



REPORT OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING OF THE CPM INFORMAL WORKING GROUP ON STRATEGIC PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

6-9 OCTOBER 2009

I. Opening of the Meeting

1. The Secretary of the IPPC opened the meeting by welcoming participants. He briefly discussed progress that had been made in the IPPC and in FAO over the past year. He noted that the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) has a unique function in the IPPC and that the meeting had a full agenda. The Secretary noted that the full time Secretary had been selected and would be starting with the IPPC within a few months.

II. Selection of Chair and Rapporteur

2. The Chairperson of the CPM welcomed the participants. She noted that the Chairperson of the SPTA is usually selected from the Bureau and noted that the Bureau had selected Mr. Kedera (Kenya) as Chairperson of the SPTA. She also noted that Mr. Greifer (USA) agreed to serve as Rapporteur.

3. The Chairperson of the SPTA outlined the logistical arrangements for the meeting. The SPTA reviewed the agenda¹ and list of documents and adopted the agenda as presented. Appendix 2 provides a list of participants.

III. Secretariat Report

4. The Secretary of the IPPC briefly presented the work that has been completed by the Secretariat in the past year². He noted the accomplishments made under the seven goals of the IPPC including standard setting, information exchange, dispute settlement, technical assistance and capacity building, sustainable implementation of the IPPC and international promotion of the IPPC.

5. The Secretary also informed the SPTA of the status of staffing in the Secretariat, noting that various positions were in different stages of being filled. A few participants expressed concerns that positions not filled in a timely manner and stressed the importance of filling Secretariat positions more promptly. One participant pointed out that the insufficient staffing in the Secretariat has additional effects on the availability of funding for IPPC activities at the national level.

6. The SPTA was informed that the Secretariat was expecting to receive one request for assistance in resolving a phytosanitary dispute.

7. The Secretariat provided an update on the development of an on-line system for compiling member comments on draft ISPMs and noted that a tender for a contract to develop this new system was imminent. The contract is expected to be awarded by the end of November.

¹ SPTA 2009/01rev.5; SPTA 2009/02ver.2

² SPTA 2009/03

8. The SPTA noted the report of the Secretariat.

9. The SPTA was informed that, at the request of the Bureau, the Secretariat conducted a survey of regional workshop participants to assess whether regional workshops on draft standards resulted in countries submitting more comments during the member consultation process. The Secretariat presented the results³, noting that less than half of the survey respondents indicated that they had submitted comments on draft ISPMs last year. However, the survey indicated that participants benefited in other ways, including feeling more confident in the standard setting process and having a better understanding regarding the implementation of ISPMs. The SPTA noted the results of the survey. The Secretariat asked for volunteers to improve and revise the survey; a few participants made suggestions for improvements to the survey. The SPTA noted that conducting such surveys in workshops would be a valuable monitoring and validation tool. Mr. Hedley (New Zealand), Mr. Ashby (United Kingdom), Ms. Bech (USA), and Ms. Yim (Rep. Korea) volunteered to assist with the survey and consider ways in which the results could be used to improve future regional workshops. The SPTA also noted that means other than such an extensive survey could be used to evaluate the effectiveness of meetings. Other IPPC meetings should also have an evaluation mechanism.

10. While discussing the survey and regional workshops, one participant asked if regional workshops could be conducted online to reach more participants and to facilitate transparency. The Secretariat agreed to explore options for conducting regional workshops online.

IV. Bureau Update

11. The Chairperson of the CPM presented the report of the June meeting of the Bureau, noting that it is available on the IPP (<http://www.ippc.int>). She informed the SPTA of various decisions and actions taken by the Bureau during the meeting in June. She highlighted aspects of the Bureau meeting that would not otherwise be discussed at the SPTA.

12. At the request of the Standards Committee, the Bureau had considered whether authors of Diagnostic Protocols could be paid honoraria. The Bureau did not recommend payment of honoraria because of the number of experts involved, the number of diagnostic protocols under development and the potential for other contributing experts to the IPPC programme to request similar honoraria.

