

Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
Bureau Meeting
11 June 2013
FAO, Rome, Italy

1. Opening of the Meeting, Yukio Yokoi, Secretary

The Bureau meeting began with opening comments from the Secretary. The Secretary was pleased to inform the Bureau that Afghanistan has become the 179th contracting party, demonstrating another great step for IPPC membership. The week following the Bureau meeting, the FAO Conference will be taking place with discussions on management issues for 2014, and other possible structural changes. Mohammad Katbeh Bader, the Near East representative, is not able to attend but the Secretariat is speaking with the Near East Representatives regarding their immediate concerns and preferences. The Rules of Procedure for CPM are currently undergoing final legal review before being submitted to the Director General for final approval.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted with the inclusion of a request to discuss the potential to go electronic for CPM9 under the topic of “Other Business.”

3. Housekeeping

Housekeeping issues were addressed and John Greifer was selected as Rapporteur.

4. Report of the last meeting

The Bureau Chair then reviewed the action points from the April Bureau meeting. Increased focus on national reporting obligations, the creation of the ePhyto Steering group, ISPM 15 implementation developments, the Grain Standard (put off for the November Standards Committee (SC) meeting), criteria for side sessions, the questionnaire on Dispute Settlement, the possibility of receiving funding for questionnaires for translations, donor participation, and enhanced involvement of the World Customs Organization (WCO) with the IPPC were items of particular interest. Near East Bureau membership was also discussed and several efforts have been made to seek representation in upcoming key meetings.

5.1 Status of National Reporting Obligations

The Secretariat presented a paper discussing the current status of National Reporting Obligations (NRO). Aside from the lead officer, there are two temporary employees, one intern and one volunteer, working on this topic. Current efforts include updating contact points and working to determine what is being reported to the WTO that is not being reported to the IPPC, and determining which contracting parties are submitting these reports.

The Bureau worked on terms of reference (TORs) for the new Advisory Group established by CPM to support and direct future work related to members' fulfilling their information exchange responsibilities. The Secretariat emphasized the need to improve

contracting party compliance in this area. Some Bureau members emphasized the need for a future work program in this area to be member driven and to reflect members' actual and practical needs. The revised TORs will be shared with and checked by the Bureau one more time before they are finalized for SPG endorsement in October and subsequent approval by CPM-9.

The Secretariat noted that contracting parties are responsible for updating their reports. During the upcoming WTO SPS Committee meeting, the Secretariat intends to inform members that some of the information currently on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) is inaccurate, and members need to update their reports to be consistent with their reporting obligations.

Once it is established, the NRO Advisory Group will work with the Secretariat to review the IPPC NRO programme and develop a revised stepwise work plan aimed at improving members' capacity to meet their NROs under the IPPC. (For the revised Terms of Reference for the NROAG see Appendix XX)

The Bureau:

- *designated* Lucien Konan Kouame as the Bureau representative responsible for National Reporting Obligations, and
- *requested* an update on the state of NRO at CPM9 (2014).

5.2 Standard Setting

5.2.1 Update from Standard Setting Group

The Secretariat presented an update regarding the activities of the Standard Setting Group since CPM-8 (2013), which can be found in Appendix XX. Regarding the *International movement of grain* (2008-007), which is a complex topic, the SC had insufficient time at the 2013 May meeting to arrange for the discussions requested by CPM on a redrafted specification. This will now be a major issue for the 2013 November SC and experts in strategic matters will be invited to participate in this meeting.

The Secretariat also mentioned concerns regarding lack of availability of some nominated experts and stewards to participate in the activities that they had been selected for (e.g. SC, technical panels, expert working groups), even though they had signed a statement of commitment. The issue was discussed in the 2012 October SPG and the SPG had proposed that a questionnaire be sent to National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) and relevant experts to identify their constraints. According the 2012 November SC request, the Secretariat had prepared a draft questionnaire with input from the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT), the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) and the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG). This questionnaire was presented to the 2013 May SC meeting and the SC requested the Secretariat to present a revised questionnaire to the TC-RPPOs for further discussion, prior to using it.

The Bureau:

- *noted* the difficulty in dealing with commodity based standards (such as the *International movement of grain*), and
- *noted* the problems related to maintaining and attracting experts to the work on standard setting.

5.3 Update on Information Management system

The Secretariat presented an update on Information Exchange, which can be found in Appendix XX. The Secretariat has increased activity and attention to social media outlets and has updated the Wikipedia IPPC page. The Secretariat hopes that the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) will receive more regular updates from contracting parties and RPPOs. The Information Exchange team noted that the transition to Drupal software should enhance the quality and responsiveness of the website, and that feedback from the Bureau is welcome and encouraged

The Bureau:

- *requested* that the Information Exchange team apply a link to the Phytosanitary Resources Page on the homepage of the IPP.

