15.6	Ministerial participation .....	22
15.7	Special topics session.....	22
15.8	Side events (decision process, criteria) .....	22
15.9	Nominations to subsidiary bodies .....	23
15.10	Rapporteur from developing countries.....	23
15.11	Planning for paperless session.....	23
15.12	Request to address CPM .....	23
16.	Dates of meetings for 2015-2016 .....	24
17.	Other business.....	24
18.	Close of meeting.....	24

### List of appendices

Appendix 01 - Agenda .....	25
Appendix 02 - Documents list.....	27
Appendix 03 - Participants list .....	29
Appendix 04 - Draft letter to the ePhyto Steering Group and ePhyto Road map.....	32
Appendix 05 - Action list for Bureau and IPPC Secretariat.....	34

## **1. Opening of the meeting**

- [1] The Chairperson of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), Ms Kyu-Ock YIM (Rep. of Korea) welcomed the Bureau members to Rome and wished them a fruitful meeting.
- [2] The newly appointed Secretary for the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), Mr Jingyuan XIA introduced himself giving a brief overview of his experience in the plant health sector worldwide, including his position as the Director General of the China National Cotton Research Institute, his roles as the Director General of the China National Agro-tech Extension Center, the Chinese Ministry of Agriculture, as well as his most recent position as the Ambassador of P.R. China to the Rome-based UN agencies for Food and Agriculture. He expressed his enthusiasm in taking up the position of IPPC Secretary highlighting his intention to facilitate renewal of the Secretariat through four main initiatives: New Image, New Performance, New Atmosphere and New Achievements.
- [3] He explained that he will aim to create a “One IPPC” with one mission, one target, one voice, and that moves by one pace. This will be done, through strengthening Team Building, Team Working, Team Cohesion and Team Spirit.
- [4] He also stressed the importance of communication (via the International Phytosanitary Portal –IPP- and other materials) to help enhance IPPC’s influence on an international level. Additionally, increased cooperation is needed from all IPPC stakeholders to strengthen the Mutual Respecting Mutual Understanding, Mutual Assistance and Mutual Cooperation. He highlighted the Bureau members’ role in this, hoping for direct support from Bureau members to the work of IPPC Secretariat to ensure the efficient work and the best results.
- [5] He concluded with the proverb that will guide him in his position as Secretary: “If you want to go fast, you go alone. If you want to go far, you go together”.

## **2. Adoption of the Agenda**

- [6] The Bureau adopted the Agenda (Appendix 1).
- [7] The Bureau elected Corné VAN ALPHEN (Netherlands) as Rapporteur.

## **3. Housekeeping**

### **3.1 Documents list**

- [8] The Secretariat introduced the documents list (Appendix 2)

### **3.2 Participants list**

- [9] The Secretariat introduced the Participants list asking that the Bureau members verify their contact details (Appendix 3).

### **3.3 Local information**

- [10] The Bureau noted the local information.

## **4. Review of the Report of last meeting**

- [11] There were no comments to the report of the March 2015 meeting.

### **4.1 Review of action items**

- [12] The Bureau reviewed the actions points from the March 2015 report.

## 5. IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation

[13] The Bureau discussed the IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation recommendations taking into careful consideration the comments provided by contracting parties<sup>1</sup>.

### [14] Recommendation 1:

The Secretariat should fully revise its working procedures and methods, aiming at improving internal communication and collaboration, transparent monitoring of work progress and reporting, and efficient and timely servicing of the CPM, and its subsidiary and ad-hoc bodies, and the Bureau. The actions proposed in the report should serve as the main guidance in the process.

[15] The Bureau fully accepted recommendation 1. In addition, the Bureau decided that the IPPC Secretary should develop an annual work plan and associated budget for the Secretariat which would be approved by the Bureau in its October meetings. The recommendation to develop an annual work plan and associated budget should be implemented in 2015.

[16] The Bureau decided to review the timing and length of its meetings conducted annually. It decided that the meeting in October should be extended to take account of the preparation of the first work plan.

[17] Furthermore, the Bureau agreed with the proposals b-e contained in paragraph ES17 of the evaluation.

### [18] Recommendation 2:

In order to clarify the roles and responsibilities within the Secretariat, and ensure that the profile of the Secretary matches the challenges, it is recommended that:

i) The profile of the Secretary should include: a proven record as strong and inspiring leader and as team player, and being authoritative in the plant health domain;

ii) The external and internal leadership of the Secretariat should be the responsibility of the Secretary, who should embody the leader, manager, voice and strategist of the Secretariat and whose professional credibility and competence should act as leverage for resource mobilization and trigger partnerships;

iii) The Secretary should be the person at the fore front, responsible for interacting with the CPM, the Bureau and the SBDS.

[19] The Bureau fully accepted the recommendation 2 without changes or additions.

### [20] Recommendation 3:

The Secretariat should be re-structured and staffed to ensure a high degree of integration between the two main areas of work, Standard Setting and Implementation Facilitation. The elements entailed in the proposed organigram and skill-mix, in terms of tasks, number of staff and their profiles, should serve as the main guidance in this process.

[21] The Bureau decided that:

- The Secretariat should be structured into two main units: the Standard Setting unit (SSU) and the Implementation Facilitation unit (IFU). The detailed attribution of tasks and responsibilities should be decided by the IPPC Secretary.
- Communication and partnerships are important horizontal functions needing dedicated staff and should be placed under the direct oversight of the IPPC Secretary.
- The IPPC Secretary is invited to use appropriate methods and procedures to ensure integration and coordination of SSU and IFU activities within the IPPC Secretariat. In addition, it is recommended that the Standards Committee (SC) and the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) should develop formalized processes for interaction.
- The unit managers of the SSU and IFU should be P5 managers as proposed in the evaluation report. It was recognized that the manager for the communication and partnership activities

---

<sup>1</sup> 24\_Bureau\_June\_2015

should hold a high professional grade and that positions covered by the regular budget should be increased.

**[22] Recommendation 4:**

The IPPC Secretary should take an active role in reaching out and advocating the mission of IPPC within FAO, and improve collaboration with the various units and divisions in the Organization, including the regional Plant Protection Officers, and taking advantage of the opportunities to present IPPC work and achievements to FAO Governing Bodies including the Committee on Agriculture, Council and Conference.

**[23]** The Bureau agreed that the recommendation be slightly amended to read: “The IPPC Secretary and the IPPC management team (e.g. unit managers) should take an active [...]”.

**[24] Recommendation 5:**

The IPPC Secretariat should:

- i) develop a good institutional knowledge of FAO rules and procedures on the variety of issues that are of concern to its mandate and work, including on Trust Fund management, staffing, procurement, calendar of work, so as to ensure a smoother implementation of its activities;
- ii) maintain close contacts with other Article XIV Bodies to be able to address more effectively the administrative issues within FAO;
- iii) facilitate approval of duty-travel by presenting a travel plan, linked to the annual work-plan, to the ADG/AG, for approval;
- iv) invest in resource mobilization and long-term planning of the budget-flow of trust funds, to create more long-term project posts, that allow at the same time continuity and flexibility;
- v) fully comply with FAO project management procedures as currently laid out in the Project Cycle Management Guide, or in any future version thereof.

**[25]** The Bureau fully accepted recommendation 5. In addition, the Bureau recommended that, due to the status of the IPPC as an Article XIV body and the critical role of the IPPC Secretary in facilitating partnerships with other international organizations and bodies, including resource mobilization, rules governing travel authorizations should be more flexible.

**[26] Recommendation 6:**

FAO Management should consider the IPPC Secretariat’s constraints caused by the current rules of the Organization regarding staffing, and identify in particular mechanisms that allow greater staff stability in the case of project posts and Non-Staff Human Resources.

**[27]** The Bureau did not make any decision in relation to this recommendation but noted the constraints identified in the FAO Management Response, namely that an organization must have consistent institutional rules regarding human resources and non-staff human resources and that inconsistencies and special conditions created for specific groups of staff would lead to confusion and concerns of discriminatory practices.

**[28] Recommendation 7:**

FAO Management, in consideration of the high level of specialization required in the Secretariat, should take measures with regards to the following:

- i. ensure that the best applicants for Regular Budget posts can be interviewed and included in the short lists of candidates for final selection, if so they deserve irrespective of their nationality; and
- ii. the CPM/Bureau should be closely engaged in the selection process regarding the appointment of the new IPPC Secretary.

**[29]** The Bureau fully supported recommendation 7. It recognized, however, that the Director-General of FAO has the right of appointing staff in FAO. The Bureau encouraged FAO to engage the CPM Bureau in IPPC Secretariat staff selection.

[30] With regards to the proposals contained in ES21, the Bureau concluded that the analysis and consequent recommendations were not covered by the ToR for the enhancement evaluation and should therefore be rejected. It recognized, however, that some of the conclusions may have merit and may be revisited by the CPM in the future within the context of developing the new IPPC strategic framework. The Bureau thought that especially recommendation “f” had merit and noted it was currently addressed under the CDC review process.

[31] **Recommendation 8:**

The IPPC Secretariat should take the lead to reinforce the Technical Consultations by:

- i. involving FAO regional plant protection officers;
- ii. establishing common actions and plans by IPPC Secretariat, RPPOs and regional plant protection officers.

[32] The Bureau fully accepted the recommendation.

[33] With regard to the monitoring of the progress of the implementation of the recommendations, the Bureau believed that there should be a regular report provided by the Secretariat. The regular monitoring report would be an integral part of the Annual Report presented to the CPM by the IPPC Secretariat.

[34] The IPPC Secretary thanked the Bureau for their analysis of the recommendation and noted that he looked forward to guiding the change process.

[35] The Bureau had the opportunity to discuss the results of the IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation and the subsequent Bureau decisions with the ADG Ren WANG. The ADG declared that he thought that the evaluation was of high value and that there are many proposals beside the eight recommendations that are valuable and should be considered. He appreciated the respect of the Bureau to FAO with regard to recommendation 6 and declared that he will accept the decisions by the Bureau and develop with the IPPC Secretary an implementation plan to implement them. With regard to the two P5 positions he voiced his support and the need for approval by the FAO senior management. He suggested that the re-profiling of positions and the opening of new positions, including vacant positions, will be viewed from the perspective of the recommendations contained in the IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation. He also informed the Bureau that he had discussed with the evaluation team the insufficient cooperation with RPPOs and showed his personal interested to improve that.

