



REPORT

Rome, Italy
9-11 Oct. 2012

Strategic Planning Group October, 2012



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the meeting	3
2. Adoption of the agenda.....	3
3. Housekeeping	3
4. Selection of a Rapporteur	3
5. Bureau Update	3
6. Secretariat's report.....	4
6.1 Engaging in the standard setting process	6
7. Governance.....	7
7.1 Focus Group (FG) on Drafting Rules of Procedure (RoP) for the Nomination, Selection and Rotation of CPM Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons.....	7
7.1.1 Bureau Rules of Procedure.....	9
7.2 IPPC Financial Committee.....	9
7.3 Communications Strategy	11
7.3.1 Communications Work Plan	11
7.4 Article XIV update	13
7.5 SBDS Review.....	14
7.6 Observers in IPPC meetings.....	14
7.7 Staffing.....	15
8. IRSS Pest categorization / listing	16
9. Legal feasibility of International Accreditation of shipping lines by the IPPC	17
10. IPPC Liaison / Partnership Program.....	18
11. e-Phyto.....	19
12. IPPC Information Exchange	20
13. Classification of CPM documents	21
14. Other business.....	22
14.1 SPS Committee Proposals for International Standard Setting Bodies.....	22
14.2 SPG Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure.....	23
15. Next meeting.....	23
Appendix 1 - Agenda	24
Appendix 2 - Documents List	26
Appendix 3 - Participants List.....	27
Appendix 4 - ToR for the FG on Drafting Rules of Procedure	32
Appendix 5 - Action Points	34

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The Chair welcomed the members of the Strategic Planning Group (SPG), and noted that the nature of the meeting has changed as it now focuses on strategic issues since the capacity development component has been moved under the Capacity Development Committee. The Chair reviewed the number of items on agenda, and noted that the SPG would be dealing with very important topics.
- [2] The IPPC Secretary, Mr. Yukio Yokoi also welcomed the SPG members to the meeting, and thanked Mr. Francisco Gutierrez (Belize) for taking the chairmanship. He further noted that the SPG is supposed to focus on strategic issues and gave updates on Secretariat and FAO activities.
- [3] The Secretary then introduced new members of the Standard Setting staff: Mirko Montuori, who will be the report writer for the meeting, and Celine Germain, who joined the team as an in-kind contribution from France. APO Programme funding from the USA for Stephanie Dubon's position within the Standard Setting team in Rome ended in July 2012. In addition, Yuji Kitahara will be working with the Capacity Development staff as an in-kind contribution from Japan from November 1st, 2012 for two (2) to possibly four (4) years.
- [4] The Secretary also mentioned that with a new Director General of the FAO many reforms are ongoing, including the review of strategic objectives them reducing from eleven (11) to four (4). As a result, the Secretariat is working on placing its activities under a new strategic objective, mainly related to standard setting.
- [5] The Secretary updated the SPG on the Secretariat's relations with other international organizations. These include: frequent participation in WTO meetings to provide updates about IPPC activities; concurrent participation in a CBD meeting in India to review the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and common operational plans; and, the upcoming MoU with the Ozone Secretariat. With regard to STDF activities, while there had been issues causing difficulties for the IPPC to participate, these are essentially considered to have been resolved.
- [6] As an Article 14 body, the Secretariat has been trying to gain more autonomy, but it has not been very successful in this venture. The current meeting of the FAO Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters (CCLM) will address a public document on legal matters, which was also shared with the SPG.

2. Adoption of the agenda

- [7] The SPG:
- [8] 1. *adopted* the Agenda (Appendix 1), after deciding to address agenda items 7.6, 8 and 13 the next day.

3. Housekeeping

- [9] The Documents List and Participants List were reviewed and noted (Appendix 2 and 3).
- [10] The Chair stressed the need to have the report done quickly, with conclusions to be summarized at the end of each agenda point. If this works as intended, it will be institutionalized as a process for IPPC meetings.

4. Selection of a Rapporteur

- [11] The SPG:
- [12] 2. *selected* Ms Shelia Harvey (Jamaica) as a Rapporteur.

5. Bureau Update

- [13] The Chair of the IPPC Bureau, Mr Steve Ashby (United Kingdom), gave a brief update of the June 2012 Bureau meeting. The Bureau Report has been finalized and just posted on the IPP. It was noted

that the process took too long, and hopefully this will not be the case in the future. Mohammed Katbeh Bader (Jordan), the representative for the Near East, could not get permission to travel to the June 2012 meeting, thus only six members were present.

- [14] The Bureau discussed operational processes with a view to making its members focus on specific areas and work more with the Secretariat members responsible for those areas. The Bureau is not sure whether this has yet really had much of an impact. The Bureau also discussed the role of Bureau members within their regions and the need to better inform their regions on IPPC matters in order for the Bureau to know what the views are in their region about IPPC-related issues.
- [15] The Bureau also discussed pest reporting and expressed concern that many countries are still not meeting their obligations – the Bureau asked that these issues be discussed at the Technical Consultation and at the regional workshops.
- [16] With regard to standard setting, the Bureau understood that other organisations are interested in using the Online Comment System (OCS), and discussed whether there might be some possible income generated as a result of sharing the system. On a related matter, the Bureau asked that FAO legal services advise on the possibility of a system of international accreditation, an issue which had arisen from the Sea Containers Expert Working Group and which had been mentioned before in connection with recognition of pest free areas. The Bureau further noted the proposal for consideration of formal objections and asked that this be presented to the Standards Committee.
- [17] Concerning the topic of e-Phyto, the Bureau was given a presentation by the USDA about a possible IPPC hub system, with a view to saving a large amount of negotiation and funds involved in the development of hundreds or thousands of bilateral e-Phyto agreements. There was a proposal for a study on this, but Bureau members wanted the views of the e-Phyto working group as well as to see if other, outside funding might be available before agreeing to fund the study.
- [18] The Bureau also considered a study on the possibility of creating a list of the world's top pests, but it concluded that this should be discussed in the technical consultation and in the regional workshops as Bureau members had doubts that agreement on a list would be possible. Other issues on the agenda were discussed, including Bureau rules of procedure, and Article XIV.
- [19] Since the last meeting, the Bureau had been informed that Lois Ransom, the representative for the SW Pacific, was changing roles and could no longer be on the Bureau. After a long discussion within the Bureau and the Secretariat, it was agreed to invite Peter Thomson to attend meetings prior to the next CPM.
- [20] Two Bureau updates were sent out since the CPM, and the Bureau Chair thought it would useful to know if they were received by contact points and to know if this is a good way of communication.
- [21] No comments were made.

6. Secretariat's report

- [20] The Secretary presented the Secretariat's report¹, underlining similarities and differences with previous reports. It was noted that with the recent adoption of the strategic framework, Secretariat activities should be in line with the four IPPC strategic objectives.
- [21] A question was raised on how the Secretariat can most efficiently present its activities. The report currently includes a calendar of activities in which the IPPC Secretariat has taken part in 2012, divided in months and areas. The objective of this table is to capture the main activities of the Secretariat, as well as giving an idea of its workload over a specific period of time. The Secretary asked SPG members to provide comments on this table before it is presented to the CPM.

¹ SPG 2012/14

- [22] The Secretary discussed standard setting activities. The OCS is a tool that is very much appreciated by the IPPC and admired by other organizations. There are ongoing discussions on possible arrangements with other international organizations interested in using it, such as Codex Alimentarius and OIE. The Secretariat added that an agreement is being discussed with Codex and other international organizations which are interested in using the system.
- [23] Additional efforts for the Secretariat are related to improving Information Exchange tools with the IPPC community and other stakeholders. The Secretary emphasized the need for a good screening of messages and materials when talking with the outside community. The Secretary also highlighted the difficulties in implementing this effort for the lack of IT-specialized human resources (e.g. for e-learning tools and other activities available on the IPP).
- [24] A new strategy for IPPC branding was adopted in March 2011, including the standardization of designs for all IPPC publications. The Secretariat noted very positive reactions for this new branding policy. In conjunction with this effort, the Secretary mentioned efforts in producing advocacy materials, and introduced a table with news items, press, videos, and other tools now available to the public, and asked the SPG to provide feedback on possible improvements. This table (Table 5) was considered a good tool to attract in-kind contributions and to acknowledge donors. A comment was made on how to best recognize donors, based on their different levels of contribution, as the current system simply sorts countries in alphabetical order, and includes the reason for the contribution. The Secretariat pointed out that the report is not exhaustive, and also acknowledged contributions from the Republic of Korea and New Zealand, as they were not included in the Secretariat's report document.
- [25] Some members expressed frustration that some SPG documents had been distributed late, and noted that the procedural manual states that documents must be distributed at least fourteen (14) days prior to the meeting. The Secretariat accepted the comments and committed to providing the documents on time in the future.
- [26] The Secretariat suggested that the use of social media could be very useful in delivering the desired messages to the public. The question was asked if there is a feedback mechanism in place for our users. The Secretariat noted that IPPC members are not aware of the use of these social media as many of them have not signed up for them; they were encouraged to do so. It was further noted that information on meetings does not generate interest, while pictures with stories are more effective. LinkedIn profile, Twitter feed, and other tools are kept active, but there are constraints on how much time the Secretariat can devote to these activities. SPG members made the point that some organizations do not allow use of social media from their offices, so this could be a possible reason for inaction.
- [27] In reference to the structure of the Secretariat's report, some members highlighted that it is comprehensive, but not suitable for the CPM, and requested modifications in order to focus on the most relevant matters, and to make it more reader-friendly. The Secretary agreed with these comments and explained that it could be a public relations tool. He also noted that the idea for the IPPC 60th anniversary was to prepare a prominent publication, and while this had been considered, the lack of sufficient resources made it difficult to fulfil all of the goals for observing the 60th anniversary.
- [28] The SPG:
- [29] 1. *expressed concerns* about lateness of some documents for the meeting;
 - [30] 2. *proposed* editing the report before going to the CPM by changing the structure of the Secretariat's report to highlight only the main points and make use of it as a public relations tool.

