



REPORT

**Rome, Italy
29-31 March & 8 April 2016**

**CPM Bureau
March-April, 2016**

Contents

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 1. | Opening of the Meeting | 4 |
| 2. | Adoption of the Agenda | 4 |
| 3. | Housekeeping | 4 |
| 4. | Progress Report of the IPPC Secretariat | 4 |
| 5. | Review: October 2015 Bureau and December 2015 Bureau Reports..... | 5 |
| 6. | Discussion on New Bureau Membership | 5 |
| 7. | Organizational Arrangements for CPM-11 (2016)..... | 5 |
| 8. | Discussion of the CPM-11 (2016) Agenda and Papers | 5 |
| 8.1 | Opening of the Session (Ag. 1) | 5 |
| 8.2 | Keynote Address on Plant Health and Food Security (Ag. 2)..... | 5 |
| 8.3 | Election of the Rapporteur (Ag. 4)..... | 5 |
| 8.4 | Governance (Ag. 8)..... | 5 |
| 8.5 | Review of the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) (Ag. 8.4.1)..... | 6 |
| 8.6 | Proposal for a new implementation oversight body (Ag. 8.4.2) | 6 |
| 8.7 | Standard Setting (Ag. 9)..... | 7 |
| 8.8 | Implementation and Facilitation (Ag. 10) | 8 |
| 8.9 | Report on ePhyto (Ag. 10.6) | 9 |
| 8.10 | Communication and Advocacy (Ag. 11.1)..... | 9 |
| 8.11 | Partnerships and Liaison (Ag. 11.2)..... | 11 |
| 8.12 | Report on the Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (Ag. 11.2.2)..... | 12 |
| 8.13 | Oral reports from selected international organizations (Ag. 11.2.3)..... | 12 |
| 8.14 | Written reports from international organizations (Ag. 11.2.4)..... | 12 |
| 8.15 | Financial Report and Budget (Ag. 11.3) | 13 |
| 8.16 | Resource mobilization (Ag. 11.4) | 13 |
| 8.17 | Recognition of Important Contributions (Ag. 11.5)..... | 13 |
| 8.18 | CPM Recommendations (Ag. 12) | 13 |
| 8.19 | Contracting Parties Reports of Successes and Challenges of Implementation (Ag. 13)..... | 14 |
| 8.20 | Special Topics Session: Sea Containers (Ag. 14) | 14 |
| 8.21 | Confirmation of membership and potential replacements for CPM subsidiary bodies (Ag. 15) | 15 |
| 8.22 | Any other business (Ag. 16)..... | 15 |
| 8.23 | Date and venue of the next CPM Session (Ag. 17)..... | 15 |
| | POST CPM-11 (2016) SESSION..... | 17 |
| 9. | Issues Arising from CPM-11 Requiring Bureau Actions | 17 |
| 9.1 | Resource impact of CPM-11 (2016) decisions and prioritization | 17 |
| 9.1 | Calendar of upcoming meetings..... | 17 |
| 9.2 | Items to be added to the June 2016 Agenda..... | 18 |
| 9.3 | CPM-12 agenda items | 18 |
| 9.4 | SPG planning and agenda | 18 |

- 10. CPM-12 Planning19
- 11. Next Meeting (scheduling)19
- 12. Any Other Business19
 - 12.1 Briefing from ADG-AG19
 - 12.2 Demonstration of the revised IPP home page21
- 13. Close of Meeting21
- APPENDIX 1 - Agenda22
- APPENDIX 2 - Participants list23
- APPENDIX 3 - Action points27

Bureau members participating in the first part of the meeting: Mr John GREIFER, Ms Kyu-Ock YIM, Mr Lucien KOUAME KONAN, Mr Diego QUIROGA, Ms Lois RANSOM, Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN.

1. Opening of the Meeting

- [1] The IPPC Secretary opened the meeting and welcomed the CPM Bureau (hereafter “Bureau”) members to Rome. He introduced the IPPC Annual Report and highlighted the main IPPC Secretariat achievements since the last Bureau meeting (see also section 4 of this report).
- [2] He recalled that plant health and food security will be the theme for 2016, but the coming year will also be marked by the ePhyto pilot hub and the IPPC work on the sustainable development goals. Internally, in the Secretariat, the emphasis will be on the continued need to enhance cooperation and cohesion between standard setting and implementation facilitation, and to intensify resource mobilization activities.
- [3] The CPM Chairperson also welcomed the Bureau and noted that 2016 will be pivotal because activities leading up to the proclamation of the International Year of Plant Health 2020 will commence.
- [4] The Bureau complimented the IPPC Secretariat on the 2015 Annual Report, which they felt gave a good overview of the yearly work carried out by the Secretariat. The Secretary noted that the Report was only available in English, due to the high translation costs. Contracting parties (CPs) were encouraged to identify opportunities for translating the report externally or through IPPC trust fund donations.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

- [5] The Bureau adopted the agenda (Appendix 1).

3. Housekeeping

- [6] The Bureau noted the participants list (Appendix 2) and the local information document¹.
- [7] The Bureau selected Mr Lucien KOUAME KONAN (Côte d’Ivoire) as Rapporteur.
- [8] A list of action points is attached in Appendix 3.

4. Progress Report of the IPPC Secretariat

- [9] The Secretary gave a presentation on the 2015 IPPC Secretariat progress, summarizing IPPC Secretariat achievements. He was particularly enthusiastic about the activities carried out to support the proclamation for the International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) 2020, and the success in relation to ePhyto with the pilot hub being awarded substantial extra-budgetary funding. On a Governance level, he stressed the steps taken to implement the Enhancement evaluation by restructuring the IPPC Secretariat, and by adopting new approaches to enhance cohesion including regular staff meetings, and matrix management.
- [10] The Bureau welcomed the changes stressing the importance of Secretariat staff having clear areas of responsibilities and of appropriate organization of work. Some Bureau members invited the Secretary to ensure that staff are well supported and content in their roles, considering the high workload of the Secretariat.

¹ [Link to Local information](#)

5. Review: October 2015 Bureau and December 2015 Bureau Reports

- [11] The Bureau reviewed the reports from their October face-to-face meeting and the December teleconference.
- [12] The Coordinator informed the Bureau that Mr Hans Dreyer, Permanent Representative of Switzerland to FAO has been appointed new Director of the Plant Protection Division (AGP). He is currently the IPPC Official contact point and comes with a strong background in plant health. The Bureau was pleased with the potential closer cooperation that could be harnessed with AGP.
- [13] The Bureau reiterated their wish to invite the Chairpersons from the SC and the CDC to the Bureau October 2016 meeting as observers.

6. Discussion on New Bureau Membership

- [14] Bureau members from all regions but Near East and Africa confirmed that Bureau representatives had been nominated.

7. Organizational Arrangements for CPM-11 (2016)

- [15] The Coordinator introduced the CPM-11 schedule and discussion papers, and noted that Mr David MASSEY would write the CPM-11 report.
- [16] The Bureau discussed the organizational arrangements, and noted that there would not be a ministerial video presentation.

8. Discussion of the CPM-11 (2016) Agenda and Papers

8.1 Opening of the Session (Ag. 1)

- [17] The FAO Deputy Director-General Operations (DDO), Mr Dan Gustafson, would open the CPM-11 session; and the IPPC Secretary, Mr Jingyuan Xia would make a keynote speech on the IPPC towards 2020.

8.2 Keynote Address on Plant Health and Food Security (Ag. 2)

- [18] Mr Rudy Rabbinge, Professor Emeritus in Sustainable Development and Food Security at Wageningen University, The Netherlands, would deliver a keynote address on plant health and food security.

8.3 Election of the Rapporteur (Ag. 4)

- [19] Two potential Rapporteurs for the CPM report had been identified, potentially they would both be elected with one taking lead and the other providing support.