[36] The Bureau thanked the ADG Ren Wang for his appreciation of the Bureau decisions with regard to the IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation and welcomed his encouraging support.

## 6. Informatics

### 6.1 International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP)

[37] The Secretariat introduced the paper on the current IT situation of the Secretariat<sup>2</sup>, highlighting that while the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) has been nominated as one of the key features in the IPPC Communications plan, only one staff is currently dedicated to the development and daily running of the site. Additional resources are needed to ensure that the IPP may fully meet the needs of contracting parties and the Secretariat.

[38] The Bureau queried whether there was news in respect to the IPP moving under the [www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org) page, suggesting that the Secretariat contact CIO to be able to identify in advance any issues that would follow a future move. Based on this, the Secretariat should develop a transition plan with cost implications to ensure a possible migration would have as little negative effect as possible on operations. The Secretariat informed that it not received new information on the possible move to fao.org. It appreciated the suggestion for the establishment of a transition plan in case of a migration

---

<sup>2</sup> 09\_Bureau\_2015\_June

of the IPP under the general FAO web-site. The Bureau expressed its concerns about such a migration for the visibility and user friendliness of the IPP and urged the Secretariat to prevent this development.

- [39] The IPPC Secretary linked the discussions on the IT needs to the IPPC's need for visibility, highlighting that the IPPC Secretariat must increase its influence, cohesion and the ability to speak with "one voice". He felt that further review of the IPPC IT needs and websites be carried out to fully address the new vision of the Secretariat. It was recalled that the IPPC Secretariat and the FAO Chief Information Officer division carried out a user requirement analysis in 2014 based on the Green Ink communication assessment. For this reason, the Bureau agreed that a minor survey be carried out to determine the structure, design, utility and functionality of the IPP (the basic two-three points that the IPP needs to accomplish). This would also be helpful to provide FAO with, in case of transition.
- [40] Bureau members suggested that CPs be more directly involved in improving or maintaining the IPP; noting that there is a wealth of expertise in the IPPC community that the Secretariat could tap into either in relation to technology or in providing assistance with translations.
- [41] The Bureau:
- (1) *noted* the current status of the IPP and suggested that focus be kept on maintaining the current site.
  - (2) In the event where a transition of the IPP to [www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org) is confirmed, *asked* the Secretariat to develop a transition plan with cost implications
  - (3) *requested* the Secretariat to contact CPs and RPPOs to identify possible areas where they could contribute to maintain or improve the IPP (e.g. technical issues, translation assistance).
  - (4) *asked* the Secretariat to solicit comments from CPs on the design, functioning, utility and vision of the IPP.

## 6.2 Online Comment System

- [42] The Secretariat provided an oral update on the development of the new Online Comment System. After five years with the current system it is now outdated and a new OCS is being built. A lengthy process to identify a suitable solution from a completely new programmed system to an off the shelf product had been undertaken the past year. The Secretariat, with support from the FAO IT and procurement divisions, were now in the final stages of the tender and an off-the-shelf "PleaseReview" has been chosen. The new system is expected to be launched in early 2016.
- [43] It was confirmed that CODEX Alimentarius will co-finance the new programme and that the total cost is within the budget allocation.
- [44] One Bureau member queried the results of the surveys carried out on the use of the OCS by NPPOs and what the main challenges identified were. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that more than 50 NPPOs had provided responses to the survey, and that the responses were posted on the IPP<sup>3</sup>. Several issues were related to availability of documents and IT compatibility and many had already been addressed for instance through enhanced training, which is available online to all interested parties. One-on-one training is available upon request through a network of Secretariat out-posted staff. It was acknowledged that updated training material is currently only available in English and new material will be developed in languages for the new system.
- [45] The Bureau *noted* the update, *welcomed* the efforts to build a new OCS and *expressed appreciation* for the efforts to find external funding for the development.

## 6.3 ePhyto

- [46] The Secretariat provided an update from the ePhyto Steering Group, which included information on planning for the global ePhyto symposium to be hosted in Korea (two delegates per country will be

---

<sup>3</sup> 2014 OCS users consultation - compiled comments are available [here](#).



invited; developing countries will receive funding for participation) and the IPPC regional workshops, a detailed discussion on the business rules of the proposed hub and generic system and a presentation on developments of a CITES e-permitting system<sup>4</sup>.

- [47] The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the STDF, in their working group meeting in March 2015, had discussed the IPPC ePhyto project. Although some STDF partners and one donor had required additional information, the STDF had approved the project *ad referendum* dependent on the additional information requested from the IPPC Secretariat and that no written objection is received by the 15 June 2015. Unfortunately, one STDF partner and one donor had objected to the project before the deadline so the *ad referendum* approval was not confirmed and the project not approved. The STDF partner and donor objecting had strong doubts on the need for an international hub as a trade facilitation means, were concerned that it may not benefit developing countries and had reservations that the development of the hub was not subject to regular IPPC funding since it belongs to the IPPCs core activities.
- [48] Considering the rejection of the ePhyto project by the STDF Working Group the Bureau thought that it should be appropriate to solicit alternative funding sources to realize this project. That would, however, not preclude a renewed application to the STDF in the future. The Secretariat noted that it would respond to the STDF and provide more information to address the concerns raised in order to keep the proposal active and for further review by STDF in October 2015.
- [49] Mr Nico HORN, Chairperson of the ePhyto Steering Group, connected via teleconference and the concerns raised by the STDF and the way forward were discussed. Mr HORN confirmed the importance of the ePhyto hub as a basis for harmonization for exchange of phytosanitary certificates and for allowing developing countries to utilize the system without requiring major investments nationally. Nevertheless, the Bureau asked that, in view of the concerns raised, the ePhyto Steering Group revalidate their position that a global hub will provide for transaction and economic savings for the individual countries.
- [50] One member noted that, depending on the outcomes of the revalidation of the ePhyto Steering Group, the United States of America would, together with other interested countries, fund a pilot of the hub, which would help demonstrate the benefits of the system.
- [51] The Bureau was pleased with this proposal and discussed how the countries would be selected to participate in the pilot (several countries had already expressed the desire to participate), how the pilot would be managed, what the estimated cost would be and how the aspects related to the financial, administrative and operational management would be handled. The Bureau asked that the Steering Group prepare an input document for the perusal of the Bureau to seek donors (see letter to the ePhyto Steering Group with the IPPC road map for ePhyto in Appendix 4).
- [52] The Bureau agreed to a proposal for having a side session during CPM-11 (2016) on various elements of the ePhyto hub project.
- [53] The Bureau:
- (5) *asked* the ePhyto Steering Group to draft an information document on the feasibility of an ePhyto hub pilot by 15 September 2015.
  - (6) *asked* the ePhyto Steering Group to draft terms of reference for the development of the ePhyto hub pilot by 15 September 2015 for presentation to the SPG October 2015.
  - (7) *asked* the Chairperson of the ePhyto Steering Group to prepare a report on activities for presentation to the SPG October 2015.
  - (8) *thanked* the United States of America for offering to fund the ePhyto hub partially and invited other CPs to fund the ePhyto pilot hub.

---

<sup>4</sup> 08\_Bureau\_2015\_June; the ePhyto reports will be posted within shortly [here](#)

- (9) *agreed* to discuss the pilot project and the intended outcomes from the ePhyto symposium and agree upon how to handle the financial and administrative implications of the hub in their October 2015 meeting.
- (10) *recommended* that the IPPC Secretariat explore other funding options for the ePhyto project.
- (11) *agreed* with the recommendation for the United Nations International Computing Center (UNICC) to support the development and eventual management of the hub.

## **7. Resource Mobilization**

### **7.1 Benefits of hosting CPM outside of Rome**

- [54] The Bureau considered the proposal to hold CPM-11 (2016) in Rep. of Korea and reviewed the advantages and disadvantages related to organizing the session outside of FAO, Rome<sup>5</sup>.
- [55] Among the advantages were mentioned that (i) the Secretariat would save approximately 20 percent of the total cost for holding CPM, (ii) it would increase awareness and visibility of IPPC; (iii) it would be an opportunity for increased CP ownership of IPPC, and; (iv) it would help build new models for holding international IPPC Secretariat meetings and prove this a funding opportunity for CPs. The Bureau also considered that it would be an opportunity for the Korean Ministry of Agriculture to invite the DG of FAO to open the session, the Asian region being one of the future's most important food production and trade regions.
- [56] Some disadvantages that were mentioned included (i) the increased travel costs for a number of countries, which could prevent them from attending; (ii) the question of quorum because CPM may depend on attendance of FAO Permanent Representatives to reach a quorum; however it was considered that the role of representatives could be taken up by accredited diplomats in the Republic of Korea.
- [57] The Bureau agreed that further exploration of how to organize the CPM outside of Rome should be sought, for instance by contacting CBD and FAO conference services. It was also felt imperative that FAO was supportive of the initiative.
- [58] The Bureau:
- (12) *supported* hosting the CPM sessions outside of Rome, even though this would not carry a significant financial savings, because of the increased awareness this would raise for the IPPC and its mandate.
  - (13) *asked* Ms Lois RANSOM, on behalf of the Bureau as Vice-Chairperson of the Bureau, to draft a letter of support to be sent to the Republic of Korea for hosting the CPM-11 (2016) by 15 July 2015.
  - (14) *asked* the IPPC Secretariat to investigate FAO support for holding CPM outside of Rome and contact CBD to understand how their COP session was organized in Republic of Korea.

