Strategic issues related to CPM recommendations and NROs

(Prepared by IPPC Secretariat)

CPM recommendations

Background

1. A proposal to present major CPM decisions in a consistent manner was discussed at CPM-3 (2008) and CPM-4 (2009) agreed to name these decisions “CPM Recommendations” and agreed to a format and a procedure.
2. CPM-5 (2010) reviewed past decisions and agreed that several past CPM decisions could be adopted as CPM recommendations; they also agreed that some should be superseded. The CPM requested the Secretariat to review the remaining decisions presented to the CPM (paragraph 19 of CPM 2010/3) with a view to updating them, if required, and to present them to the next CPM for approval.
3. CPM-6 (2011) there were no new proposals for CPM Recommendations and the CPM was informed that the existing recommendations would be posted on the IPP. However they were only posted in English.
4. Other CPM recommendations have been presented to the CPM over the past few years and CPM-10 (2015) discussed criteria for CPM recommendations and proposed a revision of the process for adopting CPM recommendations. The revised process for adopting CPM recommendations was agreed. However the criteria for CPM recommendations was not agreed to and CPM agreed to delay adopting criteria for CPM recommendations until CPM-11 (2016).

Criteria for CPM Recommendations

1. Revised criteria were not presented to CPM-11 (2016) but they are presented as attachment 1 to this paper and it is planned to present them to CPM-12 (2017).

Presentation of CPM Recommendations

1. The Secretariat has now set up a process to post the CPM recommendations in languages other than English on the IPP. In preparing the CPM recommendations, the Secretariat has noted that some parts of some CPM recommendations are no longer relevant and some sections do not really belong in an on-going recommendation but are rather a one-time decision. The Secretariat would propose that some minor revisions should be made (in line with the CPM-5 (2010) that the CPM Recommendations should be updating, if required) and the numbering system reconsidered to number them in sequential order. None of these changes would be a change to the substance. These proposed changes would be presented to the CPM Bureau for approval and then, CPM would then be informed of any changes.
2. Current CPM Recommendations are:

* Recommendation concerning Information Exchange
* Recommendations concerning LMOs, Biosecurity and Alien Invasive Species
* Threats to Biodiversity posed by Alien Species: Actions within the Framework of the IPPC
* The Role of IPPC Contact Points
* Replacement or reduction of the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure
* IPPC Coverage of Aquatic Plants
* Internet Trade (E-Commerce) in Plants and other Regulated Articles
* Sea Containers

1. The SPG is invited to:
2. *Agree* to present the revised criteria for CPM recommendations as presented in Annex XX to this report (currently presented as attachment 1 to this paper) to the CPM for adoption.
3. *Agree* that the Secretariat will review and revise adopted CPM recommendations and propose updated text and formatting to the CPM Bureau for approval.
4. *Request* the Secretariat to post revised CPM Recommendations on the IPP in FAO languages.
5. *Agree* that the CPM will be informed of the revisions approved by the CPM Bureau.

Attachment 1

Proposal is based on CPM-10 (2015) discussions but not agreed.

Criteria for CPM Recommendations

1. The following are the main criteria to be considered when reviewing proposed topics for CPM Recommendations:
2. In all cases, the proposed topic should address issues that fit within the legal framework of the Convention, it's ISPMs, or strategic goals.
3. And as much as possible, the proposed topic should:
4. address urgent issues related to plant health, either to promote action on a specific phytosanitary issue or to address a more generalized issue.
5. be relevant to the needs of the contracting **parties**, at least a majority of the parties.
6. cover issues or actions that NPPOs and/or RPPOs have some influence, authority or competence to address.
7. offer “guidance” that is not possible/appropriate to offer, at the moment, in the form of a standard.
8. may provide practical guidance and support for improving the implementation of a specific ISPM or set of ISPMs.