8.4 Governance (Ag. 8)

Summary of the Strategic Planning Group report (Ag. 8.1)

- [20] The Bureau noted that the rough outline of the 2020-2030 IPPC Strategy, which the SPG 2015 agreed should have been shared with contracting parties during CPM, would be prepared only for discussion in the Bureau June 2016 meeting.

Framework for standards and implementation (Ag. 8.2)

- [21] The Coordinator recalled that the CPM-10 (2015) had requested the Secretariat to continue developing the Framework for Standards and Implementation and to ensure that this has a broader application. CPM also agreed that once adopted, the Framework for Standards and Implementation should be used as basis for planning of the IPPC Secretariat's work program.

- [22] He noted that the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) felt that, as presently constructed, the Framework was a limited way of addressing the needs for implementation. However, the SPG discussed the Framework for Standards and Implementation and stressed that it should be a living document and that it provides a good picture of the standards and tools that are available or are in progress, for helping contracting parties implement the Convention and ISPMs. The SPG suggested that the Standards Committee (SC) and the CDC should work together when proposing new standards or tools. This would require a fluent and constant communication within the Secretariat and between the CDC and SC and should help enhance cooperation. Obviously, as the IPPC Secretariat infrastructure is reorganized, the new body replacing the CDC would assume a similar role for coordination. The SPG did not feel that it should be responsible for updating the Framework.
- [23] The Standards Officer suggested that the SPG should still have a role in reviewing and coordinating the addition of information to the Framework for standards and implementation. He felt that the CDC and SC would put forward recommendations but that a neutral coordinating body, with strategic oversight, should review them to decide if the allocation was correct. The Bureau agreed that this could be a viable approach, but also that a process should be set up to ensure that the CPM would adopt the additions or changes of items to the Framework for both standards and implementation. Currently, only topics for standards are adopted by CPM. The Bureau agreed to discuss this further in their June meeting.

Concept of a commodity standard (Ag. 8.3)

- [24] The Standards Officer introduced the agenda item noting that the concept of a “commodity standard” had been discussed by a CPM working group, the SPG, the SC, and the CDC. Based on the various discussions, the SC proposed a layered approach that would accommodate different types of standards with appropriate level of requirements depending on the type of standard.
- [25] The Bureau considered how to approach the proposal to include a topic for a commodity standard on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, as requested by some contracting parties. The Bureau agreed that the normal standard setting process should be followed. For this reason, contracting parties could disagree with the SC recommendations for the topics to be included from the 2015 call for topics, and request that one of the “commodity standard” topics, that were proposed but not accepted, be inserted. The Bureau, however, noted that the SC had agreed to not include the commodity standard topic because the submission had not met a number of the criteria for prioritization of topics (see also section 8.7 of this report).

8.5 Review of the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) (Ag. 8.4.1)

- [26] The Implementation Facilitation Officer recalled that the Bureau in June 2015 had discussed the conclusions and recommendations of the CDC Review. The CDC discussed the Review and its recommendations in its December 2015 meeting and had proposed terms of reference (TORs) for the new oversight body for implementation.

8.6 Proposal for a new implementation oversight body (Ag. 8.4.2)

- [27] The Bureau discussed the TORs for the new implementation facilitation oversight body, and the comments submitted by New Zealand as a CPM information paper. In their comments, New Zealand suggested that the TORs had not been fully considered by the Bureau and suggested that they be reviewed to more adequately reflect the new scope and goals.
- [28] The Bureau members expressed concerns that national reporting obligations (NROs) had been removed from the scope of the oversight body. They felt NROs should be included because there are implementation issues around countries’ capacities to meet them. The Bureau also supported that dispute settlement and avoidance should be included in the scope, and noted that ideally, the implementation oversight body should be so flexible as to set up ad hoc task groups to deal with specific issues, such as disputes. Also, it was felt more efficient to have one oversight body than

several. Lastly, the Bureau concurred that the Secretary may group the work of the Secretariat internally differently from the oversight bodies mandates.

[29] The Secretary explained that he had proposed to remove NROs from the scope because NROs related more closely to advocacy and communication than implementation, and therefore suggested that NROs would continue to be overseen by the NRO Advisory Group.

[30] The Bureau agreed that it would be appropriate for CPM-11 to discuss the TORs and the name of the new capacity development and implementation committee. If the CPM was not able to endorse the overall scope of the new committee, the establishment would be postponed till the next CPM.

8.7 Standard Setting (Ag. 9)

Adoption of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (Ag. 9.2)

[31] The Standards Officer noted that no formal objections had been received and therefore all standards, would be adopted, unless concerns were raised from the floor.

[32] He recalled that ink amendments to the currently adopted phytosanitary treatments were presented for noting and that they would be translated into other FAO languages and incorporated into the standards as resources would permit this. In this context, he informed the Bureau that the Secretariat had translated ink amendments previously noted in English into French and Spanish and incorporated them into the specific standards. The amendments had been reviewed by the Language review group for Spanish and the Technical Panel member for the Glossary respectively.

[33] In parallel, also ISPM 5 in Spanish and Chinese had been adjusted for translation issues. All the changes had been reviewed by the Language review groups for the specific languages and FAO translation. The adjusted versions of ISPM 5 would be finalized after CPM-11 and posted on the Adopted Standards page of the International Phytosanitary Portal.

[34] In regards to the Co-publishing process, the Bureau queried details on the change. The Secretariat explained that, after due consideration, it had been decided to invite co-publishers to contact the Secretariat should they wish to translate newly adopted standards instead of sending them MS Word files of the adopted standards after the CPM sessions. This is because there was often no response from the co-publishers and the Secretariat felt obliged to make numerous follow ups, which was time consuming. This decision was in line with the need to streamline, considering the high workload and few resources of the Secretariat.

Topics for IPPC standards - New topics and adjustments to the List of topics for IPPC standards (Ag. 9.4)

[35] The Standards Officer explained the major proposals for changes to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, specifically related to the inclusion of four new topics from the call for topics and one topic which had been added by the SC to enhance transparency on the work carried out by the TPF.

[36] He also noted that any new proposals for topics, or reconsideration of any topics that were not put forward by the Standards Committee could be discussed under this agenda item. The EU had proposed in a discussion paper that a commodity standard topic be added to the work programme so that it may provide for a pilot exercise for this type of standard. It was recalled that the CPM may add or delete topics. The Standards Officer stressed that since resources are limited, should an additional call for topics be requested in 2016, it would have an impact on other standard setting activities (see also section 8.4 of this report).

Adjustments to the IPPC standard setting procedure (Ag. 9.5)

[37] The Bureau discussed the proposed adjustment of the SSP in relation to “objections”, where the proposal emphasized that contracting parties should take an active role in providing solutions to the issues. The Bureau considered that some contracting parties may wish the Secretariat to have a stronger role in coordinating negotiations. The Bureau also discussed allowing non-CPs commenting

on draft ISPMs. The Secretariat explained the reasons for allowing non-CPs to comment was that in the IPPC they too were asked to implement them (explained in detail in the SC-7 report, May 2015), but some Bureau members believed that by not allowing non-CPs to comment they would have an additional incentive to become CPs. However, it also noted that only CPs could participate in decision-making.

[38] The Secretariat clarified that the adjustments to the SSP would be implemented immediately after adoption. The Bureau supported immediate implementation, acknowledging that some IPPC Regional workshops had already been planned for dates that would not allow sufficient time to coordinate comments on draft ISPMs before start of the consultation periods.

[39] The Bureau agreed that a Friends of the Chair meeting may be needed during CPM-11 to discuss the proposals for changes to the SSP, allowing for the adjusted procedure to be adopted at this CPM.

8.8 Implementation and Facilitation (Ag. 10)

Report on CDC activities (Ag. 10.1)

[40] The Bureau asked the Secretariat to arrange for the professional photos taken during the photographic missions be shared with the CPM, for instance on the Plenary screens during the breaks.

