



***REPORT***

Rome, Italy  
10-11 March 2011

**Bureau of the  
Commission on  
Phytosanitary  
Measures  
March 2011**



**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations**

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

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

## Contents

1. Opening of the meeting and update from the Secretary .....	5
2. Adoption of the agenda .....	5
3. Review of the participants list and documents list .....	5
4. Review and adoption of October 2010 Bureau report.....	5
6. Information on the organizational arrangements for CPM-6 (2011).....	5
7. Discussion of the CPM-6 (2011) agenda and papers .....	5
7.1 Translation of documents for CPM-6 (2011) .....	5
7.2 Observer organizations .....	6
7.3 Priorities for completion of outstanding papers for CPM-6 (2011).....	6
7.4 Reports from RPPOs .....	6
7.5 Reports from observer organizations.....	6
7.6 Goal 1: Standard setting: .....	6
7.6.1 Problems with pre-CPM comments draft ISPMs under the Regular Process .....	6
7.6.2 Comments received for Draft ISPMs following the Special process .....	7
7.6.3 Legal matter regarding the Convention on Biological Diversity and Montreal Protocol supplements .....	7
7.6.4 Re-prioritization of the List of topics for IPPC standards.....	7
7.6.5 International standard on risks associated with the international movement of sea containers .....	8
7.6.6 Grains workshop .....	8
7.6.7 Language review groups .....	8
7.6.8 SPTA meeting for 2011.....	8
7.7 Goal 2: Information exchange .....	9
7.7.1 Communication and public relations recruitment .....	9
7.7.2 Advocacy.....	9
7.8 Goal 3: Dispute settlement.....	9
7.9 Goal 4: Capacity development.....	9
7.9.1 Expert Working Group (EWG) on Capacity Building .....	9
7.9.2 IPPC capacity development projects and the future of projects and activities databases .....	9
7.9.3 Determine criteria for funding 2011 regional workshops .....	10
7.10 Goal 5a: Sustainable Secretariat .....	10
7.10.1 Staffing for the Secretariat .....	10
7.10.2 Resource mobilisation .....	11
7.10.3 Budget issues.....	11
7.10.4 Projections for 2012-13.....	12
7.10.5 Strategic framework.....	12
7.11 Goal 5b: CPM-6 (2011) operations and schedule.....	12

- 7.11.1 Complaints about the very late papers for CPM .....12
- 7.11.2 Information papers from members .....13
- 7.11.3 Posters and side events .....14
- 7.12 Goal 6: Liaison .....14
  - 7.12.1 Inter-agency group: Invasive Alien Species workshop .....14
- 7.13 Goal 7: Review of Plant Protection .....14
  - 7.13.1 Electronic Certification Open-Ended Working Group .....14
  - 7.13.2 Implementation Review and Support System .....14
  - 7.13.3 Aquatic plants .....15
- 8. Other business .....15
  - 8.1 ISPM 15:2009 registration of symbol and legal review .....15
  - 8.2 Post CPM-6 (2011) .....15
    - 8.2.1 Feedback from CPM-6 (2011): Challenges and improvements .....15
    - 8.2.2 Using Google Documents to review CPM-6 (2011) papers .....16
    - 8.2.3 Communication with the Bureau .....16
    - 8.2.4 Bureau attendance at other meetings .....16
    - 8.2.5 The IPPC and the World Trade Organization Committee on Trade and Environment...17
- 9. Close 17
- APPENDIX 1 - Agenda .....18
- APPENDIX 2 - Documents List .....20
- APPENDIX 3 - Participants List .....21

## **1. OPENING OF THE MEETING AND UPDATE FROM THE SECRETARY**

The CPM Bureau Chairperson opened the meeting.

The Secretary of the IPPC welcomed the Bureau members to Rome and presented an informal update on IPPC activities.

## **2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

The Bureau adopted the agenda change as presented in Appendix 1 to this report.

## **3. REVIEW OF THE PARTICIPANTS LIST AND DOCUMENTS LIST**

Bureau members reviewed their contact information on the participants list (Appendix 2 to this report) and provided updates as necessary to the Secretariat.

## **4. REVIEW AND ADOPTION OF OCTOBER 2010 BUREAU REPORT**

The Bureau discussed the report of the October 2010 meeting, made some minor changes, and adopted the report.

## **5. INFORMATION ON THE ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR CPM-6 (2011)**

The Secretariat reported that a minister would not attend this year to open the CPM. Instead, the meeting would be opened by the Deputy Director General (DDG: Knowledge) of FAO.

The Secretariat referred the Bureau to the Schedule for CPM-6 (2011)<sup>1</sup> which would need to be updated in the coming days before CPM.

The Secretariat reminded Bureau members that, by 2013, copies of papers will no longer be provided, as per the CPM-5 (2010) decision. One Bureau member suggested that this message be reinforced in plenary at CPM-6 (2011). Another member was concerned that the room used for CPM did not contain power outlets for delegates to charge their laptops during the meeting and hoped that this would be resolved by the time CPM went paperless.

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that a volunteer stenographer would take detailed verbatim notes during CPM-6 (2011).

## **6. DISCUSSION OF THE CPM-6 (2011) AGENDA AND PAPERS**

The Bureau reviewed the papers for CPM-6 (2011) and identified and discussed any potential difficulties.

### **6.1 Translation of documents for CPM-6 (2011)**

The Secretariat noted that some papers, although submitted ten days prior to CPM-6 (2011), would not be translated into languages before CPM-6 (2011) as the FAO Translation Services was preoccupied with another Commission meeting happening the week before CPM-6 (2011). FAO Translation Services also asked the Secretariat to reduce the number of words in the CPM-6 (2011) Report. The Bureau also questioned whether translations could be contracted outside FAO. However, the Secretariat noted that, despite FAO not being able to provide translation services as required, this was not possible.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bureau 03\_2011/09

## **6.2 Observer organizations**

The Secretariat reported that FAO rules for attendance at CPM-6 (2011) as an observer could override the rules for observers outlined in the IPPC. FAO's new registration system allows individual member countries to nominate observers without Secretariat clearance, of which some countries had done for the first time in 2011. The Secretariat was concerned that this rule could include private companies, which might not be appropriate. However, they did note that the IPPC's rules stated that the CPM meeting should be held publicly, unless the CPM decided otherwise.