### **7.2 Report on resource mobilization activities taken by Bureau members**

- [59] The Bureau discussed their individual resource mobilization activities undertaken. It was highlighted that open-ended purposes are virtually impossible to fund; clear work plans with activities that the various regions may identify as priority areas would help the Bureau members solicit funds. Additionally, it was recalled that countries may not understand requests for funding for core activities that receive regular programme funding. Lastly, it was noted that some countries only support activities with high funding needs because the cost of funding administration for the country otherwise makes the activity too challenging.
- [60] Some Bureau members have helped provide in-kind human resources to the Secretariat.

---

<sup>5</sup> 07\_Rev\_01\_Bureau\_June\_2015

[61] The CPM Chairperson noted that the offer to host the CPM session was a resource mobilization activity because it would hopefully free up some Secretariat resources to be allocated to other activities.

### 7.3 International Year of Plant Health

[62] Mr Ralf LOPIAN provided an update on the efforts made to establish an International Year for Plant Health (IYPH) in 2020<sup>6</sup>, noting that Finland had made an intervention during FAO Conference, June 2015, regarding its intention to propose an IYPH. This intervention received positive responses from 14 countries and the proposal was welcomed by FAO Conference.

[63] He highlighted the need to keep the optimistic momentum; communication and resource mobilization efforts should be intensified to ensure that a detailed work plan may be adopted by CPM-11 (2016). He informed the Bureau of the various steps to increase communication on the IYPH, which include an information tool-kit that is being developed to help national authorities lobby for political and financial support to the IYPH. The Secretariat will also participate in a number of international meetings to promote the IYPH including the Milan EXPO 2015, the G20 Agricultural Minister meeting (Turkey), EPPO Council, NAPPO annual meeting, COSAVE Directive Committee meeting, and the International Workshop on Phytosanitary Threats (Brazil).

[64] With regard to resource mobilization, he reported that individual countries would be approached to solicit extra-budgetary resources to support activities leading to the proclamation of the IYPH. In addition he reported that a volunteer programme had been envisaged in which professionals from all origins could enroll. Volunteers having donated their time would be publicly honoured at CPM-11 for their contribution. The Bureau discussed which extra-budgetary resources should be used for the IYPH related activities and which communication efforts should be prioritized.

[65] The Bureau:

(15) *noted* the developments with regard to the establishment of the IYPH 2020.

(16) welcomed the initiative to create a volunteer programme to assist with activities in relation to the IYPH.

(17) *encouraged* CPs to provide extra-budgetary funding for this activity.

## 8. Communication

[66] The Coordinator introduced a revised work plan for communications<sup>7</sup>, noting that the intent is to have a unified IPPC message targeting the specific audiences. He also informed the Bureau of a meeting between Mr Xia and the FAO DG where the DG underlined his interest in increasing the IPPC's profile.

[67] The Bureau felt that the challenge related to communication is two-sided: on one side there is not enough capacity within the Secretariat at the moment to support communications in an appropriate manner; on the other it is still not clear what the IPPC wishes to achieve through the communication efforts. As one member pointed out, communication should be a means to enable something to happen and the IPPC Secretariat needs to clearly understand what it wishes to enable and target communication accordingly.

[68] The Bureau supported the overall content of the work plan but suggested that some modifications be introduced, including (i) examples for immediate steps to take to increase visibility of the IPPC such as providing information material during large FAO meetings; (ii) the development of a communications tool kit, and; (iii) adding the general public as an audience. In addition, the Bureau asked the Secretariat to integrate the communication work plan with the communication activities carried out in relation to standard setting, capacity development and the IYPH 2020.

---

<sup>6</sup> 20\_Bureau\_2015\_June

<sup>7</sup> 06\_Bureau\_2015\_June

[69] The Bureau:

(18) *asked* the Secretariat to take into consideration the abovementioned guidance and modify the communication work plan accordingly.

## 9. Implementation

### 9.1 Implementation work plan

[70] The Secretariat presented a concept note on the implementation pilot project on surveillance<sup>8</sup>. It was noted that the concept note had been established to approach donors to fund the project and that a second more descriptive project document, which will include a work plan outlining activities, will be prepared for consultation among experts in September 2015. The experts have been selected from world experts on surveillance and project development.

[71] The Bureau expressed their appreciation for the concept note although some were concerned with the timeframe of the pilot finding a three-year preparatory phase too long. However, it was pointed out that until extra-budgetary funds for the pilot are available, the programme will inevitably have to be delayed and that the time line may be fine for this reason.

[72] The Secretariat noted that the phytosanitary resources page will have a page dedicated to case studies on surveillance.

[73] The Bureau:

(19) *noted* the concept note on the implementation pilot project on surveillance.

## 10. Review of Operational Plans / Budgets

### 10.1 Report of Finance Committee meeting

[74] The FC Chairperson provided an oral update of the outcomes of the FC meeting, 15 June 2015<sup>9</sup>. He noted that the Secretariat had spent approximately 66 percent of the regular programme budget, spending being therefore fully on track. The IPPC multi-donor trust fund is very much overspent and eight positions will depend on the replenishment of this trust fund.

[75] He explained that the FC had discussed the Enhancement evaluation recommendations that had financial implications. The FC supported that the Secretariat be organized in two units where the implementation unit would get *quasi* equal budget attention as the standard setting unit.

[76] The FC also discussed the need to review the resources allocated to translation and had agreed that the SPG should consider the issue strategically, for instance in relation to which documents could potentially be outsourced for translations. In addition the FC discussed the need to develop a work programme of the IPPC with associated costs. This would be needed to set priorities for the CPM work programme. The Bureau agreed with the conclusions of the FC.

[77] It was stressed that this was the moment for the Bureau to consider the budget allocations for specific activities to ensure transparency.

[78] One member suggested that in reporting on the regular programme funding it should be clear what activities the funds cover. From here, CPs and RPPOs would be able to identify areas where they could contribute directly by services or in-kind staff. Another member suggested that the TC-RPPO should consider this issue and asked that it be included on their agenda; the RPPOs should be directed at specific areas of intervention where they would have the opportunity to contribute.

---

<sup>8</sup> 16\_Bureau\_2015\_June

<sup>9</sup> The report of the Financial Committee meeting will be available [here](#).

- [79] The Secretariat pointed out that many staff members were on temporary contracts financed through trust funds. It was suggested that the Bureau consider possible reallocations of the regular programme budget to retain some of this staff.
- [80] A member suggested that a proposal to increase the IPPC regular programme budget be presented to Council 2016.
- [81] The Bureau:
- (20) *agreed* to initiate lobby activities to increase the IPPC regular programme budget.
  - (21) *asked* the Secretary to advise the Bureau on priority areas that would need funding, which could be highlighted in a request for budget increase.
  - (22) *requested* the Secretariat to draw up a CPM work programme with associated detailed budget allocations (see also discussions under Section 5)
  - (23) *agreed* that the CPM Chairperson will prepare a draft letter to CPs summarizing concerns regarding the lack of financial resources and detailing which activities will be suspended in short time if no additional contributions are received.
  - (24) *encouraged* the Secretariat to post the CPM Chairperson's letter as a news item on the IPP.

## 10.2 Financial implications of CPM-10 decisions

- [82] The Secretariat introduced the paper outlining the financial implications of CPM-10 (2015) decisions<sup>10</sup>.
- [83] One Bureau member expressed his surprise in terms of the few resources needed to carry out these activities and volunteered to contact his region to raise funds. The Bureau welcomed the proposal.
- [84] The Bureau:
- (25) *noted* the financial implications of CPM-10 (2015) decisions.
  - (26) *asked* the Secretariat to ensure that all proposals for activities presented to CPM include a cost overview.
  - (27) *invited* Bureau members to contact CPs in their regions to raise the funds necessary to carry out these activities.

## 10.3 ISPM 15 symbol registration

- [85] The Secretariat informed the Bureau of the recent progress related to registration of the ISPM 15 symbol<sup>11</sup>.
- [86] The Bureau felt that it would be necessary to set a date for closing registration with countries where there is little response, due to the financial implications for the Secretariat.
- [87] The Bureau:
- (28) *noted* the update.
  - (29) *agreed* to consider a specific date for closing ISPM 15 registration in their October 2015 meeting.

## 11. Partnerships, Cooperation and Liaison

### 11.1 MoUs: WTO, WCO

- [88] The Secretariat introduced the papers outlining the advantages and disadvantages from having memoranda of understanding (MOU) with the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the World

---

<sup>10</sup> 26\_Bureau\_2015\_June

<sup>11</sup> 18\_Bureau\_June\_2015

Customs Organization (WCO) asking the Bureau for guidance on respectively the IPPC-WTO and IPPC-WCO relationships and whether MOUs should be pursued<sup>12</sup>.

- [89] One member queried the legal implications of having an MoU. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that an MoU is a formal agreement between treaties or institutions; it does not relate to working arrangements.
- [90] **Regarding the possible MoU with WTO**, one member queried what the IPPC would wish to achieve with it because other less formal agreements to reach the goal may be available (e.g. a cooperation agreement). It was also suggested that it could be opportune to advocate for an MoU through FAO because WTO and FAO are on more compatible levels. It was also noted that there does not seem to be an MoU between WTO and OIE (World organization for animal health) or CODEX Alimentarius.
- [91] Other members felt that a more formal arrangement could be beneficial because it would be a way to obtain coordinated approaches in merit of a number of issues and possibly increased influence on SPS discussions that affect IPPC. As an example, there are issues related to identifying the SPS focal points on a national level because the WTO contact points are often not appointed within the agricultural ministries. The Secretariat noted that a list of SPS contact points has just been released by the WTO and will be shared by the Secretariat through the IPP.
- [92] The Bureau considered that it was not the moment to pursue an MoU with WTO. The Bureau found that in regards to the lack of clarity in the relationship between with the SPS Committee and the IPPC community, it would have more effect if countries (that are members of the SPS) draw the SPS committee's attention to the matter.
- [93] Some members pointed out that it is imperative that the IPPC emphasizes its equal relationship as a partner to the SPS. Additionally, it was suggested that the IPPC and SPS Secretariats could have a common work plan to ensure that responsibilities and activities are clear. The Bureau member from the Pacific would assist the Secretariat on achieving this.
- [94] **Regarding the possible MoU with WCO**, the Secretariat pointed out that some positive collaborations have been undertaken with WCO (e.g. for the development of the sea container standard) but that collaboration in other areas (e.g. ePhyto and capacity development for trade facilitation) could be improved.
- [95] As for the MoU with the WTO, the Bureau argued that the goal of the MoU would need to be determined (as examples, these could be clarifying the individual roles and responsibilities; information exchange to be able to determine emerging risks).
- [96] Mr Theo HESSELINK from WCO connected via teleconference and confirmed the interest of WCO to cooperate closer with the IPPC. He explained the structure of the WCO and noted that the mission of the WCO is to "provide leadership, guidance and support to Customs administrations to secure and facilitate legitimate trade, realize revenues, protect society and build capacity". He noted that WCO has an important role in implementing the trade facilitation agreement. WCO's engagement with phytosanitary issues is currently mostly related to attendance in various international meetings.
- [97] The CPM Chairperson suggested areas where increased cooperation could be sought: ePhyto; cleanliness and track-back mechanisms for sea containers; and information on the implementation of the Trade Facilitation Agreement to ensure easy communication between customs and phytosanitary regulators. Mr HESSELINK confirmed WCO's interest to collaborate in these areas.
- [98] One member queried the WCO's activities within setting standards and capacity development. Mr HESSELINK confirmed that the WCO is responsible for both types of activities but that they have shifted focus to capacity development after having focused largely on standard setting for years because their member countries found the standards difficult to implement.