Implementation pilot on surveillance (Ag. 10.2)

[41] The Bureau noted the progress on the Pilot implementation programme on surveillance, but queried the specific activities entailed for the programme. The Bureau discussed the suggestion from Rep. of Korea, put forward in an information paper to the CPM, that a small working group be set up to develop a more focused and practical plan. The plan could focus on a few selected pests which are spreading currently and have important potential impact on agriculture and trade (e.g. as *Xylella fastidiosa* in Europa or *Bactrocera dorsalis* in South Korea) and target areas such as NROs, communication, urgent measures for outbreak, development of diagnostic and surveillance material. This approach, it was pointed out, could also tie in with the 2016 theme on food security.

[42] The Bureau considered other points of advantage by taking this approach and noted that:

- It could help to mobilize resources because individual countries would be directly involved in the work; this would also be in line with the preparatory phase activity of the pilot, which foresaw exploring options to encourage national and regional participation in the programme.
- Targeting a specific pest could help set up an emergency framework, which could include diagnostics, regulatory needs, treatments, and so forth, thus allowing for a number of elements that could be funded, depending on countries' interests.
- Associating pests with specific commodities could help advocate for industry involvement, which would be helpful for implementation facilitation and resource mobilization.
- It could lead to the IPPC Secretariat taking on an active role in communicating emergency pest outbreaks to the IPPC community, and serve as a center for analysis and monitoring. This in turn could feed into the efforts to enhance implementation of NROs because it would help countries acknowledge the benefits of reporting as they would be able to obtain detailed information about outbreaks and emergencies that could be used to understand the risks and take dedicated action (e.g. *Xylella* are often spread through plants for planting).

[43] The Bureau agreed to discuss who would be responsible for coordinating the working group, the concrete plan, approach and mechanism for handling emerging pests further in June 2016.

Report on the Implementation, Review and Support System (IRSS) (Ag. 10.3)

[44] The Secretariat presented the report.

Report on the activities of the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement (SBDS) (Ag. 10.4)

[45] The Secretariat presented the report.

8.9 Report on ePhyto (Ag. 10.6)

- [46] The Coordinator explained the latest progress on the ePhyto pilot hub and the efforts to keep abreast of all progress relevant to ePhyto. As to the ePhyto questionnaire, 89 countries had responded so far. Of these, 16 countries were invited to partake in the pilot, and 15 responded positively (one country did not respond). The ePhyto Steering Group recommended approximately 10 countries for the pilot phase, subject to Bureau approval.
- [47] Mr Shane Sela, in-kind contribution from Canada as Secretariat lead for ePhyto, joined the meeting to detail how the countries had been chosen to participate in the pilot. He explained that the countries had been selected based on quantitative criteria (trade volume, infrastructure, and supporting legislation) and some qualitative considerations such as political commitment and interest in participation.
- [48] The Bureau agreed that the summary for selection should be shared with the CPM so that any country may be able to query the selection criteria and to ensure a transparent process.
- [49] One Bureau member queried if it was possible to add countries to the pilot phase, in the event that a countries would express such a wish during Plenary. The Secretariat explained that it would not be possible to include additional countries in the pilot because the number of countries had been limited to assess the feasibility of the hub effectively. Additionally, the Secretariat reminded the Bureau that all IPPC contact points had been invited to participate in the questionnaire but many had not responded.
- [50] The Bureau approved the selection of the countries for the ePhyto pilot hub.
- [51] One Bureau member queried Standard and Trade Development Fund's (STDF) influence and engagement in the pilot hub project considering their significant funding of the pilot. He felt that it would be important to ensure the continued responsibility would lie with the Steering Group. The Coordinator explained that the STDF would set up an advisory body with representatives from STDF as observers, but that the STDF had no wish to be managing the project.
- [52] The Coordinator lastly noted that there were ongoing efforts to set-up an ePhyto workshop in Africa for later this year.

8.10 Communication and Advocacy (Ag. 11.1)

Report on National Reporting Obligations (Ag. 11.1.1)

- [53] The Bureau noted that there were three papers presented under this agenda item: the NRO Quality control guidelines, the NRO work plan 2014-2023 and the NRO procedures (general and specific).
- [54] One Bureau member queried the impact of the year of IPPC contact point – 2014-2015. The NRO Officer noted that an NRO statistical analysis on the impact would be made available during CPM-11².
- [55] One Bureau member noted that some contracting parties were concerned with what they felt was a possible legal contradiction with IPPC between what information should be shared publicly worldwide through the IPP and what should be communicated to the CPs concerned or affected. As an example, Art. VII 6 of the IPPC establishes that emergency actions shall be immediately reported to the contracting parties concerned, the Secretary and any RPPO of which the CP is a member. Art. VII 2. (b) states something similar for adoption, publishing and transmittance of phytosanitary requirements, restrictions and prohibitions. A statement from Plenary would be made to this effect.

² The analysis on the impact of the Year of the Contact point is available in the NRO Statistics 2015: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82325/> and in the NROs Update March 2015: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/80437/>

Communications Work Plan 2016-2020 (Ag. 11.1.2)

- [56] The NRO Officer introduced the Secretariat's Communications work plan for 2016-2020 highlighting that some activities in the plan were already being undertaken. One Bureau member asked that the target audience be identified for each activity.
- [57] The NRO Officer noted that the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) would migrate to FAO's webpage soon and that efforts were made to ensure a smooth transition with a low cost impact. He pointed out that the website of CODEX Alimentarius had already migrated under FAO. He also explained that the various tools (e.g. the Online Comment System) would remain under IPPC.int and that there may be a need to create separate tools, for instance for the NROs, in the future to ensure that they remain under the IPP. FAO had confirmed that the phytosanitary resources page would not migrate, as it contains information that belongs to IPPC contracting parties.
- [58] The Bureau had divergent ideas about the migration of the IPP. Some Bureau members feared that by having the site under FAO.org the ownership feeling may be impacted negatively because the IPP is not only the website for the IPPC Secretariat but also a platform for the contracting parties. Other Bureau members were positive, pointing out that it may help increase the IPPC's profile as linked more closely with FAO.

Report on the activities relating to the International Year of Plant Health in 2020 (IYPH 2020) (Ag. 11.1.3)

- [59] **IYPH Steering Committee.** The Bureau discussed the composition and set up of the IYPH Steering Committee and whether it should be directly involved in the work on the annual themes, which are effectively activities leading up to the IYPH. Some Bureau members felt that it would be a good opportunity for broad involvement and that the Steering Committee would optimize this work, with a purpose of creating awareness about plant health. Other Bureau members found that the work would expand too widely, and that the Steering Committee should focus its efforts on the actual IYPH 2020.
- [60] The Bureau agreed that it would be too confusing and resource intensive if the Steering Committee would have to focus on both IYPH 2020 (as end-point) and the annual themes (as lead-up activities). The Bureau agreed that the IYPH Steering Committee should focus only on the IYPH 2020, that the work should be contracting party driven and that resources should be identified externally.
- [61] The Bureau agreed that the SPG should be the coordinating body for discussing annual theme activities and strategies. This should help ensure that the activities would be picked up by NPPOs and RPPOs. In parallel, the IPPC Secretariat would also propose and carry out some activities, such as seminars or side events, but the Bureau emphasized that the Secretariat should not be the driving force of the annual themes.
- [62] The Bureau felt it would be challenging for CPM members to select members during the session without giving further clarification on the expectations and resource implications of the committee. For this reason, the Bureau drafted terms of reference (TORs) in collaboration with IYPH lead, Mr Ralf Lopian, outlining the main activities and responsibilities, and agreed to distribute them to the CPM-11 for approval. It was anticipated that the TORs would need to be discussed in a Friends of the Chair meeting.
- [63] To allow contracting parties to start thinking about nominations for the IYPH Steering Committee and the TORs, the Bureau agreed to discuss this agenda item on the first day of CPM-11.
- [64] The Bureau agreed that the CPM should be requested to authorize the Bureau to select the IYPH Steering Committee members based on a call of interest. Each FAO region and two or three RPPOs should nominate one member and one alternate member. The Bureau agreed that the Bureau in June 2016 would decide on the members of the Steering Committee and that the number of Steering Committee members could be expanded following as needed.

