



REPORT

Rome, Italy
13-15 Oct. 2015

Strategic Planning Group October, 2015



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

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

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

© FAO, 2015

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.

All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request or addressed to copyright@fao.org.

FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org.

Contents

1. Opening of the Meeting	4
2. Adoption of the Agenda	4
3. Housekeeping	4
4. Selection of a Rapporteur	5
5. CPM Chairperson Update.....	5
6. The IPPC towards 2020.....	5
7. Strategic Topics	8
7.1 Standard setting toward 2020.....	8
7.2 Implementation facilitation towards 2020.....	9
7.3 Communication and Partnerships towards 2020.....	9
7.4 Resource mobilization towards 2020.....	10
7.5 Advanced Technology in Plant Health towards 2020.....	10
7.6 IPPC in 20 years.....	10
8. International Year of Plant Health 2020.....	12
9. Strategic Topics Proposed by Contracting Parties.....	13
10. Other Business.....	13
10.1 Concept of commodity standard	15
10.2 NPPO and wood export in the Republic of Congo: Phytosanitary certification process.....	16
10.3 Report from the ePhyto Steering Committee	16
10.4 Reflection on the future of the SPG (submission by Canada).....	18
10.5 Alternative Service delivery (submission by Canada)	19
10.6 IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation	20
11. Next Meeting and Close	20

APPENDICES

Appendix 01 - Agenda	21
Appendix 02 - Documents list.....	22
Appendix 03 – Participants list	23

1. Opening of the Meeting

- [1] The SPG Chairperson, Ms Lois RANSOM (Australia), welcomed the participants stating that she looked forward to vibrant and enlightening discussions and inviting all participants to contribute actively in the discussions. She set the scene of the SPG highlighting that this group focus should be on discussions of strategic nature to set the future priorities of the IPPC.
- [2] The IPPC Secretary, Mr Jingyuan XIA, also welcomed the participants underscoring the importance of the SPG in brainstorming on strategic issues for the medium and long term. He informed the SPG of his educational background from China, the Philippines and the Netherlands, which had provided him with expertise in plant protection. He had worked in the Chinese National Cotton Institute where he participated in the development of BT cotton. He also worked for the Ministry of Agriculture of China, where he was involved in numerous transnational and international projects for plant protection and plant quarantine. Most recently, he covered the position as the Chinese Ambassador to the three Rome-based UN agencies.
- [3] He reflected on the Convention and its Secretariat noting that over the past 63 years and 23 years respectively, both have grown stronger thanks to the contributions from contracting parties (CPs) and from the management of the Secretariat. He thanked his team, in particular the team leaders, for the daily support and dedication. However, he also stressed that the future holds challenges and that we need to keep improving. Based on the Enhancement Evaluation in 2014, the Secretariat is, at present, undergoing the renewal to be able to face the future in a robust and efficient manner.
- [4] He underlined his strategy to renew the IPPC Secretariat is to create “One IPPC” through increasing internal cohesion and external influence. To do so, three actions are being taken: reshaping the structure, regrouping the responsibilities and renewing the operational mechanisms. The main objective of such renewal is to provide better services for the IPPC membership.
- [5] On the mandate of the SPG, he underlined his deep respect for the work done throughout time and the need for the group to contribute important thoughts to the future planning for the Secretariat. He recalled that recently, the United Nations (UN) had adopted the post-2015 development agenda, of which several sustainable development goals are directly and indirectly related to the IPPC. For this reason, he had suggested adding to this year’s SPG agenda the point of planning for the next five years of the IPPC.
- [6] He concluded his introductory remarks by highlighting that he looked forward to participating in the fruitful discussions this week, thanking in advance all the participants for their valuable contributions.
- [7] The participants introduced themselves.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

- [8] One participant suggested that the SPG discuss a plan for the new strategic framework; this discussion would be conducted under Section 6.
- [9] The SPG adopted the agenda (Appendix 1).

3. Housekeeping

- [10] The Secretariat introduced the Documents list (Appendix 2) and the Participants list (Appendix 3). Logistic arrangements were clarified.
- [11] Several participants expressed their concerns that there were very few papers for this meeting and that those there were had been made available very late. They highlighted the importance of the early availability of documents as this is vital for preparing effectively for the meeting.

4. Selection of a Rapporteur

- [12] Due to the nature of this year's meeting with its focus on five-year and longer-term goals, it was agreed to have two Rapporteurs and the SPG elected Mr Sam BISHOP (United Kingdom) and Mr Lucien KOUAME KONAN (Côte d'Ivoire) as Rapporteurs.

5. CPM Chairperson Update

- [13] The CPM Chairperson, Ms Kyu-Ock YIM, provided an oral update from the CPM Bureau. She specifically mentioned: the Bureau deliberations on the Enhancement Evaluation; that the Bureau had agreed on the benefits of the Rep. of Korea hosting CPM in 2017; Bureau's involvement in the development of the International Year of Plant Health, and; the progress on the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) review. Lastly, she was pleased to inform that FAO had granted the IPPC Secretariat the same regular programme funds as the previous year, but was also dismayed to know that hardly any donations had been made in 2015 to sustain the IPPC Secretariat's activities. She reached out to all participants to consider the difficult budget situation of the Secretariat and recalled that if the funding crisis was not mitigated the number of staff in the Secretariat would need to be reduced, meaning many key activities, particularly in the capacity development area, would have to be cancelled.

- [14] She noted that the reports from the Bureau meetings are available on the IPP¹.

6. The IPPC towards 2020

- [15] The IPPC Secretary provided a keynote speech on his vision for the IPPC towards 2020.
- [16] After providing a historical overview of the IPPC, the Secretariat, the CPM, and the formation of the various subsidiary bodies he described some of the major achievements within these areas. He started from 1881 where the predecessor for the Convention was signed between five countries to control the spread of grape aphids, till 1952 when the IPPC first came into force after ratification by three countries, till 1979 where the first revision of the Convention was adopted by FAO. He then turned to the major achievements within the various units of the Secretariat and mentioned some of the major challenges to be faced in the next five years.
- [17] In this context, he stressed the relevance of linking IPPC's activities to the relevant UN post-2015 sustainable development goals and to fully deliver on the two FAO strategic objectives relevant to IPPC (i.e. SO 2 - increase and improve provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner and SO 4 - enable Inclusive and efficient agricultural and food systems). Other challenges include the increasing demands on the IPPC of CPs to support them on international, regional and national levels. Internally in the Secretariat, challenges include implementing the Enhancement Evaluation recommendations to increase efficiency and coordination of the Secretariat.
- [18] One SPG participant suggested that activities would also link to the FAO strategic objective to "contribute to the eradication of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition" because he felt that this objective was highly relevant for the IPPC and that the IPPC would be essential for FAO to meet this objective. Another SPG participant commented on the proposed linkages to the UN goals and suggested that focus should rather be on the FAO strategic objectives as, in operational terms, it would be challenging to dedicate sufficient resources to work on all these different strategic objectives and goals. There was also some concern expressed at linking too closely with the various FAO objectives as these may be amended or changed.
- [19] The Secretary explained that his vision for 2020 was that the IPPC Community would work towards "One general goal" to increase capacities to implement the IPPC. This would be facilitated by "One IPPC" which would operate through: "Two key strategies" namely (i) strengthening the coordination among the Secretariat, RPPOs and NPPOs and (ii) strengthening the cooperation with relevant

¹ The Bureau reports are available here: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/bureau/>.

international organizations; “Three core activities” namely (i) Standard setting, (ii) Implementation Facilitation and (iii) Integration and support; “Four major mandates” i.e. enhancing food security, protecting the environment, facilitating trade and developing capacity; and lastly “Five themes” to be worked on over the next five years, such as (i) Climate change and plant health (2016), (ii) ePhyto and plant health (2017), (iii) Capacity building and plant health (2018), (iv) Safe trade and plant health (2019), and (v) IYPH (2020). These core themes entailed that for the specific year, the Secretariat would do some dedicated seminars or a conference on the topic to create awareness and enhance the visibility of the IPPC.