---

<sup>12</sup> 05\_Bureau\_2015\_June; 12\_Bureau\_2015\_June



[99] The Bureau asked if there were specific priorities WCO would like to work on together. Mr HESSELINK used the MoU with the OIE<sup>13</sup> as an example of elements that the WCO would wish to include, and highlighted information exchange to enhance understanding and identification of new areas of collaboration as an important point. One practical result from the MoU was that the WCO had created a focal point who the OIE could contact regarding specific shipments.

[100] The Bureau:

- (30) *asked* the Secretariat to draft a paper outlining the main challenges encountered from the relationship with the SPS committee, and what the Secretariat wishes to achieve with improved relations.
- (31) *welcomed* the initiative from Australia to submit a paper, based on the IPPC Secretariat draft, to the SPS committee drawing their attention to the issues currently experienced by IPPC contracting parties and the Secretariat in relation to the SPS-agreement and encouraged the Bureau members to advocate for similar initiatives from other contracting parties.
- (32) *asked* the Secretariat to invite the WCO to participate in part of the SPG October 2015 meeting to explore in detail various areas of collaborations.

## 11.2 Working Arrangements with IAEA-FAO Joint Division

[101] The Secretariat informed the Bureau of the ongoing working arrangement with the IAEA-FAO joint division.

[102] The Bureau:

- (33) *noted* the excellent collaboration between the IPPC and IAEA, welcoming any extension of this relationship for instance within capacity development and training.

## 11.3 Review of Organizations requesting liaison status

[103] The Bureau reviewed the request from Mr Guy Hallman of the Joint FAO/IAEA Programme on Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture in Vienna to obtain liaison status for the Phytosanitary Temperature Treatment Expert Group (PTTEG) with the IPPC<sup>14</sup>.

[104] One Bureau member queried what the liaison status would imply. The Secretariat explained that the request was to formalize the link between the PTTEG and the Secretariat for the Secretariat to use the findings and conclusions from the group in their considerations, for instance in the SC meetings.

[105] Some Bureau members wondered if a formal relationship between the group and the Secretariat was really necessary, worrying about the potential implications this sort of request would have on the Bureau agendas. The Bureau, however, was positive about the role this group could play in this area.

[106] The Bureau:

- (34) *encouraged* the collaboration with the PTTEG but *referred* the decision to the Secretariat.

## 12. Review of activities of the IPPC Secretariat

### 12.1 Standard Setting

[107] The standard setting officer of the Secretariat introduced the volume, products and processes of the Standard setting team and the technical panels it manages. He also provided an overview of the current and future human resources allocated to the team. He stressed the need for considering carefully the standard setting work programme versus the very few regular programme funded staff with stable contracts; unless actions are taken to change this situation a number of activities will have to be

---

<sup>13</sup> The Cooperation Agreement between OIE and WCO is available at: [http://www.wcoomd.org/en/about-us/partners/~/\\_media/5C6FC360161D446F8D12757C5F15CA57.ashx](http://www.wcoomd.org/en/about-us/partners/~/_media/5C6FC360161D446F8D12757C5F15CA57.ashx)

<sup>14</sup> 14\_Bureau\_2015\_June

suspended. He noted that when the huge number of DPs will have been processed for adoption, it might be considered to stop the work of the TPDP.

[108] The Bureau suggested the Secretariat to inform CPs of various opportunities for in-kind contributions, clarifying for instance that in-kind staff may work remotely.

[109] A Bureau member suggested that an analysis be undertaken to understand the actual implementation of the DPs. However, the Bureau agreed that it may still be too early to determine the usefulness of the standards.

[110] One Bureau member raised issues related to the standard setting process, specifically in regards to the development of priorities standards (mentioning as an example the delay of the draft standard on the *International movement of grain* (2008-007)), the fact that many topics are added to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* but they may not all be equally relevant, and the ever increased weight the opinion of the SC-7 has. The Secretariat noted the concerns and recalled that the Standard setting procedure will be reviewed by CPM-11 (2016).

[111] A Bureau member stressed that resource constraints may have substantial effects on the work-programme in standard setting. He proposed that the IPPC Secretariat undertake some contingency planning to determine which priorities should be pursued if no additional resources would be made available. To that effect the Bureau decided that the Secretariat develops a list of priorities in the standard setting work programme based on a financially worst case scenario.

[112] The Bureau:

(35) *noted* the resource constraints that may affect negatively the standard setting activities in the coming year.

(36) *asked* the SC to review the standard setting work programme and develop a list of priority activities to be undertaken if a budgetary worst case scenario comes into effect.

## 12.2 National Reporting Obligations

[113] The Secretariat introduced the paper on the NRO guidelines for quality control recalling that the purpose of quality control is to provide administrative support to CP to help ensure that the reports they upload are easily located by the IPP users, correctly found when the IPP search tool is used and that the title correctly reflects their content<sup>15</sup>.

[114] The Bureau discussed the guidelines finding them to be clear. A few comments for improvement were provided. The guidelines would be presented to the Bureau October 2015 meeting for approval.

[115] The Secretary queried whether it would be beneficial to undertake some analysis of the NRO collected and available information. He felt this would be useful to shed light on the number of countries meeting their NROs. Bureau members noted that since the IPPC NROs are not measured for compliance, it may not be opportune to spend resources on this sort of analysis.

[116] The Secretariat introduced the work plan of the NRO<sup>16</sup>. The Bureau were concerned about the feasibility of the activities and asked that performance indicators be added to measure success. The Bureau also suggested that the main goals of the programme be added so that the overall value was clear. The work plan was felt to be too detailed for Bureau and CPM level. It was agreed that it should provide a clear summary of the objectives, priorities and costs whereas the current format would be useful for managing the internal process.

[117] One Bureau member queried the activity to develop and maintain a functional “reporting through RPPO” tool. The Secretariat explained how the tool would work and that it is expected to be launched within a few months.

---

<sup>15</sup> 04\_Bureau\_2015\_June

<sup>16</sup> 25\_Bureau\_2015\_June



[118] The Bureau:

(37) *asked* the Secretariat to modify the NRO guidelines for quality control and the NRO work plan taking into consideration the above mentioned guidance.

### 12.3 Capacity Development

[119] The Secretariat updated the Bureau on the outcomes from the CDC meeting, June 2015<sup>17</sup>, highlighting that the CDC had asked the Bureau consider providing regular programme funding to the CD activities to allow, among other things, for staff to have contracts that match the lifecycle of the projects they manage. The Bureau confirmed that balance between CD and other units of the Secretariat should be sought in terms of finding core activities that should be funded from regular programme (see also discussions under 12.1).

[120] She also informed the Bureau that IICA expressed interest in funding the Regional Workshop in the Caribbean. This would free up resources to fund the African Regional Workshop, which would not otherwise be funded.

[121] Several Bureau members welcomed the CDC idea of having different types of tools in response to topics, noting that international harmonization may be needed through an international standard (vs an ISPM), through guidelines or through a manual. This means that not only ISPMs would be developed but also other types of standards.

[122] The Bureau:

(38) *noted* the update on capacity development.

#### 12.3.1 CDC Review

[123] Mr Ralf LOPIAN introduced the recommendations on the CDC Review<sup>18</sup>, explaining the methodology, process and limitations from the review. The overall results were that there was high appreciation and recognition of the work of the CDC.

[124] The review recommended that the CPM abolishes the current CDC and establishes an oversight committee, named “Implementation Committee”, which will oversee all capacity development activities, including IRSS and those related to the implementation pilot project on surveillance. It also recommended that the current member selection process, language regime and committee size should be retained. The interviewees wished to keep focus on the results and therefore wished to retain an informal working environment with as few formal procedures as possible. One Bureau member found that procedures cannot be retained if the formal structure is changed; the change to the structure would then not be warranted.

[125] The review also recommended that the SC and the implementation committee should develop guidelines for cooperation and submit them to the CPM for adoption; this would give a clear signal of the desire to integrate activities. One Bureau member found this to be inappropriate because they both report to the CPM and on an equal level. Other Bureau members felt that the current conceptions between SC and CDC are such that increased transparent cooperation would be warranted.

[126] Comments on the draft report had been requested from the review group, the Secretariat and the CDC and would be incorporated before the report will be submitted to the SPG 2015.

[127] The Secretary stressed the need to recall the recommendations of the Enhancement evaluation and that actions suggested from the CDC review should be adjusted to the overall enhancement evaluation actions. . Consequently, several members felt that a new committee should be formed only once the Implementation unit had been formed in the Secretariat so that it would be clear what activities should be considered by this committee.