5.4 Cooperation and Partnerships

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that they hosted with FAO the Inter Agency Liaison Working Group on Invasive Alien Species (IALG-IAS) on 28 February – 1 March 2013. The report from this meeting was finalized and is now posted on the CBD's website (<http://www.cbd.int/invasive/lg>). The IALG-IAS reviewed its Terms of Reference during the meeting, and the revised Terms of reference and *modus operandi* are included in the 2013 February IALG-IAS meeting report as Appendix 3. Participants in the IALG-IAS meeting had agreed that the mandate and purpose of the IALG-IAS should be broadened, allowing all organizations in the group to share roles and responsibilities in the issues of IAS. The IALG-IAS emphasized the importance of working together and taking advantage of synergies to avoid unnecessary duplications.

5.4.1 IPPC Liaison, Cooperation and Partnership policy

In noting that FAO's general guidance to the IPPC has been to go and look for partnerships, the IPPC Secretariat emphasized the importance of clarifying its relationships and, specifically, to determine whether a relationship is categorized as a liaison relationship, a cooperative relationship, or a partnership. The Secretariat provided a comprehensive review of its relationships, which can be found in Appendix XX.

The Secretariat noted the value in developing a procedure for creating new relationships and is currently referencing the FAO strategic framework for the establishment of partnerships. For FAO, there are 3 potential legal documents/procedures for establishing liaisons/ cooperative activities/partnerships:

- 1) memoranda
- 2) partnership agreements
- 3) exchange of letters

It was recognized that managing relationships can be time and resource consuming. Hence, there is a need to define, prioritize, and structure the various relationships that CPM wishes to pursue with other relevant international organizations. SPG will be requested to discuss the question of which international organizations are of the greatest strategic interest to CPM.

The Bureau:

- requested the Secretariat to prepare a draft policy on partnerships which defines the criteria, different levels of commitments, benefits, and mechanisms for different types of collaborative relationships.
- *requested* that the Secretariat make a draft revised table to present at the next Bureau meeting defining terms of all IPPC relationship/partnership agreements. This chart should clearly define which relationships require an MoU to formalize an agreement, when an MOU is not needed, and when the Secretariat utilizes other mechanisms to establish the type of agreement,
- *advised* the Secretariat to present the document to the SPG, and show the SPG the process for establishing partnerships, cooperative relationships or liaisons,
- *noted* the SPG primary role would be to advise on the highest priority organizations for collaborative purposes from a strategic standpoint.
- *noted* that as partnerships fully share risks, resources, and responsibilities, the Secretariat should continue to utilize the three FAO legal characterizations, and
- *requested* that the IPPC Coordinator organize a meeting with IAEA to explore the potentials of that relationship.

5.4.2 Roles and Functions of RPPOs within their relationship in the Commission

The Secretariat presented a paper to discuss the clarification of the roles of the RPPOs in the IPPC framework. The paper aims to clarify when RPPOs are considered observers and when are they granted the right to represent a region. It is also necessary to clarify the role of the RPPOs at CPM, outside of CPM, during the TC, in meetings of IPPC bodies, in other technical meetings, and other strategic meetings. There was also a lengthy discussion on the status of RPPOs with the Convention as it was pointed out that there are a couple of inactive or non-participatory RPPOs. Two criteria for the withdrawal of recognition under the convention were proposed: if the organization no longer exists as an RPPO or if it has been inactive for an extended period in CPM and all related IPPC activities. A request for clarification will be sent and if there is no response within 60 days, their recognition will be considered automatically withdrawn.

The Bureau:

- *encouraged* RPPOs to work together collectively to raise the level of participation in IPPC activity

- *supported* the contention that the principle source of communication should be with the RPPOs, but in specific circumstances where resources are in question, the communication can occur through the RECs.
- *noted* that regional standards do not have the same status as ISPMs.
- *requested* the Secretariat to write a withdrawal of recognition clause into the Manual, Part 8, Partners
- *requested* the Secretary to write to the Andean community saying that he is concerned with their lack of participation in CPM activities and as a result, they are at risk of losing their status as an IPPC recognized RPPO.
- *noted* that there are discussions ongoing about CAHFSa and the potential for it to become a new RPPO, and
- *requested* the Secretary to send a letter to all RPPO representatives noting that there will be two criteria for the withdrawal of recognition under the convention: if the organization no longer exists as an RPPO or if it has been inactive for an extended period. The draft will be reviewed during the October Bureau meeting before going to CPM-9.

5.5 Registration of ISPM 15 Symbol

The legal office provided an update on the ISPM 15 Symbol registration. A letter is in the process of being drafted for the purpose of communicating to senior levels of contracting parties the urgency and importance of both initial ISPM 15 symbol registration and renewal. Also, the Legal Office reported that first time registration is needed for 74 countries. Renewals are needed for the other 103 countries (177 total, EC not included). The FAO legal office is moving forward with countries to complete these registration procedures with resources set aside from the IPPC budget as agreed at CPM-8. FAO Legal is working to register countries currently registered with Madrid system as well as non-members such as Hong Kong. Non-member countries will also be registered with the understanding that costs incurred by the IPPC Secretariat must be reimbursed. Efforts will also be taken to encourage countries to reimburse FAO/IPPC for these costs. Longer term funding options will be explored by the SPG.

The Bureau:

- *proposed* that all countries interested in initial registration receive a brief notification that the process has commenced and they will receive an invoice for services rendered.