13. The Chairperson of the CPM reviewed the work done by the IPPC relative to the budget and noted that activities had been adjusted according to available resources. The Bureau had considered priorities for work identified by the CPM and had made the following suggestions for resources at the June meeting:

a. Staff resources

- One person to be hired for standard setting (administrative aspects)
- One person to be hired for the IRSS
- One consultant for standard setting to ensure that an additional working group takes place to develop another draft standard, that would have been planned to take place in December 2009 or very early in 2010

³ SPTA 2009/22

- One consultant hired to further development (through the tender process) of the online comment system, and further development of the PCE tool

b. Non staff resources for:

- an additional expert working group
- additional development of online comment system and the PCE tool
- three capacity building networking workshops

14. The Chairperson noted that the Bureau had presented its Terms of Reference (TORs) and Rules of Procedure (ROPs) to CPM-4 for adoption. CPM-4 suggested changes to these TORs and ROPs and referred them back to the Bureau for further development. The Bureau had agreed that it should be allowed to work for a year under the current draft TORs and ROPs before putting them forward to the CPM again.

15. The Bureau had also discussed the workshop for the international movement of grain. No extra-budgetary funds have been made available yet. The Bureau discussed the possibility of finding a partner through FAO to develop a guide using existing applicable ISPMs which may assist in the preparation of the workshop or assist in the preparation of an ISPM for grain movement.

16. The Bureau had discussed the length and schedule of CPM-5. It had decided that the CPM meeting would start at 2 pm on Monday. Evening sessions would take place only on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday for a total of 12 interpretation sessions.

17. The Bureau had also provided guidance on the use of the terms “a few members” or “some members” in the CPM report. The Bureau had agreed that one member means one member, a “few” means between 2-4 members and “some” means more than four members.

18. The Bureau had discussed that the CPM requested the development of lists of experts that could be called upon by the SPS Committee in the case of a phytosanitary trade dispute. The Bureau decided that there are too many issues involved with developing generic lists of experts and that every dispute would require unique consideration. The Bureau recommended instead that each request for experts should be addressed on an *ad hoc* basis.

19. The Bureau had discussed the role of observers at the CPM in the context of conserving CPM meeting costs and resources. The Bureau suggested that observer organizations with whom the IPPC has a joint work programme should be able to give verbal reports in the CPM, but other organizations are encouraged to provide their written reports or in side events rather than during plenary.

20. The Bureau had discussed the role of regional standards and their status under the IPPC. The Bureau had asked the Secretariat to consult with the FAO Legal Service to clarify the legal status of regional standards since the Convention states that regional standards can be deposited with FAO. The advice from the Legal Service indicated that, as it appears in the Convention text, deposit means to submit for consideration as international standards and other than that, regional standards do not have an official status within the IPPC.

21. The Chairperson of the CPM noted that members of the Bureau had participated in a variety of international meetings, as well as IPPC workshops and the Standards Committee.

22. The SPTA noted the report of the Bureau.

V. Budget

23. The Bureau wished to simplify the presentation of the Operational plan and the financial reports covering regular programme funding and trust funds. It asked the Secretariat to try to present this information in a clearer manner to the SPTA and consider how to present less detailed information at the CPM. The Secretariat prepared these reports as an excel spreadsheet that presented consolidated revenues available to the Secretariat. Instead of the former Operational plan, activities were transferred into a single spread sheet that matched the strategic areas from the Business plan. Additional work sheets were added to provide the details on specific sources of revenue and their related expenditure.

24. The SPTA reviewed both the 2009 Financial report (including a partial budget for the remainder of 2009) and the 2010 Operational Plan and Budget and made further suggestions. It noted that this format was an improvement, presented a clearer picture and saved the Secretariat time. It was agreed that the Secretariat report⁴ to CPM would provide the details on all planned activities that were delivered and that this information would not have to be repeated in the financial report. It was also suggested that the budgeted amount (as presented to CPM) originally allocated as a total against each goal should be displayed in a separate column for reference purposes.

25. Starting with the 2010 Financial report, it was agreed that only the overview of revenues from all sources and expenditures would be presented at the CPM along with the estimated total expenditures for the 7 goals (with goal 5 reporting on the CPM costs separately), and a break down of staff costs into regular and temporary posts. In addition, the SPTA requested some commentary on specific allocations be added to each goal. As required by the financial rules for the Trust Fund for the IPPC, details on the revenues and proposed expenditure for this fund would be presented to the CPM for their approval.