6.1 Engaging in the standard setting process

- [31] The Secretariat introduced a paper² on the standard setting process.
- [32] It was noted how the development of ISPMs relies heavily on in-kind contributions by members, which are many and varied. This has worked remarkably well over the years and has been achieved through the extraordinary efforts by many, and these contributions are acknowledged and appreciated.
- [33] However, while the work continues, it appears that the participation of CPM members may be declining. It has been increasingly difficult to keep experts motivated and engaged and in relation to phytosanitary treatments, to get responses from CPM members. The Secretariat is getting some signs that this may not go so well in the future and mentioned several examples of cases where difficulties have been identified concerning the development of diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments, the call for experts and the participation of members to meetings. This situation may reflect a number of factors (e.g. the relatively small pool of experts in the subject, shrinking resources available to NPPOs and the need for commitment beyond a single working group meeting or treatment submission). There is a need for the SPG to consider the sustainability of standard setting processes, particularly as more technical standards are being developed. The SPG was invited to consider the issues of engaging and motivating members in the standard setting process, to discuss and if possible recommend some proposed solutions to the CPM.
- [34] Several SPG members pointed out that resources for IPPC related work had been constrained due to budget and staff cuts at the national level and that this was a reality having to be faced. Other possible factors for the problems were also mentioned: complexity of the process, countries' real interest in dealing with treatments, and initial uncertainty about expert's workload. In response to a question from a member, the Secretariat indicated that feedback from relevant working groups on this issue has not yet been sought, but this could be done if needed and coming meetings of the Technical Panels and the Standards Committee may be good occasions to do so.
- [35] One member suggested that, as very technical standards would need the involvement of the best experts, paying for the expertise could be considered (not on a routine basis). Another member underlined the importance of doing some succession planning for experts, while he noted that experts are not motivated by money necessarily. It was also mentioned that there is a need to think about how the process operates, as countries allocate their limited resources where they can get outcomes.
- [36] The SPG felt more investigation on these issues was necessary before the group could recommend some solutions. Several SPG members suggested seeking the views of the relevant Expert Working Groups and NPPOs, possibly through a survey and targeted questions, in order to better understand the issues. The SC Chair added that if the issue was raised in the next SC meeting, she could mention it in her report to the CPM-8 (2013). It was suggested that the SC could lead the discussion on this and prepare a formal questionnaire to get feedback from the Technical Panels and NPPOs. However, as several members expressed concerns on the SC workload, the SPG decided that the Secretariat should first investigate the issue further with an informal questionnaire.
- [37] The SPG:
- [38] 1. *asked* the Secretariat to send a simple, informal, targeted questionnaire both to NPPOs and relevant experts, in order to get their analysis on the difficulties mentioned above;
- [39] 2. *asked* the Secretariat to find out what the reasons might be behind the declining participation in the standard setting process and possible appropriate solutions, before presenting the issue again to the SPG.

² SPG 2012/10

7. Governance

7.1 Focus Group (FG) on Drafting Rules of Procedure (RoP) for the Nomination, Selection and Rotation of CPM Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons

[36] The Focus Group (FG) on Drafting Rules of Procedure (RoP) for the Nomination, Selection and Rotation of the CPM Chairpersons and Vice-Chairpersons met in Rome from 21st to 23rd August 2012. Mr Peter Thompson, its Chair, introduced the Report, which was posted on the IPP for SPG members' reference. The FG Chair also thanked participants to this meeting as well as the Secretariat for its support in finalizing the report quickly.

[37] The members of the SPG were reminded of the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the FG by the FG Chair. (Appendix 4). Their task as outlined in the ToR was to prepare a document including the following:

- identify roles and responsibilities of the chairperson and the vice chairpersons in relation to the functioning of the Bureau of the CPM and of the IPPC activities;
- identify competence, expertise or experience that are desirable for the chairperson and the vice-chairpersons;
- identify all the possible options for rotation, selection and nomination of the chairperson and the vice-chairpersons;
- analyse the above mentioned options, and especially the pros and cons (for instance through a SWOT analysis) in regard to the following general principles:
 - o transparency
 - o equity, fairness and inclusiveness, especially in terms of representation between IPPC contracting parties in successive nominations
 - o competency, in terms of ease to select the most valuable candidates given the role, responsibilities and competence identified
 - o efficiency
 - o continuity
- present the document

[38] The roles and responsibilities of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons and the desired competencies, expertise and experiences for these positions were discussed, and the SPG was invited to review the report taking into consideration the comments made by the FG and to develop a proposal for consideration and adoption by CPM-8 in 2013.

[39] The Chairman reviewed the process for addressing the issue and explained that the group perused the entire RoPs of CPM and used them as a guide.

[40] A lengthy discussion took place within the SPG on the task of identifying all the possible options for rotation, selection and nomination of the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson. Listed below are the key concerns, questions and recommendations from those discussions.

[41] The first question asked was whether the FG was able to determine whether or not there are other international organisations using rules on rotation for their chair and vice-chair. The FG replied that an analysis was made with regard to the election mechanisms and rotations of other organizations. Most of these bodies do not have written RoPs. The IPPC may be the first to formally deal with this issue. The FAO Legal Office reported that many FAO bodies are moving to have a First Vice-Chairperson and a Second Vice-Chairperson in addition to an elected Chair, but strongly recommended keeping the

process simple. Once the Chair finishes its mandate, it does not automatically become a Vice-Chair. Most FAO bodies have regional rotation policies.

[42] The Chair explained that there is need to find balance but all facets must be taken into account: skills, regional balance and competencies are all very important. Members explained that when you start writing down the rules, you also bind yourself for the future, and expressed need for flexibility as to allow for a review of the rules in the future as new issues may arise. Some members also expressed the view that there should be no automatic rotation between Vice-Chair and Chair in order to allow for more flexibility. There was also a lot of discussion as to whether the Chair of the CPM should have served at least one term in the Bureau with a consensus that this is important. A recommendation was accepted for changing the wording of one of the competencies: “Experience in Financial Management” to “Experience in Projects with Financial Management”. The SPG felt that selection, rotation and succession should be considered together.

[43] Several proposals were then discussed:

[44] **Proposal E: Proposal of Candidates as Vice-Chairperson**

- **Option 1:** Proposed by Bureau from within the Bureau - with or without a rotation
- **Option 2:** What we have now - an agreed rotation
- **Option 3:** No automatic succession at all – elections would be held every year (not efficient)

[45] **Proposal F: Proposal for Succession Among Vice-Chair Persons**

- **Option 1:** Automatic succession to the position of Chairperson – it facilitates succession planning
- **Option 2:** Automatic succession to and from the position of Chairperson – members of the SPG felt that it is going to be very difficult for CPM to implement
- **Option 3:** No automatic succession of the Vice-Chairperson

[46] The SPG was informed that only in two cases would the proposal work for having a Vice-Chairperson elevated to Chairperson. Some members were of the view that the decision of first and second Vice-Chairs should be left to the Bureau.

[47] **Proposal G: Proposal for Rotation of Chairpersons**

- **Option 1:** Rotation among FAO Regions with the same frequency for each region
- **Option 2:** Rotation among the FAO Regions with a differential frequency
- **Option 3:** Rotation among the negotiating groups (developing/developed)
- **Option 4:** No rotation – the candidate can come from any region for any term

[48] Strong opposition was raised to option three (3) as sixty-five countries are not included in either the OECD or G-77 groups and as a result they would not be able to participate; this was not considered a realistic option. Some SPG members expressed concern that the balance between developed and developing countries is important and that a good mix of both is the best solution. It was decided that the principles of transparency, equity, competency, efficiency and continuity should guide the process and whatever the final arrangements are, they should be reviewed again in the future.

[49] The Legal Officer explained that the concept of FAO regions does not exist formally, while there are FAO regional offices. The Secretariat explained that they use seven (7) regions for operational purposes. A discussion on IPPC geographical regions and the concept of equity among the regions due to the varying number of countries per region took place. There was a consensus that most developing

countries are in the Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, Near East, and Africa regions, while developed countries are for the most part in Europe, South West Pacific, and North America.

[50] The SPG:

[51] 1. *proposed* rotating the CPM Chair beginning with the seven (7) FAO regions: Asia, South West Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, North America, Near East and Europe, then the next cycle would begin with the four (4) largest regions (the ones with the highest number of countries): Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, Europe, Africa, followed by the seven listed above. Thus, the rotation scheme would be: 7-4-7-4. The scheme would facilitate the alternation of developed and developing countries, and would come as close to an equitable process as possible;

[52] 2. *agreed* that there will be seven (7) members, one (1) Chair and only one (1) Vice-Chair, and the region who is next in line for the Chair will nominate the Vice-Chair, while in the following term it will nominate the Chair (without an automatic succession). In the event the Chair cannot continue, the region would be allowed to identify a suitable candidate for the position of Chair;

[53] 3. *proposed* that the preferred position of the SPG will be presented to the CPM as guidelines for adoption. The Secretariat will consult with the FAO Legal Office for an appropriate title of the document;

[54] 4. *agreed* that the candidates for the Chair should be employed by the NPPO and have served on the Bureau for at least one (1) term;

[55] Members of the SPG *commended* the FG for their work.

7.1.1 Bureau Rules of Procedure

[56] A representative of the FAO Legal staff provided comments relative to the development of CPM Bureau Rules of Procedure. The Legal representative noted that the CPM may have to change the CPM Rules of Procedure depending upon the elements of the new Bureau Rules of Procedure. The FAO Legal Office representative also stated that the CPM, as is the current practice, needs to elect members of the Bureau.

[57] Legal also stated that based on the CPM Rules of Procedure, the Chair of the Bureau should be independent and not represent the views of any region. As a result, whoever is the Chair of the Bureau cannot technically represent the region from which they were nominated to the Bureau.

[58] The SPG:

[59] 1. *agreed* that the Bureau is responsible for preparing its own RoPs.

7.2 IPPC Financial Committee

[60] The Secretary introduced the 2012/2013 Secretariat Financial Report.³

[61] The Financial Committee (FC) was established as proposed under the Resource Mobilization Strategy adopted at CPM-7. Since its creation, the FC convened two (2) meetings: the first was held on 15th - 16th June 2012 soon after CPM-7, the second on 8th October 2012 just before the SPG meeting. Ms Lois Ransom (Australia) was elected as Chair, but had since resigned; Ms Kyu-Ock Yim (Republic of Korea) was appointed as Chair for the second meeting.