## **6.3 Priorities for completion of outstanding papers for CPM-6 (2011)**

The Secretariat reported that there were still a number of papers being developed for CPM-6 (2011). There was now insufficient time to complete all of these papers, and the Secretariat requested some prioritization.

The CPM-6 (2011) paper on the review of FAO Article XIV bodies was still under preparation to incorporate some recently received legal advice. The Bureau agreed that completing this paper should take priority over other outstanding papers. Changes to the Article XIV body rules could have important implications on how the IPPC does its business.

At its last meeting, the Bureau requested a paper for CPM-6 (2011) on pest reporting under the IPPC, which still needed more work. The Bureau agreed that, because other outstanding papers (such as the one on Article XIV bodies) were higher priority, the paper on pest reporting could wait until CPM-7 (2012). The Secretariat will present the paper to the Bureau at its next meeting in June 2011.

## **6.4 Reports from RPPOs**

Normally, individual RPPOs do not provide reports to the CPM, but this year the Secretariat had accepted written reports from several RPPOs. The Bureau agreed that, as an exception, these will be provided at the documents desk.

## **6.5 Reports from observer organizations**

The Bureau noted that, unless there was a particularly important point that needed to be highlighted, an oral report would not be given if the representative of an observer organization scheduled to give an oral report was not present at the CPM-6 (2011) meeting.

## **6.6 Goal 1: Standard setting:**

### **6.6.1 Problems with pre-CPM comments draft ISPMs under the Regular Process**

The Secretariat received a significant amount of member comments on the revision of ISPM 7, revision of ISPM 12 and the Annex to ISPM 26 on Fruit fly trapping during the member consultation period 14 days prior to CPM-6 (2011). The Secretariat received some comments after the due date and therefore rejected them. In addition, the compilation of a large number of comments in this timeframe used a significant amount of Secretariat resources. These member comments received 14 days prior to CPM are normally addressed in the evening sessions: however, because of the large number of comments to address and some of these are likely to be controversial, the Bureau was concerned this will have a significant impact on the Secretariat's resources during the CPM-6 (2011).

The Bureau recalled that at CPM-5 (2010) members had been requested to not submit excessive amounts of comments during the member consultation period 14 days prior to CPM, but that this had clearly not been heeded. The Bureau had a lengthy discussion around the idea of postponing the adoption of these standards at CPM-6 (2011) due to the high volume of comments. The Bureau also discussed sending the draft standards back to the Standards Committee (SC) and/or cancelling the CPM-6 (2011) evening session on draft standards. One Bureau member suggested abolishing the member consultation period 14 days prior to CPM as there were no Secretariat resources to deal with a

high volume of comments two weeks before CPM. Another Bureau member noted that many of the comments had been identified as substantive, but they actually appeared to be little more than editorial. Another suggestion was to require members to justify why their comments are substantive and important.

The Bureau decided to reiterate the message given to the CPM-5 (2011), but to give an even stronger message this year. The Bureau recommended considering a change to the process to ensure that comments received during the member consultation period 14 days prior to CPM were truly substantive (i.e. would prevent the adoption of the standard). In addition, each Bureau member agreed to consult with their regional groups before the start of CPM-6 (2011) to identify comments that could be withdrawn to reduce the number of comments to be addressed at the CPM-6 (2011) evening sessions.

### **6.6.2 Comments received for Draft ISPMs following the Special process**

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that some member countries had submitted written comments for draft ISPMs under the special process. The Secretariat does not formally accept these comments, but noted that some of the comments could contain useful information, which the Secretariat will forward to the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) to consider.

### **6.6.3 Legal matter regarding the Convention on Biological Diversity and Montreal Protocol supplements**

The Secretariat noted that an Appendix similar to Appendix 1 to ISPM 5: *Terminology of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms* will be developed for IPPC glossary terms in relation to the Montreal Protocol (MP). The Secretariat has consulted with the Secretariats of both the CBD and MP, whose members were invited to comment.

One IPPC Secretariat member noted that the current Appendix 1 to ISPM 5 may appear to be interpreting CBD terms and, therefore, consulted FAO Legal Services, who recommended that the IPPC request clearance from the CBD. If this clearance was not forthcoming, FAO Legal Services suggested revoking Appendix 1 to ISPM 5. However, the Bureau felt that the IPPC's consultative process with both the CBD and Ozone Secretariats had been sufficient and that the supplement was useful.

### **6.6.4 Re-prioritization of the List of topics for IPPC standards**

The Bureau discussed the reprioritizing the List of topics for IPPC standards. The Secretary commented that a clear set of criteria was needed to support the priorities. The Bureau noted that some criteria exist to place topics on the List of topics for IPPC standards, but that these criteria are not clear or useful. The Secretariat noted that more recently adopted (CPM-3 (2008)) criteria could be applied to existing topics. The Secretariat also noted that the draft strategic plan for standards setting outlines reprioritization and identifying strategic gaps in existing standards.

One Bureau member suggested using the impact focus areas in the draft IPPC strategic framework as a guide for deciding what standards should be supported. The total resources allocated to these areas should be considered. This re-orientation may also be useful for securing funding. Under this model, all activities would be related to the organization's purpose and objectives, rather than simply being activities unto themselves. This would be a change of approach, whereby decisions would need to be made about what programs would be included in impact focus areas. The Secretariat agreed that the priorities and strategic plan for standards setting should align with the strategic framework for the whole IPPC.