- [20] The SPG queried various elements of the presentation, such as the correlation between the mandates and the core activities, and the involvement of RPPOs, NPPOs and FAO regional officers.
- [21] The Secretary explained that the IPPC strategic objectives were the mandates and that, as an example, climate change was linked to the protection of the environment, and ePhyto to safe trade. All activities would be linked to plant health with the purpose of increasing visibility and impact of the IPPC and that RPPOs and NPPOs were included in “One IPPC”.
- [22] The SPG discussed the relevance of the proposal for working on a yearly theme and what it would entail. Some participants appreciated the attempt to raise the profile of the IPPC, highlighting that this should be a clear priority when deciding on the themes, just as it should be clear as to what would be the desired achievements. It was also pointed out that the SPG should analyze which activities would have the most impact. The SPG felt that focus on one theme should not exclude work on that topic in the other years, but simply provide an opportunity to spotlight attention.
- [23] Some participants expressed concern that the yearly themes may divert the focus and budget from the core work of the IPPC and that, should the IPPC work with the themes, it needed to be clear how they would continue delivery of the ongoing core work. Others felt that these themes, by careful design of their content, would ultimately contribute to the IYPH and help increase visibility.
- [24] The SPG discussed whether “climate change and plant health” should feature as a theme. Some participants felt that the IPPC should not work directly on climate change because, in relative terms, this is an area for which it is difficult to clearly show the importance of plant health. Other participants argued that while this may be true, climate change influences plant health greatly as it affects pest presence, spread and resilience and should, for this reason, be considered as an important topic. Developing countries in particular struggle with climate change adaptation and mitigation and IPPC could play a role in building capacities to assist with this.
- [25] The SPG discussed topics for the five themes.
- [26] Some SPG participants felt that one theme should focus on the Enhancement Evaluation and on creating a centre of excellence to ensure that CPs and donors have trust in the IPPC and in the Secretariat. Others felt that this focus was too “inward” and the SPG agreed that it would not match the objective of raising awareness of the IPPC. The SPG also considered that a theme could explore new forms of partnerships, for instance with industry, academia (plant health networks) and IT/technology networks, but felt that this area would be cross cutting and that it did not match the requirements for a yearly theme.
- [27] The SPG agreed that one theme should feature plant health and food security to raise awareness on all levels about the importance of the IPPC in reducing hunger and poverty. Another theme the SPG felt was important was ePhyto and trade facilitation in terms of helping to reduce the gaps between developed and developing countries on aspects of phytosanitary certification. The SPG agreed this theme should coincide with the launch of the pilot ePhyto hub. The third theme the SPG agreed upon derived from the many requests for building capacities to implement the IPPC and its standards, and the SPG suggested that this theme would use the conclusions and results achieved from the Pilot Implementation project on surveillance. The last theme would relate to environmental protection.
- [28] The themes would lead towards the IYPH in 2020 which would ultimately combine them all.

[29] The SPG elaborated on the themes as per below and invited the Bureau and the Secretary to consider these for the IPPC Secretariat five-year plan. In introducing the themes, SPG agreed that the primary purpose of IPPC annual themes is to focus the advocacy efforts of the IPPC. Each theme will reinforce the important role and contribution made by the IPPC towards achieving important global objectives. While not intended to impact on core work programmes, SPG noted that from time to time, some specific activities may need modest amounts of additional funding, for instance to run a seminar or conduct a survey or study, to achieve the purpose of each theme.

[30] **Topic for 2016: *Plant Health Contributes to Food Security***

<i>Purpose:</i>	This year demonstrates that uncontrolled pests have a direct effect on food security and are directly responsible for hunger and poverty. It could also demonstrate how poverty can be reduced in rural populations through creating opportunities that generate sufficient food to participate in international trade. The topic would show that plant health and reducing the spread of pests is an important activity within FAO and would very much place the IPPC at the centre of FAO's undertakings in this regard.
<i>Content:</i>	Since 2016 is an important year for rebuilding the IPPC Secretariat due to several regular staff retiring and the need to implement recommendations from the Enhancement Evaluation report, any additional Secretariat work associated with the theme should be minimal. The activities to advance the theme could be limited to commissioning a study on the theme to be conducted by a university or research institute. The study could then form the basis for a couple of seminars, popular publications and media stories, and would be one of the pillars in the IYPH 2020 programme.
<i>Costs:</i>	The thematic year could be relatively cheap with spending some USD 30-40 000 on a study and some minor staff costs in managing that. The organization of two seminars could cause some minor staff costs, and some time would be required from communications staff to promote the results of the study.

[31] **Topic for 2017: *Plant Health Contributes to Trade and Economic Development***

<i>Purpose:</i>	This year highlights the important role of the IPPC in trade facilitation through implementation of an electronic certification hub and generic ePhyto portal. It will show how these systems will offer the world a less costly, more efficient and safer system for the trade of food and plant commodities.
<i>Content:</i>	This would largely involve communication efforts to profile the positive benefits accruing to developing countries that will have been involved in using the hub or generic portal. Outputs from this and other themes may also be used as the content for a major conference on "Plant Health and Trade" to be organized in 2020.
<i>Costs:</i>	This year would leverage activities already occurring in the ePhyto programme. Additional costs should be modest and will be solely related to communications efforts.

[32] **Topic for 2018: *Improving Plant Health Requires National Capacity Building***

<i>Purpose:</i>	This year highlights how the IPPC helps countries to build national capacity as they implement the IPPC and ISPMs. The Pilot implementation programme on surveillance will be used as the focus for demonstrating this. Harmonization of international plant health measures through better implementation will also be highlighted.
<i>Content:</i>	The surveillance pilot would stand at the centre of this topic. By 2018 several developed and developing countries will be able to show how their capacity and capability to undertake plant health surveillance activities has been enhanced as a result of participating in the implementation programme, using the tools developed, etc. The IPPC will be able to demonstrate how integrated approaches can help developing countries to implement standards more easily. A number of materials (e.g. manuals, databases) developed or distributed through the implementation programme will be profiled and the impact the programme has had. Case studies will be developed and profiled in publications and via other channels to target audiences. Through this IPPC's professionalism in capacity building will be demonstrated.
<i>Costs:</i>	The costs of this year and the materials produced will be part of the surveillance programme. No other specific costs can be specified other than some communications resource.

[33] **Topic for 2019: *Improving Plant Health Contributes to Environmental Protection***

<i>Purpose:</i>	This year highlights the important role of the IPPC in environmental protection through managing the spread of damaging pests and diseases. There are many examples of the decline of natural ecosystems as a result of pest and disease invasions. The application of ISPMs assists countries to avoid these negative impacts and will deliver environmental and social benefits to communities and countries. This topic could be a major pillar in the IYPH 2020.
<i>Content:</i>	This would largely involve communications efforts to case study and profile negative impacts of pests on natural ecosystems and positive examples of where the application of ISPMs has helped to avoid or mitigate the negative impacts of pests.
<i>Costs:</i>	The efforts to do this will need to be relatively low cost. The approach of the year 2020 will put lots of strain on the IPPC Secretariat.

7. Strategic Topics

[34] The IPPC Secretariat gave presentations on the various core topics of the Secretariat (summarized in the following subsections). All presentations were divided into four sections: history and milestones, main achievements, the way forward towards 2020 and questions for SPG consideration.

[35] After the presentations, the SPG was divided into three groups (1. Standard setting, 2. Implementation facilitation, 3. Communication) to discuss the various topics presented, keeping in mind previous SPG strategic discussions of relevance. The different groups reconvened and the SPG discussed the analyses in plenary.

7.1 Standard setting toward 2020

[36] The Standard Setting Officer gave the presentation².

[37] The SPG considered which would be the standard setting needs of CPs in five years noting that the work programme for standard setting for the next five years is already agreed to by the CPM. The SPG felt, however, that trends and new needs for the longer-term future would include commodity, commodity class or pathway standards as well as standards addressing third party involvement, such as audit. The SPG also felt that it would be essential to use the Framework for Standards and Implementation and continuously ensure that gaps be considered as indication of possible priorities. The SPG found that the adoption of further phytosanitary treatments would be essential to complement the commodity standards.

[38] Regarding which should be the priorities for CPs for standard setting, CPM's role in deciding the standard setting work programme was reiterated. However, some SPG participants voiced the need for CPs to be able to formulate their priorities to the Secretariat and the CPM. There may be developing countries that have priorities which are not felt as such in the developed countries, and hence are somehow disregarded. The SPG agreed that the regional workshops could serve as a forum for discussing regional issues and priorities for standard setting that could then be directed, by the individual countries, to the CPM.