- [65] **Funding for IYPH 2020.** The Bureau discussed the resource mobilization for IYPH 2020, noting that while resources may be earmarked for IYPH 2020 flexibility would be needed to fund also lead-up activities.
- [66] **Scope and definition.** Several Bureau members felt that the definition of “plant health” was still too IPPC- and regulatory specific and the Bureau discussed how to target a wider plant health and plant protection audience to ensure that IYPH would extend beyond IPPC. The Bureau agreed that the role of RPPOs would be essential to facilitate the work on a global level. However, some Bureau members pointed out that work on specific IYPH activities in 2016 would be challenging as budgets and work programmes had already been approved for this year.
- [67] The Bureau discussed the way forward because it was not felt appropriate to have lengthy discussions on this from CPM plenary. The Bureau agreed that the IYPH Steering Committee should define “plant health”, using the analysis done by contracting parties for the CPM-11. Additionally, the Bureau highlighted that the scope and definition should be carved from the objective, i.e. to raise awareness of the importance and impacts of plant health in addressing issues of global importance, including hunger, poverty, threats to the environment and economic development.
- [68] The Bureau recommended that the scope and definition be clarified before the COAG side-event (i.e. before September 2016).
- [69] The Bureau encouraged that RPPOs add IYPH 2020 to their yearly meeting agendas.
- [70] The Bureau briefly discussed what would happen in the event that the IYPH would not be proclaimed, and the Bureau concurred that independently from the outcome, the lead up activities would be helpful to reach the goal of increased awareness about plant health.
- [71] In this context, the Bureau noted that it would be necessary to lobby nationally for support to the IYPH and that it would be critical, for this purpose, to have briefing material on the IYPH to share with government officials. The Bureau asked the IYPH Lead to draft such briefing material, e.g. in the form of a generic letter, for CPs to be able to present the case consistently. The Bureau agreed to review the material in June 2016.

8.11 Partnerships and Liaison (Ag. 11.2)

- [72] The Coordinator briefed the Bureau on the current partnerships and liaison activities undertaken by the Secretariat. In particular, he mentioned the progress to enhance collaboration with the World Customs Organization (WCO). The Bureau welcomed this progress, and agreed that the WCO collaboration would provide opportunities to raise awareness about trade facilitation (the theme for 2017). The Coordinator also informed the Bureau that the Secretary General of the WCO was invited to deliver the keynote speech at CPM-12 (2017).
- [73] The Bureau discussed the expression of interest from the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) to become involved in the IYPH 2020 and agreed that it was still premature to discuss partnerships on this with other organizations, as the scope and planning should be developed and clarified first.

Report on IPPC Regional Workshops (Ag. 11.2.1)

- [74] The Bureau noted the success of the six IPPC Regional workshops (RWS) held in 2015 and regretted that the African RWS had not been held. The Coordinator explained that each core team Secretariat member would be responsible for one RWS in 2016.
- [75] With regards to the funding of developing country participation to the RWS, the Coordinator informed the Bureau that the Secretariat would have less funds available for this in 2016. One Bureau member suggested that countries try to seek regional funding, which should be possible in some regions as the RWS have a wide scope from discussion on draft ISPMs to capacity building.

- [76] The Bureau discussed the scope and focus of the RWS, and the role of the regions and the IPPC Secretariat in deciding the agendas. The Bureau noted that the focus of the RWS in 2015 had been different from previous years.
- [77] The Secretariat explained that the change in focus was led by the Secretary in an effort to bring together the regions and the RPPOs and create a stronger *One IPPC*. This would foresee that the RPPOs take on a stronger role, e.g. through the TC-RRPO, by aligning the priorities between the RPPOs and the IPPC to ensure that they are vehicles for the implementation of IPPC agreed activities. In this context, the regional workshops have an essential role in being a platform for national strategy and decision making.
- [78] Several Bureau members expressed strong concerns in not allowing the regions to decide fully on the content of the regional workshops. Some Bureau members also expressed concerns regarding the IPPC Secretariat decision to change the focus and scope from review and discussion of draft ISPMs to awareness raising and briefings about the IPPC Secretariat activities. They pointed out that the workshop participants for commenting on standards would not be the same as those attending capacity building workshop, so such a change should be considered thoroughly. They also felt that with such a change in focus, the IPPC Secretariat should take a likewise stronger role in the organization and funding of the RWS.
- [79] Other Bureau members noted that the workshops are helpful for countries to fully understand the ISPMs and discuss implementation issues, and that they present a good opportunity to discuss and table any regional phytosanitary issues.
- [80] The Bureau requested the Secretariat to liaise with the RPPOs to jointly decide the focus of the RWS, reiterating that the RPPOs should have the opportunity to influence the scope and focus. The Bureau agreed that they would discuss this issue further in their June 2016 meeting. The Bureau also encouraged the Secretariat to participate only in the RWS where the regions had expressed such a need.
- [81] In this context, the Bureau recognized that there might be other opportunities for liaison between regions and the IPPC Secretariat in other regional meetings, and encouraged the Secretariat to investigate this further.

8.12 Report on the Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (Ag. 11.2.2)

The Secretary highlighted the importance of the Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPOs) meeting because of the crucial role RPPOs play in creating a strong IPPC. The RPPOs would meet in the margins of CPM and discuss the focus of this year's TC-RRPO.

8.13 Oral reports from selected international organizations (Ag. 11.2.3)

- [82] The Bureau discussed the role of the STDF to IPPC, noting that it is driven by five international organizations including FAO. Additionally, the IPPC Secretariat is a deciding member in one of the STDF working committees. For this reason, there may be confusion on the relation between the IPPC Secretariat and the STDF because the partnership is different in nature from other partnerships under the IPPC scope. The Bureau suggested that the Coordinator explain the nature of the partnership between the IPPC Secretariat and the STDF when introducing the agenda item "oral reports from international organizations".

8.14 Written reports from international organizations (Ag. 11.2.4)

- [83] The Bureau discussed the written reports from international organizations, pointing out that not all of the statements were from actual international organizations. The Bureau felt it should be clarified what the roles of the various organizations and groups were, and suggested that the Secretariat clarify this in the introduction of the papers. The Bureau welcomed the liaison activities and the input that the

informal relationships provide into the IPPC, but felt that it would be positive to have a clarifying overview.

- [84] The Bureau asked the Secretariat to prepare a paper for the Bureau June 2016 meeting on the various partnerships, liaison relations and technical groups to provide clarity on the types of relation with the IPPC.

8.15 Financial Report and Budget (Ag. 11.3)

2015 Financial Report and Resource mobilization (Ag. 11.3.1)

- [85] The Bureau discussed the underspending on specific projects and the Secretariat explained that dedicated oversight was being provided to safeguard that the projects are carried out within the timeframes agreed.

- [86] Due to FAO rules, additional positions cannot be created against regular programme funding. This means that, effectively, positions can only be created if funded through the IPPC Multi-donor trust fund or some other project but this does not allow for stable funding of staff. The Secretariat is therefore in a fragile situation with few stable human resources.

2016 Budget (Ag. 11.3.2)

- [87] The Bureau noted that the Work plan and budget was being presented for approval by CPM. In the budget, there was an approximate deficit of USD 400 000 meaning that the work programme would be carried out only if additional resources were identified. The Bureau pointed out that the Secretariat would need to determine which activities would not be carried out, in the event that funds were not secured.

8.16 Resource mobilization (Ag. 11.4)

- [88] The Bureau discussed the Secretariat proposal for the CPM to encourage a voluntary, nominal and sustained contribution to ensure stable trust funds. The Bureau agreed that the SPG October 2016 should discuss in-depth the proposal of assessed contribution and asked that the Secretariat prepare a mock up overview of assessed contributions by the individual countries to provide a tentative overview of how the contributions countries should provide.