One Bureau member commented that if the IPPC changed its priorities, it could lead to opportunities to attract funding. Another Bureau member commented that it was important to set the strategic framework first and then all other work should relate to that. Once activities are aligned to the strategic

framework, it would be easier to present a clear picture to donors, the public and others. Another Bureau member commented that the framework should be flexible.

### **6.6.5 International standard on risks associated with the international movement of sea containers**

The Standards Committee has selected the experts to develop an international standard on risks associated with the international movement of sea containers. The Secretariat has been testing Adobe Connect, a virtual meeting tool) to develop this standard. The Secretariat is concerned that the development process has been rushed because there has not been enough time to communicate and liaise with international organizations and other relevant bodies.

The Bureau decided that work should proceed on the assumption that a meeting would be held in December 2011, which could be postponed if necessary.

### **6.6.6 Grains workshop**

Canada had informed the Secretariat that it was unable to find full funding to host a workshop on the international movement of grain. There was a possibility that the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) and North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) could assist with organizing the workshop. The Bureau noted that the issue of *adventitious presence* should not be a main discussion point at the workshop, as the CPM terms of reference specifically excluded any issues relating to GMOs.

The Secretariat noted that some opportunities were being lost by having only expert working groups, whereas there were actually a range of other types of meetings that could be held (e.g. high level consultations, etc.). This could be utilized in the case of grain (e.g. an international symposium on the risk associated with the movement of grain). The Bureau supported this suggestion.

### **6.6.7 Language review groups**

The Secretariat reported that only French and Spanish Language Review Groups (LRGs) had been established according to the process agreed at CPM-5 (2010). The Secretariat advised that a “*Friends of the Chair*” group should be organized at CPM-6 (2011) to consider the proposed changes to the LRG process.

The Secretariat sought advice from the Bureau regarding the new language versions: published as Annexes to the French and Spanish language CPM Reports or published on the IPP; and whether the old versions should be revoked and replaced or amended. The Bureau agreed that the changes could be treated as ink amendments and that these should be revoked and replaced with the new versions.

### **6.6.8 SPTA meeting for 2011**

The Secretariat asked the Bureau to consider whether the length of the 2011 October SPTA meeting should be extended to allow for thorough discussions regarding the IPPC strategic plans. The Bureau agreed to extend the 2011 October SPTA meeting to four days. The Bureau would then meet on the Monday preceding the SPTA and the Saturday immediately after the SPTA to follow-up on actions arising from the SPTA.

One Bureau member suggested the SPTA participants begin developing the work before the meeting to allow more time for discussion during the meeting. The Bureau and Secretariat agreed that it was essential that the work on the other strategic plans be aligned with the overall IPPC strategic framework. The Bureau hoped that CPM-6 (2011) could come to an overall agreement on the focus areas of the strategic framework to enable the SPTA to review it at its 2011 meeting.



## **6.7 Goal 2: Information exchange**

### **6.7.1 Communication and public relations recruitment**

The Communications Strategic plan had been briefly discussed at the 2010 October SPTA, but its development has since slowed as it needs to align with the overall IPPC Strategic Framework, which is still under development. However, the Secretariat had proceeded with some work on communications, including the creation of posters, brochures, lanyards, IPPC pins and stickers. A communications consultant had been hired on a part time basis but there have been some problems finding suitable time when both the consultant and the Secretariat were available to work together. The Secretariat was considering hiring another consultant instead (possibly someone internal to FAO).

### **6.7.2 Advocacy**

The Secretary has held some meetings and observed the reactions of potential donors. He concluded that the Secretariat should develop more advocacy material, of which the Secretariat has already begun developing, such as an IPPC poster and a brochure on standards. The Secretary deems that more focus is now needed on developing simplified material for the general public.

## **6.8 Goal 3: Dispute settlement**

The Secretariat had limited time to spend on the IPPC dispute that was currently underway, but had internally discussed the possibility of hiring someone to do this work for them.

## **6.9 Goal 4: Capacity development**

### **6.9.1 Expert Working Group (EWG) on Capacity Building**

The Secretariat praised the work of the Expert Working Group (EWG) on Capacity Building and noted that the group had provided useful suggestions. The Secretariat will report the outcomes of the EWG to CPM-6 (2011) and noted that the report of the EWG was posted on the IPP.

The EWG on Capacity Building had developed a brief work plan to be implemented between CPM-5 (2010) to CPM-7 (2012) and some recommended actions for implementation.

One Bureau member did not think it necessary to ask the CPM for permission on how to seek funding for capacity building activities and that donors should be actively engaged. The Bureau agreed that the Secretariat could meet with donors to secure funds and then provide updates on progress.

The Secretariat reported that the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) was not willing to fund the development of specific ISPMs, but that there were plenty of capacity development projects that the IPPC Secretariat could coordinate with the STDF (e.g. the PCE work in the Pacific). One Bureau member noted that, in the case of the Pacific, some problems had been identified (e.g. waste material from ships and used machinery) and it should be easy to solve these needs by developing an international standard on this topic. However, the Bureau did acknowledge that standards needed to be developed in a coordinated manner and that this was why it was important that new proposals for standards needed to be evaluated against the strategic framework and the relevant strategic plan.

### **6.9.2 IPPC capacity development projects and the future of projects and activities databases**

The Secretariat planned to put a lot of effort into training-the-trainers for using the PCE tool the Secretariat plans to present a proposal to the 2011 June Bureau to fund this training. The Secretariat anticipates that the PCE tool would be finalized in the first half of 2011 and the training-of-trainers would take place in the second half of the year. The Secretariat did not consider it necessary for the CPM to review or approve the PCE tool prior to commissioning the final version.

The Secretariat is developing an area on the IPP that would house non-official information material that would be useful for the implementation of standards, which would include links to other websites, such as RPPOs. The Secretariat hopes to have this completed before the 2011 October SPTA meeting.