[39] The SPG suggested that the IPPC community should look into supporting standard setting through sponsorships of technical panels, meetings, translations and similar to ensure that the IPPC Secretariat would be able to meet CPs' expectations.

[40] The SPG also considered how to better engage CPs and felt that this was dependent on CPs' awareness of the IPPC and of the importance of implementing the IPPC standards. Capacity building activities to help ensure CPs can fully and confidently engage with the standard setting process will be essential to achieve this.

[41] The SPG were asked whether they felt that an independent body to provide scientific advice should be established. Ad hoc bodies have been used in the past to provide advice, for example on both probit 9

² The Standard setting in 2020 presentation is available here: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81609/>

and debarking. The SPG agreed that such bodies were useful but that consideration should also be given to setting up a single advisory body rather than relying on establishing individual ones for specific topics.

7.2 Implementation facilitation towards 2020

- [42] The Capacity Development Officer gave the presentation³.
- [43] In response to CPs' implementation facilitation needs in five years, the SPG agreed that the common purpose was implementation of the Convention and its obligations as well as ISPMs. The future needs were confirmed as a number of tools including manuals, IRSS studies, support for dispute avoidance, assistance for project application and ePhyto.
- [44] The SPG agreed that by establishing the Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU) and having a comprehensive and detailed work plan and sufficient funding, the IPPC Secretariat would be expected to meet the priorities set by the CPM. The SPG suggested that implementation plans should be developed for newly adopted ISPMs and that this development should happen at the same time the ISPMs are being drafted.
- [45] As to the question "in which way do you foresee CPs demonstrating their commitment in implementing the priorities", the SPG felt that CPM already showcases implementation challenges and successes and that this is a good way for CPs to demonstrate their commitment. Also the many resources provided to the phytosanitary resources page demonstrate CPs' commitment. The SPG also suggested that the Secretariat undertakes an annual analysis of which of the obligations in the convention have or have not been met, and report this to the CPM. Highlighting during CPM which countries are successfully meeting their obligations might encourage others to improve their own implementation.

7.3 Communication and Partnerships towards 2020

- [46] The NRO Officer gave the presentation⁴ explaining what had been done on communication and partnerships over the years, what were the major challenges and future activities.
- [47] Some SPG participants expressed concern with the lack of reference to previous SPG discussions on communication, especially the 2014 discussions which lead to the elaboration of a theme on communication and advocacy. They felt that the SPG had provided ample guidance on communication and advocacy which should be taken into consideration.
- [48] Additionally, the SPG agreed that the communication and partnership needs of CPs over the next five years could be used both to improve communication amongst the IPPC community and to enhance the visibility of the IPPC. CPs should be encouraged to recognize that meeting national reporting obligations is beneficial to all CPs and to understand the added value that comes from sharing information. In this context, the SPG suggested that IPPC contact points could take on different and more important roles in the future to enhance communication efforts. As to priorities for communication, the SPG agreed that new communication technologies should continue to be explored. The SPG also recognized the importance of effective communication and advocacy activities to the success of the IYPH.
- [49] The SPG discussed the CPs' priorities for partnerships and agreed that a strategic approach to new partnerships should be developed by the Secretariat. The goal of the individual partnership should be clarified at the outset and partnerships should only be sought where there was a true recognizable need for them.

³ The Implementation Facilitation in 2020 presentation is available here:
<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81611/>

⁴ The Communication and Partnerships in 2020 presentation is available here:
<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81610/>

- [50] The SPG considered how CPs, RPPOs and Secretariat should work to achieve these goals and agreed that an important point was to be aware of conflicting roles or priorities with partners. Also a longer-term communication strategy should broaden its target audience to include both other international organizations and the “farmer in the field”, because the farmer is ultimately who is benefitting from the IPPC.

7.4 Resource mobilization towards 2020

- [51] The Finance and Planning Associate gave the presentation⁵ emphasizing the goal to obtain sustainable and sufficient funding in order to fulfill the IPPC strategic objectives. He highlighted the increased demand on the Secretariat to provide results in a number of areas, and the lack of a corresponding increase in funding to support these activities.
- [52] The SPG did not discuss the questions raised in the Resource Mobilization presentation further as they were considered enabling actions in support of core functions.

7.5 Advanced Technology in Plant Health towards 2020

- [53] The IPPC Coordinator had prepared the presentation, and the IPPC Consultant gave the presentation⁶ on the Coordinator’s behalf. The presentation highlighted the past achievements with advanced technology and on recent developments specifically within diagnostics.
- [54] He emphasized the tremendous potential of ePhyto to assist in plant health efforts by introducing technologies that will help facilitate safe trade in plants and plant products. Challenges include an increasing need for support strategies, resources, and capacity building programmes to ensure that these new technologies are accessible to all countries.
- [55] The SPG did not discuss the questions raised in the Resource Mobilization presentation further as they were considered enabling actions in support of core functions.

7.6 IPPC in 20 years

- [56] The IPPC Consultant introduced the paper⁷ explaining that the SPG 2014 had agreed on seven themes that would be important for the future of the IPPC. The CPM Bureau, in their June 2015 meeting, agreed that the SPG should focus its discussion on the Themes 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7 over the next four years, concentrating on one theme each year to allow for a thorough discussion on each theme. The CPM Bureau agreed that the SPG in their 2015 meeting should focus on “Theme 7: Simplify regulatory environment for the complexities of future global trade”. The Secretariat had adjusted the original narrative for the purpose of this discussion, drawing on information in the papers generated by SPG-2014.
- [57] Regarding recommendations on the proposed format for the narratives so that the Secretariat could make the necessary adjustments to the other narratives for future SPG discussion, the SPG agreed with the format presented.
- [58] The SPG decided that rather than discussing in detail Theme 7, focus of discussions should be on developing a solid basis for the next IPPC Strategic framework 2020-2030 (hereafter “IPPC Strategy”). The SPG felt that the activities or solutions proposed under this Theme were relevant and sufficiently enabling and broad to provide a good foundation for the development of the IPPC Strategy.
- [59] The SPG discussed how to approach the drafting of the new IPPC Strategy in terms of pragmatically and strategically setting up a plan, assigning responsibilities and deciding on the approval process. The

⁵ The Resource mobilization 2020 presentation is available here: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81608/>

⁶ The Advanced technology in plant health in 2020 presentation is available here: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81607/>

⁷ 08_SPG_2015_Oct

SPG agreed that it was essential that work be initiated soon, building on 2014 and 2015 SPG discussions and ensuring that all CPs have the opportunity to provide input. Developing countries in particular should be made to feel that they are involved in the process.

[60] The SPG discussed at length the intended purpose and goals of the IPPC Strategy. The SPG suggested the below strategic guidelines and desired outcomes for the IPPC Strategy, and invited the Bureau to consider and discuss the proposals.

[61] What should be the guiding principles of the IPPC Strategy?

- Goals should be easily identifiable on a national level (it needs to clear what the risks are by not investing in IPPC).
- It should link with the FAO strategic objectives.
- Priorities for 2020-2030 should be focused and achievable.
- Links to other plant protection areas should be investigated (Integrated Pest Management, safe use of pesticides to ensure safe trade, relationships with the Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, whether IPPC has a role in assistance to the control of migratory pests).
- Links to other organizations (and possibly these organizations' strategic frameworks) should be investigated.
- The capacity of the IPPC should be profiled underlining what has been achieved since the first strategic framework.

[62] What are the desired outcomes?

- Global ownership and common understanding of plant health has been encouraged.
- Plant health is recognized globally as essential to ensure food security and help eradicate poverty worldwide.
- Plant health initiatives, the IPPC and NPPOs receive the necessary financial support.
- IPPC is directed in its adaptation to future needs.
- The world recognizes the need for plant health research and development.
- International trade is further facilitated through ePhyto and capacity building on implementation of the IPPC.

[63] The SPG suggested that a preliminary drafting group be set up to draft the IPPC Strategy Outline and invited the Bureau to decide on the composition of this drafting group.