26. Starting with the 2010 Operational Plan and Budget, it was agreed that the presentation and format would be the same as for the Financial Report with the addition of the description of planned activities (without detailed costs) which would also be presented to the CPM.

27. The 2009 Financial Report was presented. The Secretariat provided some changes to the information presented and explained that most of these changes to revenues were due to the refinement of the figures and some additional late incoming receipt of donations to the Trust Fund for the IPPC. The SPTA welcomed the overview of staffing. The Financial report showed that allocations to any activities not certain to take place in 2009 had been dropped. The SPTA discussed how best to use the remaining unallocated resources (an estimated \$500,000) and agreed to the following list of activities that could be completed this year or initiated this year and completed next year using funds transferred through letters of agreements.

- Regional workshop for the review of draft ISPMs: Caribbean, Latin America, Russian speaking countries and the Pacific
- Initial meeting of the NEPPO this December
- Review of ISPMs in Arabic and Spanish

⁴ SPTA 2009/03

- Two TPs and two EWG
- Web content writer to populate the new IPP
- Capacity building working group to develop an implementation framework and work plans using a logical framework approach.
- Staff development - implementation of monitoring and evaluation of the Building National Phytosanitary Capacity (BNPC) implementation framework.

28. The 2010 Operational plan and Budget was presented. There was an extensive discussion as to whether the proposed budget should be within projected funding or exceed the projected funding while recognizing that additional funds could be made available. After some discussion, the SPTA agreed to propose a budget that exceeded the projected funding. The SPTA noted that the budget would be adjusted to reflect activities that would be carried out in 2010 but be paid for from 2009 funds transferred through letters of agreement and in light of the FAO budget and the IPPC staffing situation. The SPTA reviewed the proposed activities and identified a range of potential savings including.

29. It was agreed that the 2010 Operational plan and Budget would be presented at CPM-5 with an over expenditure of approximately \$900,000. The SPTA also agreed that additional funding mechanisms should be discussed at the CPM.

VI. Business Plan

30. The SPTA discussed the revision of the Business Plan. Mr. Gutierrez (BZ) briefly discussed the process of revising the Business Plan for 2012 -2017. He indicated that he will develop a preliminary document in the next month, modifying existing components of the Business Plan, as well as adding new components. The SPTA also discussed forming a virtual working group to facilitate the process of revising the existing Business Plan. The virtual working group (Mr. Gutierrez (Belize), Mr. Ribeiro e Silva (Brazil), Mr. Greifer (USA), Mr. Hedley (New Zealand), Mr. Ashby (United Kingdom), Mr. Roberts (Australia), Mr. Kedera (Kenya), Ms. Bast-Tjeerde (Canada)) would develop the Business Plan for 2012-2017 taking into account what exactly needs to be included, what is feasible, who is the audience and what approaches might be used.

31. The Secretary noted that standard setting had been agreed as the first priority by the CPM, that capacity building was the second, and that the remaining goals in the current business plan, especially information exchange, should be reformulated as cross-cutting activities rather than goals.

VII. CPM and Preparations for CPM-5

A. Status of Recommendations

32. The SPTA discussed the topic of the legal status of CPM Recommendations⁵. The SPTA discussed the need to better record agreements and decisions by the CPM. The SPTA recommend a recording tool and noted that there may be a need to further define the difference between CPM Recommendations and standards.

33. The SPTA recommended the development of a recording mechanism or tool that could be presented to the CPM, with the idea that new Recommendations could simply be recorded with existing CPM agreements and decisions. The SPTA agreed on modified language to be included in the paper to be presented to the CPM (see Appendix 1) that defines the status and scope of Recommendations and clarifies the difference between a Recommendation and ISPMs.

B. Credentials

34. The SPTA discussed the need for credentials for the CPM⁶. Requirements for credentials are described under the General Rules of the Organization; the IPPC required credentials for the CPM under specific circumstances (e.g. for voting) as described under these rules. The SPTA debated the advantages and disadvantages of requiring credentials, noting in particular that obtaining credentials is a difficult and lengthy process for NPPOs.

35. It was suggested that credentials could be issued by the FAO Permanent Representatives for each country and that the Secretariat would collect and retain credentials as they come in. The SPTA also recommended that CPM can make its own rules of procedure regarding credentials and the Secretariat (with the assistance of the FAO Legal Office) should draft Rules of Procedure for submission to CPM-5 for possible inclusion in the CPM Rules of Procedure.