The Secretariat has developed databases on phytosanitary capacity building projects and activities, but needs a decision on updating and maintaining them in the future. International organizations and a number of donor countries had provided information for the databases. The databases had been very useful so far and had helped detect overlapping projects and inform the Secretariat about opportunities for savings and collaboration. The databases had also revealed agencies not qualified in phytosanitary work were the implementing agencies on projects to develop phytosanitary capacity. Some donors have expressed interest in contributing to these databases. The next step will be to provide the databases on the IPP for the public to access.

The Secretariat asked the Bureau whether permission was required to proceed with these databases which are developed using extra-budgetary resources. The Bureau noted that if the databases would have a significant impact on the existing work of the Secretariat, then permission would be needed; otherwise, the Bureau encouraged the Secretariat to move ahead where resources (financial and staffing) were external. The Secretariat would need to use good judgment in making these decisions and work should align with the IPPC's strategic objectives and the relevant strategic plans.

### **6.9.3 Determine criteria for funding 2011 regional workshops**

The Bureau discussed the situation for funding the regional workshops in 2011. The Secretariat noted that full-funding is available for only two of the 2011 regional workshops and the Secretariat planned to raise this issue at CPM-6 (2011). The Secretariat asked the Bureau to advise on what criteria the Secretariat should consider to determine the prioritization for workshops if further funding did not become available.

One Bureau member noted that these workshops were intended to be self-funding and the Secretariat also noted that there had been an attempt three years before to develop some criteria. The Bureau acknowledged that if no more funding became available, the regional workshops that did not have funding would not be held in 2011.

## **6.10 Goal 5a: Sustainable Secretariat**

### **6.10.1 Staffing for the Secretariat**

The Secretary announced the arrival of two new staff members for the Secretariat. Ms Sayuri Inafuku from Japan had joined the Secretariat for six months as an in-kind contribution from the Japanese government. Ms Ida Mancini had been recruited as a new G5 permanent staff member. The Secretariat also received four in-kind staff contributions to assist with CPM-6 (2011): two from Japan, one from Canada and one from the United Kingdom. The US provided Mr Craig Fedchock as an in-kind contribution assist with capacity building at 15% time.

The recruitment for the Coordinator (P5) was nearing completion and interviews had already been completed. The Secretariat was also close to advertising the vacancy for the Programme Specialist (P3) position in standards setting.

The French government is considering an in-kind contribution for two years, on secondment, to work in standards setting.

One Bureau member noted that this was the first time he had heard the word secondment in the context of the IPPC. Perhaps there should be some more discussion about developing a system for more structured secondments (in addition to, but separate from, Associate Professional Officers (APOs)). The Secretariat also noted that this could become a partnership program: Codex has an agreement where each member provides two staff members on a rotational basis to work in the organization. The IPPC Secretariat will investigate this further.

The Secretariat noted that it will be able to hire more staff under possible financial resources from the STDF in conjunction with a capacity building project (\$600,000 project to develop technical material – manuals and training material - for capacity building) for which the IPPC will be the implementing agency.

The Secretariat had identified some challenges with working with part-time and remote staff, including that time-zones were different and that other work priorities and pressures competed for the staff member's time.

### **6.10.2 Resource mobilisation**

The Secretary updated the Bureau on resource mobilisation actions and why there would not be an EWG on resource mobilisation as originally anticipated, indicating that there were no plans to call another meeting as it was not clear that this would be useful. The Secretariat was now having some success with fund raising but noted that there was not much willingness on the part of donors to provide funding for standard setting. One of the reasons that the papers had been late this year for CPM was that the Secretariat had been involved in resource mobilisation within the FAO.

The Secretary noted that a plan is needed for resource mobilisation during 2011. It was difficult to find the right people to provide advice on fundraising: however, the development of a plan could still be discussed with the SPTA, but noted that the SPTA is made up of phytosanitary experts rather than fundraising and resource mobilisation experts.

The Bureau noted that the CPM needs some significant feedback on resource mobilization. The Secretary agreed to provide CPM with an update on resource mobilisation.

### **6.10.3 Budget issues**

#### ***Paper on 2010 budget***

The Bureau did not have any comments on the 2010 budget.

#### ***2011 budget***

The Secretariat reported that a lot of the income from 2010 would actually be spent in 2011. In December 2010, the Secretariat discovered that FAO had provided an additional \$500,000 USD, of which 80% had been allocated to the standard setting programme. In return, standards setting increased from \$195,000 USD to \$475,000 USD and Capacity development increased from \$56,000 USD to \$215,000 USD. The Secretariat also noted a small increase in the CPM-6 (2011) budget and a substantial increase in funds made available for resource mobilisation and advocacy.

The Secretariat advised creating another trust fund to manage money allocated or recouped for specific projects with predetermined outputs not subject to CPM approval, as the rules for the IPPC Trust fund do not allow for this as CPM's approval is required for expenditure from the IPPC Trust fund. Also, if the Secretariat negotiated a supplementary agreement, another Trust fund might need to be created.

The Secretariat would need to finance Russian translation and interpretation for 2011 via the regular programme because the Russian Language Trust Fund does not consider the IPPC and the CPM a priority, which will result in only a very small amount of money.

One Bureau member enquired as to whether the operational plan could be defined in terms of the activities listed. The Secretariat noted that it did not intend to do this for the CPM-6 (2011), but that more detailed information could be provided to the Bureau. The Secretariat will have a more general outline of the budget near June.

The Bureau noted that the format for the operational plan needs to be rewritten to comply with the new IPPC Strategic framework, once it is adopted. One suggestion was to reorganize activities in the budget and operational plan underneath impact focus areas (IFA). However, the Secretariat advised

that this is not possible because it does not comply with the FAO reporting system: IFAs are fund raising areas to advertise to donors but do not relate to the internal administrative system for FAO.