[64] The SPG suggested the following process for drafting the IPPC Strategy 2020-2030:

- (1) A preliminary drafting group would be established by the Bureau in October 2015.
- (2) A rough outline of the IPPC Strategy should be drafted by early 2016. The SPG agreed that the elements that would need to be considered when drafting the outline would include the Secretariat's five-year plan, the previously agreed themes, evaluation and validation of the current IPPC Strategic Framework and the UN post-2015 development goals.
- (3) The draft outline should be shared with CPs at CPM-11 (2016). CPs should provide their ideas of strategically important themes (as CPM discussion papers).
- (4) The Bureau would confirm the formal drafting group in their April 2016 (post CPM-11) meeting.
- (5) The drafting group should expand the rough outline following input from CPM-11 and liaise with RPPOs and CPs during regional workshops to get the broadest possible input. The outline should be discussed and revised in the SPG 2016 meeting.
- (6) The outline should then be revised by the drafting group for presentation to the CPM in 2017 for agreement. This agreement would ensure that the draft IPPC Strategy correctly reflected CPs' priorities. Possibly a full session (side or plenary) could be held on the IPPC Strategy and the way forward during CPM in 2017.
- (7) The drafting group should then further elaborate on the outline and produce a draft IPPC Strategy.

- (8) The draft IPPC Strategy would be submitted for discussion at the SPG in 2017.
- (9) The draft IPPC Strategy would be presented for preliminary endorsement by CPM in 2018. Leading up to and during CPM in 2018, comments from CPs would be solicited and the IPPC Strategy adjusted accordingly by the drafting group.
- (10) The final draft IPPC Strategy would be discussed at the SPG in 2018.
- (11) The IPPC Strategy would be presented back to CPM in 2019 for agreement.
- (12) The official adoption by CPM would take place during the IYPH in conjunction with the Ministerial conference.

[65] The SPG asked the Secretariat to prepare a paper for CPM-11 informing of the process and action plan, soliciting for input and comments by a specific date, and attaching the rough outline for the drafting of the 2020-2030 IPPC Strategy. In this context, the SPG invited the Bureau to add an item to the CPM-11 (2016) agenda on the “IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030”.

8. International Year of Plant Health 2020

[66] Mr Ralph LOPIAN (Finland) introduced the papers⁸ on the planning of the International Year of Plant Health proposed by and under the leadership of Finland and which had been strongly supported by CPM-10 2015. He highlighted the need to come to a common perception of plant health and set objectives that the CPM would agree to.

[67] The SPG discussed the definition of “plant health” to be proposed for decision firstly by the Bureau and secondly for agreement by CPM. The main concerns expressed by the SPG were how to define “plant health” because depending on the narrowness or broadness of the definition, there could be difficulties in scoping the IYPH, explaining the purpose at a national level and deciding on the objectives. Some SPG participants felt that leaving it undefined could leverage support from other communities and organizations (dealing with pesticides, integrated pest management (IPM), farmer field schools and similar), but the majority of the SPG felt that it was important to retain the scope to the definition of plant health as understood in the IPPC context. The SPG agreed on a mixture of the narrow and broad definitions: Keeping the objectives of the IYPH clear but building a matrix to obtain the necessary support.

[68] The SPG discussed the proposed outcomes and objectives for the IYPH. Proposals included targeting children to raise awareness for the future populations; creating awareness about plant health as a safeguard for food security; identification of new relationships and partnerships that may be useful in the future because they would generate common interests; enhancing international cooperation between NPPOs to increase compliance; and emphasizing development and research.

[69] The SPG agreed that a specific goal for 2020 could be the “Review of the global situation of plant health” and suggested that this be discussed at the SPG 2016.

[70] Mr LOPIAN also informed the SPG of the work programme for the IYPH including the proposed structure of the Steering Committee and asked that the SPG provide guidance to the Bureau on the composition of the Steering Committee and the desired outcomes for the IYPH. Regarding the size and composition of the proposed Steering Committee, the SPG felt that it was too large, and suggested that it contain seven CP members and seven CP alternates. Three committees with specific expertise on communications, resource mobilization and partnerships/liaison would support the Steering Committee. It was also suggested that a professional communications expert should be consulted. The SPG suggested the Secretariat should lead the process, although the SPG agreed that there should only be one Secretariat member (the Secretary who could, when needed, delegate to other Secretariat staff). The SPG suggested that an FAO member outside of the Secretariat should be included to harness cooperation with other FAO divisions. The SPG suggested that qualification requirements be set for the Steering Committee members to ensure that the right people be chosen.

⁸ 09_SPG_2015_Oct; 13_SPG_2015_Oct

9. Strategic Topics Proposed by Contracting Parties

[71] See discussions under 10.5.

10. Other Business

[72] The SPG reviewed actions deriving from the SPG 2014 meeting.

[73] Framework for Standards and Implementation. The SPG discussed the progress on the Framework in terms of including further details for implementation, as requested by the SPG in their last meeting.

[74] The Secretariat explained that the CDC had reviewed the Framework deeming that it was a reduced way of addressing the needs for implementation. Indeed, the CDC felt that several other tools would be needed to address the gaps for implementation – too many to be included in a Framework format. For instance, implementation of the Convention was a key activity that was not easy to include in the framework. The CDC had also suggested that different types of standards (other than ISPMs) could be developed alongside manuals etc. The CDC also felt that an implementation plan for each ISPM should be developed, and for those in production these should be developed before the standard is adopted.

[75] Several SPG participants acknowledged that it may be true that it would be challenging to include all details to ensure the fullest picture possible. However, they felt that there was still great value in including some and starting to use the integrated Framework to get a better understanding (if not complete) of the work done, the tools available and the gaps that needed to be addressed. They stressed that the Framework was a living document which currently provided a good picture of the standards and gaps across the areas of the Convention and that a step-by-step approach would be appropriate to collect and add all the details. In the future, the Framework could be expanded to address the concerns from the CDC, although some participants felt that it might be necessary to recognize that the Framework would never be able to address all gaps fully. Furthermore, having one Framework would help clarify whether a topic that was proposed as a standard should rather be developed as a different type of document, it would help understand 2020 priorities, would be a resource mobilization tool and would help with interaction and communication between the two new pillars of the secretariat.

[76] The SPG agreed that there is a clear direction from CPM that implementation and standard setting need to be more closely integrated, and the adoption of the Framework would be a step in this direction. The SPG agreed that there was full support to use the existing Framework for Standards and Implementation to assist in understanding gaps and prioritizing the work. The SPG supported that the CDC would continue to develop ideas on implementation and that these would be integrated into the Framework at a later stage.

[77] The Secretariat suggested that a separate dedicated expert working group should meet to develop the implementation part of the Framework, or that a pilot be developed to “test” the Framework. However, the SPG felt that these proposals were not needed at this point, and that the Pilot implementation project on surveillance could be used for this purpose.

[78] As to the body responsible for modifying and updating the Framework (currently mandate of the SPG), the SPG suggested that the SC and the CDC should both be responsible for proposing topics to be developed as implementation tools, ISPMs or other. This would involve a fluent and constant communication between the units and bodies, and help enhance cooperation. The SPG also concurred that due to this and the integrated format of the Framework it would be a tool for the Secretariat to cooperate and collaborate more closely. The SPG did not feel that it should be responsible for updating the Framework due to fact that the group should focus on strategic direction and it does not have a fixed membership.

[79] The SPG agreed that the Framework for Standards and Implementation should be forwarded to CPM-11 (2016), and that time be dedicated during the CPM to discuss the Framework with an intention of securing agreement for the Framework to be used to assist the identification of gaps and allocation of

priorities for standard setting. CPM would also be invited to discuss the CDC proposal to use “other standards” to aid implementation of the Convention. SPG invited the Bureau to add these items to the CPM-11 agenda. The SPG agreed that at this moment in time the Framework would be presented with the notion that the CDC is reviewing implementation input and that it will be clearer in the future, following Secretariat integration, how to address the concerns raised by the CDC. The SPG invited the Secretariat to prepare a CPM paper coordinating the input from the concerned parties.

[80] Communications. Referring to Section 5.2 paragraph 17 of the SPG 2014 report, an SPG participant queried the outcome of the suggestion to develop communication material on the economic benefits from implementing the Convention and its standards. The Secretariat informed the SPG that no action had been taken on this. The SPG reiterated the importance of this subject, particularly in relation to communication purposes.