[62] The current Chair gave an overview of discussions and outcomes of the first FC meetings.

[63] The FC developed an informal working arrangement for its membership, which is restricted to four (4) persons with the possibility to invite additional participants as needed. This made it possible to have effective discussions on a number of points. Current FC members are Cote d'Ivoire, Republic of

³ SPG 2012/11 rev. 1

Korea, United Kingdom, and Mr. Lopian from Finland. The FC shall meet at least once a year, preferably associated with Bureau meetings.

- [64] In the FC meeting in June 2012, Ms Maria Bonomi from the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division was invited to explain the FAO budgetary system. Ms Bonomi emphasized that IPPC has a high profile in FAO, so it has experienced no budget cuts in this biennium; nonetheless cuts are foreseen in the next one. With regard to the multidonor IPPC Trust fund, this fund has lower Project Support Costs (PSC) than the ordinary FAO PSC, which is 13%. Nevertheless, such a low rate may not be applied to future trust funds.
- [65] The FC was updated on the IPPC's financial status. The current total budget is approximately US 5.5 million dollars, of which approximately 53% comes from the FAO regular budget [see the Report's table for reference]. The FC also reviewed the draft explanatory documents for donors, and suggested that benefits for donors should be emphasized with easy language and practical examples. In this regard, the FC proposed a two-step approach: 1) developing general material for donors; 2) developing action plans for specific projects, such as certain ISPMs or targeted donors.
- [66] The FC agreed to develop standardized form for financial report and FC meeting reports, and expressed wish to have such new forms ready for CPM 9 in 2014. The FC discussed how to present the financial report to CPM-8. For the summary report, the FC suggested some more information included such as total FAO regular program budget and staff salary. The FC also suggested attaching the simplified accounting table of the IPPC work program for transparency, but these detailed figures would not be subject to discussion in CPM. The FC recognized the need of revising trust fund guidelines, as approved by CPM-4, in order to allow more flexibility. The FC was also updated on contributions from member countries, RPPOs, and other organizations, and ongoing efforts of Secretariat for resource mobilization.
- [67] The FC discussed the work program for 2012/2013, and presented the budget cycle: in March the CPM approves the budget and work program; in June the FC reviews the detailed budget plan and monitors; in October 2012 the FC reviews the budget expenditures and analyzes major changes, while starting initial planning for the next year. The Secretariat stressed that the budget is an approximation, but the outlook is consistent with the current financial constraints being experienced at national levels. Therefore, while funds allocated from FAO regular program will be the same in 2013, it is expected that they will diminish over the next few years. It was noted that in 2012 there were 15 to 20% cuts in other programs of the FAO. The Division has been continuously trying to exclude the IPPC and other conventions from such cuts, but it will be very hard to avoid this for the future.
- [68] In addition, travel costs have already been reduced on average in the Division, including those allocated to the IPPC Secretariat. This has to do with the general budget cuts and with the clear intention of the new Director General to allocate more resources to the regional offices rather than to headquarters. The Secretariat highlighted that travel costs cuts are particularly harmful, especially in terms of the reduced opportunity to mobilize resources. The Secretariat further noted that there is a need for more sustainable financial commitments, especially from members, and the current budgetary surplus has been maintained by not taking on additional activities. The Secretariat nevertheless committed to continue working on increasing resources. Some SPG members suggested charging a fee on e-Phyto to increase IPPC resources.
- [69] The SPG:
- [70] 1. *noted* the current financial situation of the Secretariat; and
- [71] 2. *proposed* exploring further resource mobilization options.

7.3 Communications Strategy

- [72] The SPG reviewed the Communications Strategy document. The Secretariat presented the Communications Strategy⁴ document to the Bureau in June, where it was decided to present it to the SPG to finalize it before presenting it to the CPM. The Secretariat received comments by the Bureau, Australia, EU, EPPO, and integrated them in the document. It was decided that the Information Exchange section should be kept as a separate component in an attempt to make the text brief. The Secretariat developed a Communications Work Plan, as an integration of the strategy, to be discussed following this agenda item. A table on IPPC audiences was introduced, based on the OECD stakeholders' study, after which the objectives, goals, structure, and implementation were presented.
- [73] SPG members noted the need to set clear objectives to stick to consistent messages. It was suggested that goal A.3 should be an overall objective, as this enhances trust and credibility in the organization. Another suggestion was to utilize a communications expert from FAO, in order that the IPPC could rely on this person for communications advice; in addition, the SPG felt that a crisis communications component should be included in order to include how to react when negative messages are addressed in regard of the IPPC.
- [74] SPG members further proposed attaching a budget to the document, as several expenses are mentioned, including the establishment of a communications focal point within the Secretariat. The SPG noted the necessity to include deliverables and indicators in order to measure the impact of each communications action.
- [75] A question arose regarding how branding is related to protecting IPPC intellectual property. The Secretariat noted that at this stage there is not much to protect and that discussions with the FAO Legal Office are on-going on how to protect our products, including the PCE. The protection of IPPC branding is deemed crucial and will be further investigated while the process to design a new logo is finalized. The Secretariat proposed considering hiring a lawyer to facilitate the way forward. The SPG also recommended adding a point on specific audiences to whom the IPPC should reach out under goal A. With regard to goal C, some members offered to provide virtual support. The SPG suggested including the idea of virtual/remote groups in the document.
- [76] The Secretariat underlined that one of the main messages that needs to be communicated is an overall strategy for IPPC activities. The strategy will be implemented by the whole Secretariat, and will be a cross-cutting service for all.
- [77] Upon request by the SPG, the Secretariat discussed the issue of the IPPC 60th anniversary. After the last CPM, the Secretariat sent out a press release to FAO Media Office, but no further activities have taken place due to limited resources.
- [78] The SPG:
- [79] 1. *asked* for the addition of an overview of immediate actions for the next year.
- [80] The Secretariat will review the document based on the comments received and will present it to the next CPM for approval.

7.3.1 Communications Work Plan

- [81] The Secretariat introduced the Communications Work Plan⁵, noting the document outlines the modalities and task distribution of its communications-related work. As such, it is much more detailed than the communications strategy, and will be further implemented after the approval of the 2013 budget. The Secretariat acknowledged the need to improve communication and stressed the need to

⁴ SPG 2012/02

⁵ SPG 2012/16

receive inputs from NPPOs. The Capacity Development group has a separate plan which will be integrated in the current Work Plan.

- [82] The Secretariat also expressed concern over the amount of time that can be devoted to non-Secretariat activities, and stressed a willingness to participate in more scientific meetings if time and resources allow.
- [83] Communications material is now available, mostly in English, and it will be sent out to our mailing lists. The website is a crucial element, a mechanism through which we try to communicate.
- [84] The SPG conducted a brainstorming session on the development of the work plan and acknowledged that it is difficult to see what and how we are communicating.
- [85] SPG considered that the most important thing is to demystify the IPPC. Therefore, it would be useful to link the image of IPPC to interesting issues like food security, economic development, and trade facilitation. The focus needs to be put on subjects that laypersons can identify with easily. The SPG also suggested that the Secretariat work on using the media to deliver its messages, in cooperation with the FAO Media Office. The Secretariat, however, noted certain difficulties in working with FAO Media Office, and showed interest in a proposal by some NPPOs present to provide experts to work on these issues.
- [86] The Secretariat asked the SPG to identify the top five (5) or six (6) priorities for the next couple of years and to add deliverables. This would also allow us to clarify key audiences and to link activities to objectives.
- [87] Finland introduced a document proposing the development of a university course on international regulatory phytosanitary matters.⁶ This represents a follow-up of a comment submitted by the EU to the Secretariat in reply to the request for feedback on the Communications Strategy.
- [88] According to the proposal, the Secretariat would be responsible for designing the course, which would include a number of modules. The course would provide students with IPPC basic principles and phytosanitary regulatory capacity. A coordinator should be hired for this purpose, and a number of universities and experts should be involved. The financing might be a challenging factor. The estimated expense is around US\$300,000 a year for two (2) years, but it may be higher depending on the work plan.
- [89] Benefits are cross-cutting, not only in terms of communications strategy. The course would build up a wider knowledge of IPPC activities and objectives. For many years the CPM and SPTA have been discussing possible liaison activities with universities, training and research centres; this would be the ideal chance to fulfil this need. This course would be designed for universities in developed and developing countries. In terms of capacity building, the course would develop synergies in terms of production of standard operating procedures, procedural manuals and e-learning modules.
- [90] Potential disadvantages include: additional costs; need for regular updating (as IPPC is a very dynamic organization); possibility of controversial interpretations by teachers.
- [91] The SPG discussed the proposal at length. New Zealand, Australia, the United States, Jamaica, Kenya, and Finland mentioned the existence of phytosanitary courses in their countries, and their past and current involvement in them. The presence of university courses related to plant health was positively received, although some SPG members pointed out difficulties in getting participants, high costs for the course, and the use of copyrighted materials. The Secretariat added that the phytosanitary portal has a number of resources, including training material that could be used as project resources.
- [92] The SPG suggested the possibility of investigating current courses and integrating them, in order to allow some sustainability and reach out to a wider number of people. The SPG concluded that before

⁶ SPG 2012/19

proceeding further on this proposal, the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) should be cataloguing phytosanitary courses currently available worldwide.

[93] The Secretariat later emphasized the need for linkage with the world of academia. A stronger link would also be beneficial in terms of selection of experts and external resources. Currently, plant protection and/or plant protection specialists are rarely mentioned in international gatherings, while most universities ignore plant health issues in their curricula. The issue is perceived to be broader than communications. The Secretariat added that the job done by OIE in terms of relations to the academic world and veterinarians can be taken as an example.

[94] The SPG:

[95] 1. *agreed* on the need to build up a relationship with universities and research centres worldwide, and decided to add this point to the Communications Strategy.