- [89] The Bureau also agreed that the SPG should develop a plan for the Ministerial donor conference 2020, with the voluntary assessed contribution scheme as a target.

- [90] In this context, the Bureau felt that there would be value in determining a minimal reasonable IPPC Secretariat work programme that would outline the results and outputs (e.g. number of standards, number of implementation projects, etc.) so that the contracting parties would be able to understand the added value of investing in the IPPC. The Secretariat explained that, currently, the overall budget for a sustainable IPPC Secretariat work programme would be approximately USD 5 M, of which half was provided through the FAO regular programme. The Bureau noted that in light of the sums that international trade generates, and if all CPs provided funding through a fair and transparent assessment scheme, it should be possible to identify the USD 2.5 M needed to sustain the work programme.

8.17 Recognition of Important Contributions (Ag. 11.5)

- [91] The Bureau noted that the paper was complex to comprehend but also that it was important to express recognition and demonstrate the co-contributions made by countries.

8.18 CPM Recommendations (Ag. 12)

- [92] The Coordinator recalled that the draft CPM Recommendation on pest diagnosis had been submitted for commenting through the Online Comment System. One Bureau member noted that some strategic points from the original recommendation had been lost in the final version, but that the final version nevertheless met the expectations. In this context, it was also noted by a Bureau member that the EU would prepare a strategic paper on diagnostics for the SPG 2016 meeting.

8.19 Contracting Parties Reports of Successes and Challenges of Implementation (Ag. 13)

- [93] The Secretariat noted that the papers under this agenda point would be accompanied by PowerPoint presentations and questions and answers sessions.
- [94] The Bureau discussed the International Phytosanitary Conference in Africa, organized by Kenya Plant Health Inspection Service (KEPHIS) and planned for 12-16 September 2016, and asked that the IPPC Secretariat contact the organizers to understand if any input from the Secretariat would be useful.

8.20 Special Topics Session: Sea Containers (Ag. 14)

- [95] The Standards Officer informed the Bureau on the progress made on the topic of Sea Containers (2008-001), highlighting that the work had been resource intensive while there were still very divergent ideas as to whether a standard should indeed be developed. Additional challenges for the development of the standard had been identified, for instance in relation to the shipment of empty containers. It was recalled that the Code of practice for packing cargo transport units (CTU Code) had been revised to include taking account of pest risks. The implementation of the CTU Code had begun only this past year, but it was hoped that it would lessen the pest risk connected to the international movement of sea containers.
- [96] Regarding the implementation of the CPM Recommendation on sea containers adopted in 2015, the Standards Officer noted that it was not clear what had been done so far by contracting parties or whether organizations such as CBD and OIE had started to develop similar guidance. The Bureau considered that it may be useful to develop a process to understand how the recommendation has been implemented and its impact.
- [97] The Bureau discussed the way forward for the topic on sea containers.
- [98] Some Bureau members favoured developing other types of tools or guidance material because it seemed too challenging to develop and implement a standard. They suggested a commercial or management strategy approach pointing out that it may be impossible to find a harmonized regulatory way forward. It was suggested that the topic could be reconsidered in the future, after the CTU Code would have been used for a number of years and interception data could be gathered and analyzed to understand the CTU Code's impact.
- [99] Other Bureau members highlighted that while the topic is challenging, it would be irresponsible not to address this specific pathway considering the pest risk which had been identified. One Bureau member strongly supported that the IPPC be a front runner in developing guidance through a standard because an ISPM carries more weight than any other guidance. Through an ISPM, NPPOs would have guidance on what regulation they could develop and it would provide a safety net in the event that the private sector-driven initiatives were not implemented. The standard would be a first step in what will likely become a series of guidelines and tools to tackle the issue. If global harmonization was too challenging, the IPPC community could target a standard related to specific points that present particularly high risks where harmonization could be attained.
- [100] The Coordinator mentioned that the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has an elaborate system and programme for examining sea containers, and that possible collaboration could be sought. For instance, UNODC does profiling and the IPPC could tap into this to profile high pest risk containers.
- [101] In conclusion, the Bureau acknowledged the high pest risks connected with this pathway but also that developing a standard on the international movement of sea containers would be very challenging at this moment.
- [102] In the event that the CPM decided not to develop a standard at this moment, the Bureau discussed whether the current expert drafting group (EDG) (scheduled to meet in Los Angeles, July 2016) would be able to develop a different type of guidance. The Secretariat noted that the current EDG had been

selected because of their regulatory experience and that it was unlikely that they had the necessary expertise to develop other types of guidance or tools and this would be outside of the established IPPC Standard setting procedure. The Bureau considered that an ad hoc working group could be set up. Potentially it could consist of experts from the seven FAO regions with expertise in developing and implementing alternative strategies for approaching the topic.

8.21 Confirmation of membership and potential replacements for CPM subsidiary bodies (Ag. 15)

- [103] The Secretariat recalled that unless there is an established process for how to nominate members for CPM subsidiary bodies agreed to by the specific regions, the default FAO process is applied. The Secretariat encouraged all regions to agree on processes that facilitate the nominations and notify the Secretariat accordingly.
- [104] The CPM Chairperson informed the Secretariat that the Asia region had agreed on a process and had notified the Secretariat via the appropriate channels.
- [105] The Bureau noted that the CPM Bureau rules state that the Bureau members need to be present in the CPM Session to be nominated, and discussed if this rule should also be applied to replacement Bureau members because the rule was unclear. The Bureau agreed that the rule should not be applicable to the replacement nominations and agreed, following FAO Legal advice, that the CPM Bureau rules should be modified to clarify this point in their Bureau June 2016 meeting. In this occasion, the Bureau also agreed to decide on the process for selecting the first and second replacement, where more than one replacement was nominated by a region.

8.22 Any other business (Ag. 16)

Pre-CPM training session (Sunday) and CPM side sessions.

- [106] The Coordinator informed the Bureau that almost 90 participants had signed up for the pre-CPM training.
- [107] The Bureau expressed enthusiasm about the side events and hoped there would be high participation.
- [108] The Secretariat noted that three manuals (400 copies each) had been printed in Rep. of Korea for distribution at CPM during the side events.

8.23 Date and venue of the next CPM Session (Ag. 17)

- [109] A proposal from Rep. of Korea to host CPM-12 (5-11 April 2017) would be presented to the CPM for agreement although it was recalled that CPM approval for holding the CPM session outside of FAO, HQ, was not formally needed. The CPM Chairperson explained that it had been suggested to hold the session from Wednesday to Tuesday to allow for training and side sessions to take place over the weekend. This would provide for opportunities for externals (e.g. from Academia) to participate. The cost implications for holding the session over the weekend would not be particularly high, because many countries normally come for the Sunday training session in any case and there would therefore only be the addition of one day.
- [110] The Bureau discussed details regarding the arrangements. It was clarified that the selected venue was close to the international airport to facilitate arrival of delegates, and that the translation of the report would be done by FAO, HQ. The weekend events would be clearly stated in the agenda to allow for national agreement to participate. It was also noted that Rep. of Korea would fund travel for some developing country participants and would also help funding the travel of the Secretariat staff.
- [111] There were some concerns regarding how to ensure quorum (91 countries) and skilled interpretation of the session, but Rep. of Korea was confident that it should be possible to ensure both provided advance planning. The organizers would contact the Embassies in Korea well in advance to ensure that they obtain the credentials (*note verbale*) to attend the CPM session on behalf of the countries. The

Bureau stressed that credentials would need to be received well in advance and that due dates would need to be respected.

- [112] The Bureau was convinced about the numerous benefits of holding the CPM outside of Rome, and highlighted it as a great opportunity to profile IPPC and create awareness about plant health.
- [113] The Bureau briefly discussed the special topics session for CPM-12 and considered there could be an opportunity to invite Industry (e.g. citrus or grain) as speakers to enhance collaboration and understanding, and to mobilize resources. The focus should be on articulating the value of IPPC to the Industry. As to side sessions, the Bureau considered that some side events could target environment protection as lead up to the 2018 theme.