---

<sup>17</sup> 21\_Bureau\_2015\_June; the report of the June 2015 meeting of the CDC is available [here](#).

<sup>18</sup> 11\_Bureau\_2015\_June

[128] The Bureau:

(39) *noted* the draft report on the review of the CDC report, *thanked* the Lead for having completed the review, and *agreed* that the comments from this Bureau meeting would be incorporated and shared with the SPG October 2015 meeting for input to the discussions.

## 12.4 IRSS

[129] The Secretariat presented a number of IRSS proposals: (i) Diversion from intended use; (ii) The action “trace-back” in the phytosanitary context; (iii) NRO: Emergency action reporting; and (iv) Implementation of ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*)<sup>19</sup>.

[130] Regarding (i) one member noted that the original request to the SPG had been made to understand whether several countries had concerns in relation to diversion becoming effectively a trade barrier. The Bureau agreed that this IRSS study be undertaken, but narrowed the scope accordingly.

[131] Regarding (ii), one member noted that this is a very challenging issue to address because there are so many different understandings of the purpose of trace back. The Bureau deferred the review of a possible IRSS proposal only after the outcomes of the TPG discussions (December 2015) so that it would be a more focused analysis. The proposal was not approved.

[132] The Bureau did not think it was clear why there was a need for an IRSS study in relation to (iii) reporting on emergency actions. The Secretariat explained that there is confusion as to which actions to report on and through which mechanism, as some CPs report these but not through the IPP. The IRSS should give clear guidance on how reporting should be done and then how to help NPPOs build capacities. The Bureau agreed that it would be important to understand the impediments before proposing solutions but discussed whether the study should be undertaken by the NRO instead of the IRSS, noting that the proposal differed significantly from regular IRSS studies. The proposal was not approved.

[133] The Bureau found that (iv) would benefit from the outcomes of the RPPO workshop on the challenges of implementation of ISPM 15 as agreed by CPM-10 (2015), and decided that decision on this study be deferred. The proposal was not approved.

[134] The Secretariat queried other activities that IRSS could undertake such as a study of the usefulness of DPs. The Bureau agreed that this would be helpful, but that it should be undertaken when more DPs had been adopted and more experience obtained.

[135] The Bureau:

(40) *approved* the IRSS study on “Diversion from intended use” with a narrowed scope.

## 12.5 Dispute settlement

[136] The Secretariat updated the Bureau on the activities of the SBDS noting that progress has been made in preparation of the various SBDS communication materials. The SBDS meeting scheduled for early 2015 had been postponed to September 2015 to take into consideration outcomes from the dispute between South Africa and the EU because the dispute is progressing much slower than anticipated.

[137] He noted that the dispute settlement procedures currently in use do not provide adequate guidance and need to be reviewed. For instance, no time lines are mentioned in respect to the various steps and hence countries are not encouraged to get back by specific dates. FAO Legal will be sending revised draft procedures to the IPPC Secretariat by October 2015. When the revised procedures will have been approved, a number of materials, including the TORs of the SBDS, will be able to be finalized too.

---

<sup>19</sup> 17\_Bureau\_2015\_June

- [138] The Bureau felt that the IPPC Secretariat should have waited with reviewing the procedures (and allocating resources to this work) until the current dispute has been concluded and lessons can be learned from it.
- [139] As to the specific dispute, the most notable challenge has been to find experts that both parties could agree to. The experts need to have knowledge of the disease and of assessing if the risk was correctly analysed. The Bureau suggested that the IPPC Secretary, through the SBDS, may propose mutual experts considering other options have been sought. At this point the parties will then need to make a decision and if they cannot, the dispute should not be handled by the IPPC any longer. In the latter case, the dispute would be “closed” because the Bureau felt that the parties would then have expressed a lack of interest in finding a solution. Following, the lessons learned would be reported to the CPM.
- [140] The Bureau was concerned with the resources spent on the current dispute and the challenges met in resolving it. One member was concerned with the possible negative message it would send to CPs if the Secretariat was not able to handle disputes. It was acknowledged, however, that resources are limited and that the question should be considered strategically.
- [141] The Bureau felt that the role of the IPPC Secretariat in dispute settlement should be reconsidered and that it would be more appropriate that the IPPC Secretariat take on a technical advisory role to help avoid disputes through facilitating implementation. The Bureau recommended that the IPPC Secretariat should assist countries bilaterally on technical issues, but that any dispute should be dealt with by the WTO where adequate legal expertise to handle the dispute is available.
- [142] The Bureau:
- (41) *asked* the Secretariat to report the Bureau discussions to the SBDS face-to-face meeting for their consideration.
  - (42) *asked* the SBDS, in their face-to-face meeting in September 2015, to review the IPPC Secretariat’s role in dispute settlement taking into consideration the Bureau recommendation above.
  - (43) *asked* the Secretariat to set a deadline for selecting experts to the dispute between South Africa and the EU and inform the parties that should they not agree upon the selection of experts, the dispute will be closed.

### **13. Preparation of October Bureau**

- [143] Due to the number of items to be discussed in the October Bureau meeting, which includes the review of the IPPC Secretariat work plan, the Bureau considered it may be needed to extend the meeting to the Saturday or to the week following.

#### **13.1 Agree Bureau agenda items**

- [144] The Bureau discussed the agenda items to be discussed in the October Bureau meeting. These included (in order of priority):
- Progress on implementing the Enhancement evaluation (encompassing a number of areas such as IT, communication)
  - Progress on the preparation of the IYPH (and review of the IPPC Secretariat’s participation in the Milan EXPO)
  - IPPC Secretariat work plan and budget
  - ePhyto
  - Review of the CPM-11 preparation
  - Preparation for IPPC presence in FAO Council side events.

### 13.2 Assignment of leads for topics

[145] The areas of liaison were not changed and reported here for easy reference. The Leads for the topics would take an active role in preparing for the next Bureau meeting.

Mr John GREIFER - Communications, SBDS, FC  
Mr Lucien Konan KOUAME - NRO  
Ms Lois Ransom - SC  
Mr Diego Quiroga – ePhyto, Implementation  
Ms Kyu-Ock YIM - Enhancement Study  
Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN - CDC

### 13.3 Deadlines

[146] Papers should be posted two weeks before.

## 14. Preparation of SPG Agenda

### 14.1 Agree SPG agenda

[147] The Bureau identified the following items for the SPG 2015 agenda (not in order of priority):

- IYPH - discussion on objectives and detailed further work-programme, including resource mobilization and communications.
- IPPC in 20 years - (see discussions under 14.2)
- Bridging strategic plan - identifying the strategic objectives for the IPPC in the five years leading up to the IYPH and the release of the next 10 year strategic plan, which could include the implementation of ePhyto, preparations for IYPH, implementation of Secretariat operational changes, other strategic initiatives that may arise from the concept of commodity standards/partnerships
- IPPC Secretariat Enhancement evaluation - review plan for implementing the recommendations of the IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation and information on immediate actions regarding operationally and economically feasible recommendations such as IPPC Secretariat structure and functions
- Communication - revised draft IPPC Communications work plan for review
- Partnerships - strategic considerations on cooperation with WCO and other international organizations
- Resource mobilization - external strategy for resource mobilization
- Translations - resource needs and possible partnerships in undertaking translations
- Concept of a commodity standard
- Ministerial level CPM in 2020 - topics and organizational procedures
- ePhyto.

[148] The Bureau agreed that the agenda should be divided into two sections covering long term and medium term strategy issues.

[149] The Secretary stressed the need for the SPG participants to be very well prepared for the meeting. He also suggested inviting experts on some of the topics to provide input to the discussions, mentioning as examples a FAO communications officer, a partnership specialist and some FAO officers responsible for organizing international years. The Bureau agreed with this idea.

[150] The Bureau:

- (44) *asked* the Secretariat to invite selected FAO experts to parts of the SPG meeting to provide input on areas such as communication, partnerships and the organization of international years.

## 14.2 Review of report of 14th SPG and outcomes of CPM-10 (2015) IPPC in 20 years

[151] The Secretariat introduced the paper pertaining to the next steps for the narratives on “IPPC in 20 years”<sup>20</sup>. The Bureau agreed that the narratives should be revised for consistent wording and structure, and circulated to the SPG. The Bureau also agreed that the SPG focus its discussion on the themes 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 over the next four years, concentrating on one theme each year. This will allow for a thorough discussion on each theme, resulting in a well-developed and strong basis for the next IPPC Strategic Framework. It was suggested that themes 2 and 3, although important for the implementation of the IPPC work programme in its entirety, did not constitute individual strategic themes.

[152] For the 2015 SPG, the Bureau agreed that the SPG focus on theme 7 “Simplify regulatory environment for the complexities of future global trade” as it was closely related to the core activity of the IPPC - international harmonization. The Bureau also felt that several elements of the narratives were drivers and others enablers, and that these should be kept distinct to clearly focus on the strategic discussion points with a view to prepare the future strategic framework. The Bureau would expect from the SPG a clear view on where the IPPC wishes to go, what the goals we wish to reach are and start to form the future of the IPPC accordingly.

[153] The Bureau:

- (45) *asked* the IPPC Secretariat to revise and edit the narratives on the IPPC in 20 years for consistent wording and structure by 15 September 2015.
- (46) *agreed* that SPG October 2015 should focus discussions on theme 7 “Simplify regulatory environment for the complexities of future global trade”, and apply concepts from other papers as relevant.

## 14.3 Assignment of leads for topics

[154] It was agreed that the same leads for topics would be assigned as indicated in agenda item 13.2.

## 14.4 Chair for next SPG

[155] The Bureau agreed that Ms Lois RANSOM would be Chairperson for the SPG. Mr Craig Fedchock would be the Secretariat lead for the SPG.

[156] The Bureau discussed participation to the SPG specifically in regards to participation from developing country and continuity of participation. The Bureau felt that the nature of the SPG was open-ended and that continuity could be encouraged in the call for participants, but that it should not be a prerequisite. The Bureau agreed that developing countries should be encouraged to participate, as had been the case for SPG October 2014, where attendance had been high and discussions fruitful for this reason.