[96] 2. *recommended* establishing up priorities for the Communications work plan, to be tied with IPPC strategic objectives: food security, environmental protection, trade facilitation, capacity development. Two different sets of priority issues were: 1) subjects (branding, media campaign material, developing specific materials for donors, surveillance, Q&A / IRSS help desk, crisis strategy, danger caused by internet trade, standards (new standards - waste, containers, e-phyto, seeds, used machinery, existing ones), IAS / CBD (environment and biodiversity), forestry e-learning, academia (research), economic development); and 2) tools (a layperson brochure, improving Wikipedia and internet pages). The Secretariat noted that some of these issues are already part of the Communications Work Plan.

[97] 3. *proposed* having a goal of three (3) stories on how the IPPC contributes to food security, environmental protection and trade facilitation. Examples of the stories to be provided, which will be integrated in the Communications Work Plan, are:

- Food security: producing a brochure on poverty reduction and on the IPPC work on it.
- Environment: internet trade, forestry people e-learning, and CBD.
- Trade: sea containers, e-phyto, new pests.

[98] The Communications Work Plan will be modified in accordance with the comments and presented to the CPM. This will include three (3) concrete stories related to the three (3) strategic objectives A, B, and C as deliverables.

[99] 4. *asked* the CDC to catalogue current university IPPC-related courses according to their costs and language before taking a decision, but also *warned* on the necessity to build a relationship with academic institutions.

7.4 Article XIV update

[100] The Secretariat presented a document updating the Article XIV situation, which included a review of the current status; disappointment over the production, distribution and analysis of a questionnaire to FAO members; and the current legal interpretation by the legal staff of what type of autonomy Article XIV bodies truly have in the FAO context.

[101] The Secretariat informed the SPG that efforts had been made to provide guidance over the content and distribution of the questionnaire, but the results were not very successful. The Legal Office received forty-five (45) total responses and the overwhelming majority favoured the gaining of greater autonomy by such bodies in handling relations with international organizations, countries, and donors. The interpretation of the questionnaire results was currently under discussion concurrently in the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters (CCLM) meeting.

[102] There have been few minor steps towards increasing the autonomy of Article XIV bodies. There is a general sense that FAO leadership is not interested in going too much forward, therefore the

Secretariat does not have great expectations related to autonomy increase. The Secretariat mentioned the travel policy as an example, where greater autonomy was granted in principle, but limitations on the number of staff allowed to go on duty missions were made. The Secretariat expressed appreciation for the efforts made by NPPOs to respond to the questionnaire.

- [103] The SPG was asked to review the document, and to note that the issue of operational autonomy of FAO Article XIV bodies continues to be discussed. There was a discussion over the insufficient participation of members to the questionnaire, and this was attributed to the legal office contacting only permanent representatives, who had to answer on the basis of all Article XIV bodies rather than in reference to a specific organization. In addition, the Secretariat outlined the need to explore opportunities for autonomy such as independent channels of communication with governments, funding, and rules for observers.
- [104] The Secretariat reported that in all likelihood there will not be major changes operationally, and it is up to countries to take action. It will be up to delegations to talk to their permanent representatives to explain why plant protection is important.
- [105] The SPG:
- [106] 1. *recommended* taking a pragmatic, step-by-step approach on the subject of Article XIV , as committees are meant to solve problems and capitalize what is being granted;
- [107] 2. *expressed disappointment* over the questionnaire structure and distribution, and noted disagreement with some of the conclusions in the FAO Legal Department's paper for the CCLM⁷, i.e. that FAO members are not interested in the topic;
- [108] 3. *acknowledged* that there are some windows that can be analyzed and from which the IPPC can take advantage to get more autonomy. The Secretariat cannot really take any action, and it requires countries to act in this context.
- [109] 4. *asked* that an update be given to the CPM on continuing developments; and
- [110] 5. *requested* a summary of the answers to the fore-mentioned questionnaire for CPM.

7.5 SBDS Review

- [111] The Secretariat informed the SPG that the SBDS meeting scheduled in September 2012 did not take place. This was a missed opportunity to have a review of the IRSS. Formally, the Secretariat did not receive a letter of resignation of the current Chair of the SBDS Review. Once received, the current Vice-Chair will become the Chair.
- [112] The Secretariat noted that the five-year review has been postponed to next year, as it could not fit in the 2012 work program. The outcome of that meeting will be discussed by the SPG in October 2013.
- [113] The SPG:
- [114] 1. *noted* the Report; and
- [115] 2. *agreed* with its conclusions.

7.6 Observers in IPPC meetings

- [116] The Secretariat introduced the Rules for Observers document.⁸ The Secretariat is receiving new requests for observers, but currently there is no guidance on the matter. The Secretariat drafted this proposed new rule of procedure, and noted that highlighted paragraphs still need clarification by the Legal Office. The Secretariat highlighted the following points: the Chair of any of the IPPC bodies has

⁷ CCLM 95 12, attached

⁸ SPG 2012/06

the power to give the floor to an observer. In addition, the rules for observers in IPPC meetings could be one of the windows of Article XIV autonomy.

- [117] The SPG discussed point four (4) of the table and decided to delete the following sentence: “And the income of the organization should be made up mainly, if not exclusively, of contributions from governments.”
- [118] The SC Chair noted that SC Rule of procedure for observers currently refer to Rule VII of the Rules of procedure of the Commission. She added that, as a consequence of the above proposed changes for Rule VII, SC rules of procedure for observers would need to be reviewed at the next SC meeting and then presented to the CPM for approval.
- [119] The SPG:
- [120] 1. *reviewed* the Secretariat papers and made recommendations for presentation to CPM-8 in 2013;
- [121] 2. *decided* that the Secretariat would review the document taking into account SPG suggestions and submit it to FAO Legal Office for review. After FAO Legal Office’s review, the proposal for changes to Rule 7 (Observers) and Rule 4 (Sessions) of the Rules of procedure of the Commission would be presented to CPM-8 (2013) for approval;
- [122] 3. *recommended* that the CPM Subsidiary bodies reviews, if needed, its Rules of Procedure for observers and presents a proposal to CPM-8 (2013) for approval.

7.7 Staffing

- [123] The Secretariat introduced a document⁹ illustrating the current status of staffing, noting that this topic was intended to begin a conversation with SPG members. The Secretariat currently counts three (3) General Service staff (G) and five (5) Professional (P) staff. Other resources come from a variety of contract types, including in-kind, temporary, consultants, short-term posts. This causes problems related to sustainability and historical knowledge, which are vital for the continuity and efficient operation of the Secretariat.
- [124] The Secretariat noted that while the P and G staff members have a background in the IPPC, continuous training for new staff is necessary. The Secretariat stated that the overwhelming majority of the personnel are often employed for eleven (11) months with a mandatory one (1) month break. The concern that this paper is trying to portray is that there is no sustainability or foundation for developing loyalty over time in this policy. APO programs, in-kind support are really useful, but the sustainability of the current turnover system is questionable.
- [125] The Secretariat asked if there is an interest in developing a succession plan. Long-term project posts were mentioned as a source for change. Acknowledging the need to deal with scarcity of resources, the Secretariat underlined the need to think about staffing process sustainability and continuity of knowledge, as frequent turnover implies drawbacks in the process. The Secretariat further noted that some contracts have to be renewed even monthly, and this entails a significant amount of work that takes away from the real work of the IPPC. The question arose of whether the Secretariat has the authority to prepare a succession plan within FAO. The answer was that currently this is not the case, but shifting from funding through FAO regular program towards trust funds would help gain more operational independence.
- [126] The SPG:
- [127] 1. *noted* the current staff situation in the Secretariat, commenting that there have been improvements in the past few years. It was noted that the problem could be related to FAO general rules for personnel, and that the IPPC could try to seek another opportunity for autonomy;

⁹ SPG 2012/15

- [128] 2. *asked* the Secretariat itself to propose a succession plan for the SPG to consider;
- [129] 3. *noted* that drafting an informal plan on how to deal with staff rotation should be possible;
- [130] 4. *suggested* the preparation of orientation packages for new staff, with the support of FAO. The Secretariat stated that all relevant information for staff is shared through an internal drive, and that each team in the Secretariat is responsible to train new staff members;
- [131] 5. *acknowledged* that the staffing autonomy resulting from trust funds is much more flexible, and *noted* that the Secretariat is thinking of maximizing the its use for staffing costs (thus eliminating the problem of blank periods for temporary staff);
- [132] 6. *asked* the Secretariat to produce an informal staffing plan, and *noted* the request by the Secretariat to use trust funds for temporary staff in order to reduce difficulties resulting from frequent turnover.

8. IRSS Pest categorization / listing

- [133] The Secretariat discussed the IRSS work program, including a possible project to identify the world's top ranked regulated pests.¹⁰ The issue was discussed by the EWG on Capacity Development, and reviewed by the Bureau in June 2012. The Bureau considered that such a project would stimulate the exchange of valuable scientific information and it would be a good communication tool, but was unsure whether such a project would be placed under the IRSS activities. As a result, the Bureau proposed additional discussion at the SPG on the proposed project.
- [134] The Secretariat noted that the idea was two-fold: induce countries to meet their obligations (providing a list of pests); and make an analysis at the regional level on the most frequent regulated pests. Suggested actions that may come out of the project are listed in the "Purpose" paragraph of the document. In addition, the categorization will help focusing on defining priorities on regulated pests, favouring the effectiveness of the plant protection process.
- [135] The SPG thoroughly discussed the proposal and showed concern over the subjectivity of the matter and its political implications. In addition, the SPG discussed the need to focus on national lists and encourage countries to look at what they are doing in terms of regulated pest analysis. The Secretariat noted that RPPOs already have regional lists of top regulated pests, and this helps them to develop a joint work with the Secretariat. Some members noted that the European Union is currently revising its pest list process. The case of COSAVE was also mentioned, where emergency programs are developed.
- [136] The SPG:
- [137] 1. *noted* that creating a pest categorization which is valid globally implies a problem with prioritization of resources and activities. Some members considered that this proposal could be catalytic, as it would imply the need for several actions, including training and global prioritization;
- [138] 2. *asked* for clarification of the need for having a global pest list. Members agreed that there may be a value for regions to identify the top ten pests and develop joint actions, but there was doubt over the usefulness in building a global list in terms of impacts;
- [139] 3. *encouraged* RPPOs to pursue this topic further, and *asked* for feedback for the next SPG meeting to determine further activities to be undertaken by IRSS or some other mechanisms;
- [140] 4. *proposed* that the Bureau consider having the topic as the scientific session for CPM-9.