POST CPM-11 (2016) SESSION

Bureau members participating in the second part of the meeting: Mr Kamal El Din Abdelmahmoud Amein BAKR, Ms Marie-Claude FOREST, Mr John GREIFER, Mr Lucien KOUAME KONAN, Mr Diego QUIROGA, Ms Lois RANSOM, Mr Francisco Javier TRUJILLO ARRIAGA, Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN, Ms Kyu-Ock YIM.

9. Issues Arising from CPM-11 Requiring Bureau Actions

- [114] The former and new CPM Chairpersons welcomed the Bureau members. As per tradition, the former Bureau members participated in the meeting.
- [115] The Bureau discussed issues arising from CPM-11, drafted on the draft Bureau June 2016 agenda and identified items for the SPG 2016 agenda.
- [116] The Bureau agreed on the composition of the Financial Committee (FC):
- [117] Ms Marie-Claude FOREST was selected as Chairperson.
- [118] The other members selected were: Mr Lucien KOUAME KONAN, Ms Lois RANSOM and Ralf LOPIAN.
- [119] The Bureau assigned areas of liaison following the change in Bureau membership.

| | |
|---|--|
| Mr Kamal BAKR: NRO, SBDS, TC-RPPO | Ms Lois RANSOM: Implementation |
| Ms Marie-Claude FOREST: FC, support ePhyto | Mr Francisco Javier TRUJILLO ARRIAGA: SC |
| Ms Kyu-Ock YIM: ePhyto | Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN: CDC |
| Mr Lucien KOUAME KONAN: Communication, IYPH | |

- [120] The Bureau members confirmed that they would try to attend the meetings within their areas of responsibility.

9.1 Resource impact of CPM-11 (2016) decisions and prioritization

- [121] As to CPM-11 decisions, the Bureau noted that:

- The EWG for the *Minimizing pest movement by sea containers* (2008-001) had been cancelled. This would have a positive resource impact.
- There were not enough experts for the EWG for the *Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages* (2008-004) to function and the meeting had been cancelled for that reason. This would have a positive resource impact.
- The Focus group meeting to discuss the TORs for the new capacity development and implementation body would require some resources for travels.
- The IYPH Steering Committee meetings required some resources from the Secretariat in terms of organizing and facilitating the meetings.

9.1 Calendar of upcoming meetings

- [122] The Bureau noted upcoming meetings. The Secretariat recalled that all dates for IPPC Secretariat-led meetings are available on the IPP calendar.

9.2 Items to be added to the June 2016 Agenda

- [123] The Secretariat summarized items to be discussed at the Bureau meeting in June stemming from previous discussions and decisions. In addition, the Bureau agreed to add the following items to the Bureau June 2016 agenda:
- [124] **IPPC Secretariat sustainable funding strategies (short term and long term).** The Bureau asked the Secretariat to prepare a discussion paper with consolidated information from the Secretary's presentation to CPM-11 on resource mobilization, a mockup of voluntary assessments from CPs, and with elements of the work done some years ago by the Coordinator and Mr Ralf Lopian on resource mobilization. Under this agenda item, the Bureau would also initiate discussions on the plan for the 2020 Donor conference.
- [125] **Plan for the yearly themes.** The Bureau agreed to plan for the 2017 theme on Plant health and trade facilitation and initiate discussions on the 2018 theme on Plant health and environment protection. The Bureau acknowledged that a plan of activities should already have been drawn up by October, but that there would still be value in having the SPG brainstorm strategically on the theme.
- [126] **IYPH 2020.** The Bureau would agree on the members of the IYPH Steering Committee (see section 11.1.3 of the CPM-11 report).
- [127] **Pilot programme on surveillance.** The Bureau would discuss coordination of the working group as set up during CPM-11, the action plan, and mechanism to handling emerging pests.
- [128] **Types of IPPC liaison activities and partnerships.** The Bureau agreed to discuss the current types of liaison and partnerships to clarify the relationship between the organizations or institutions and the IPPC (see also sections 8.13 and 8.14 of this report), and develop of a strategic approach to new partnerships (see SPG 2015 report, section 7.3).
- [129] The Bureau would also discuss specific partnerships including those with the Biodiversity Liaison Group, CABI, International Atomic Energy Agency, review the CBD – IPPC joint work plan, and review the draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the World's Customs Organization, and asked that the Secretariat ensure the drafts of these documents be provided in time for the meeting.
- [130] **IPPC Strategy 2020-2030.** The Bureau agreed to review the draft outline and confirm the drafting group. The Bureau asked the CPM Chairperson to liaise with lead for the draft outline for it to be submitted in time for the meeting.
- [131] **Procedural guidance.** The Bureau would adjust the CPM Bureau rules to clarify nomination of replacement members, and agree on a process for deciding the first and second replacements (see section 8.21 of this Report). The Bureau would also review the FC working arrangements (as agreed in the Bureau October 2015 meeting, section 10).
- [132] **Emerging issues that require global action.** The Bureau would discuss means or mechanisms to deal with these issues (see section 8.3 of the CPM-11 report).
- [133] **Sea containers.** The CPM requested the Bureau to consider the development of a "set of complimentary actions" which, combined, may offer some value in assessing and managing the pests threats associated with sea containers and to propose such a possible program of complimentary actions to CPM-12 (2017). The Bureau agreed to assign half a day to this agenda item.

9.3 CPM-12 agenda items

The CPM-12 agenda will be discussed in the Bureau June 2016 meeting.

9.4 SPG planning and agenda

- [134] In addition to SPG agenda items proposed by the CPM (see section 8.1 of the CPM-11 report), the Bureau added the following items to the SPG 2016 agenda:

- Sustainable funding and planning for the 2020 Donor conference. The Bureau invited New Zealand, the EU, and other interested CPs to submit concept papers for SPG discussion.
- Resource mobilization IPPC Strategy.
- Framework for Standards and Implementation review.
- Capacity development and implementation oversight body TORs and outcomes from focus group meeting.

10. CPM-12 Planning

[135] For the detailed discussions on CPM-12 in Rep. of Korea, see section 8.23 of this Report.

[136] The Asian Bureau member noted that Rep. of Korea would contact FAO to initiate the official request to hold CPM in Rep. of Korea as it was important that the FAO Director-General invitation letter be sent out earlier than normal. She also confirmed that CPM-12 would be paperless.

[137] The Bureau members expressed their profound gratitude to Rep. of Korea for hosting CPM-12.

11. Next Meeting (scheduling)

[138] The Bureau will convene next in Beijing, China, from 21-24 June 2016, and tentatively on 3 October (pm) and 7 October 2016 in Rome, Italy. The SPG is tentatively scheduled for 4-6 October 2016, Rome, Italy. The SC and CDC Chairpersons would be invited to the October Bureau meeting. The Bureau would have a virtual meeting tentatively on 6 December 2016.

[139] The Financial Committee will meet in Beijing, China, on 20 June 2016.

[140] The Bureau agreed that Mr Ralf Lopian, member of the FC, would be invited to the June Bureau meeting because he was directly involved in several agenda items to be discussed. The Bureau also agreed to invite representatives from the EU to the FC June meeting (as previously agreed, see FC and Bureau October 2015 reports).

[141] As to holding the Bureau meeting in China, the Secretary highlighted the opportunities for building closer relations with the Chinese NPPO and Academia. He would make efforts to invite some Chinese officials to give presentations and discuss issues of common interest. The Bureau welcomed possible discussions with Chinese officials on the value of IPPC and on areas of collaboration but considered that there would be negative financial impact by having the Bureau June meeting in Beijing, China, considering that several Secretariat staff would attend.

[142] The Secretariat noted that the IPPC Secretariat-led meetings were available on the IPP Calendar, and recalled that the Regional workshops should be held from July until mid-September to allow countries to coordinate comments on draft ISPMs under the revised Standard setting procedure.