C. Topics and speakers for CPM-5 keynote address

36. The SPTA discussed options for topics and speakers for CPM-5. The SPTA noted that 2010 is the UN International Year of Biological Diversity, and therefore topics related to the IPPC and biodiversity would be appropriate. In accordance with what was discussed at the June Bureau meeting, one participant suggested potential speakers with expertise in forestry issues or aquatic plants. In light of the suggested topic, the Secretariat suggested that a high level representative of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) could be invited to speak, as well as the speaker on forestry issues. The SPTA agreed that the Secretariat should enquire with the Secretariat of the CBD.

D. Options for hosting the CPM outside of Rome

37. The Secretariat presented a paper on options for hosting the CPM outside of Rome⁷. The Secretariat noted that costs could be quite variable for activities such as printing or translation, depending on where the meeting could be held. The SPTA was also informed that most alternate venues require booking at least one year in advance and therefore there would not be an option to host the CPM outside of Rome in 2010. The SPTA noted the report.

⁵ SPTA 2009/11

⁶ SPTA 2009/12

⁷ SPTA 2009/13

E. Exhibitions at CPM meeting

38. The SPTA discussed options for having side events and exhibitions at the CPM meeting. The Secretariat will develop guidelines and cost estimates before CPM next year.

F. Election of new bureau

39. The Chairperson of the CPM indicated that new Bureau members would need to be elected at CPM-5. She noted that once her tenure as Chairperson was complete, she would no longer be available to serve on the Bureau. In addition, one of the current Vice-Chairs indicated he would not continue to serve after the SPTA. The Secretariat pointed out that there was also a need to appoint new members to the Standards Committee and the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement.

G. Opening address by Minister or Secretary

40. The SPTA discussed options for having the CPM meeting opened by a high level ministerial representative from a member country. Various options were suggested; one participant volunteered to communicate with the high level ministerial representative for that country and to follow up with the Secretariat at a later date.

VIII. Standards and Standard setting

A. Standard setting work programme

41. The Secretariat provided an overview of the existing IPPC Standard Setting Work Programme⁸, informing the SPTA on the latest status of the various topics. It is difficult to precisely predict the number of standards that will be adopted each year. The Secretariat provided the following estimate of the potential number of standards that will be going forward for adoption by the CPM over the next few years:

- a. 2010 (CPM-5): two new ISPMs, one diagnostic protocol, 14 treatments, modifications to eight ISPMs for consistency and amendments to the glossary.
- b. 2011 (CPM-6): one new ISPMs, two revised ISPMs, two diagnostic protocols, 1 treatment, modifications to several other ISPMs for consistency and amendments to the glossary.
- c. 2012 (CPM-7): five new ISPMs, three annexes to existing ISPMs, possibly some treatments for ISPM No. 15, modifications to several ISPMs for consistency and amendments to the glossary.

42. There are many factors that come into play when predicting the number of standards that will be adopted by each CPM and these factors could allow for more or fewer standards being adopted. The Standards Committee (SC) is now transiting into the extended time schedule for the development of additional ISPMs, which will normally mean a year for the development process but it is hoped that the extra time will allow more time for stewards to fully respond to member comments and also allow the full SC to study the SC-7 versions in more detail and seek technical input.

⁸ SPTA 2009/24

43. Although the IPPC Standard Setting Work Programme seems very large, given the time needed for the development of ISPMs it is important to continuously add topics to the work programme in order for future work on standards to continue.

B. New topics for ISPMs

44. The Secretariat presented proposals for new topics for the SPTA to consider⁹. It was noted that the SPTA provides strategic direction for the Standards Committee to consider when reviewing the IPPC standard setting work programme. After considering options, the SPTA stated the following strategic priorities should be considered:

- Attempt to cover all high risk pathways
- Develop treatments for commodity groups that are broadly applicable and useable
- Endeavor to ensure that topics (especially for treatments) are added considering the long term needs
- The Standards Committee should give high consideration to the revision of at least one previously adopted standard each year to ensure continuous and timely updating.
- The Standards Committee should not add topics that are already generally covered by other topics on the work programme (or adopted ISPMs).