¹⁰ SPG 2012/12

9. Legal feasibility of International Accreditation of shipping lines by the IPPC

- [141] The Secretariat introduced the topic. This issue was discussed by the Expert Working Group (EWG) on *Minimizing Pest Movement by Sea Containers* in May 2012, during which a draft standard was developed which will be presented to the next SC for approval for member consultation. The EWG was having difficulties with how to deal with the possible accreditation of industry to carry out the majority of the cleaning of containers. As most of shipping lines are international, industry was concerned they might have to all engage all CPs for accrediting of all the depots in the world, which would consume huge resources both for industry and the NPPOs. The EWG had asked the IPPC Secretariat to seek guidance from the CPM Bureau for pursuing accreditation including the possibility of the IPPC Secretariat accrediting the shipping lines at a global level. The Bureau discussed this issue during its meeting in June 2012 and understood the huge resource pressure but was skeptical about how an international accreditation would be handled. The Bureau asked the Secretariat to consult FAO legal services to get advice on the feasibility of this type of international accreditation.
- [142] An SPG member mentioned that shipping companies had the operations in place for carrying out the cleaning of depots, but that they would need the authorization of some authority (NPPOs, IPPC ...). The issue was here whether the IPPC Secretariat could serve as an international accreditation body. It was added that a similar discussion took place a while ago on the issue of recognition of pest free areas, and it might be useful to look into what was said at that time.
- [143] The FAO Legal Office stated that the IPPC Secretariat is under the framework of FAO, whose mandate as a UN organization does not include accreditation. The Legal Office stated that under the FAO and IPPC current mandates there is no possibility for the IPPC to act as an accreditation entity. Firstly, if the IPPC Secretariat started accrediting industry, it would be charging for this activity and this might be considered as a conflict of interest by the parties to the Convention. Secondly, the wording "accreditation" is not included in the FAO and IPPC mandates. As a principle, the IPPC Secretariat should not be carrying out this activity and NPPOs should be dealing with the accreditation.
- [144] Some SPG members noted that the International Maritime Organization (IMO) is a UN body and could carry out certification or accreditation activities. However, the FAO Legal Office stated that FAO had a different mandate, and the IPPC Convention did not include any point that could justify a role in the accreditation of shipping lines. Others mentioned that if the IPPC Secretariat could coordinate this process, it may be able to generate some funding.
- [145] The SPG felt caution was needed on this issue and the advice given by FAO Legal Office should be followed. There was a suggestion to investigate the options of establishing an arrangement between the IPPC and the IMO (with the IMO carrying the international accreditation of shipping lines for the IPPC) and of having an international accreditation agency doing the work. The FAO Legal Office mentioned that the legal basis for such an arrangement between the IPPC and the IMO could be found under the Article XI of the IPPC Convention, as it reads: «2. The functions of the Commission shall be to promote the full implementation of the objectives of the Convention and, in particular, to: [...] (f) establish cooperation with other relevant international organizations on matters covered by this Convention. ». However, this would need to be further discussed with the IMO.
- [146] The IPPC Secretary mentioned Article I: Purpose and responsibility and Article XII: Secretariat of the Convention as possible legal basis for the coordination of an international accreditation mechanism by the IPPC and wondered whether the absence of fee collection by the Secretariat would solve the problem. The FAO Legal Office said it would solve one of the two problems, but the FAO mandate does not include accreditation. She also suggested the possibility of looking into a system similar to the system implemented for ISPM 15.
- [147] The SPG:

- [148] 1. *noted* the proposal and the legal advice given on the possibility of the IPPC Secretariat acting as an accrediting body, which stated that there was no provision in the Convention for the IPPC Secretariat to carry out this activity;
- [149] 2. *recommended* that FAO Legal Office investigate the possibility of the IMO or an international accreditation agency pursuing international accreditation of shipping lines on behalf of the IPPC Secretariat. The FAO Legal Office will try to gather substantive information on this topic for the next SC meeting (12-16 November 2012).

10. IPPC Liaison / Partnership Program

- [150] The Secretariat presented the SPG information regarding a proposal presented by the Secretariat during the June, 2012 Bureau for establishing an industry advisory committee with the purpose of expanding non-traditional partnerships and liaisons. In the past year the Secretariat established relations with organizations like Safe Supply of Affordable Food Everywhere, the Container Owners Association (through its participation at the EWG on Sea Containers), and the Forestry industry.
- [151] Following the Bureau's request to develop a strategy, the Secretariat asked the SPG to provide strategy suggestions.
- [152] An SPG member pointed out that partnerships must be structured, as to identify win-win options. Identifying benefits in partnering with IPPC is paramount for a successful partnership strategy.
- [153] Another SPG member discussed the necessity to think about objectives. It was suggested to start with standards that are currently being developed (sea containers, seeds, grains, etc.), and to add the scientific world in addition to the industry world. The SPG also suggested contacting RPPOs and NPPOs to seek guidance on their experience related to partnerships. Liaising with private sector is acknowledged to be a complex issue, but also a potentially productive one.
- [154] There was a suggestion to focus on partners that are involved in current projects. The SPG warned that if the IPPC goes further, there will be a need to find out what industry needs from a plant protection organization, and how much the Secretariat can commit to this effort. The SPG further noted that if there is a linkage with industry, there will be a need to be more active, enhance efforts to get results quickly, improve budgeting activities, and meet specific targets on time.
- [155] The Secretariat discussed the EWG on Sea Containers, in which the presence of OCA and IMO was very useful for the discussions which will serve to provide mutual understanding of each others' positions, and to raise awareness on the standard drafting process. The SPG stressed the need to take into account the needs of industry, and reiterated that targeting specific standards would be helpful. It also suggested that partnerships could be a good way to increase funding, and that for this reason it is necessary to look at benefits for both sides.
- [156] The FC Chair informed the SPG that the FC work program includes a generic document for donors and an action plan for projects. There was a suggestion to select a standard and make an action plan for approaching donors. This is not only about resource mobilization, but it also includes aspects related to communications.
- [157] The Secretary noted that when talking about donors in the FC, specific donors were discussed. He further noted that there are three (3) categories of partners, resulting out of different approaches: the ones related to a specific subject (standard setting and capacity building); donors in general (resource mobilization); and donors for strategic cooperation (which are needed to improve the reputation of the IPPC).
- [158] The SPG suggested building partnerships with universities. It noted that it would be useful if students could get credits for subjects related to IPPC and potentially intern for the Secretariat, as this could also be a source of future staff.
- [159] The SPG:

- [160] 1. *concluded* that, while resources are limited for the Secretariat, the Secretariat should pursue a partnership strategy;
- [161] 2. *noted* that a significant amount of time is needed in research for developing clear parameters for future partnerships, clearly outlining mutual benefits;
- [162] 3. *suggested* that research should be undertaken to find partners for the development of specific standards, and to build partnerships with universities.

11. e-Phyto

- [163] The Secretariat introduced the document on the Terms of Reference for a feasibility study on establishing and managing a global e-Phyto hub.¹¹
- [164] With the introduction of ISPM 12:2011 electronic certification known as e-Phyto, many countries are looking at the implementation of national e-Phyto systems. A primary objective of e-Phyto is to reduce the number of bilateral agreements that are necessary under the current phytosanitary trade framework. As a result of these considerations, a number of countries have expressed their strong preference to establish a single global e-Phyto system.
- [165] The Secretariat informed the SPG of the progress on Appendix 1 of ISPM 4 which is currently up for county consultations. Additional codes are needed for both country and commodity. There was also a suggestion to use Latin names for pests in the system. The process of putting the code into HTML is not yet complete. The Secretariat also informed SPG members about the recent e-Phyto meeting held in Paris. Significant progress was made on the system's HTML scheme and code development. Countries are currently running a code check to make sure that codes are working. The Secretariat stated that the system should be ready within the next two weeks for field testing, and minor adjustments will be needed. Feedback is expected from several regional meetings to adjust the codes, with official comments closing on 15 October 2012. The same applies for the actual communications mechanism, which is being finalized and will be tested soon.
- [166] The Secretariat also noted that in Paris that the idea of developing a global e-Phyto hub generated a high degree of positive interest. How a hub should be developed, what features should it include were also discussed. Participants agreed that a feasibility study is needed.
- [167] The Secretariat stated that an ePhyto would not be hosted in FAO, and that the Secretariat will play an oversight role. It was noted that there is a need to find someone else to manage the system and to collect fees, due to legal constraints within FAO. The Secretariat proposed the timeline for the feasibility study process: a first draft would be submitted by 28 February 2013; the document will be completed by 30 June 2013; then it would go for consideration by the SPG in October 2013; and it would be finally submitted to CPM-9 in 2014. Estimated expenses for a consultant working on the process are between US\$30,000 and US\$50,000.
- [168] The Secretariat explained that such a system would be a channel between importing and exporting countries, based on an information network system. Some countries have e-systems for ISPM 12 and have standardized the entire process. By building a centralized system, many options will be standardized, but bilateral negotiations will not disappear. The global e-Phyto system will be a sort of post-box that brings coherence and clarity for communications between countries. The Secretariat further noted that any message that would be transmitted would be totally secure, cannot be opened, and will include digital signatures. The SPG also believed that more information and data are needed on how the system would work, and discussed prioritizing the issue on the IPPC agenda.
- [169] In addition, the SPG discussed several points, including:
- the need for an alternative plan if the system fails not to have consequences for trade;

¹¹ SPG 2012/17

- providing adequate justification to provide a basis of support for NPPOs in those countries that would need to invest in hardware and software;
- consideration of compatibility with other customs systems, especially those functioning on a 24/7 basis (i.e. banking);
- prioritizing expertise over regional representation with reference to the composition of the group at this initial stage.