The Secretariat highlighted the fact that four Technical Panels had been cancelled for 2011 due to lack of financial resources. Canada has also withdrawn its in-kind contribution for running the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine, so it was no longer possible to move forward on developing treatments for wood packaging. The Secretariat also noted that funding was limited to publish ISPMs: therefore, the ISPMs adopted at CPM-6 (2011) might not be ready for publishing for some time.

#### **6.10.4 Projections for 2012-13**

The Secretariat noted that there were no commitments of donations for the IPPC Trust Fund for 2012–2013 and it was likely that there would be large deficit for the IPPC work programme budget.

One Bureau member reminded the Secretariat that the CPM had clearly indicated that it wanted a role in budget planning for the future and not only for the current year. This would require more information to be presented to the CPM about the budget for 2012-13.

#### **6.10.5 Strategic framework**

The Bureau agreed that the Secretariat should receive CPM input at an evening session and an agreement to work on the medium term plan, with the goal to obtain a broad agreement on the strategic objectives.

One Bureau member indicated that some members were cautious about the strategic framework as it was a large document and it had become available just before CPM-6 (2011). The Secretariat also noted that the strategic framework was currently only available in English, which would be another limitation to detailed consideration of the document.

One Bureau member noted that, in a broad sense, there had so far been a positive reaction. However, the CPM should analyse and discuss the specific types of activities that would go under each of the new strategic objectives.

Another Bureau member noted that the draft had not come back as promised to SPTA members and that this may cause some concern due to the missed opportunity to provide input.

The Secretariat commented that it was important to get the strategic framework completed as soon as possible as the new FAO reporting system was already underway and the Secretariat was now servicing two detailed reporting systems (FAO and CPM).

### **6.11 Goal 5b: CPM-6 (2011) operations and schedule**

#### **6.11.1 Complaints about the very late papers for CPM**

The Secretariat explained that preparations for CPM-6 (2011) had been delayed for various reasons and asked the Bureau for advice on how to deal with complaints. The Bureau felt that the best way to deal with these would be to apologise for the lateness of the documents and inform the CPM that the Secretariat would endeavour to address the issues that caused the lateness and not discuss this issue at length in plenary at CPM-6 (2011).

One Bureau member was concerned that FAO processes were intensive and had contributed to the delay in CPM-6 (2011) preparations and that the changes in the FAO system were not leading to improvement for the IPPC Secretariat. Another Bureau member suggested for CPM-7 (2012) that the Secretariat factor-in these possible delays in their document preparation.

The Secretariat advised that until it had resources, it would need to condense the CPM and SPTA agendas and proposed to reduce the number of papers. The Secretariat also proposed to decrease the routine discussions on feedback and to focus only on strategic issues. One Bureau member noted that

the Bureau had previously agreed that the number and length of papers could be reduced, but suggested that the 2011 Bureau and SPTA evaluate what areas should be reduced. However, the Bureau noted that it was important not to create false expectations about what a small Secretariat could achieve.

### 6.11.2 Information papers from members

The Bureau discussed the following conference room papers submitted by IPPC members for distribution at CPM-6 (2011):

- *Australia* – Proposal to add agenda items regarding resource mobilization and communications strategies and Australian position on certain agenda items for CPM-6 (2011)
- *New Zealand* – Improving the standard setting process for diagnostic protocols (DPs) and phytosanitary treatments (PTs) (CRP under agenda item 9.7). This paper outlines that if the current process continues to develop these documents, then they will not be developed fast enough to cope with technical advancements in around the world: either the process needs to change or the IPPC should stop creating these documents. Standards are needed that are scientifically sound but administratively flexible. The suggestion is that final approval would be given by the SC rather than the CPM for these standards.
  - . One Bureau member agreed that the process should be accelerated and that technical standards should not be adopted by the CPM. Some DPs currently under development are already out-of-date with the latest scientific developments.
  - . The Secretariat noted that this would be a significant decision and cautioned that the changes might not be achieved at CPM-6 (2011), considering that similar proposals in the past had been rejected. The key issue for the SPTA had been that the documents would no longer qualify as international standards which would help harmonize phytosanitary measures if the CPM did not adopt them. In addition, it was not clear whether this change to the process would decrease the workload for the Secretariat and streamline the process.
  - . The Secretariat noted that the IPPC standard setting process would need to be changed to reflect that adoption could be permitted by the SC, rather than by the CPM.
- *US* – A proposal for informal dispute settlement procedures for clarifications of ISPM implementation. This proposal is intended to encourage countries to use the system for clarifications of minor issues of implementation rather than only for large disputes. The proposal was not to re-write the existing SBDS system but for the Secretariat to share informal information with the CPM so that others could learn from this.
  - . The Secretariat recalled that about five years ago FAO Legal Services office noted that minor issues solved by the Secretariat were part of the dispute settlement system. However, there have not been any minor issues raised recently, so there has been nothing to report.
  - . The Secretariat noted that it would be useful if the SBDS could take on some additional tasks of clarification rather than only just dispute settlement. The Bureau agreed that the paper could be passed directly to the SBDS and that the SBDS could perhaps take on the role of examining implementation.
  - . The Secretariat also noted that there is a proposal in the SPS Committee regarding a consultation mechanism and procedure. The procedure would involve participation by the IPPC Secretariat and there could be some overlap.
- *COSAVE* – letter to the Secretariat on reporting problems with the implementation of ISPMs. The letter was dated September 2010 and is in regards to the interception of insects in wood packaging material. There had been a lack of response from the exporting country regarding the notification of these interceptions. There was no intention of going to dispute as COSAVE believed that this could be a problem with ISPM 13:2001 (notification of non-compliance) and

that there was no obligation for countries to investigate when there was non-compliance. A paper had not been prepared for CPM.