C. Prioritization of the IPPC standard setting work programme

45. Mr. Ashby (UK) discussed results of the prioritization exercise requested by CPM-4 using specific criteria and noted that the priority of several topics changed depending on what criteria was applied¹⁰. The SPTA analyzed the results. After much discussion it was decided the main goal of the exercise was to reduce the number of high priority topics. As a result the SPTA recommended the SC change the following two topics on the work programme from high to normal: Pre-clearance for regulated articles and Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities.

D. Presentation of Diagnostic Protocols in English

46. The Chairperson of the CPM reported that the Bureau discussed in June the issue of sending Diagnostic Protocols only in English language during member consultation, noting that Diagnostic Protocols would be translated after adoption to save on costs. Bureau members agreed in June 2009 to consult within their regions whether this approach would be acceptable. All regions, except the Latin American and Caribbean region, had agreement from their constituency. Some participants of the SPTA agreed to clarify this matter within their region before the next meeting of the Standards Committee in November 2009, and to provide an answer to the Standards Committee.

E. ISPM No. 15 registration of symbol and legal review

47. The Secretariat introduced the topic of the registration of the ISPM No. 15 symbol in countries¹¹. The Secretariat provided an overview of some of the challenges associated with protecting the symbol on a country by country basis, including high costs associated with registration. Some

⁹ SPTA 2009/16rev.1

¹⁰ SPTA 2009/15

¹¹ SPTA 2009/17

countries have included the symbol in their regulations as a means of protecting the symbol at the national level. The Secretariat noted that efforts have been underway to hire a legal consultant to develop alternate strategies and options to registering the ISPM No. 15 symbol and that one member country has offered to help identify a consultant who will help determine alternate options to the existing registration process of the ISPM No. 15 symbol.

F. Other activities

48. The Secretariat informed the SPTA that the FAO Forestry Department is developing a guide for foresters on the use of ISPMs¹². The document, “Guide to the implementation of good forest health practices in support of international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs)” is being developed in cooperation with phytosanitary experts. The Secretariat will endeavor to update the CPM, the Standards Committee, the SPTA and other relevant bodies on the ongoing progress in the development of this guide and members will be invited to provide comments to the FAO Forestry department during the consultation phase.

IX. Information Management

A. New IPPC Website

49. The Secretariat introduced the new website that is nearing finalization. The SPTA was informed that the website will undergo further testing, and that new content and functionality was being added at the same time. The Secretariat noted that the existing IPP has had several problems related to accessibility and stability and that the new website would be faster and simpler to access and use. It was also noted that the new website would integrate information across different languages more efficiently. The SPTA expressed its concern that the website be made available in a timely manner but noted the improved functionality. The Secretariat noted its intention to release the website well before the end of 2009. The SPTA noted the likely need to provide updated training to IPP editors to support and operate the new website.

B. Electronic Phytosanitary Certification

50. The Secretariat discussed the issue of electronic phytosanitary certification. The SPTA was informed that the Secretariat attended a meeting on electronic certification in Ottawa, Canada in May, 2009. It was noted that electronic certification refers only to the issuance of phytosanitary certificates through electronic means, and does not include other aspects of certification in general (e.g. electronic transmittal of field data, general phytosanitary information management, etc.).

51. Maintaining security and confidentiality of electronic information is a major priority. It was also noted that electronic certificates are less flexible in terms of the information that can be transmitted, compared to traditional paper certificates. There is substantial work that is necessary before all standardized and agreed protocols could be utilized on a global scale. In addition, there is no intention, nor possibility, that the current paper phytosanitary system will be replaced in the foreseeable future.

¹² SPTA 2009/23

C. EPPO Survey on Pest Reporting

52. Mr. Ashby (UK) introduced the topic of the EPPO survey on pest reporting. He informed the SPTA that EPPO conducted a survey of its members to assess whether they were reporting pests, how they were reporting, and reasons why they were reporting or not. He informed the SPTA that the results indicate that many countries are not using the IPP for pest reporting, while some countries prefer to use EPPO as their regional organization for pest reporting.

53. He indicated that suggestions for improving pest reporting included creating templates and providing training on the IPP. It was suggested that this topic could be addressed by the Technical Consultation among RPPOs with the possibility of an enhanced role for RPPOs in the global pest reporting system and that the TC could raise the issue in the CPM. It was also suggested that other organizations (e.g. OIE) with experience in reporting could provide useful guidance on pest reporting.