[170] There was a general consensus that the use of an e-cloud system as a hub for the exchange of phytosanitary certificates would be positive, especially in the event that it could be a generator of revenue for the IPPC. Nevertheless, there was also a consensus that attention should be paid to appropriate security. The Secretariat informed the SPG that there is a lack of expertise for developing such a hub, but that it could start implementing a plan soon.

[171] The SPG further discussed the Terms of Reference and *agreed* on the following: 1.4) in order to avoid difficulties at later stages, *the provision* on the “income generator” should be deleted, 3.1) asked for clarification that the Secretariat cannot be directly involved, 3.2) e-certification should not be mandatory, 3.6.b) Necessary business practices: ownership and use of data are not business practices, therefore the SPG asked for a revision of the wording, and the Secretariat should undertake a financial feasibility study.

[172] The SPG also asked where the funds for the feasibility study would come from. The Secretariat informed the SPG that a funding proposal was submitted to the European Union, but there is no feedback yet.

[173] The Secretariat highlighted that importance of the link with the custom system, and noted that the World Customs Organization (WCO) is interested in collaborating in this process. Once the system is finalized, the coding will be used by the WCO.

[174] The SPG:

[175] 1. *agreed* to proceed with the study, provided that funding is available, and to submit it to CPM for consideration in 2014;

[176] 2. *noted* the offer by the United States to provide support for the feasibility study and thanked the US for the support.

12. IPPC Information Exchange

[177] The Secretariat introduced the document on the Revision of the IPPC Information Exchange Program.¹² While going through the document, the Secretariat stressed the need to revitalize the program, as its staffing and financial resources are limited.

[178] With reference to the use of the IPP, the Secretariat pointed out its role in providing support and advice to countries when they post information, which is a quick and easy process. What is perceived as complicated is the national collection of information for the IPP, as editors are not necessarily the contact points and do not have the necessary permission to act once they return to their countries from workshops.

[179] With regard to RPPO reporting on the behalf of countries, the system is still not working. The Secretariat suggested pushing RPPOs to comply with the new provisions through the establishment of an IPP advisory group, with two people from each region, or through external input, as previous experiments of this kind did not work. The review process will be finalized by the next SPG, then go to CPM in 2014. The Secretariat will involve different stakeholders (through surveys and feedback from workshops). The Secretariat clarified that the term “stakeholders” in the text is referred to as

¹² SPG 2012/18

NPPOs, RPPOs and other stakeholders such as industry representatives, and informed that relevant mailing lists have been generated.

- [180] The SPG discussed the proposal and provided guidance on it.
- [181] The SPG discussed the idea of registration for industry representatives, with possibility of charging a subscription fee. The SPG noted that the information posted on the IPP does not belong to the Secretariat, but it is public information provided by the parties to the Convention. The SPG also expressed disappointment that developed countries comply more than developing countries.
- [182] The SPG noted the need for a study to clarify the reason for not complying with reporting obligations and to review the system. The SPG suggested asking countries directly what they think the problem is, and to consider benchmarking with other organizations, like OIE, which have strict reporting obligations. For example, a naming and shaming mechanism could make a difference. The SPG also expressed concern over the value of the advisory group, and recommended finding ways to make a real difference.
- [183] The Secretariat noted the need to be careful when dealing with countries, so as not to be seen as interfering with internal systems, and acknowledged the need for a balance between collecting information and interfering. The SPG suggested that Bureau members should be active in their respective regions, to include urging the updating of contact points. Some SPG members proposed to link up with WTO SPS Committee's flow of reporting, to let these reports come over to IPPC, and asked the Secretariat to explore this possibility during upcoming SPS Committee meetings.
- [184] The Secretariat noted that WTO notifications had appeared on the IPP in the past. Nevertheless, they were deleted, as problems arose because documents were outdated, and the Legal Office clarified that WTO notifications do not meet pest reporting obligations for the IPPC. The SPG concluded that WTO reports cannot be considered IPPC reports and vice-versa, but asked to consider the informative character of WTO reports, i.e. having a column with WTO notifications on phytosanitary issues.
- [185] The SPG further noted that the CBD uses IPPC information on its website, and agreed to request consideration of alternative means of posting, such as adding a link to the IPP.
- [186] The SPG:
- [187] 1. *fully supported* the continuation of the review that has been presented by the Secretariat. The group discussed in length how to improve responsibility for reporting obligations from contracting parties;
- [188] 2. *agreed* to continue asking for feedback, while considering benchmarking policies with other organizations.

13. Classification of CPM documents

- [189] The Secretariat introduced the paper on CPM document classification¹³ and mentioned that, during the June 2012 meeting, the Bureau asked the Secretariat to discuss further the status of explanatory documents internally and to present the issue to the SPG.
- [190] The Secretariat indicated that a small modification has been made to the table that was presented to the Bureau: the example of "explanatory documents" has been removed from the list of examples under Technical resources – Good Phytosanitary Practices – as explanatory documents are made available to the SC which may comment in the reviewing process and they do not really follow the clearance process that is described in the table under Technical resources – Good Phytosanitary Practices.
- [191] The SPG felt there was a need to clarify the meaning of "noted" as the table presented to the Bureau states that Good Phytosanitary Practices "will be reviewed and noted by the relevant subsidiary body (ies)". It was indicated that explanatory documents are developed by an author, that the SC can

¹³ SPG 2012/07

comment on the explanatory documents, but does approve them, and that explanatory documents are the responsibility of the author, not of the IPPC. Some members indicated that “noted” did not seem to imply a formal approval, but implied a certain level of recognition.

- [192] An SPG member noted that not all explanatory documents could be good phytosanitary practices.
- [193] The Secretariat clarified that the term “noted” did not mean formally adopted, nor approved, nor endorsed (which are the terms in use for formal CPM documents). The FAO Legal Office provided further clarification supporting the Secretariat’s use of language, since the meaning of ‘noted’ is only to notice or observe with care, not implying adoption, endorsement or approval. It was mentioned that once Good Phytosanitary Practices have been reviewed and noted by the relevant subsidiary body (ies), they can be published in the Phytosanitary Resources Page. It was also mentioned as an example that the CPM adopts ISPMs and then notes the following year that ISPMs have been reviewed by the Language Review Groups.
- [194] The SC Chair suggested that the SC discuss the issue of explanatory documents at its next meeting in November, as it has not yet been discussed.
- [195] The SPG:
- [196] 1. *noted* the document;
- [197] 2. *asked* the SC to discuss the issue of “explanatory documents” i.e. to consider the need for “explanatory documents”, if they should be listed in the table and where, without altering the current section on technical resources;
- [198] 3. *asked* that the SC Chair considers mentioning the SC discussion in her report to the CPM-8 (2012).

14. Other business

14.1 WTO/SPS Committee Proposals for International Standard Setting Bodies

- [199] The Secretariat introduced the World Trade Organization’s Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures’ (WTO/SPS) Proposals for International Standard Setting Bodies, including a paper by the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) for the next meeting of the SPS Committee, which proposes that the WTO/SPS Committee Chair routinely invite the “Three sisters” (the IPPC, OIE and Codex) to comment, as appropriate, on the bilateral trade concerns placed on the Committee agenda by members.¹⁴
- [200] The SPG is invited to discuss this proposal, and earlier proposals presented during the June WTO/SPS Committee meeting and provide advice to the Bureau and CPM on the issue.
- [201] The OIE paper proposes a more active role of the three Secretariats in the context of WTO/SPS committee meetings (i.e. for issues between members).
- [202] The SPG expressed concern over the proposal, and emphasized that the Secretariat’s role is not that of interpreting standards. It must be clear that explanatory documents are produced by individuals, while commenting on bilateral trade concerns might cause harm for the Secretariat.
- [203] The SPG suggested the Secretariat to ask for clarifications on the current proposal. If it is meant to solve trade disputes at an early stage, this could be useful, and also an opportunity for increasing the Convention’s visibility. If we can find out more on how this would work in terms of information on the spot or more time given to Secretariat to respond to this issue.
- [204] The SPG further noted that the IPPC has its own dispute settlement body, which has not been very active, and this could be a good opportunity to start working.

¹⁴ SPG 2012/05

- [205] The SPG then proposed that the SBDS be the place to ask for recommendations on standards, but only on specific disputes asked for by countries. It was agreed that official interpretation of standards can only be given by the CPM, as the body which adopts them. The Secretariat can only provide standards interpretation subject to CPM approval.
- [206] The SPG agreed that the resource issue should be considered, in terms of resources that can be dedicated to accomplishing the new role.
- [207] The document was presented to the SPG. After a lengthy discussion, many members expressed their concerns that the IPPC should be very cautious on how it approaches this matter.
- [208] The SPG:
- [209] 1. *asked* the Secretary to approach the SPS and seek further clarification of the scope of the proposal and how it is supposed to work. The Secretariat should intervene in this process at the meeting or later through consultations. The OIE will be requested to provide feedback on how it came up to this decision and Codex will be approached to have their position on the matter.
- [210] 2. *further advised* to make use of the IPPC own dispute settlement mechanism.

14.2 SPG Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure.

- [211] The Secretariat introduced the document on the Terms of reference for the SPG and Rules of Procedure.¹⁵ The SPG was asked to revisit, review and discuss whether these Rules of Procedure are appropriate.
- [212] The SPG:
- [213] 1. *reviewed* the document and generally *agreed* that it only needs minor modifications, including the removal of references to technical assistance as well as some aspects related to finances;
- [214] 2. *noted* that the document should have an emphasis on strategic planning.
- [215] The Secretariat *requested* the SPG's assistance in revising and editing the document for adoption at CPM-8.

15. Next meeting

- [216] The next meeting is scheduled for the second week of October 2013 in Rome, subject to a check of the WTO/ SPS committee meeting and the NAPPO annual meeting dates.