## 14.5 Deadlines

[157] Documents should be posted two weeks before the start of the meeting.

## 15. Organization of CPM-11 (2016)

### 15.1 Possible draft ISPMS

[158] Two draft standards may be presented for adoption: Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) (2006-031) and Amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001).

### 15.2 Number of interpretation sessions

[159] The interpretation sessions needed would be as for CPM-10 (2015).

---

<sup>20</sup> 23\_Bureau\_June\_2015

### 15.3 Discussions on concepts and implementation issues related to draft or adopted standards

[160] It was recalled that CPM-10 (2015) had agreed to have a standing agenda item to discuss issues in plenary that are of global interest, hereby giving CPs the possibility to have an alternative to what the evening sessions provided for. The Bureau discussed whether to issue a call for discussion topics, but agreed that it would be more opportune for the SC and the CDC, in close collaboration, to propose topics (issues in relation to standard setting and implementation) to ensure discussions are focused.

[161] See also discussions reported under 15.8.

[162] To ensure there would be enough time for these discussions, it was suggested that, if needed, timing of other agenda items be reduced when these items were not considered central to the IPPC (e.g. reports from other international organizations).

### 15.4 Evening sessions

[163] No evening sessions were foreseen.

### 15.5 Agenda / length / schedule

[164] The Bureau discussed the provisional agenda for CPM-11 (2016)<sup>21</sup>. It would be modified to include items on: the Enhancement Evaluation to report on the Bureau discussions and what has and will be done by the Secretary to implement the decisions (under the report of the CPM Chairperson); IYPH; and Strategic framework discussions (under Governance).

[165] The length of CPM-11 (2016) will be five days, 4-8 April 2016. The Bureau acknowledged that the dates may slightly vary if CPM-11 may be held in the Republic of Korea

[166] The Bureau *agreed* to add to the Bureau June 2016 agenda an item on the format of the CPM to discuss how it may be improved in the future.

### 15.6 Ministerial participation

[167] The Bureau *agreed* that it would contact first China and secondly Australia to invite the Minister of Agriculture to make a speech to CPM-11 (2016).

### 15.7 Special topics session

[168] The Secretariat presented proposals for the special topics sessions as suggested by the Capacity Development Committee, Standards Committee and the TC-RPPO. It was recalled that CPM-10 (2015) had agreed on a special topic session on Sea containers<sup>22</sup>. The Bureau considered the elements proposed by the SC and agreed that there should be three speakers to address (i) Risks associated with the movement of sea containers; pathway risk analysis; (ii) Logistics of movement of sea containers (Container Owners Association, International Maritime Organization, World Customs Organization, World Shipping Council) and (iii) Experiences from NPPOs on checking or inspection of sea containers (i.e. practical aspects).

### 15.8 Side events (decision process, criteria)

[169] The Secretariat presented proposals for side events as gathered by the Capacity Development Committee, Standards Committee and the TC-RPPO<sup>23</sup>.

[170] The Bureau considered the need for identifying principles and priorities for the selection of future side sessions and events. One way of doing this, a Bureau member noted, would be to define what the

---

<sup>21</sup> 10\_Bureau\_2015\_June

<sup>22</sup> 13\_Bureau\_2015\_June; 19\_Bureau\_2015\_June; 22\_Bureau\_2015\_June

<sup>23</sup> 13\_Bureau\_2015\_June; 19\_Bureau\_2015\_June; 22\_Bureau\_2015\_June



participants should gain from their participation. Side sessions should provide opportunities for training or additional information that may help NPPOs on a number of phytosanitary issues. The Bureau agreed that an overarching theme for all sessions should be chosen for each CPM meeting. The theme may concern any topic, from a standard and its implementation to the preparation of the IYPH. The Bureau would select the theme, with a specific goal in mind, well in advance of the CPM to facilitate planning and organization.

[171] The Bureau *agreed* that “surveillance” should be the overarching theme for CPM-11 (2016); hence more or less all events should tie into this theme. It *decided* that the six side sessions organized at CPM-11 (2016) would be:

- ePhyto (1 session)
- Surveillance related topics (5 sessions):
  - diagnostic protocols and surveillance
  - standard setting and surveillance (e.g. on the revision of ISPM 6)
  - surveillance manuals
  - emerging issues in plant health
  - Plant Health in the 21th Century: use of drones, Apps, smart phones

[172] Additionally, a training session (pre-CPM) would be held on ISPM 32 - standard and capacity development related aspects.

[173] The Bureau *asked* that the Secretariat demonstrate its work programme on diagnostic protocols in plenary.

## 15.9 Nominations to subsidiary bodies

[174] The Bureau *encouraged* the Bureau members to solicit timely nominations to subsidiary bodies.

## 15.10 Rapporteur from developing countries

[175] The Bureau discussed what the role as rapporteur encompasses and whether this is clear to the CPs. Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN agreed to draft terms of reference for the role as CPM rapporteur; these would help the Bureau to identify suitable rapporteurs against the key competences required.

[176] The Bureau:

- (47) *asked* Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN to draft CPM Rapporteur terms of reference by 15 September 2015.

## 15.11 Planning for paperless session

[177] The Secretariat noted that in spite of efforts to have paperless CPM sessions, there continues to be a need to make some copies of documents available to participants.

## 15.12 Request to address CPM

[178] The Bureau discussed the request from the Eurasian Economic Commission (ECC) to address CPM-11 (2016) to provide a presentation on the activities of the ECC in the area of plant quarantine<sup>24</sup>. The Bureau was concerned with giving the opportunity to a predominantly economic organization to speak without having a clear understanding of the real relevance of the organization’s mandate to that of the IPPC. The Bureau agreed that the ECC may prepare a written statement for the CPM’s attention, and that any IPPC CP being a member of the Eurasian Economic Union could intervene and briefly present the ECC's mandate in plant health.

---

<sup>24</sup> 15\_Bureau\_2015\_June

[179] The Bureau:

(48) *declined* the request from the Eurasian Economic Commission to address CPM-11 (2016) to provide a presentation on the activities of the ECC in the area of plant quarantine.

## 16. Dates of meetings for 2015-2016

[180] The Bureau meeting in October 2015 was extended to Saturday 17 October. Due to lack of meeting room availability, the Bureau considered hosting the meeting outside of Rome, possibly in Bangkok, which would allow also for looking into collaboration with the Asian Development Bank.

[181] The Bureau members informed each other on their participation in IPPC related meetings<sup>25</sup> and the CPM Chairperson encouraged all Bureau members to attend the Global ePhyto Symposium, 16-20 November 2015.

## 17. Other business

[182] The Bureau queried when the CPM-10 (2015) report would be posted. The Secretariat noted it would be done within a week from the Bureau meeting.

[183] The CPM Chairperson informed the Bureau that the Bureau report would be cleared by the Rapporteur and circulated to the Bureau for comments. The Rapporteur would be asked to clear the report again if there were any substantial comments. The Bureau did not wish the Secretariat to comment on the report.

[184] The Bureau found that it had been an excellent meeting with a positive work environment.

[185] For ease of reference, a list of action items with deadlines is attached in Appendix 5.

## 18. Close of meeting

[186] The CPM Chairperson, on behalf of the Bureau, thanked the Secretary for his strong leadership, expressing their full support in ensuring a smooth transition towards “One IPPC”.

[187] Some Bureau members thanked the Secretary for the smooth organization of the meeting. They welcomed the changed format in the participation of individual IPPC Secretariat staff members and stressed that the measured input of staff in the Bureau meeting deliberations had facilitated the constructive and successful outcome of the meeting.

[188] The Secretary thanked the Bureau members for the discussions and decisions taken throughout the week, and the Chairperson for her competence in leading the CPM. He reiterated his desire to lead change, highlighting also the solid support from the FAO DG. He thanked the IPPC Secretariat staff for the preparatory work and measured input to the Bureau meeting.

---

<sup>25</sup> For dates for IPPC related meetings, see the [IPP Calendar](#)



## Appendix 01 - Agenda

Agenda item	Document No	Presenter
<b>1. Opening of the meeting</b>	--	XIA
<b>2. Adoption of the agenda</b>	01_Bureau_2015_June	YIM
Selection of rapporteur		YIM
<b>3. Housekeeping</b>		FEDCHOCK
3.1 Documents list	02_Bureau_2015_June	FEDCHOCK
3.2 Participants list	03_Bureau_2015_June	FEDCHOCK
3.3 Local information	<a href="#">Link to local information</a>	FEDCHOCK
<b>4. Review of the Report of last meeting</b>		YIM
4.1 Review of action items		YIM
<b>5. IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation</b>	24_Bureau_2015_June	YIM
<b>6. Informatics</b>		FEDCHOCK
6.1 International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP)	09_Bureau_2015_June	FEDCHOCK
6.2 Online Comment System		LARSON
6.3 ePhyto	08_Bureau_2015_June	FEDCHOCK
<b>7. Resource Mobilization</b>		FEDCHOCK
7.1 Benefits of hosting CPM outside of Rome	07_Rev_01_Bureau_2015_June	YIM
7.2 Report on RM activities taken by Bureau members		BUREAU MEMBERS
7.3 International Year of Plant Health	20_Bureau_2015_June	LOPIAN
<b>8. Communication</b>	06_Bureau_2015_June	FEDCHOCK
<b>9. Implementation</b>		FEDCHOCK
9.1 Implementation pilot project on surveillance	16_Rev_02_Bureau_2015_June	STEWART/ PERAI TA
<b>10. Review of Operational Plans / Budgets</b>		FEDCHOCK/ BENOVIC
10.1 Report of Finance Committee meeting	Oral Report	GREIFER
10.2 Financial implications of CPM-10 decisions	26_Bureau_2015_June	FEDCHOCK/
10.3 ISPM15 symbol registration	18_Bureau_2015_June	FEDCHOCK/ BENOVIC
<b>11. Partnerships, Cooperation and Liaison</b>		FEDCHOCK
11.1 MOUs: WTO, WCO	05_Bureau_2015_June 12_Bureau_2015_June	FEDCHOCK/WCO
11.2 Working Arrangements with IAEA-FAO Joint Division		FEDCHOCK
11.3 Review of Organizations requesting liaison status	14_Bureau_2015_June	FEDCHOCK
<b>12. Review of activities of the IPPC Secretariat</b>		FEDCHOCK
12.1 Standard Setting		LARSON
12.2 National Reporting Obligations	04_Bureau_2015_June 25_Bureau_2015_June	NOWELL