54. The Secretariat noted that the improved website should allow countries to more easily undertake pest reporting and there will be an on-line training module that should facilitate this process.

55. The Secretariat noted that discussions are ongoing with RPPOs with regard to pest reporting through RPPOs on behalf of countries. With the release of the new IPP, the Secretariat will be in a position to activate this system but indications are there could be some delay due to necessary technology adjustments needed by the reporting RPPOs.

X. Capacity Building Strategy

A. Revised Capacity Building Strategy and Operational Plan

56. The Secretariat introduced the revised capacity building strategy and operational plan¹³. Mr. Roberts (AU) noted that comments provided after CPM-4 were incorporated into the appendixes of the paper for CPM-4 (CPM 2009/13/Rev.1). The SPTA noted the revised document. The Secretariat discussed plans and objectives for a December workshop aimed at developing annual operational plans based on the already adopted CPM Capacity Building strategy. The Secretariat also discussed its proposal to train the Secretariat staff in monitoring and evaluating Capacity Building activities consistent with the new FAO approach related to results based management. The finalized capacity building strategy, updated operational plan and detailed implementation plans will be submitted to CPM-5 for its consideration.

B. Virtual Working Group on Advocacy and Communications

57. At its meeting in June, the Bureau suggested the formation of a virtual Working Group on Advocacy and Communications. The Secretariat informed the SPTA that potential participants for the working group have been identified and that the Secretariat will work on establishing the virtual working group as soon as possible.

XI. Other Business

58. The Chairperson of the CPM introduced the issue of the role and future of the SPTA, taking into consideration that the Bureau has been expanded to include all FAO regions. The participants agreed that the SPTA provided valuable input and ideas, and that the SPTA should continue to meet

¹³ SPTA 2009/21

as an open-ended group. It was suggested that increased representation from developing countries could be useful to ensure better balance and the Secretariat was asked to consider how this might be achieved. The SPTA stressed that it is especially important that documents are prepared and distributed in a timely manner in order to ensure that participants are able to adequately prepare for the meeting. Participants stated that the SPTA should spend more time discussing more strategic issues, [for example the IPPC to be part the global agenda] and leave administrative matters to the Bureau. Participants also agreed to send ideas for strategic directions in the near future to the Secretary to ensure continuity for when the new Secretary arrives.

59. The SPTA agreed it would also be useful to develop indicators to measure the performance of IPPC activities.

60. The SPTA discussed the potential development of Technical Manuals¹⁴. The Secretariat noted that the need for technical guidance has come from many sources such as requests for new topics for standards, support of adopted ISPMs and member comments on draft ISPMs. It was noted that the process for developing a technical manual could be considerably more flexible than that for ISPMs and at the same time provide useful guidance to countries on how to conduct certain phytosanitary activities.

61. The SPTA discussed various options for how such manuals could be developed within or outside of the IPPC. This included whether such manuals should be approved by the CPM in some way, if the manuals should be considered similar to explanatory documents for ISPMs, or if the technical manuals should be developed outside of the IPPC altogether (e.g. by FAO or another external body) with the IPPC and its technical bodies serving a liaison role. It was noted that the IPPC could solicit external bodies and extra budgetary funding to develop such manuals. It was noted that there are manuals already published within FAO and generated in capacity building projects that could be updated.

62. It was suggested that the documents could be referred to as “technical reference manuals” to prevent confusion with guidance provided by ISPMs. The SPTA considered that technical reference manuals for certain types of very technical topics are necessary. The SPTA noted that the Secretariat can investigate options for how these manuals can be developed within FAO and report back to the CPM.

XII. Next meeting of the SPTA

63. The next meeting of the SPTA will be 5 – 8 October 2010.

¹⁴ SPTA 2009/25

CPM Recommendations—New Paragraph to Clarify their Use

CPM Recommendations are decisions and agreements made by CPM, according to existing procedures noted by CPM-4 (see 2009, CPM Report, section 13.9.4.3), and are intended to promote or achieve the objectives of the Convention.

These decisions and agreements may consist of directions, guidance, or calls to action to the contracting parties and/or Secretariat on matters that may not be appropriately or effectively expressed as an ISPM (which offers a standard operating procedure on which to base a phytosanitary measure(s)).