- . The Bureau discussed this issue and concluded that there was already a system in place and this issue should be sent to the SBDS.
- . The Bureau noted that there was a general lack of details and that discussion was unlikely to be fruitful until more information became available. They advised the Secretariat that this was between the countries involved and should be resolved among them. These countries need to take responsibility for ensuring that trade is aligned with their requirements. The Bureau suggested that it could be a topic for the next year's scientific presentation at CPM-7 (2012): a review of the implementation of ISPM 15. The Secretariat suspects many countries are still struggling to implement ISPM 15. However, the Secretariat noted that by CPM-7 (2012), the IRSS will have been operating for one year and some more data will have been collected on implementation issues: this could be analyzed and presented to CPM-7 (2012).

### **6.11.3 Posters and side events**

The Secretariat reported member countries, organizations, and partners have provided 19 posters for CPM-6 (2011). The Secretariat had requested voluntary financial contributions from the poster presenters, though few had contributed. Despite these contributions, the Secretariat had not recovered its costs for this activity.

A Japanese intern had assisted with side event organization for CPM-6 (2011) and this had been very helpful. Because the Secretariat was concerned about the relevance to the IPPC and quality of the many capacity building projects being undertaken, the Secretariat requested FAO Regional Officers to participate in more CPM-6 (2011) side events. The Secretariat noted that there would also be a session from FAO Legal on legal issues associated with the implementation of the IPPC. The Secretariat noted that it would be helpful if Bureau members would attend the side events for their regions.

## **6.12 Goal 6: Liaison**

### **6.12.1 Inter-agency group: Invasive Alien Species workshop**

The Secretariat reported that the Inter-Agency Group on Invasive Alien Species (IAG-IAS) had held its second meeting. The meeting was positive and there was good dialogue. FAO fish and livestock areas and the WTO SPS Committee were actively involved in the meeting. The group was discussed the development of a guide for managing invasive species, similar to the forestry guide. The group is also encouraging the OIE to develop standards for invasive species and the OIE is considering this. There was some discussion on aquatic invasive species and a query on whether fungi are covered by the IPPC. The Bureau noted that the meeting report will be posted on the CBD website, which is yet to be approved.

## **6.13 Goal 7: Review of Plant Protection**

### **6.13.1 Open-Ended Working Group on e-Certification**

The Secretariat did not have sufficient time to prepare a paper for CPM-6 (2011) on the open ended working group on e-certification, so a verbal update will be given. The next meeting is scheduled for the last week of April 2011, but it was likely that this date will change due to the lack of Secretariat resources to organize the meeting.

### **6.13.2 Implementation Review and Support System**

The Secretariat asked the Bureau whether it had any new concerns about implementing the first year of the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS). The EU had expressed some concern about the interaction of the SC with the IRSS. The Secretariat acknowledged that there would need to be a feedback mechanism to provide information on standards implementation to the SC, but that this

had not yet been implemented. The Bureau agreed that this should be an agenda item for the 2011 May SC meeting.

### **6.13.3 Aquatic plants**

One member country had requested that FAO legal provide guidance on whether algae are covered under the IPPC. However, the Bureau considered this a technical and scientific question rather than a legal question and felt that algae was in the Plant Kingdom and therefore covered by the IPPC.

## **7. Other business**

### **7.1 ISPM 15 registration of symbol and legal review**

The Secretariat had received the consultant's report on the legal review of the registration of the ISPM 15 symbol but was not ready for release. FAO Legal Services has requested more time to review and provide an opinion on the consultant's report. Once FAO Legal Services has provided their advice, the Secretariat will revise and release the document.

### **7.2 Post CPM-6 (2011)**

#### **7.2.1 Feedback from CPM-6 (2011): Challenges and improvements**

The Secretariat asked Bureau members for their feedback on CPM-6 (2011) and to provide any improvements for future CPM meetings.

The Secretary deemed that CPM-6 (2011) was more forward-looking than CPM-5 (2010).

The Bureau was unanimous in its feedback that preparation of papers for CPM-6 (2011) was the main area where improvements are needed. They requested the Secretariat to have papers prepared earlier in order to facilitate good discussions at CPM-7 (2012). The Bureau emphasized that as the key governing body of the IPPC, preparation for CPM should be prioritized over other work. In addition, the Bureau noted the following about CPM-6 (2011) preparations:

- the message about timely preparation had been clearly conveyed by members during the CPM-6 (2011) meeting
- many delegates needed to travel long distances to CPM-6 (2011) so it was important that papers were ready prior to travel
- preparing papers in advance to allow sufficient time for translation was important for non-FAO language countries
- the quality of papers should take precedent over the quantity of papers. Too many papers had been discussed at CPM-6 (2011) and that a number of these were not of adequate quality. In the future, fewer but better quality papers should be prepared
- less issues could be discussed overall. Some prioritisation would be needed to decide what issues were less important and could be dropped from the CPM agenda.

The Bureau identified another important issue: members had submitted too many comments on draft ISPMs during the member consultation 14 days prior to CPM-6 (2011). The Bureau agreed that if the Secretariat received too many comments on a standard during this period, the standard should be sent back to the SC for more guidance.

One Bureau member asked the Secretariat to provide more thorough background information and to introduce the topics more effectively as not all participants at the CPM are familiar with the agenda items and struggle to keep up with what was happening. This Bureau member thought that the CPM should put more trust in the previous decisions of the Bureau and SPTA so that the same material and decisions are not repeatedly discussed.

Several Bureau members thought that the order that topics are addressed in plenary should match the CPM schedule, rather than move around, as this also contributed to the confusion.

One Bureau member noted that it was important for those sitting on the podium at CPM to be punctual and ready at the podium at least five minutes prior to the start of the session.

### 7.2.2 Using Google Documents to review CPM-6 (2011) papers

The Bureau used Google Documents to comment on the papers prepared for CPM-6 (2011). Some of the pros and cons of using Google Docs included:

#### Pros

- The software was free and did not need to be downloaded and installed on the user's computer.
- All reviewers were able to put their changes and comments into the same document, which meant that the Secretariat did not need to compile different sets of comments.
- More than one reviewer could work on the document at the same time

#### Cons

- Some reviewers had problems viewing the whole document at once, viewing edits that other people had made and accessing the documents.
- Google Docs did not deal well with formatting and complex documents.