Agenda item	Document No	Presenter
12.3 Capacity Development	21_Bureau_2015_June	<i>PERALTA</i>
12.3.1 CDC Review	11_Bureau_2015_June	<i>LOPIAN</i>
12.4 IRSS	17_Bureau_2015_June	<i>STEWART/</i>
12.5 Dispute settlement		<i>NOWELL</i>
<b>13. Preparation of October Bureau</b>		<i>YIM</i>
13.1 Agree Bureau Agenda items		
13.2 Assignment of Leads for Topics		
13.3 Deadlines		
<b>14. Preparation of SPG Agenda</b>		<i>YIM</i>
14.1 Agree SPG Agenda		
14.2 Review of report of 14th SPG and outcomes of CPM-10 (2015) IPPV in 20 years	23_Bureau_2015_June	<i>FEDCHOCK</i> <i>/LOPIAN</i>
14.3 Assignment of Leads for Topics		
14.4 Chair for next SPG		
14.5 Deadlines		
<b>15. Organization of CPM-11 (2016)</b>		<i>YIM</i>
15.1 Possible draft ISPMS		
15.2 Number of interpretation sessions		
15.3 Discussions on concepts and implementation issues related to draft or adopted standards		
15.4 Evening sessions		
15.5 Agenda / Length / Schedule	10_Bureau_2015_June	
15.6 Ministerial participation		
15.7 Special topics session	22_Bureau_2015_June 13_Bureau_2015_June	<i>LOPIAN</i>
15.8 Side events (decision process, criteria)	22_Bureau_2015_June 13_Bureau_2015_June	<i>LOPIAN</i>
15.9 Nominations to subsidiary bodies		
15.10 Rapporteur from developing countries		
15.11 Planning for paperless session		
15.12 Request from ECC	15_Bureau_2015_June	
<b>16. Dates of meetings for 2015-2016</b>		<i>FEDCHOCK</i>
<b>17. Other business</b>		<i>YIM</i>
<b>18. Next meeting</b>		<i>FEDCHOCK</i>

## Appendix 02 – Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGEND A ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
<b>Other Documents</b>				
01_Bureau_2015_Jun	2	Draft Agenda	<i>Bureau</i>	09-06-2015
02_Bureau_2015_Jun	3.1	Documents list	<i>Bureau</i>	09-06-2015
03_Bureau_2015_Jun	3.2	Participants list	<i>Bureau</i>	12-06-2015
04_Bureau_2015_Jun	12.2	Guidelines for the NRO Quality Control Programme	<i>Bureau</i>	04-06-2015
05_Bureau_2015_Jun	11.1	Pros and Cons for an MOU with the World Trade Organization	<i>Bureau</i>	04-06-2015
06_Bureau_2015_Jun	8	Communications Work plan	<i>Bureau</i>	09-06-2015
07_Rev_01_Bureau_2015_Jun	7.1	Benefits of hosting of the CPM-11 outside of Rome	<i>Bureau</i>	05-06-2015
08_Bureau_2015_Jun	6.3	ePhyto Steering Group update	<i>Bureau</i>	12-06-2015
09_Bureau_2015_Jun	6.1	International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP)	<i>Bureau</i>	04-06-2015
10_Bureau_2015_Jun	15.5	Provisional Agenda CPM-11	<i>Bureau</i>	04-06-2015
11_Bureau_2015_Jun	12.3. 1	CDC Review Report	<i>Bureau</i>	12-06-2015
12_Bureau_2015_Jun	11.1	Pros and Cons for an MOU with the World Customs Organization	<i>Bureau</i>	04-06-2015
13_Bureau_2015_Jun	15.7; 15.8	SC proposals for Special Topics and Side Sessions for CPM-11	<i>Bureau</i>	04-06-2015
14_Bureau_2015_Jun	11.3	Request for liaison status	<i>Bureau</i>	04-06-2015
15_Bureau_2015_Jun	15.12	Request from the EEC	<i>Bureau</i>	09-06-2015
16_Rev_02_Bureau_2015_Jun	9.1	Implementation pilot project on surveillance	<i>Bureau</i>	12-06-2015
17_Bureau_2015_Jun	12.4	IRSS	<i>Bureau</i>	12-06-2015
18_Bureau_2015_Jun	10.0	ISPM 15 Symbol registration - progress	<i>Bureau</i>	11-06-2015
19_Bureau_2015_Jun	15.7; 15.8	Analysis of key decision and proposals for CPM-11 side programme	<i>Bureau</i>	12-06-2015
20_Bureau_2015_Jun	7.3	Update on the Efforts to Establish IYPH 2020	<i>Bureau</i>	12-06-2015
21_Bureau_2015_Jun	12.3	Update on the 6 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of the IPPC CDC	<i>Bureau</i>	12-06-2015
22_Bureau_2015_Jun	15.7; 15.8	Planning the CPM-11 Special Topic Session and Side Sessions	<i>Bureau</i>	12-06-2015
23_Rev_01_Bureau_2015_Jun	14.2	IPPC in 20 Years	<i>Bureau</i>	12-06-2015

DOCUMENT NO.	AGEND A ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
24_Bureau_2015_Jun	5	Comments received to the IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation	<i>Bureau</i>	12-06-2015
25_Bureau_2015_Jun	12.2	Update on NRO Workplan	<i>Bureau</i>	12-06-2015
26_Bureau_2015_Jun	10.2	Financial implications of CPM-10 decisions	<i>Bureau</i>	12-06-2015

LINKS:	Agenda item	Content
<a href="#">Local information</a>	3	FAO Rome meetings: Local information
<a href="#">Bureau March 2015</a>	4	Bureau March 2015 Report

### Appendix 03 - Participants list

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed <sup>26</sup>	Term expires
Africa Member	<p><b>M Lucien KOUAME KONAN</b> Inspecteur Direction de la Protection des Végétaux, du Contrôle et de la Qualité Ministère de l'Agriculture B.P. V7 Abidjan, <b>COTE D'IVOIRE</b> Phone: (+225) 07 903754 Fax: (+225) 20 212032</p>	<a href="mailto:l_kouame@yahoo.fr">l_kouame@yahoo.fr</a>	2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 2 years  (2)	2016
Asia Member <i>Chairperson</i>	<p><b>Ms Kyu-Ock YIM</b> Senior Researcher Export Management Division Department of Plant Quarantine Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs 178 Anyang-ro Manan-gu Anyang city, Gyunggi-do <b>REPUBLIC OF KOREA</b> Phone: (+82) 31 4207665 Fax: (+82) 31 4207605</p>	<a href="mailto:koyim@korea.kr">koyim@korea.kr</a>	CPM-8 (2013) 3 <sup>rd</sup> term / 2 years  (0)	2016
Europe Member	<p><b>Mr Corne VAN ALPHEN</b> Coordinating Policy Officer Phytosanitary Affairs Plant Supply Chain and Food Quality Department Ministry of Economic Affairs P.O. Box 20401 2500 EK - The Hague <b>THE NETHERLANDS</b> Phone: (+31) 618 596867</p>	<a href="mailto:c.a.m.vanalphen@minez.nl">c.a.m.vanalphen@minez.nl</a>	1st term / 2 years  (0)	2016

<sup>26</sup> The numbers in parenthesis refers to FAO travel funding assistance. (0) No funding; (1) Airfare funding; (2) Airfare and DSA funding.

<b>Region / Role</b>	<b>Name, mailing, address, telephone</b>	<b>Email address</b>	<b>Membership Confirmed<sup>26</sup></b>	<b>Term expires</b>
Latin America and Caribbean Member	<b>Mr Diego QUIROGA</b> Director Nacional de Protección Vegetal Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria (SENASA) Av Paseo Colón, 315 - 4 Piso Buenos Aires, <b>ARGENTINA</b> Phone: (+54) 11 4121 5176 Fax: (+54) 11 4121 5179	<a href="mailto:dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar">dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar</a>	1st term / 2 years (0)	2016
Near East Member	<b>Mr Khidir Gibriel MUSA EDRES</b> Director General Plant Protection Directorate P.O.Box 14 Khartoum North <b>SUDAN</b> Phone: (+249) 912138939	<a href="mailto:khidirgme@outlook.com">khidirgme@outlook.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:khidirgme@gmail.com">khidirgme@gmail.com</a>	1st term / 2 years  (2)	2017
North America Member	<b>Mr John GREIFER</b> Assistant Deputy Administrator Plant Protection and Quarantine Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Department of Agriculture 1400 Independence Ave., South Building Washington DC 20250 <b>USA</b> Phone: (+1) 202 7207677	<a href="mailto:john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov">john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov</a> <a href="#">v</a>	3rd term / 2 years  (0)	2016
Pacific Member	<b>Ms Lois RANSOM</b> Assistant Secretary, Plant Import Operations GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 <b>AUSTRALIA</b> Ph.: (+61) 262723241	<a href="mailto:Lois.ransom@agriculture.gov.au">Lois.ransom@agriculture.gov.au</a> ;	3rd term / 2 years  (0)	2017

**Others**

<b>Region / Role</b>	<b>Name, mailing, address, telephone</b>	<b>Email address</b>	<b>Members hip Confirmed</b>	<b>Term expires</b>
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Jingyuan XIA</b> Secretary	<a href="mailto:Jingyuan.Xia@fao.org">Jingyuan.Xia@fao.org</a>	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Craig FEDCHOCK</b> Coordinator	<a href="mailto:Craig.Fedchock@fao.org">Craig.Fedchock@fao.org</a>	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Ralf Lopian</b> Consultant	<a href="mailto:Ralf.Lopian@fao.org">Ralf.Lopian@fao.org</a>	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Ana Peralta</b> Capacity Development Officer	<a href="mailto:Ana.Peralta@fao.org">Ana.Peralta@fao.org</a>	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr David Nowell</b> National Reporting Obligations Officer	<a href="mailto:Dave.Nowell@fao.org">Dave.Nowell@fao.org</a>	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Brent LARSON</b> Standards Officer	<a href="mailto:Brent.Larson@fao.org">Brent.Larson@fao.org</a>	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Eva Moller</b> Report writer	<a href="mailto:Eva.moller@fao.org">Eva.moller@fao.org</a>	N/A	N/A