[81] Other participants queried updates on the various communication actions stemming from Section 7.3 of the SPG 2014 report. The Secretariat explained that little work had been done as the experts recruited had not been able to deliver to the extent desired. An SPG participant expressed deep concern about the lack of actions on this, reflecting on the past many years of discussions and ideas which have not had any results. The Coordinator highlighted that there is no one on the staff of the Secretariat who is a communication specialist, and that the Office of Corporate Communication of FAO requires all communication products to be approved through a lengthy process (even recruitment of communication consultants must now be centrally approved), but that little guidance or help is provided from this office.

[82] The SPG felt that it would be appropriate at this point in time that the Secretariat invest more in communications and encouraged the Secretariat to recruit a communication specialist. In this context the Secretary recalled the critical budget situation of the Secretariat but also reiterated his priority to invest in communication, partnerships and advocacy. For this reason, he had assigned one team leader and a task force to work exclusively on these subjects.

[83] The SPG acknowledged the resource constraints and encouraged CPs to provide funding for communications. One SPG participant also suggested that the communication networks available in NPPOs can be exploited, as suggested on earlier occasions. He also proposed to solicit support from the Office of the Assistant Director-General, Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department, as there may be human resources on a departmental level that the Secretariat could get assistance from. Concrete proposals that would seem quite easy to implement included optimizing IPPC presence online, for instance by making sure that Internet search engines include the IPPC as one of the first hits returned when searching for key words related to the IPPC’s mandate.

[84] The SPG encouraged the Secretariat to take all the proposals made during this meeting and previous meetings and incorporate them into the Secretariat’s work programme.

The SPG discussed the priorities of the communication activities and agreed that having a functional and user-friendly International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP – www.IPPC.int) was the first priority. The SPG noted that the IYPH communication plan would cover approximately 80 percent of the communication needs of the IPPC as a whole because most of the activities would have dual purpose and therefore referred to this communication work plan for further prioritization.

[85] CDC review. The Secretariat explained that the processes for implementing the CDC review recommendations will depend on the structure of the Secretariat. The currently proposed structure of two units (Standard Setting Unit, SSU, and Implementation Facilitation Unit, IFU) will allow for the CDC to expand its role, as suggested by the review, to also include other implementation areas such as national reporting obligations. The SPG encouraged the Secretariat to have a step-wise approach to inform the SPG of developments so that the group can provide input and advice as per its mandate. The Secretariat explained that the CDC will discuss the review and its recommendations in December and their conclusions will be presented to CPM-11. The SPG noted this and asked the Secretariat to post the CDC review publicly on the IPP as soon as possible.

10.1 Concept of commodity standard

- [86] The Secretariat introduced the report from the meeting of the Working Group on the Concept of a Commodity Standard held in Edinburgh, Scotland, 20-24 July 2015⁹, and presented the recommendations for SPG consideration.
- [87] The SPG considered the conclusions of the report and the recommendations.
- [88] Regarding details such as how to proceed with the development of commodity standards, how to prioritize them, and whether to change the standard setting process to tackle these standards more effectively, the SPG felt that the current standard setting procedure should be followed but they were not the right forum to answer these queries and highlighted the need to further work to be done on commodity standards before these aspects should be considered. However, in the future, the SPG suggested that it should be considered whether the call for topics process should be changed to be a call for “needs”, a process for determining what would be the best tool to address the need (concept or commodity standard, CPM recommendation, manual, or other).
- [89] In this context, the CPM Chairperson briefed the SPG on an informal meeting that took place during the SPG between the SC Chairperson and a representative of the CDC (Mr Sam BISHOP) to explore the possibility of having one call for topics. She suggested having a standing SPG agenda item for the parties to meet and decide in cooperation on the allocation of the work on the topics. The SC Chair and CDC representative will present the outcomes of this meeting to their respective Committees for discussion, and the outcomes of these discussions will be presented to CPM-11 (2016).
- [90] The SPG discussed strategic issues in relation to commodity standards, the following points were raised:
- [91] Criteria for selection of topics for IPPC standards. Some SPG participants felt that the current standard setting selection criteria may not be adequate and may need to be changed in the future. For this reason, the SPG encouraged the SC to test whether the current criteria for inclusion of new topics are relevant to determine on the development of the commodity standard topics (current and new ones) and provide advice to the CPM or the SPG as appropriate. The SPG felt that the CPM should also consider whether the benefits of commodity standards outweigh the challenges and costs of developing them.
- [92] The SPG suggested that consideration be given to where commodity standards fit within the Framework for Standards and Implementation considering that no gaps had previously been identified for this category of standard.
- [93] The SPG concurred that commodity standards should be developed as ISPMs because only ISPMs carry the necessary weight for global implementation. However, in the future, as an alternative to commodity standards, topics for standards could focus on pests or pest groups.
- [94] Challenges or difficulties associated with the development of commodity standards. The SPG noted that commodity standards may often actually be standards for groups of commodities, which will have to encompass a variety of commodities within a commodity class. These standards would be very complex to develop because they would need to set requirements for hundreds of pests.
- [95] Recognizing the difficulties posed by these challenges, the SPG suggested that a global appropriate level of protection (similar to ISPM 15) should be strived for and the IPPC community should target a list of the most important pests or groups of pests for the individual commodity as the focus of the standard. The SPG suggested that the key principles guiding the specific commodity standards should be clarified (by the SC) to try and determine the global minimum requirements while also ensuring they match the risk (trade barriers vs safe trade).
- [96] The SPG supported that the standards already progressed on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, which are really standards for groups of commodities, should continue to be developed according to

⁹ 04_SPG_2015_Oct; The report is available here: [WG Commodity Standard Report 2015 July 2015.pdf](#)

the current standard setting procedure. The SPG fully agreed that standards for commodities or groups of commodities should contain requirements. Some SPG participants felt that, in addition to the standards for groups of commodities currently being worked on, the development of a standard on a specific commodity as a “pilot” could help understand feasibility challenges for the future work.

[97] Alongside the development of a commodity standard, the SPG agreed that relevant phytosanitary treatments should also be developed to ensure that the world has tools to implement the standard (there may be even a greater need for treatments or diagnostic tools rather than commodity standards), acknowledging that this would put a strain on Secretariat resources.

[98] Importance and benefits of commodity standards. The SPG agreed that these standards are important for a number of reasons. For staple crops such as grains a standard would be essential to help facilitate safe trade (especially in the developing world), and ultimately have a direct impact on food security. They may also help increase visibility of the IPPC and ensure that that IPPC is a front runner on developing commodity standards to keep its global relevance as an international standard setting organization. The SPG noted in this context that it will be essential to ensure that the IPPC retains its credibility, which may be undermined if the development of standards takes decades without countries being able to agree. The SPG felt that the IPPC needs to try to obtain global agreement on concrete topics (commodity or pathway related), not only on concepts. The SPG also suggested that commodity standards may be used as a pilot for “sponsorship of standards”.

10.2 NPPO and wood export in the Republic of Congo: Phytosanitary certification process

[99] Mr Lucien Kouame KONAN presented a paper on behalf of Ms Alphonsine LOHOUARY (Republic of Congo)¹⁰. He summarized the role of the Congolese NPPO in the process of wood export certification and highlighted the organizational and technical constraints they face. He emphasized in particular four challenges they face, namely the need to: (i) Strengthen the capacity of the NPPO staff to implement the IPPC and its standards; (ii) Disseminate ISPM 15 with logging companies, delivery companies phytosanitary and other exporters; (iii) Develop a single phytosanitary certificate for all plant quarantine stations following the model of the IPPC, and; (iv) Develop a guide for inspectors, building standards and the IPPC inspection manuals. Concluding the paper, the Rep. of Congo asked for guidance on obtaining appropriate assistance and capacity building to better implement ISPM 15.

[100] The Secretariat informed the SPG of various initiatives to address implementation challenges of wood relevant standards. These included the APPPC-NAPPO workshop on new approaches to ISPM 15 implementation (the report contains important recommendations for CPs¹¹), an initiative in development by the CDC on ISPM 15 implementation: a global workshop to address new challenges; and a proposal to organize ISPM 15 related workshops in other regions.