[143] It was also recalled that the IYPH steering group and the Focus group on the new Capacity development and implementation body would meet, and that the dates would be added to the calendar as soon as they were agreed.

[144] The Bureau encouraged the Secretariat to arrange the CDC meeting at the same week as the SC meeting.

12. Any Other Business

12.1 Briefing from ADG-AG

[145] The ADG-AG, Mr Ren WANG, met with the Bureau. The Bureau briefed him on the progress of work on the IYPH 2020, emphasizing the wish for FAO support, and on ePhyto, specifically relaying the success in setting up a pilot hub. The Bureau also stressed the importance of the implementation of the Enhancement evaluation recommendations, noting that the governance level restructuring will depend on this. In this connection, she highlighted the critical need for additional sustainable resource needs to

be allocated to the Secretariat. While understanding the financial framework of FAO, she stressed that the increased demands for IPPC related activities (e.g. also related to biodiversity, protection of the environment, trade, climate change) should be reflected in FAO's recognition of the IPPC Secretariat.

[146] She also mentioned that the CPM-11 would have a keynote speech on plant health and food security, which should help contracting parties and FAO understand the linkages. Lastly, she noted that CPM-12 would be held in Rep. of Korea.

[147] The ADG informed the Bureau that the structural changes of FAO, which he had briefed the Bureau in their October 2015 meeting, took effect on 1 January 2016. Extensive restructuring has taken place (e.g. the forestry and fisheries departments have been consolidated), to allow for increased synergies and delivery of the strategic objectives. He mentioned that leading up to the agreement of the restructuring, much debate had taken place with member states, specifically in relation to the continued trend of decentralization because of fear of losing the technical capacity of HQ. He also reiterated FAO's support to the normative work, including Article XVI bodies.

[148] He noted that FAO is experiencing a trend of decreased voluntary contributions in spite of various concrete demands from member states that core resources be focused on specific areas. Some countries are committing significant funds to areas such as emerging pandemic threats, the South-South cooperation and regional initiatives under the strategic programmes particularly in Africa.

[149] Another area that is increasing importance is "agroecology". He explained that FAO held an international symposium on agroecology two years ago. Leading up to that, it had become apparent that there were different views on agroecology and that it was being used as a tool in social campaigns to drive agricultural transformation of agriculture from green revolution to organic agriculture and so forth. Exporting countries had concerns that it would be used as a force against trade, and that it would impact world food supply (because it targets the large scale productions). The symposium resulted in consensus to the fact that technology may help agroecology. However, he noted, that a continued effort to build a common understanding of agroecology continues, specifically on a regional level. He also explained the set up of the symposium, which had included active and direct involvement of university students. This initiative had been highly appreciated and nominated as "ground breaking".

[150] Connected to this is also climate change and biotechnology because, as stated by the Director-General, "when the world is faced with unprecedented challenges all approaches must be explored". In that context FAO would organize an international symposium on agroecology and biotechnology with a wish to:

- broaden the concept and definition of agroecologic biotechnology, away from polarized GMO ideas, through broad stakeholder discussions.
- successfully explore the available technologies and identify gaps e.g. in regards to regulatory frameworks.

[151] He also briefed the Bureau on upcoming FAO engagements such as the next climate change Conference of the Parties (COP) will take place in Morocco.

[152] He reiterated FAO's support for IYPH. He also applauded the progress on ePhyto highlighting the benefits for developing countries in facilitating trade.

[153] Regarding the restructuring of the IPPC Secretariat, the ADG informed the Bureau that the proposal has been approved by the FAO Director-General. He confirmed that this included approval of one new Regular programme P5 position. Additional positions would be created on a fixed-term basis subject to extra-budgetary funding. He pointed out that in the future these project posts could become programme and work budget (PWB) positions. He invited the Secretary to take immediate action to implement the new structure.

- [154] He reconfirmed that FAO would not be increasing the regular programme funding for the IPPC Secretariat and the overall budget of the FAO will likely not increase. Therefore, he reiterated the need to mobilize external funds.
- [155] The Bureau thanked the ADG for the thorough briefing and invited the ADG to liaise with the Secretariat on any outcomes from summits, symposiums or other work of the FAO that relates to the IPPC mandate.
- [156] The Bureau expressed their appreciation for the ADG's support and active engagement to implement the Enhancement evaluation recommendations. The Bureau also thanked the ADG for taking the time to meet with the Bureau on a regular basis.
- [157] Following on the briefing from the ADG, the Bureau considered IPPC related activities on plant health and climate change. One Bureau member advocated for studies that would help understand in depth the impact of climate change on pest populations and suggested that the IPPC consider working on this. The Secretariat noted that activities on plant health and climate change had already been carried out, e.g. in the form of the IPPC Seminar held in 2015, and that the activities would be increased as we move towards the annual theme on "plant health and environment protection" in 2018.
- [158] The Secretariat also noted that the Potato CGIAR Centre had prepared a publication on pest mapping and pest risk management that the Secretariat is reviewing for inclusion on the Phytosanitary Resources page. Other suggestions included contacting the Pest risk analysis group and IFQRG to enquire if they could prepare reports on pest mapping and climate change (although such a request should originate from CPM); holding a seminar bringing various technical areas together (plant health, forestry, etc.) with a focus on adaptation.

12.2 Demonstration of the revised IPP home page

- [159] The Secretariat demonstrated the new IPPC home page (IPP) and explained the main reasons for changing the structure and layout. The Secretariat highlighted that the IPP was not the IPPC Secretariat's website, but that of the IPPC community. For this reason, it would be crucial that NPPOs and RPPOs supply news and information (in any official FAO language) to the website.
- [160] Regarding the section "brief news", the Bureau suggested that the news be moderated allowing for balanced input from various regions. One Bureau member queried how the news would be populated in the event that they would not be supplied by externals, and suggested the Secretariat use population web tools. The Secretariat noted that it would be proactive in finding information but that it would investigate using such tools.
- [161] The Bureau commented on the website providing suggestions for improvements. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that it would carry out a user survey by the end of 2016, i.e. some six months after launching, and adjust the site accordingly.

13. Close of Meeting

- [162] The Coordinator thanked the departing Bureau members for their work over the past years, especially in leading the transformation of the IPPC, and welcomed the new Bureau members.
- [163] Departing Bureau members thanked the Bureau colleagues and the IPPC Secretariat for their good spirits and collegiality. They also thanked the Secretary for bringing new energy and for his willingness to lead change to the Secretariat.
- [164] The CPM Chairperson thanked the Bureau members and the IPPC Secretariat for the fruitful meeting, a well-run and successful CPM session and closed the meeting.

APPENDIX 1 - Agenda

| AGENDA ITEM | DOCUMENT NO. | PRESENTER |
|--|---|------------------|
| 1. Opening of the meeting | | Xia/Yim |
| 2. Adoption of the agenda | 01_ Bur_2015_Mar_Agenda | Yim |
| 3. Housekeeping | | Fedchock |
| 4. Progress report of the IPPC Secretariat | | Xia |
| 5. Review: October 2015 Bureau and December 2015 Bureau reports | https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/governance/bureau | Yim |
| 6. Discussion on new Bureau membership | | Yim |
| 7. Organizational arrangements for CPM-11 (2016) -Thursday evening cocktail -Other | CPM Schedule distributed at meeting Handout of CPM Schedule- Friday 1 April 16:00 last version | Fedchock |
| 8. Discussion of the CPM-11 (2016) Agenda and papers -Marta Pardo from FAO Legal office to discuss legal issues (to be decided when) Updates of DOC / INF / CRP | Agenda CPM-11 documents - Link to IPP CPM page CRP 01 – will be e-mailed to Bureau | All Larson |
| 9. Issues arising from CPM11 requiring Bureau actions | | Fedchock/Yim |
| 10. CPM 12 planning | | Yim |
| 11. Next meeting (scheduling) | | Xia |
| 12. Any other business | | Yim |
| 13. Close of the meeting | | |

APPENDIX 2 - Participants list

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates attendance at this meeting.