¹⁵ SPG 2012/13

Appendix 1 – Agenda**Commission on Phytosanitary Measures****Strategic Planning Group (SPG) Meeting**

09-11 October 2012

FAO, Rome, Italy

(Start time: 09:00)

AGENDA

Agenda item	Document No.	Presenter
1. Opening of the meeting		Yokoi
2. Adoption of the agenda	SPG 2012/01	Yokoi
3. Housekeeping		
3.1 Documents list	SPG 2012/03	Fedchock
3.2 Participants list	SPG 2012/04	Fedchock
3.3 Local information	https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110798&frompage=1110514&tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=2184224&type=publication&L=0	Fedchock
4. Selection of a Rapporteur		SPG
5. Bureau Update		Ashby
6. Secretariat's Report	SPG 2012/14	Yokoi
6.1 Engaging in the standard setting process	SPG 2012/10	Germain
7. Governance		
7.1 FG Responsible for Drafting Rules of Procedure for the nomination, selection and rotation of the CPM Chairperson and vice chair-persons		
7.1.1 Changes to the CPM RoP	https://www.ippc.int/file_uploaded/1348156504_2012_-_Report_of_the_Focus_Group.pdf	Thomson
7.2 IPPC Finance Committee	SPG 2012/11	Yim/Yokoi
7.3 Communication Strategy	SPG 2012/02 SPG 2012/19	Nowell/Montuori Lopian
7.3.1 Communication Work Plan	SPG 2012/16	Nowell
7.4 Article XIV Update	SPG 2012/09	Fedchock
7.5 SBDS Review	<i>Oral Presentation</i>	Nowell
7.6 Observers in IPPC meetings	SPG 2012/06	Peralta
7.7 Staffing issues	SPG 2012/15	Fedchock

Agenda item	Document No.	Presenter
8. IRSS Pest categorization / listing	SPG 2012/12	Peralta/Sosa
9. Legal Feasibility of International Accreditation by the IPPC	Oral Report	Pardo/Germain
10. IPPC Partnership Policy	SPG 2012/08	Fedchock
11. ePhyto	SPG 2012/17	Nowell
12. IPPC Information Exchange	SPG 2012/18	Nowell
13. Classification of Documents	SPG 2012/07	Germain/Peralta
14. Other business		
14.1 SPS Committee Proposals for International Standard Setting Bodies 14.2 SPG Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure	SPG 2012/05 SPG 2012/13	
15. Next meeting		

Appendix 2 – Documents List**Commission on Phytosanitary Measures****Strategic Planning Group (SPG) Meeting****DOCUMENTS LIST**

DOCUMENT NUMBER	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED
SPG 2012/XX			
--	3.3	Local Information	11-05-2012
--	7.1.1	Report of the Focus Group on CPM RoP	20-09-2012
01	2	Provisional agenda (<i>updated regularly</i>)	07-10-2012
02	7.3	Communication Strategy	25-09-2012
03	3.1	Documents list (<i>updated regularly</i>)	07-10-2012
04	3.2	Participants List	06-10-2012
05	14.1	SPS Committee Proposals for International Standard Setting Bodies	04-10-2012
06	7.6	Talking points on Rule VII - Observers of the CPM - Rules of Procedure	07-10-2012
07	13	Classification of CPM Documents	07-10-2012
08	10	Liaison Cooperation Partnership Programme	07-10-2012
09	7.4	Update on FAO Article XIV	07-10-2012
10	6.1	Engaging in the standard setting process	07-10-2012
11	7.2	Financial Report	07-10-2012
12	8	IRSS Pest categorization / listing	07-10-2012
13	14.2	SPG Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure	07-10-2012
14	6	Secretariat's Report	07-10-2012
15	7.7	Staffing issues	07-10-2012
16	7.3.1	Communication Work Plan	
17	11	Feasibility Study on Managing a E-Phyto Hub	08-10-2012
18	12	IPPC Information Exchange	08-10-2012
19	7.3	Communication Strategy	09-10-2012

Appendix 3 - Participants List**Commission on Phytosanitary Measures****STRATEGIC PLANNING GROUP (SPG) MEETING****LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

(Rome, 9-11 October 2012)

A (√) indicates attendance at the meeting

	Role	Name, address, telephone	Email address	FAO region/Country
√	Member	Mr. Mohammad KATBEH BADER Director of Phytosanitary Department Ministry of Agriculture P.O. Box 11732 Area code 662 Amman Tel: (+962) 6 568 6151/795 895 691 Fax: (+962) 6 568 6310	katbehbader@moa.gov.jo	Near East/ Jordan
√	Member	Mr. Steve ASHBY Food and Environment Research Agency, DEFRA, Plant Health Policy Programme Fera, Sand Hutton York - YO41 1LZ Tel: (+44) 0 1904 465633	steve.ashby@Fera.gsi.gov.uk	Europe/ United Kingdom
√	Member	Mr. John GREIFER Assistant Deputy Administrator Plant Protection and Quarantine Animal Plant Health Inspection Service U.S. Department of Agriculture RM 1128 South Building, USDA 1400 Independence Ave. Washington, DC 20250 Tel.: (+1) 202 799-7159 Fax: (+1) 202 690-0472	john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov	North America/ USA
√	Member	M Lucien Konan KOUAME' Direction de la protection des végétaux, du contrôle et de la qualité - Ministère de l'agriculture B.P. V. 94 (Immeuble Caisse de Stabilisation) Abidjan Tel: (+225) 07903754 Fax: (+225) 20 212032	lucien.kouame@aviso.ci	Africa/Côte d'Ivoire
√		Ms. Kyu-Ock YIM Export Management Division Department of Plant Quarantine Animal, Plant and Fisheries Quarantine and Inspection Agency MIFFAF 433-1 Anyang- 6 dong Manan-gu, Anyang City (430-016) Gyunggi-do Tel: (+82) 31 420-7665 Fax: (+82) 31 420-7605	koyim@korea.kr	Asia/ Republic of Korea

	Role	Name, address, telephone	Email address	FAO region/Country
√	Chair Person	Mr. Francisco GUTIERREZ Director of Plant Health Plant Health Department Belize Agricultural Health Authority Central Farm, Cayo District Tel: (+501) 824-4899 Mobile: (+501) 604-0319 Fax: (+501) 824-3773	frankpest@yahoo.com	Latin America and Caribbean/ Belize
√	Member	Dr. Vanessa FINDLAY Australian Chief Plant Protection Officer Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 Tel: (+61) 2 6272 5936 Fax: (+61) 2 6272 3567	vanessa.findlay@daff.gov.au	Southwest Pacific/ Australia
√	Member	Dr. Colin GRANT First Assistant Secretary Plant Division Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 Tel: (+61) 2 6272 3937	colin.grant@daff.gov.au	Southwest Pacific/ Australia
√	Member	Mr. Abu HANIF MIAH Director Plant Protection Wing Department of Agricultural Extension Khamarbari, Dhaka-1215. Tel: (+88) 02 9131295 Mobile : (+88) 01819252139	dppw@dae.gov.bd	Asia/ Bangladesh
	Member	Mr. Francis TSATSIA NPPO Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock P.O. Box G13, Honiara Tel: (+677) 28926 Fax: (+677) 28365	ftsatsia@yahoo.com	Southwest Pacific/ Solomon Islands
√	Member	Mr Johnny MASANGWA Senior Agricultural Research Scientist Chitala Agricultural Research Station Private Bag 315 Salima Tel: (+265) 0111902 343 Mobile: (+265) 0999 486 443	masangwajohnny@gmail.com	Africa/ Malawi
√		Mr. Ralf LOPIAN Senior Advisor International Affairs Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry of Finland Department of Food and Health Mariankatu 23 Helsinki FI-00023 Tel.: (+358) 295 16 2329 GSM: (+358) 405965698 Fax: (+358) 916052443	ralf.lopian@mmm.fi	Europe/ Finland

	Role	Name, address, telephone	Email address	FAO region/Country
√	Member	Ms. Do-Nam KIM Animal, Plant and Fisheries Quarantine and Inspection Agency Jungbu Regional Office Tel: (+83) 327228265	dongam75@korea.kr	Asia/ Rep.Korea
√	Member	Mr. Hoang TRUNG Deputy Director General Plant Protection Department, MARD 149 Ho Dac Di, Dong Da, Hanoi Tel: (+84) 435334813 Fax: (+84) 35330043	hoangtrungppd@fpt.vn	Asia/ Vietnam
	Member	Mr. Radjendre DEBIE Coordinator Plant Protection and Quality Control Division Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries Paramaribo Tel: (+597) 479112	radebie@hotmail.com	Latin America and Caribbean/ Suriname
√	Member	Ms. Shelia HARVEY Chief Plant Quarantine/Produce Inspector Plant Quarantine/Produce Inspection Branch Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries 193 Old Hope Rd. Hope Gardens Kingston tel: (+1) 876 977 0637 Mobile: (+1) 876 891 8191 Fax: (+1) 876 977 6992	syharvey@moa.gov.jm	Latin America and Caribbean/ Jamaica
√	Member	Mr. Corné A.M. VAN ALPHEN Coordinating Policy Officer Plant Health Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation Directorate-General for Agro Plant Supply Chain and Food Quality Department Tel: (+31) 703785552 Mobile: (+31) 618596867	c.a.m.vanalphen@mineleni.nl	Europe/ Netherlands
√	Member	Mr Peter THOMSON Director - Plants, Food & Environment, Ministry for Primary Industries 25 The Terrace, Pastoral House PO Box 2526, Wellington Tel: (+64) 4 894 0353 Mobile: (+64) 29 894 0353	peter.thomson@mpi.govt.nz	South West Pacific/ New Zealand
	Member	Mr. Ediamine BEDJA Coordinateur du Projet Chaines des Valeurs Mohéli Ministere de la production, de l'environnement, de l'energie et de l'industrie BP 514 Moroni Tel: (+269) 3376494	ediamineb@yahoo.fr	Africa/ Comores