10.3 Report from the ePhyto Steering Committee

[101] The Secretariat briefed the SPG on the recent positive developments for the creation of the ePhyto hub, thanking in particular the Chairperson of the ePhyto Steering group (SG), Mr Nico HORN for his dedication and determined efforts facilitating the success of the project. He also thanked Mr Peter THOMSON (New Zealand), Diego QUIROGA and Walter Fabian ALESSANDRINI (Argentina), the NPPO of Australia and many other countries for providing assistance. He was immensely pleased to inform the SPG that the STDF had approved the pilot project on the ePhyto hub. This was the much needed encouragement to proceed with the pilot. He also explained that the STDF had been reluctant to fund the project as they felt that it should be part of the core mandate of the IPPC (hence funding should come from FAO) and because the beneficial impact on developing countries were not clear to the STDF. However, after lengthy negotiations, the STDF understood the benefits for developing countries in particular and the overall value to trade facilitation. He stressed the importance of this

¹⁰ 05_SPG_2015_Oct

¹¹ The report from this joint workshop is available here: http://www.nappo.org/files/2614/3741/9391/Report_APPPC_-_NAPPO_ISPM15_workshopJune2014.pdf

achievement because it is a remarkable step within implementation, taking the IPPC from being a standard setting organization to being something more. He suggested that perhaps it was time to revise the Convention to include this and the possibility of other types of sustained funding, reiterating that it has been a major challenge to obtain approval for the STDF – ePhyto project.

[102] Mr Nico HORN for his part thanked the steering group, the full support from CPM and the contributions from individual countries. He echoed the historical achievement noting that during the STDF meeting, OIE and CODEX had been invited to join the work but had declined as they were not ready to take this step; a testimony to IPPC's leadership.

[103] He presented the ePhyto developments from CPM-10, which supported the development of a hub and generic system, to the STDF proposal which was first submitted in December 2014 and provisionally approved in April 2015. The provisional approval meant that members could object, which some did - arguing that the ePhyto hub should be part of the core activities of the IPPC and not be funded externally, that the IPPC should work with the OIE and CODEX and that it should be clear that developing countries should benefit first of all. A second discussion of the proposal was held on 12 October 2015 and on this occasion the STDF approved the project with funding of USD 1 million on the conditions that IPPC would provide evidence of how the rest of the costs (approximately USD 250 000) would be funded, of the fact that developing countries would benefit and of the sustainability of the project. Additional funding needs to be identified and the project proposal revised.

[104] An SPG participant queried if in-kind staff contribution would be counted towards the additional funding needed. It was explained that this should be possible, but would be confirmed.. The SG Chairperson asked that all proposals for funding be forwarded to the SG before the end of December, as that is when the SG will meet to rewrite the proposal.

[105] With regards to the SG, the Chairperson noted that they had met face-to-face twice in 2015 and also met virtually on several occasions. Additionally, a separate working group had been set up for work on specifications. He reiterated his appreciation of the full SG who had worked hard on the project, in addition to their normal work. He noted that a project manager will be needed to set up and run the pilot, because this will be a full time job in the start-up phase (and then part time).

[106] Regarding the pilot hub, Mr HORN explained that it will involve eight to ten countries and will be a basic hub focusing on exchange with a single mechanism authenticated by X509 (private key). The pilot period will last three-six months. He noted some countries that already use national systems will have to adapt their systems and that the harmonization of contents of the electronic phytosanitary certificates (PCs) would need separate work. The generic system will have the basic functionalities to produce, send out, store, receive and read electronic PCs. It will also be open to countries that do not have a national system in place.

[107] The countries for the pilot will be selected based on a number of criteria, among which will be their readiness, ability and willingness to continue after the pilot and that they have the resources to make the link between their national systems and the generic hub. A country's trade volume will also be taken into consideration as it needs to be of a certain level to ensure effective testing of the system but different volumes need to be included in the pilot. The country's infrastructure (access to Internet) and suitable legislation being in place will also be considered. The readiness of countries to participate will be analyzed based on a survey that will be sent out soon, hopefully in the week following the SPG meeting. The SPG suggested that both the TC-RPPO meeting and the Global ePhyto Symposium in Korea would be opportunities where responses to the survey could be encouraged. The first selection will be done by December 2015 and the final selection before CPM 2016, during which period the countries will be contacted and their suitability attested to. He explained that the Bureau will take the final decision on which countries will participate in the pilot.

[108] He further explained that the UN International Computing Services (UNICC) will host the pilot hub, as well as the final hub and generic system. Mr Horn highlighted that the UNICC is a professional and experienced organization and it had been deemed the best and most secure place for storing of the

phytosanitary certificates. UNICC does not have a similar system, but they are focal point for exchange of information between organizations.

[109] He noted that the Global ePhyto symposium will focus on how to start implementing ePhyto. A number of organizations (WCO, CODEX, CITES, and others) will participate and it will be an opportunity to liaise with them on issues of common interest.

[110] He highlighted that involvement of industry would be important too, both in terms of creating awareness and to understanding their perspectives. He explained that some industry sectors, such as cut flowers, already have a very clear idea on what the hub would mean to the sector, whereas others do not.

[111] For future work, he mentioned that further harmonization on the ePhyto format is needed before the generic system can be developed. He also noted that CITES was interested in joining the hub but with their own specific needs being addressed. During the Symposium discussions will be initiated on this, for potential implementation only after the pilot phase. Lastly, he showed the tentative time lines for the next year.

[112] The CPM Chairperson updated the SPG on the arrangements for the Global ePhyto symposium highlighting that many participants from Industry will attend and that developing country participants will be funded also directly by the Rep. of Korea to underscore the importance of their attendance.

[113] The SPG thanked the SG for their extremely valuable work and discussed various details in regards to the further development. The SPG invited the Secretariat, Bureau and SG to consider that:

- The full ePhyto SG may be invited to CPM-11 where the ePhyto hub pilot will be demonstrated.
- The Bureau should take an active role to look at the pilot holistically, taking into consideration legislation issues and developing policies.
- An ePhyto SG member should be sought from the Near East (ensuring geographical representation).
- A monitoring and evaluation system of the pilot be set up.
- Observers (e.g. OIE, CODEX, UNCTAD, WCO) may be invited to attend the yearly face-to-face meeting of the ePhyto SG as this would help create synergies, and because they may in the future develop such a hub. Alternatively, the SPS meeting could be used for the purpose of informing these other interested parties.
- Information on the requirements for the national level implementation should be made available to be used to engage regional donors. Mr HORN explained that these requirements will depend on a number of things, such as whether the country joins the hub (in which case there must be a national system in place) or the generic system but agreed that it would be helpful and would ask the ePhyto SG to consider putting together these requirements.
- Most developing countries would need capacity building in order to implement the system or hub.

10.4 Reflection on the future of the SPG (submission by Canada)

[114] Mr Gregory WOLFF (Canada) presented a paper¹² supported by Australia, New Zealand and the United States, which reflected on the SPG.

[115] He highlighted the importance of the SPG as a vital forum for analysis and discussion on strategic priorities and approaches for the IPPC. He emphasized the negative impact of abolishing the SPG (as proposed in the Enhancement Evaluation) because no other forum would be in a position to provide the same strategic guidance.

¹² 06_SPG_2015_Oct

- [116] Before inviting the SPG to consider the questions posed in the paper, he expressed his disappointment in the Secretariat as the 20% in-kind contribution from Canada for work with the SPG had not been utilized and because this year's SPG agenda had been less strategically directed.
- [117] The SPG discussed the questions raised in the paper and agreed that it was important to improve the participation of developing countries, just as active participation by all participants in the meeting was essential.
- [118] Based on the discussions the SPG encouraged the Secretariat to call for strategic topics from CPs to be added to SPG agendas and to make SPG papers available to CPs publicly well in advance of the SPG meetings to allow for appropriate preparation which would help enhance discussions during the meeting.
- [119] The SPG considered that standing agenda items would help discussions, and invited the Bureau to consider if these should be IYPH, the IPPC Strategy, the five-year plan, status of global plant health, review of the previous SPG decisions and actions. They also felt that all participants should be asked to prepare a paper before each SPG meeting as had happened in 2014.
- [120] The SPG suggested that the concept and understanding of the "status of the global plant health" be added to the agenda of SPG 2016 encouraging all CPs and the Secretariat to submit papers on this.