The CPM process for developing and adopting recommendations is much more flexible than the process for adopting ISPMs. This allows the CPM the possibility to consider the appropriate format for a given decision or agreement once the subject has been sufficiently analyzed and developed

CPM recommendations do not prescribe specific requirements to contracting parties regarding the establishment of phytosanitary measures.

Appendix 2

11th Meeting of the CPM SPTA – Rome, Italy, 6-9 October, 2009

PARTICIPANTS LIST

Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Elected	2 Year term expires
Member: CPM Chair	Ms. Reinouw BAST-TJEERDE Manager, International Plant Protection Issues Canadian Food Inspection Agency 1400 Merivale Ottawa, ON, K1A 0Y9 CANADA Tel: +1 613 773 6091 Fax: +1 613 773 6088	<a href="mailto:reinouw.bast-tjeerde@inspecti
on.gc.ca">reinouw.bast-tjeerde@inspecti on.gc.ca	CPM-3 (2008)	2010
Member: CPM Vice Chair	Mr. Mohammad KATBEH BADER Head of Phytosanitary Division Ministry of Agriculture P.O. Box 11732 Area code 662 Amman JORDAN Office +962 6 568 6151 Mobile +962 795 895691 Fax: +962 6 568 6310	<a href="mailto:katbehbader@mo
a.gov.jo">katbehbader@mo a.gov.jo	CPM-3 (2008)	2010
Member: CPM Vice Chair	Mr. Chagama KEDERA Managing Director Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) Oloolua Ridge, Karen KENYA Phone: +254 020 3536171/2 Fax: +254 020 882265/3536175	<a href="mailto:director@kephis.
org">director@kephis. org	CPM-3 (2008)	2010
Member: Bureau	Mr. Stephen ASHBY Deputy Head, Plant Health Policy Team, Policy Programme Food and Environment Research Agency Sand Hutton, York Y041 1LZ UNITED KINGDOM Phone: +44 1 904 465633	<a href="mailto:steve.ashby@fer
a.gsi.gov.uk">steve.ashby@fer a.gsi.gov.uk	CPM-3 (2008)	2010

Participants list

Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Elected	2 Year term expires
Member: Bureau	Mr. Francisco GUTIERREZ Director of Plant Health Plant Health Department Belize Agricultural Health Authority Central Farm, Cayo District BELIZE Tel: +501 824-4899 Fax: +501 824-3773	frankpest@yahoo.com ; cymbureaulac@gmail.com	CPM-3 (2008)	2010
Member: Bureau	Mr. Bill ROBERTS Principal Scientist Biosecurity Australia Department of Agriculture Fisheries & Forestry GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT AUSTRALIA Phone: + 61 2 6272 4047 Fax: + 61 2 6272 5245	bill.roberts@biosecurity.gov.au	CPM-3 (2008)	2010
Member: Bureau	Mr. Arifin TASRIF Surabaya Agriculture Quarantine Service Jalan Raya Bandara Juanda Surabaya, East Java, INDONESIA Tel: +6231 8673997 Fax: +6231 8673996	arifintasrif@yahoo.co.uk	CPM-3 (2008)	2010
SC Chair	Mr. Odilson RIBEIRO E SILVA SDA Deputy Secretary Secretariat of Animal and Plant Health Inspection Esplanada dos Ministerios, Bloco D, Anexo B, Sala 406 Brasilia DF 70043-900 BRAZIL Tel: (+55) 61 3218 2615/2172 Fax: (+55) 61 3224 3995	odilson.silva@agricultura.gov.br	CPM-4 (2009)	2012
SBDS Chair	Mr. John HEDLEY Principal Adviser International Coordination Biosecurity New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry P.O. Box 2526 Wellington NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0733	john.hedley@maf.govt.nz	CPM-4 (2009)	2012