	Role	Name, address, telephone	Email address	FAO region/Country
√	Member	Ms Rebecca BECH Deputy Administrator APHIS' Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) Program US Department of Agriculture 1400 Independence Avenue SW Room 302-E Washington, DC - 20250 Tel: (+1) 202 799 7963	rebecca.a.bech@aphis.usda.gov	North America/ USA
√	Member	Mr. Diego QUIROGA Director de Protección Vegetal Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria (SENASA) Representante de la Organización de Protección Fitosanitaria Av Paseo Colón, 315 - 4 Piso Buenos Aires Tel: (+54) 11 41215176 Fax: (+54) 11 41215179	dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar	Latin America and Caribbean/Argentin ina
√	Member	Ms Jane CHARD Head of Branch - Plant Health Science and Advice for Scottish Agriculture (SASA) Roddinglaw Road, Edinburgh, EH12 9FJ, Tel: (+44) 131 244 8863 Fax: (+44) 131 244 8940	Jane.Chard@sasa.gsi.gov.uk	Europe/ United Kingdom
√	Member	Mr. John HEDLEY Principal Adviser, International Organisations International Policy, Science and Economics Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Pastoral House 25 The Terrace PO Box 2526 Wellington Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0736 Mobile: (+64) 29894 0428	john.hedley@maf.govt.nz	Southwest Pacific/ New Zealand
	Member	Mr. Ebbe NORDBO Frø og Planter Ministeriet for Fødevarer, Landbrug og Fiskeri Plantedirektoratet Skovbrynet 20, 2800 Kgs. Lyngb Tel.: (+45) 45 26 36 00 Fax (+45) 45 26 36 10	eno@pdir.dk	Europe /Denmark
√	Member	Mr Greg STUBBINGS Director, Chief Plant Health Officer Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 Tel:(613) 773-7247 Fax: (613) 773-7204	Greg.Stubbings@inspection.gc.ca	North America/ Canada

	Role	Name, address, telephone	Email address	FAO region/Country
√	Member	Mr. Masato FUKUSHIMA Director of Plant Protection Office Plant Protection Division Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku Tokyo Tel: (+81) 3 3502 5978 Fax: (+81) 3 3502 3386	masato_fukushima@nm.maff.go.jp	Asia/ Japan
√	Member	Mr Yuji KITAHARA Section Chief, Plant Protection Division, MAFF Address: 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo Tel: (+81) 3 3502 5987	Yuji_kitahara@nm.maff.go.jp	Asia/ Japan
	Member	Mr Hisashi SAKATA Director, Plant Quarantine Office, Plant Protection Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) Address: 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo Tel: (+81) 3 3502 5987	masato_fukushima@nm.maff.go.jp	Asia/ Japan
√	Member	Dr. James ONSANDO Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) P. O. Box 49592 Nairobi Tel: (+254) 020 3536171/2 Mobile: (+254) 722 516221 / 723 786779 / 734 874141	director@kephis.org	Africa/ Kenya

Appendix 4 – ToR for the FG on Drafting Rules of Procedure

Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Focus Group (FG) on Drafting Rules of Procedure (RoP) for the Nomination, Selection and Rotation of CPM Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Seventh Session
Rome, 19 - 23 March 2012
Draft Terms of Reference - Working Group Responsible for Drafting Rules of Procedure for the nomination, selection and rotation of the CPM Chairperson and vice Chair-persons
Agenda item 5.1

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

1. At its 7th session, the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-7 (2012)) recognized that there are currently no written rules for the nomination, selection and rotation of the CPM Chairperson and vice-chairpersons.
2. The CPM agreed on the need for transparent and equitable written Rules of Procedure (RoP) in the future.
3. These RoP should take into account, to the extent possible, the following:
 - Rights and obligations conferred by the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) on contracting parties in relation to facilitating delivery of Convention objectives;
 - Rules of Procedure of the CPM and FAO General Rules of the Organization for electing officers in the Bureau;
 - The relationship between the election of vice-chairpersons to the CPM Chair;
 - Previous discussions, informational papers and draft rules developed by CPM members, and any other contributions;
 - Practices of other organisations and similar bodies relevant to the IPPC and its governance arrangements.

PROCESS

4. In light of the above, a working group will undertake information collection, and analysis relevant to the election of executive positions on relevant international bodies. The working group will meet in Rome if necessary and make a report to the SPTA in October 2012.
5. This report will be reviewed by the Bureau and FAO Legal Office prior to its submission to the SPTA.
6. The SPTA will review and discuss this report, will consider the analysis and make a proposition of draft Rules of Procedure for the nomination, selection and rotation of positions of chairperson and vice-chairpersons, for consideration and adoption by CPM-8 in March, 2013.

TASKS

7. This working group will prepare a document including the following:
- identify roles and responsibilities of the chairperson and the vice-chairpersons in relation to the functioning of the Bureau, of the CPM and of IPPC activities;
 - identify competence, expertise or experience that are desirable for the chairperson and the vice-chairpersons ;
 - identify all the possible options for rotation, selection and nomination for the chairperson and the vice-chairpersons;
 - analyse the above mentioned options, and especially the pros and cons (for instance through a SWOT analysis) in regards to the following general principles :
 - transparency
 - equity, fairness and inclusiveness, especially in terms of representation between IPPC contracting parties in successive nominations
 - competency, in terms of ease to select the most valuable candidates given the role, responsibilities and competence identified under (a)
 - efficiency
 - continuity
- e) present the document to the SPG.

MEMBERSHIP

8. The working group will be represented as follows:
- one expert designated by the Africa FAO region : AAA
 - one expert designated by the Asia FAO region : BBB
 - one expert designated by the Europe FAO region : CCC
 - one expert designated by the Latin America and the Caribbean FAO region : DDD
 - one expert designated by the Near East FAO region : EEE
 - one expert designated by the North America FAO region : FFF
 - one expert designated by the Southwest Pacific region : GGG

REFERENCES

CPM2012/Inf 4
CPM2012/Inf 24
CPM Rules of Procedure – function of the Bureau of the IPPC
International Plant Protection Convention

APPENDIX 5 - Action Points**Table of Action Points – SPG October 2012**

Action	By	Timeline
<p>Secretariat's Report: Editing the Secretariat's report by changing its structure to highlight only the main points and make use of it as a public relations tool.</p>	Secretariat	Before CPM-8
<p>Engaging in the standard setting process: Sending a simple, informal, targeted questionnaire both to NPPOs and relevant experts, in order to get their analysis on the difficulties in motivating experts in the standard setting process. Finding out what the reasons might be behind the declining participation in the standard setting process and possible appropriate solutions, before presenting the issue again to the SPG.</p>	Secretariat	Between CPM meetings
<p>FG on new RoPs for the nomination, selection and rotation of CPM Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons: The preferred position of the SPG to be presented to the CPM as guidelines for adoption. Secretariat to consult with the FAO Legal Office for an appropriate title of the document.</p>	SPG members Secretariat	CPM-8 Before CPM-8
<p>Bureau RoPs: Bureau to draft its own RoPs.</p>	Bureau	TBC
<p>IPPC Finance Committee: Exploring further resource mobilization options.</p>	Secretariat	TBC
<p>Communications Strategy: Reviewing the document by adding an overview of immediate actions for the next year and present it to CPM-8.</p>	Secretariat	Before CPM-8
<p>Communications Work Plan: Cataloguing phytosanitary courses currently available worldwide before taking a decision on developing a new academic course. Integrating the Communications Work Plan with the comments presented at the SPG and presenting it to CPM-8.</p>	CDC Secretariat	TBC Before CPM-8
<p>Article XIV update: Update to be given to CPM-8 on continuing developments, including a summary of the answers to the questionnaire to FAO members for CPM.</p>	Secretariat	CPM-8
<p>SBDS Review: Secretariat to present the outcome of the next meeting at SPG in 2013.</p>	Secretariat	SPG 2013
<p>Observers in IPPC meetings: Reviewing the document including SPG recommendations for presentation to CPM-8. Secretariat to review the document taking into account SPG suggestions and to submit it to FAO Legal Office for review.</p>	Secretariat Secretariat	CPM-8 Before CPM-8

<p>After FAO Legal Office's review, the proposal for changes to Rule 7 (Observers) and Rule 4 (Sessions) of the Rules of procedure of the Commission would be presented to CPM-8 (2013) for approval.</p> <p>CPM Subsidiary bodies to review, if needed, its Rules of Procedure for observers and present a proposal to CPM-8 for approval.</p>	CPM Subsidiary bodies	CPM-8
<p>SBDS Review: Secretariat to produce an informal staffing plan.</p>	Secretariat	TBC
<p>IRSS Pest categorization / listing Clarification of the need for having a global pest list. RPPOs to pursue this topic further, and feedback to be given to the next SPG meeting to determine further activities to be undertaken by IRSS or some other mechanisms.</p> <p>Bureau to consider having the topic as the scientific session for CPM-9.</p>	Bureau and RPPOs Bureau	SPG 2013 Bureau 2013
<p>Legal feasibility of International Accreditation of shipping lines by IPPC: Legal Office to send a note on the possibility of the IMO or an international accreditation agency pursuing international accreditation of shipping lines on behalf of the IPPC Secretariat.</p>	FAO Legal Office	SC Nov. 2012
<p>IPPC Liaison / Partnership Program: Secretariat to pursue a partnership strategy, with specific research to be undertaken to find partners for the development of specific standards, and to build partnerships with universities.</p>	Secretariat	TBC
<p>e-Phyto: To proceed with the study, provided that funding is available, and to submit it to CPM for consideration in 2014.</p>	Secretariat, with support from the USA	Before CPM-9
<p>IPPC Information Exchange: Secretariat to continue the review by asking for feedback by contracting parties, while considering benchmarking policies with other organizations.</p>	Secretariat	TBC
<p>Classification of CPM documents: The SC to discuss the issue of "explanatory documents" i.e. to consider the need for "explanatory documents", if they should be listed in the table and where, without altering the current section on technical resources.</p> <p>The SC Chair to consider mentioning the SC discussion in her report to the CPM-8.</p>	SC SC Chair	SC 2012 CPM-8
<p>SPS Committee Proposals for International Standard Setting Bodies: Secretary to approach the SPS and seek further clarification of the scope of the proposal and how it is supposed to work. The OIE will be requested feedback on how it came up to this decision and Codex will be approached to have their position on the matter.</p>	IPPC Secretary Secretariat	TBC TBC
<p>SPG ToR and RoPs Revise the document, with an emphasis on strategic planning.</p>	Secretariat, with assistance by SPG	Before CPM-8