The Bureau decided the pros outweighed the cons and would continue to use this tool.

### 7.2.3 Communication with the Bureau

The Bureau asked the Secretary to communicate regularly and to prepare a quarterly report for the Bureau. This would be a summary of key points, rather than an extensive report.

The Bureau agreed to use the forum on the IPP to provide comments by 15 April on the draft IPPC Strategic Framework.

### 7.2.4 Bureau attendance at other meetings

The table below shows what meetings Bureau members agreed to attend in 2011:

Start date	End date	Activity	Type	Location	Bureau member attending
02 May 2011	06 May 2011	Standards Committee	Standards Committee	(German room), Rome, Italy	Tentative, Ashby
07 June 2011	11 June 2011	IPPC eCertification Open-Ended Working Group	Workshops/seminars	Seoul, Korea, Republic of	Yim, Katbeh-Bader
19 Sep 2011	23 Sep 2011	Regional workshop on draft ISPMs - Asia	Workshops/seminars	Korea, Republic of	Yim, Hedley
03 Oct 2011	03 Oct 2011	CPM Bureau	CPM	(Canada room), Rome, Italy	All
04 Oct 2011	07 Oct 2011	SPTA	CPM	Rome, Italy	All
08 Oct 2011	08 Oct 2011	CPM Bureau	CPM	(Canada room), Rome, Italy	All
07 Nov 2011	11 Nov 2011	Standards Committee	Standards Committee	(German Room), Rome, Italy	Greifer



### **7.2.5 The IPPC and the World Trade Organization (WTO) Committee on Trade and Environment (CTE)**

The Secretariat reported that the Secretariat of the WTO CTE had asked the IPPC Secretariat to become more involved in the CTE and to attend its meetings. The Secretariat therefore planned to start liaising with the CTE. One Bureau member commented that this should be approached cautiously until the IPPC understood what was expected. The Bureau decided to invite the CTE to its next meeting (June 2011). One Bureau member commented that if the Secretariat did not have time to attend these types of meetings, Bureau members could attend as the Bureau is authorized to represent the IPPC.

### **8. Close**

The Bureau decided to meet the day before the 2011 October SPTA meeting to prepare for the SPTA and then to meet again immediately after the SPTA meeting. The Bureau agreed that the SPTA and Bureau would be scheduled as follows:

- Monday Bureau (start 09:00)
- Tuesday – Friday SPTA
- Saturday Bureau

Suggestions for the agenda of the next SPTA meeting included:

- Strategic framework
- Aquatic plants
- Other IPPC strategies (particularly Standards Setting and Communications)
- The issue of needing to provide the budget for the IPPC Trust Fund 60 days before CPM and consideration of whether procedures needed to be changed to deal with this.
- The review of bodies under Article XIV of the FAO Basic Texts

Ms Kyu-Ock Yim agreed to chair the next SPTA meeting.

**APPENDIX 1 - Agenda****BUREAU OF THE COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

10-11 March 2010, 10:00 AM

Canada Room, FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>
<b>1. Opening of the meeting and update from the Secretary</b>		<b>YOKOI</b>
<b>2. Adoption of the agenda</b>	<b>2010-Bureau-March-01</b>	<b>KATBEH BADER</b>
<b>3. Review of the participants list and documents list</b>	<b>2010-Bureau-March-02</b>	<b>NOWELL</b>
<b>4. Review and adoption of the October 2010 Bureau Report</b>	<b>2010 October SPTA Report</b>	<b>KATBEH BADER</b>
<b>5. Information on the organizational arrangements for CPM-6 (2011)</b>		<b>NOWELL</b>
<b>6. Discussion of the CPM-6 Agenda and papers</b>	<b>[CPM-6 (2011) documents]</b>	
6.1 Translation of documents for CPM-6 (2011)		NOWELL
6.2 Observer Organizations		NOWELL
6.3 Priorities for completion of outstanding papers for CPM-6 (2011)		NOWELL
6.4 Reports from RPPOs		NOWELL
6.5 Reports from observer organizations		NOWELL
6.6 Goal 1: Standard setting		LARSON
6.6.1 Problems with pre-CPM comments draft ISPMs following the Regular Process	Bureau 03_2011/ 06	LARSON
6.6.2 Comments received for Draft ISPMs following the Special Process		LARSON
6.6.3 Legal matter regarding the CBD and Montreal Protocol supplements		LARSON
6.6.4 Re-prioritization of the List of topics for IPPC standards		LARSON
6.6.5 International standard on risks associated with the international movement of sea containers		LARSON
6.6.6 Grains workshop		LARSON
6.6.7 Language review groups		LARSON
6.6.8 SPTA meeting for 2011		LARSON
6.7 Goal 2: Information exchange		NOWELL
6.7.1 Communication and public relations recruitment		NOWELL
6.7.2 Advocacy		NOWELL
6.8 Goal 3: Dispute settlement		NOWELL
6.9 Goal 4: Capacity development		PERALTA
6.9.1 Expert Working Group (EWG) on Capacity Building		PERALTA
6.9.2 IPPC projects and the future of projects and activities databases		PERALTA