(Updated 2016-04-28)

| | Region / Role | Name, mailing, address, telephone | Email address | Membership Confirmed³ | Term expires |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|---------------------|
| ✓ | Africa Member | 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) 07 903754 Fax: (+225) 20 212032 | l.kouame@yahoo.fr | 2 nd term / 2 years (2) | 2016 |
| ✓ | Asia Member <i>Chairperson</i> | 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 | CPM-8 (2013) 3 rd term / 2 years (0) | 2016 |
| ✓ | Europe Member | 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) 618 596867 | c.a.m.vanalphen@minez.nl | 1st term / 2 years (0) | 2016 |

³ The numbers in parenthesis refers to FAO travel funding assistance. (0) No funding; (1) Airfare funding; (2) Airfare and DSA funding.

| | Region / Role | Name, mailing, address, telephone | Email address | Membership Confirmed³ | Term expires |
|---|---|---|--|---|---------------------|
| ✓ | Latin America and Caribbean Member | 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) 11 4121 5176 Fax: (+54) 11 4121 5179 | dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar | 1st term / 2 years (0) | 2016 |
| ✓ | North America Member | 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 Phone: (+1) 202 7207677 | john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov | 3rd term / 2 years (0) | 2015 |
| ✓ | Pacific Member <i>Vice chairperson</i> | Ms Lois RANSOM Assistant Secretary, Plant Import Operations GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Ph.: (+61) 262723241 | Lois.ransom@agriculture.gov.au | 3rd term / 3 years (0) | 2017 |

Bureau members participating in the second part of the meeting

| Region / Role | Name, mailing, address, telephone | Email address | Membership Confirmed⁴ | Term expires |
|------------------------------------|---|--|--|---------------------|
| Near East Member | Mr Kamal El Din Abdelmahmoud Amein BAKR Plant Protection Directorate Khartoum North, Industrial Area P.O.BOX 14 SUDAN Phone: +249 913207800 Fax: +249 185 337462 | kamalbakr91@yahoo.com | CPM-11 (2016) 1st term / 2 years (2) | 2018 |
| North America Member | Ms Marie-Claude FOREST National Manager and International Standards Advisor Plant Biosecurity and Forestry Division Import, Export and Technical Standards Section Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 CANADA Tel: (+1) 613-773-7235 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7204 | marie-claude.forest@inspection.gc.ca ; ippc-contact@inspection.gc.ca | CPM-11 (2016) 1st term / 2 years (0) | 2018 |
| Latin America and Caribbean Member | Mr Francisco Javier TRUJILLO ARRIAGA SAGARPA/SENASICA/DGSV Blvd. Adolfo Ruiz Cortines No. 5010, Piso 4 Col. Insurgentes Cuicuilco Deleg. Coyoacan, D.F.; C.P. 04530 MEXICO | trujillo@senasica.gob.mx ; | CPM-11 (2016) 1st term / 2 years (0) | 2018 |

⁴ The numbers in parenthesis refers to FAO travel funding assistance. (0) No funding; (1) Airfare funding; (2) Airfare and DSA funding.

Others

| | Region / Role | Name, mailing, address, telephone | Email address | Membership Confirmed | Term expires |
|---|----------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat | Mr Jingyuan XIA Secretary | Jingyuan.Xia@fao.org | N/A | N/A |
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat | Mr Craig FEDCHOCK Coordinator | Craig.Fedchock@fao.org | N/A | N/A |
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat | Mr David NOWELL National Reporting Obligations Officer | Dave.Nowell@fao.org | N/A | N/A |
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat | Mr Marko BENOVIC Finance associate | Marko.Benovic@fao.org | N/A | N/A |
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat | Mr Brent LARSON Standards Officer | Brent.Larson@fao.org | N/A | N/A |
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat | Mr Orlando SOSA IRSS Officer | Orlando.Sosa@fao.org | N/A | N/A |
| ✓ | IPPC Secretariat | Ms Eva MOLLER Report writer | Eva.Moller@fao.org | N/A | N/A |

Member not attending

| Region / Role | Name, mailing, address, telephone | Email address | Membership Confirmed | Term expires |
|----------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Near East Member | Mr Khidir Gibriel MUSA EDRES Director General Plant Protection Directorate P.O.Box 14 Khartoum North SUDAN Ph.: (+249) 912138939 | khidirgme@outlook.com ; khidirgme@gmail.com | 1st term / 2 years (2) | 2017 |

APPENDIX 3 - Action points

| Action | Section # / Para # | Lead | Lead within Sec | Deadline |
|---|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---|
| Invite the Chairpersons from the SC and the CDC to the Bureau October 2016 meeting as observers. | 5 [13] | Secretariat | Fedchock | ASAP |
| Discuss further setting up a process to ensure that the CPM would adopt the additions or changes of items to the Framework for both standards and implementation. | 8.4 [23] | Bureau | Fedchock | 03-06-2016 Document deadline, Bureau June |
| Discuss who would be responsible for coordinating the working group on the Pilot programme on surveillance, the concrete plan, approach and mechanism for handling emerging pests. | 8.8 [43] | Bureau | Sosa | June Bureau |
| Coordinate annual theme activities and strategies | 8.10 [61] | SPG | Fedchock | 23-09-2016 Document deadline, October SPG |
| Decide on the members of the IYPH Steering Committee | 8.10 [64] | Bureau | Fedchock | 03-06-2016 Document deadline, Bureau June |
| Clarify the scope and definition of "plant health" | 8.10 [68] | IYPH SG / Ralf Lopian | Fedchock | Before the COAG side-event (i.e. before September 2016) |
| Draft IYPH briefing material, e.g. in the form of a generic letter, for CPs to be able to present the case consistently | 8.10 [71] | Ralf Lopian | Fedchock | 03-06-2016 Document deadline, Bureau June |
| Liaise with the RPPOs to jointly decide the focus of the Regional workshops reiterating that the RPPOs should have the opportunity to influence the scope and focus | 8.11 [80] | Secretariat | Core members team | ASAP |
| Discuss RPPOs' opportunity to influence the scope and focus of Regional workshops | 8.11 [80] | Bureau | Secretary | 03-06-2016 Document deadline, Bureau June |
| Investigate other opportunities for liaison between regions and the IPPC Secretariat in other regional meetings | 8.11 [81] | Secretariat | Secretary | N/A |
| Prepare a paper on the various partnerships, liaison relations and technical groups to provide clarity on the types of relation with the IPPC | 8.14 [84] | Secretariat | Larson | 03-06-2016 Document deadline, Bureau June |
| Develop a plan for the Ministerial donor conference 2020, with the voluntary assessed contribution scheme as a target | 8.16 [89] | SPG | Fedchock | 23-09-2016 Document deadline, October SPG |
| Contact the organizers of International Phytosanitary Conference in Africa, organized by Kenya Plant Health Inspection Service (KEPHIS), to understand if any input from the Secretariat would be useful. | 8.19 [94] | Secretariat | Fedchock | ASAP |

| Action | Section # / Para # | Lead | Lead within Sec | Deadline |
|---|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|
| Modify CPM Bureau rules to clarify that replacement members need not to be present at CPM for election and decide on the process for selecting the first and second replacement, where more than one replacement was nominated by a region. | 8.21 [105] | Bureau | Fedchock | 03-06-2016 Document deadline, Bureau June |
| Liaise with lead for the draft IPPC Strategy 2020-2030 outline for it to be submitted in time for the June Bureau meeting | 9.2 [130] | CPM Chairperson | | 03-06-2016 Document deadline, Bureau June |
| Invite Ralf Lopian to the June Bureau meeting. | 11 [140] | Secretariat | Fedchock | ASAP |
| Invite representatives from the EU to the FC June meeting. | 11 [140] | Secretariat | Fedchock | ASAP |