10.5 Alternative Service delivery (submission by Canada)

- [121] Mr Gregory WOLFF (Canada) presented a paper¹³ on Alternative Service Delivery (ASD) in Canada, noting that this paper should have been discussed under Section 9 as it is a strategic topic.
- [122] He advocated for ASP or third party service deliver being an important issue that CPs should consider strategically. In Canada, he noted, there is a demonstrated increase in the use of ASD due to budget demands and cuts, and the trend seems to be increasing and likely to be similar in other countries.
- [123] If, as expected, the use of ASD does become more widespread, he suggested that the IPPC may have an important role in setting harmonized requirements for third party involvement to help ensure credible and robust systems that trading partners have confidence in.
- [124] He further noted that there are already some topics on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and Canada has submitted a new topic for audit this year. With this need, he stressed, Canada had no wish to invite the IPPC to support third party involvement but only to address the realities.
- [125] The SPG discussed whether and how the IPPC should consider third party involvement.
- [126] The Secretariat appreciated the initiative and confirmed that ASD is used frequently in developing countries but that the major challenge relates to audit. Efforts to address the gaps in this area had been made through the IPPC manual on "Establishment and Operation of NPPOs" which will soon be available on the Phytosanitary Resources page. She applauded the initiative because the evidence analyzed by the IFU demonstrated that hardly any countries would be left untouched by this. It would help set standards for staff requirements.
- [127] The SPG agreed that it was important to consider third party service delivery, especially for audit where it would be helpful if the IPPC would develop indicators for audit making auditing easier and more transparent. The SPG also felt this would provide opportunities for industry to understand implementation issues and might encourage them to look at ways of streamlining their operations.
- [128] The SPG agreed that the paper be considered when the IPPC Strategy be outlined.

¹³ 07_SPG_2015_Oct

10.6 IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation

- [129] Mr Yukio YOKOI (Japan) presented a paper to seek clarification on the follow up from the Enhancement Evaluation querying the linkages with the 2003 and 2007 evaluations. The CPM Chairperson advised the SPG that the Bureau had considered fully the Enhancement Evaluation recommendations in their June meeting, and discussed them with FAO Senior Management¹⁴. It was clarified that approximately 10 countries provide comments on the recommendations.
- [130] The Secretary updated the SPG on the implementation of the Enhancement Evaluation recommendations and his attempts to improve managerial operations, internal cohesion and external cooperation. He mentioned the frequent staff meetings as an example of this, and highlighted the fact that minutes from the meetings are prepared and shared among the Secretariat staff and chronicles of events are prepared monthly. He highlighted recent actions taken to mobilize resources and enhance visibility of the IPPC.
- [131] In thanking the Secretary for the verbal update, the SPG invited the Secretary to provide a written update on the progress of the implementation of the recommendations and present this to the CPM. The Secretary noted that he would address this request only when the actions proposed would have been approved by FAO Senior Management.

11. Next Meeting and Close

- [132] The next meeting of the SPG will be scheduled by the Bureau but is tentatively planned for 4-6 October 2016.
- [133] The SPG Chairperson thanked the participants and the Secretary for their contributions to discussions, the Secretariat for their support, and the Rapporteurs for their help in recording the discussions and decisions from the meeting. She closed the meeting.

¹⁴ See [Bureau June report](#) for details on the deliberations on the Enhancement Evaluation recommendations.

Appendix 01 - Agenda

Agenda item	Document No.	Presenter
1. Opening of the meeting		XIA/RANSOM
2. Adoption of the agenda	01_SPG_2015_Oct	RANSOM
3. Housekeeping		
3.1 Documents list	02_SPG_2015_Oct	FEDCHOCK
3.2 Participants list	03_SPG_2015_Oct	FEDCHOCK
3.3 Local information	Link to the local information	FEDCHOCK
4. Selection of a Rapporteur		RANSOM
5. CPM Chairperson Update		YIM
6. The IPPC towards 2020		XIA
7. Strategic Topics		
7.1 Standard setting towards 2020	PowerPoint Presentation	LARSON
7.2 Implementation facilitation towards 2020	PowerPoint Presentation	PERALTA
7.3 Communication and Partnerships towards 2020	PowerPoint Presentation	NOWELL
7.4 Resource Mobilization towards 2020	PowerPoint Presentation	FEDCHOCK
7.5 Advanced Technology in Plant Health towards 2020	PowerPoint Presentation	FEDCHOCK
7.6 IPPC in 20 years	08_SPG_2015_Oct	LOPIAN
8. International Year of Plant Health 2020	09_SPG_2015_Oct 13_SPG_2015_Oct	LOPIAN
9. Strategic topics proposed by Contracting Parties		
9.1 TBD		
10. Other business		
10.1 Concept of commodity standard	Link to the report 04_SPG_2015_Oct	LARSON / AUSTRALIA
10.2. NPPO and wood export in the Rep. of Congo	05_SPG_2015_Oct	REP. OF CONGO
10.3 Report from the e-Phyto Steering Committee		FEDCHOCK/HORN
10.4 Reflection on the future of the SPG (submission by Canada)	06_SPG_2015_Oct	CANADA
10.5 Alternative Service delivery (submission by Canada)	07_SPG_2015_Oct	CANADA
10.6 IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation	10_SPG_2015_Oct Link to the Bureau report of June	Japan
11. Next meeting		

LINKS

- SPG 2014 October meeting Report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/2649/>
- Bureau 2015 June meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81307/>
- CPM-10 report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81242/>

Appendix 02 - Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED
01_SPG_2015_Oct	2	Provisional agenda	2015-10-12
02_SPG_2015_Oct	3.1	Documents list	2015-10-29
03_SPG_2015_Oct	3.2	Participants list	2015-10-29
04_SPG_2015_Oct	10.1	Concept of a commodity standard	2015-10-06
05_SPG_2015_Oct	10.2	NPPO and wood export in the Rep. of Congo	2015-10-06
06_SPG_2015_Oct	10.4	Reflection on the future of the SPG (submission by Canada)	2015-10-06
07_SPG_2015_Oct	10.5	Alternative Service delivery (submission by Canada)	2015-10-06
08_SPG_2015_Oct	7.6	IPPC in 20 years	2015-10-08
09_SPG_2015_Oct	8	International Year of Plant Health	2015-10-09
10_SPG_2015_Oct	10.6	IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation (submission by Japan)	2015-10-12
13_SPG_2015_Oct	8	International Year of Plant Health – Communication	2015-10-08

LINKS	AGENDA ITEM
Bureau 2015 June meeting report: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81307/	5
CPM-10 report: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81242/	Various
IPPC Developments on ePhyto	10.3
Link to the local information: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81577/	3.3
Mid-year report of the IPPC Secretariat: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81591/	N/A
PPT presentation on Advanced Technology and Plant Health Towards 2020	7.5
PPT presentation on Communication and Partnerships Towards 2020	7.3
PPT presentation on IPPC Resource Mobilization Towards 2020	7.4
PPT presentation on Standard Setting Towards 2020	7.1
PPT presentation on the IPPC Implementation Facilitation Towards 2020	7.2
SPG 2014 October meeting Report: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/2649/	7

Appendix 03 – Participants list

	Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Bureau Member / CPM Chairperson	Ms Kyu-Ock YIM 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 REPUBLIC OF KOREA Phone: (+82) 31 4207665 Fax: (+82) 31 4207605	koyim@korea.kr
✓	Bureau Member / CPM Vice- chairperson	Ms Lois RANSOM Assistant Secretary, Plant Import Operations GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Phone: (+61) 262723241	lois.ransom@agriculture.gov.au
✓	Bureau	Mr Corné van ALPHEN Coordinating Policy Officer Phytosanitary Affairs Plant Supply Chain and Food Quality Department Ministry of Economic Affairs P.O. Box 20401 2500 EK – The Hague THE NETHERLANDS Phone: (+31) 618596867	c.a.m.vanalphen@min.ez.nl
✓	SPG	Mr Joselito L. ANTIOQUIA Supervising Agriculturist National Plant Quarantine Services Division (NPQSD) Central Office 692 San Andres Street, Malate Manila PHILIPPINES Fax: (+632) 4040409	banglen2001@yahoo.com pqsbpi@yahoo.com
✓	SPG	Mr Sam BISHOP Plant Health Specialist Office of the Chief Plant Health Officer Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Sand Hutton, York, YO41 1LZ UNITED KINGDOM Phone: (+44) 1 904462738 Fax: (+44) 1 904455198	sam.bishop@defra.gov.uk

	Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
	SPG	Mr Radjendre DEBIE Coordinator Plant Quarantine and Quality Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries Kankantriestraat no 9, Paramaribo, SURINAME Phone: (+597) 402965 Fax: (+597) 403912	radebie@hotmail.com
✓	SPG	Mr Sergejus FEDOTOVAS Director State Plant Service of Lithuania	Sergejus.fedotovas@vatum.lt
✓	SPG	Mr Weldehawariat Assefa FESSEHA Director G Plant Health Regulatory Directorate of the Ministry of Agriculture Ethiopia ETHIOPIA Phone: (+251) 116462417 Mobile; (+251) 914746348	hapruasseafa2@gmail.com
✓	SPG	Ms Mennie J. GERRITSEN-WIELARD Ministry of Economic Affairs DG Agriculture and Nature Bezuidenhoutseweg 73 2594 AC The Hague NETHERLANDS	m.j.gerritsen@minez.nl
✓	SPG	Mr Fitzroy A. GORDON Certification and Compliance Manager Plant Quarantine/ Produce Inspection Branch Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries 193 Old Hope Road, Kingston 6, JAMAICA Phone: (+1 876) 924 8906 or (+1 876) 924 8754 Fax: (+1 876) 924 8907	gordon_fitzroy@yahoo.com
✓	Bureau	Mr John GREIFER Assistant Deputy Administrator Plant Protection and Quarantine Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Department of Agriculture 1400 Independence Ave., South Building Washington DC 20250 USA	john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov

	Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	SPG	<p>Mr Nico M. HORN Senior Officer Plant Health Affairs Plant Protection Service Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority Ministry of Economic Affairs NETHERLANDS Phone: (+31) 65 1998151</p>	n.m.horn@nvwa.nl
✓	SPG	<p>Mr Muhammad Tariq KHAN Deputy Director (Quarantine) Department of Plant Protection, Government of Pakistan, Jinnah Avenue, Malir Halt, Karachi PAKISTAN Phone: (+92) 21 99248119, (+92) 21 99248607 Fax: (+92) 21 99248673</p>	quarantine@plantprotection.gov.pk
✓	SPG	<p>Mr Aung KYAN OO Director (Head of PPD) Plant Protection Division, Yangon Department of Agriculture Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation MYANMAR Office Phone : (+95) 1 644214 Fax: (+95) 1 644019</p>	ppmas.moai@mptmail.net.mm directorppddoa@gmail.com
✓	Bureau	<p>M Lucien KOUAME KONAN Inspecteur Direction de la Protection des Végétaux, du Contrôle et de la Qualité Ministère de l'Agriculture B.P. V7 Abidjan, COTE D'IVOIRE Phone : (+225) 07903754` Fax : (+225) 20212032</p>	l_kouame@yahoo.fr
✓	SPG	<p>Mr Damas MAMBA MAMBA Point de contact CIPV Chef de Division chargé de la Protection des Végétaux à la DPPV Ministère de l'agriculture et développement rural Croisement Blvd du 30 Juin et Batetela B.P. 8722 Kinshasa-Gombe CONGO DEM. REP Phone: (+243) 812959330</p>	damasmamba@yahoo.fr

	Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Bureau	<p>Mr Khidir Gibril MUSA ENDRES Director General Plant Protection Directorate and Registrar for National Pesticide Council Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry P.O. Box 14 Khartoum North SUDAN Phone: (+249)912138939</p>	<p>khidirgme@outlook.com; khidirgme@gmail.com</p>
✓		<p>Mr Ichiro NAKAGAWA Director, Plant Quarantine Office, Plant Protection Division, Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) Address: 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, JAPAN Phone: (+81)-3-6738-7359</p>	<p>ichirou_nakagawa2@nm.maff.go.jp</p>
✓	SPG	<p>Mr Pich OP Deputy Director of Department of Plant Protection Sanitary and Phytosanitary of GDA PPSPSD, GDA #54B, St. 271 Sangkat Tuek Laak3, KhanTouk, Phnom Penh, Kingdom of CAMBODIA Phone: (+855) 12817152</p>	<p>oppich1970@gmail.com</p>
	SPG	<p>Mr Luis Eduardo PACIFICI RANGEL Director of Plant Health Department IPPC Official Contact Point Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D Anexo B, Sala 310 Brasilia DF 70043900 BRAZIL /COSAVE Phone: (+55) 61 32182675 Fax: (+55) 61 3224 3874</p>	<p>luis.rangel@agricultura.gov.br</p>
		<p>Mr Leanid PLIASHKO Director of Main State Inspectorate for Seed Production, Quarantine and Plant Protection Quarantine and Plant Protection 8 Krasnozvezdnaya st.220034 Minsk, BELARUS Phone: (+375) 17 2844061 Fax: (+375) 17 2845357</p>	<p>labqbel@tut.by</p>

	Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Bureau	<p>Mr Diego QUIROGA Director Nacional de Protección Vegetal Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria (SENASA) Av Paseo Colón, 315 – 4 Piso Buenos Aires, ARGENTINA Phone: (+54) 1141215176 Fax: (+54)1141215179</p>	dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar
✓	SPG	<p>Mr Amal Mohamed RAHEL Chef de la Division de la Protection des Végétaux Office National de Sécurité Sanitaire des Produits Alimentaires (ONSSA) Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Pêche Maritime Point focal CIPV Avenue Hadj Ahmed Charkaoui Agdal, Rabat MAROC Phone: (+212) 537 676538 Fax: (+212) 537 682049</p>	mohammedamal.rahel@onssa.gov.ma
✓	SPG	<p>Mr Kim RITMAN Chief Plant Protection Officer Department of Agriculture and Water Resources 18 Marcus Clarke Street Canberra ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Phone: (+61) 2 62724671</p>	kim.ritman@agriculture.gov.au
✓	SPG / SC Chairperson	<p>Mr Jan Bart ROSSEL Director International Plant Health Department of Agriculture, and Water Resources GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Phone: (+61) 2 62725056 Fax: (+61) 2 62725835</p>	bart.rossel@daff.gov.au bart.rossel@agriculture.gov.au
✓	SPG	<p>Mr Peter THOMSON Director Ministry for Primary Industries NEW ZEALAND</p>	peter.thomson@mpi.govt.nz

	Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	SPG	Mr Roman VAGNER Policy Officer Plant Health Directorate-General Health and Food Safety (SANTE) European Commission in Brussels Rue de la Loi, 149 Brussels BELGIUM – EUROPEAN UNION Phone: (+32) 02 2959664 Fax: (+32) 02 2969399	roman.vagner@ec.europa.eu
✓	SPG	Mr Gregory WOLFF Chief Plant Health Officer Director Plant Protection Division Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa Ontario, K1A 0Y9 CANADA Phone: (+1) 613 773 7727	greg.wolff@inspection.gc.ca
✓	SPG	Mr Yukio YOKOI Director Research Division Yokohama Plant Protection Station Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 1-16-10 Shin-yamashita, Naka-ku, Yokohama, Kanagawa, 282-0004 JAPAN Phone: (+81) 456228692 Fax: (+81) 456217560	yukio_yokoi@nm.maff.go.jp
✓	SPG	Sun Hyoeg YOON Export management division Dept. of Plant Quarantine Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency/MAFRA REP KOREA Tel: (+82) 31 420 7668	e.shyoon99@korea.kr

IPPC Secretariat

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Jingyuan XIA Secretary	jingyuan.xia@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Craig FEDCHOCK Coordinator	craig.fedchock@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Ralf LOPIAN Consultant	ralf.lopian@fao.org

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Ana PERALTA Capacity Development Officer	ana.peralta@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr David NOWELL National Reporting Obligations Officer	dave.nowell@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Brent LARSON Standards Officer	brent.larson@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Orlando SOSA IRSS Officer	orlando.sosa@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Marko BENOVIC Finance and Planning Associate	marko.benovic@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Eva MOLLER Report Writer	eva.moller@fao.org