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
6.9.3 Determine criteria for funding 2011 regional workshops		PERALTA
6.10 Goal 5a: Sustainable Secretariat		YOKOI / NOWELL
6.10.1 Staffing for the Secretariat		YOKOI / NOWELL
6.10.2 Resource mobilization		YOKOI / NOWELL
6.10.3 Budget issues		YOKOI / NOWELL
6.10.4 Projections for 2012-13		YOKOI / NOWELL
6.10.5 Strategic framework		YOKOI / NOWELL
6.11 Goal 5b: CPM-6 (2011) operations and schedule		NOWELL
6.11.1 Complaints about the very late papers for CPM		NOWELL
6.11.2 Information papers from members		NOWELL
6.11.3 Posters and side events		NOWELL
6.12 Goal 6: Liaison		YOKOI
6.12.1 Inter-agency group: Invasive Alien Species workshop		LARSON
6.13 Goal 7: Review of Plant Protection		NOWELL
6.13.1 Open-ended Working Group on e-Cert		NOWELL
6.13.2 Implementation Review and Support System		NOWELL
6.13.3 Aquatic plants		NOWELL
<b>7. Other business</b>		
7.1 ISPM 15:2009 registration of symbol and legal review		PERALTA
7.2 Post CPM-6 (2011)		KATBEH BADER
7.2.1 Feedback from CPM-6 (2011): Challenges and improvements		KATBEH BADER
7.2.2 Using Google Documents to review CPM-6 (2011) papers		KATBEH BADER
7.2.3 Communication with the Bureau		KATBEH BADER
7.2.4 Bureau attendance at other meetings		YOKOI
7.2.5 the IPPC and the World Trade Organization Committee on Trade and Environment		KATBEH BADER
<b>8. Close</b>		<b>KATBEH BADER</b>

**APPENDIX 2 - Documents List****BUREAU OF THE COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

10-11 March 2010, 10:00 AM

Canada Room, FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy

<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TITLE</b>	<b>AGENDA NO.</b>
Bureau Mar 2011/01	Provisional Agenda	2.
Bureau Mar 2011/02	Documents list	3.
Bureau Mar 2011/03	Participants list	3.
Bureau Mar 2011/04	Local information	1.
Bureau Mar 2011/05	Report in relation to the current and potential options in relation to the ISPM 15 symbol.	8.1
Bureau Mar 2011/06	Steward's summary regarding comments to the draft appendix to ISPM26: Fruit Fly Trapping.	7.6.1
Bureau Mar 2011/07	Steward's summary regarding comments to draft ISPMs, revision of ISPM No.7 and No.12	7.6.1

**APPENDIX 3 - Participants List****BUREAU OF THE COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

10-11 March 2010, 10:00 AM

Canada Room, FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy

*A (√) in the first column indicates attendance at the meeting*

√	Chair, Member of the CPM Bureau	<b>Mr Mohammad KATBEH BADER</b> Head of Phytosanitary Department Ministry of Agriculture P.O. Box 11732, Area code 662, Amman JORDAN Tel: (+962) 6 568 6151/795 895 691 Fax: (+962) 6 568 6310	katbehbader@moa.gov.jo;	2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 2 years	2012	Near East
√	Vice Chair, Member of the CPM Bureau	<b>Ms Kyu-Ock YIM</b> National Plant Quarantine Service National Plant Quarantine Cooperation Division 433-1 Anyang-b dong, Manan-gu, Anyang City (430-016), Gyunggi- do REPUBLIC OF KOREA Tel: 82-31-420-7605 / 82-10-8752- 3132 Fax: 82-31-420-7605	koyim@korea.kr;	1 <sup>st</sup> term / 2 years	2012	Asia
√	Vice Chair, Member of the CPM Bureau	<b>Mr Steve ASHBY</b> Food and Environment research agency, Defra, Plant Health Policy Programme Room 10GA07, FERA, Sand Hutton, York, YO41 1LZ , UNITED KINGDOM Phone 01904 465633	steve.ashby@Fera.gsi.gov.u k;	2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 2 years	2012	Europe
√	Member of the CPM Bureau	<b>Mr Francisco GUTIERREZ</b> Director of Plant Health Plant Health Department Belize Agricultural Health Authority Central Farm, Cayo District BELIZE Tel: +501 824-4899 Mobile: +501 604-0319 Fax: +501 824-3773	frankpest@yahoo.com;	2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 2 years	2012	Latin America and Caribbean

√	Member of the CPM Bureau	<b>Mr John HEDLEY</b> 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;	1 <sup>st</sup> term / 2 years	2012	Southwest Pacific
√	Member of the CPM Bureau	<b>Mr John GREIFER</b> Associate Deputy Administrator International Services, Animal Plant Health Inspection Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture RM 1132 South Building, USDA 1400 Independence Ave., Washington, DC 20250 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Tel.: (+1) 202-720-7677 Fax: (+1) 202-690-2861	john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov;	1 <sup>st</sup> term / 2 years	2012	North America
√	Member of the CPM Bureau	<b>Mr Arundel SAKALA</b> National Coordinator Plant Quarantine and Phytosanitary Service Zambia Agriculture Research Institute Mount Makulu Research Station Private Bag 07 , Chilanga ZAMBIA Tel: (+260) 1 278 141 / 278 130 Fax: (+260) 1 278141 / 278 130	mwati1lango@yahoo.com; pqpsmt@zamtel.zm;	1 <sup>st</sup> term / 2 years	2012	Africa

<p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p>	<p>IPPC Secretariat</p>	<p>IPPC Secretariat, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153, Rome, Italy</p> <p><b>Mr Yukio YOKOI</b> Secretary to the IPPC (+39) 06-570-53588</p> <p><b>Mr David NOWELL</b> Acting Coordinator (+39) 06-570-52034</p> <p><b>Mr Brent LARSON</b> Standards Setting Officer (+39) 06-570-54915</p> <p><b>Ms Ana PERALTA</b> Implementation Officer (+39) 06-570-55322</p> <p><b>Ms Joanna HAMILTON</b> Agricultural Officer (+61) 412 367 377</p>	<p>yukoi.yokoi@fao.org;</p> <p>dave.nowell@fao.org;</p> <p>brent.larson@fao.org;</p> <p>ana.peralta@fao.org;</p> <p>joanna.hamilton@fao.org; joanna.hamilton.fao@gmail.com</p>			
--	-------------------------	---	--	--	--	--