Participants list

Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Elected	2 Year term expires
Argentina	Mr. Diego QUIROGA National Director of the Plant Protection Av. Paseo Colón 315 4 th floor CP 9063 SENASA – ARGENTINA Tel: +54 11 4121 5495 / 5976	dnpv@senasa.gov.ar ; dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar		
Bosnia & Herzegovina	Ms. Sladjana KRESTALICA Expert Associate of Administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina for Plant Health Protection Radiceva 8, Sarajevo 71000, BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA Tel:+38733212387 Fax: :+38733217032	upravabihzzb@bih.net.ba ; sladjana.krestalica@uzzb.gov.ba		
Bosnia & Herzegovina	Mr. Milad ZEKOVIC Director Administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina for Plant Health Protection, Radiceva 8, Sarajevo 71000, BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA Tel: +38733212387 Fax: :+38733217032	upravabihzzb@bih.net.ba ; milad.zekovic@uzzb.gov.ba		
Canada	Mr. Greg STUBBINGS Director & Chief Plant Health Officer for Canada Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot drive Ottawa, Ontario KIA OYA CANADA Tel: +1 613 221 4316 Fax: +1 613 228 6606	gstubbings@inspection.gc.ca		
Japan	Mr. Hisashi SAKATA Deputy Director Plant Protection Division Consumer Affairs Bureau Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries The Government of Japan JAPAN Phone: +81 3 3502 2291 Fax: +81 3 3507 4232	hisashi_sakata2@nm.maff.go.jp		
Netherlands	Mr. Corné VAN ALPHEN Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality Department of Agriculture NETHERLANDS Tel: (+31) 0 70-3785552 Fax: (+31) 0 70-3786156	c.a.m.van.alphen@minlnv.nl		

Participants list

Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Elected	2 Year term expires
Republic of Korea	Ms. Kyu-Ock YIM International Quarantine Cooperation DTV National Plant Quarantine Service MIFFAF REPUBLIC of KOREA Tel: +82 31 420 7665 Fax: +82 31 420 7605	koyim@korea.kr		
Sweden	Ms. Marianne SJOBLOM Ministry of Agriculture Fredsgatan 8 10333 Stockholm SWEDEN Phone: +46 84051121	marianne.sjoblom@agriculture.ministry.se		
USA	Ms. Rebecca BECH Deputy Administrator Plant Protection and Quarantine Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Whitten Building 14th Independence Ave. SW Washington, DC, 20250 USA Phone: +1 202 7205601 Fax: +1 202 6900472			
USA	Mr. John GREIFER Associate Deputy International Services Animal and Plant Health Service US Department of Agriculture 12th Independence Washington, DC, 20250 USA Phone: +1 202 7207677 Fax: +1 202 6902861	john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov		
Resource Person	Mr. Alimov LUTFULLA Head of Government Plant Quarantine Inspection – Tashkent Region Republic of Uzbekistan Tel: +99 898 302 7836 +99 891 292 2645	kamronbek_78@mail.ru		

Participants list

Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Elected	2 Year term expires
Resource Person	<p>Mr. Yukio YOKOI Director Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Activities Division Japan External Trade Organisation (JETRO) JAPAN Tel: +81 3 3582 5546 Fax: +81 3 3582 7378</p>	<p>yulio_yokoi@jetro.go.jp</p>		
IPPC Secretariat	<p>Mr. Tomoyuki ARAKI Tel: +39 06 5705 3806</p> <p>Ms. Melanie BATEMAN Tel: +39 06 5705 3071</p> <p>Ms. Christina DEVORSHAK Tel: +1 919 855 7547</p> <p>Ms. Lottie ERIKSON, Tel:+39 06 5705 5696</p> <p>Mr. Peter KENMORE Tel: +39 06 5705 2188</p> <p>Mr. Brent LARSON, Tel: +39 06 5705 4915</p> <p>Mr. David NOWELL, Tel:+39 06 5705 2034</p> <p>Mr. Orlando SOSA Tel: +39 06 5705 3613</p> <p>Ms. Marina ZLOTINA Te: +39 06 5705 2534</p> <p>IPPC Secretariat FAO-AGP Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Fax: + 39 06 5705 4819</p>	<p>tomoyuki.araki@fao.org</p> <p>melanielynn.bateman@fao.org</p> <p>christina.devorshak@fao.org</p> <p>lottie.erikson@fao.org</p> <p>peter.kenmore@fao.org</p> <p>brent.larson@fao.org</p> <p>dave.nowell@fao.org</p> <p>orlando.sosa@fao.org</p> <p>marina.zlotina@fao.org</p> <p>ippc@fao.org</p>		