**Via teleconference**

WCO	<b>Mr Theo HESSELINK</b> Technical Officer World Customs Organization	<a href="mailto:Theo.Hesselink@wcoomd.org">Theo.Hesselink@wcoomd.org</a>	N/A	N/A
ePhyto Steering Group	<b>Mr Nico HORN</b> Senior Officer Plant Health Plant Protection Service, Geertjesweg 15 Postbus 9102, 6700 HC Wageningen, Netherlands Tel: +31-651998151	<a href="mailto:n.m.horn@minlnv.nl">n.m.horn@minlnv.nl</a>	N/A	N/A

## Appendix 04 - Draft letter to the ePhyto Steering Group and ePhyto Road map

Dear Nico van Horn and ePhyto Steering Group,

On behalf of the CPM Bureau, we wish to thank you and the Steering Group for your dedicated efforts to progressing CPM goals related electronic global phytosanitary certification. This Steering Group has provided critically needed leadership to advance our collective interests and goals in this area. The Bureau will continue to rely on this key Steering Group as we go forward.

As many know by now, our proposal for STDF funding was not approved. However, this has not dampened Bureau interest in pursuing our collective interest in adopting an efficient, fraud proof, and cost effective certification exchange system for the future.

The Bureau has agreed to proceed with another plan for going forward and requests that the steering group to undertake the following:

- (1) Prepare a short explanatory document that explains and reemphasizes the purpose of a hub system, clarifies comparative benefits of a hub versus point to point system, and describes the essential requirements for building an effective hub system. This document is needed to continue building support and understanding for ePhyto.
- (2) Develop plans for undertaking a pilot of an ePhyto hub system with a small group of countries, including a country or two from a developing region. In this regard, we request the Steering Group to:
  - develop terms of reference for the pilot
  - estimate the costs
  - identify criteria for selecting countries to participate in the pilot
  - identify potential donors
  - validate the economic costs and comparative savings of a hub system
  - continue to explore a future fee system to maintain the system in the future.
  - any other significant considerations and suggestions from the ePhyto group.

We would like to target the October Bureau meeting (12 October 2015) for seeing these outputs and to reconvene with you to discuss next steps. Attached, please find a suggestion for an ePhyto steering group road map.

Again, we want to thank you and the group for your continued dedication to this strategic work.

Sincerely,

Kyu-Ock  
CPM Chairperson



## **Attachment – ePhyto Steering Group road map**

### **2015**

#### **SEPTEMBER (first days)**

Steering Group output:

- A short explanatory document explaining and reemphasizing the benefits and advantages for contracting parties (CPs) of having a developed and working ePhyto hub and a generic system, describing the essential requirements for building an effective hub system.

#### **OCTOBER (13-15 SPG meeting)**

Steering Group output:

- Proposal for the development of a Pilot for an ePhyto hub and a generic System, including:
  - Technical parameters
  - Which CPs should participate in the pilot with an explanation on the criteria for selection.
  - How the pilot will be managed.

During the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) meeting, the Steering Group Chairperson, Mr Nico Horn, will make a presentation about the contents of the proposal of the pilot. Later the necessary terms of reference (TORs) and cost calculations will be developed by the Steering Group.

Late October the Steering Group should finish the TORs and estimated cost of the development of the hub and the generic system for the pilot.

The pilot project proposal and TORs will be used by the Bureau and Secretariat to explore other possible donors for this first stage of the implementation ePhyto, independently of other early contacts with donors able to finance the currently fully developed project proposal.

At a later stage, a cost estimate or confirmation of building and maintaining a first generation hub will need to be communicated to CPM.

#### **NOVEMBER (9-13)**

Global ePhyto Symposium in Korea:

The objective will be not only to update the world situation of ephyto and national experiences but also to discuss the effective implementation of the hub and the generic system as well as related regulatory and legal issues.

### **2016**

#### **APRIL (4-8)**

CPM 11: The work done during 2015 for the implementation of ePhyto will be presented in a Plenary session and in a specific side session, to keep CPs informed of progress in a transparent manner.

## Appendix 05 - Action list for Bureau and IPPC Secretariat

Action	Section / Para.	Responsible	Deadline
Monitor the progress of implementation of the Enhancement evaluation recommendations through a regular monitoring report that is to be an integral part of the Annual Report presented to the CPM by the IPPC Secretariat.	5 [33]	XIA	CPM-11 posting deadline
In the event where a transition of the IPP to www.fao.org is confirmed, develop a transition plan for the IPP with cost implications	6.1 [41]	FEDCHOCK / BENOVIC	No deadline
Contact CPs and RPPOs to identify possible areas where they could contribute to maintain or improve the IPP (e.g. technical issues, translation assistance).	Section 6.1 [41]	FEDCHOCK	No deadline
Solicit comments from CPs on the design, functioning, utility and vision of the IPP.	6.1 [41]	FEDCHOCK	No deadline
Draft an information document on the feasibility of an ePhyto hub pilot.	6.3 [53]	ePhyto Steering Group (QUIROGA to follow up)	15 September 2015
Draft terms of reference for the development of the ePhyto hub pilot.	6.3 [53]	ePhyto Steering Group (QUIROGA to follow up)	15 September 2015 (for presentation to the SPG 2015)
Prepare a report on ePhyto activities for presentation to the SPG October 2015.	6.3 [53]	Chairperson of the ePhyto Steering Group	SPG 2015 posting deadline
Discuss the pilot project and the intended outcomes from the ePhyto symposium and agree upon how to handle the financial and administrative implications of the hub	6.3 [53]	Bureau	October 2015 Bureau meeting
Explore other funding options for the ePhyto project.	6.3 [53]	Secretariat	October 2015 Bureau meeting
On behalf of the Bureau, as Vice-Chairperson of the Bureau, draft a letter of support to be sent to the Republic of Korea for hosting the CPM-11 (2016) by July 15th 2015.	7.1 [58]	RANSOM	15 July 2015
Investigate FAO support for holding CPM outside of Rome and contact CBD to understand how their COP session was organized in Republic of Korea.	7.1 [58]	FEDCHOCK	ASAP
Take into consideration the guidance provided in [67-68] and modify the communication work plan accordingly.	8 [69]	FEDCHOCK / CHERFAS	October 2015 Bureau posting deadline
Initiate lobby activities to increase the IPPC regular programme budget.	10.1 [81]	Bureau	No deadline
Advise the Bureau on priority areas that would need funding, which could be highlighted in a request for budget increase.	10.1 [81]	Secretariat / BENOVIC	October 2015 Bureau meeting
Draw up a CPM work programme with associated detailed budget allocations (see also discussions under Section 5)	10.1 [81]	Secretariat / BENOVIC	October 2015 Bureau posting deadline
Prepare a draft letter to CPs summarizing concerns regarding the lack of financial resources and detailing which activities will be suspended in short time if no additional contributions are received.	10.1 [81]	YIM	Bureau update
Post the CPM Chairperson's letter mentioned in the action above as a news item on the IPP.	10.1 [81]	FEDCHOCK	Following Bureau update

Ensure that all proposals for activities presented to CPM include a cost overview.	10.1 [84]	GREIFER / BENOVIC	CPM-11 posting deadline
Contact CPs in their regions to raise the funds necessary to carry out the activities with financial implications decided by CPM-10 (2015).	10.1 [84]	Bureau	No deadline
Consider a specific date for closing ISPM 15 registration.	10.3 [87]	Bureau	October 2015 Bureau meeting
Draft a paper outlining the main challenges encountered from the relationship with the SPS committee, and what the Secretariat wishes to achieve with improved relations.	11.1 [100]	Secretariat	October 2015 Bureau meeting
Invite the WCO to participate in part of the SPG October 2015 meeting to explore in detail various areas of collaborations	11.1 [100]	FEDCHOCK	15 July 2015
Review the standard setting work programme and develop a list of priority activities to be undertaken if a budgetary worst case scenario comes into effect.	12.1 [112]	Standards Committee (LARSON to follow up)	SC November 2015 meeting
Modify the NRO guidelines for quality control and the NRO work plan taking into consideration the guidance mentioned in section 12.2.	12.2 [118]	NOWELL	SPG 2015 posting deadline
Incorporate comments on the CDC review from this Bureau meeting and share the review with the SPG October 2015 meeting for input to the discussions	12.3.1 [128]	LOPIAN	SPG 2015posting deadline
Report the Bureau discussions to the SBDS face-to-face meeting for their consideration.	12.5 [142]	NOWELL	SBDS meeting 2015
Review the IPPC Secretariat's role in dispute settlement taking into consideration the Bureau recommendation above.	12.5 [142]	SBDS (NOWELL to follow up)	SBDS meeting 2015
Set a deadline for selecting experts to the dispute between South Africa and the EU and inform the parties that should they not agree upon the selection of experts, the dispute will be closed.	12.5 [142]	NOWELL	No deadline
Invite selected FAO experts to parts of the SPG meeting to provide input on areas such as communication, partnerships and the organization of international years.	14.1 [150]	XIA	ASAP
Revise and edit the narratives on the IPPC in 20 years for consistent wording and structure	14.2 [153]	LOPIAN	15 September 2015
Contact China to invite the Minister of Agriculture to make a speech to CPM-11 (2016).	15.6	XIA	ASAP
Solicit nominations to subsidiary bodies	15.9	Bureau	Before CPM-11 (2016)
Draft CPM Rapporteur terms of reference.	15.10	VAN ALPHEN	15 September 2015