6.5 Revision of the Convention

The Secretariat tabled a paper outlining a process for analyzing the merits and steps for launching a revision of the Convention. It was noted that this consideration has mainly arisen in the context of past discussions (and frustrations) related to establishing a long term sustainable funding base for the IPPC. The Bureau was generally ambivalent about the concept because of the complexity and enormity involved in re-opening and re-negotiating a treaty. The Bureau asked the Secretariat to refocus on specific problems that need to be addressed rather than begin with a “revision” as an answer to some non-specified shortcoming in the current text. Also, the mechanism for revision and

ratification at the national level and duration of the process must be considered in detail. FAO Legal was requested to provide a flow chart on the revision processes, outlining the risks and benefits of a revised convention. The Bureau considered that it may be possible that specific amendments could be negotiated; depending on the strategic rationale and need and CPM views, without re-opening the entire Convention. This idea of revising the Convention will be discussed further with the SPG for more in-depth strategic consideration. The Bureau also considered that if any amendment included a financial instrument such as assessed contributions, there could be considerable difficulties getting in-country agreement.

The Bureau:

- *requested* that issues regarding the Revision of the Convention be brought to SPG with an initial assessment. This would be a comprehensive review of our current issues and mechanisms by which such issues can be resolved.
- *requested* that the SPG assess the strategic need to explore a new Convention or amendments, and
- *requested* the Secretary to develop a discussion document for the SPG.

5.6 ePhyto

The e-Phyto Hub Feasibility Study has been proposed and accepted. An initial teleconference will be taking place on Monday, June 17 for the ePhyto steering group to organize the initial work and plan a face-to-face meeting. Bryant Christie Inc. has been chosen for the e-Phyto Feasibility Study as they are neutral and possess a wide knowledge and interest in international trade and phytosanitary certification. Steering committee nominations include representation from all regions except the Near East.

The Bureau:

- *requested* that the steering committee discuss the possibility of arranging more workshops for the ePhyto Hub, and
- *requested* that the Secretariat continue to keep the Bureau informed of the status of this issue.

5.7 Implementation

Several discussion papers (CPM 2013/INF/13 and two other papers prepared by New Zealand) were presented, exploring the implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs, emphasizing the importance of establishing a common vision, guiding principles, the process of establishing an implementation programme, the elements of such an implementation programme, the elements of a work area, the implications for already existing bodies, and other related considerations. The Bureau also reviewed a new IRSS proposal for developing indicators which would support an implementation program by demonstrating that IPPC obligations or objectives have been achieved or fulfilled. .

As many of the ISPMs are conceptual and implemented in different countries with different systems, measuring the success of implementation under one list of criteria is challenging. There needs to be an agreement on terminology and a strong effort to measure implementation under common issues that apply to all geographic regions. It is also in the IPPC's interest to provide a baseline of the status of a pest before implementing a standard so the world can see that the IPPC standards are actually improving phytosanitary conditions and increasing the opportunities for safe trade among its contracting parties. Essentially, there are two parts to the initiative, how good has implementation been and has it made a difference.

A key focus of the discussion regarded taking a different perspective and approach to working on the topic of implementation; a holistic and integrated approach. This approach would include elements and support from all primary sections of the IPPC Secretariat: standard setting, capacity development, dispute settlement, and national reporting obligations. It was emphasized that the standard setting, capacity development, and NRO elements of the IPPC will operate as distinct programs, but will seek on an ongoing basis to work in a complimentary and collaborative fashion to ensure all CPM and Secretariat outputs, services, and products reflect the best expertise and resources available from and through the various sections of the Secretariat staff. It was believed that this paper is very important and a specific presentation would be helpful for the SPG.

The Secretariat also informed the Bureau that the 2013 May SC had requested a small group to develop a draft paper on the future development of a framework for standards. The Secretariat was now trying to organize in September 2013 a task force to develop an IPPC framework for standards (according CPM-7 (2012) Decision 15 on improving the standard setting process – Appendix 4 of CPM-7 (2012 report) as some funding had been secured. This work may help to discuss the strategic issues mentioned above and could be presented to the next SPG.

The Bureau:

- *requested* a redraft of the New Zealand paper by the Bureau member representing the South West Pacific region for presentation to the SPG in October, 2013 with a clear model for this proposed implementation program.

5.8 IRSS

The IRSS officer presented a paper anticipating the next phase of the IRSS project, IRSS 2.0. The paper recommends that if a strong focus group can be utilized, implementation can be approached in a more holistic manner to identify any additional elements needed and enhancing resources for IRSS 2.0. The Bureau felt that the proposed approach is reasonable, and there is a need to think about what exactly falls under the IRSS. The Bureau believes that analysis of emerging issues can come under the IRSS program. The PCE element of this study occurs at an operational level, demonstrating the success or failure of implementation and the impact that implementation has made. The IRSS officer proposed a focus group of experts to review current IRSS procedures. The Bureau was asked to provide comments by 15 July 2013.

The Bureau:

- *requested* the Secretariat to produce a paper defining all the issues with Implementation and IRSS for comment by 15 July, with a final copy prepared for presentation to the SPG in October.

5.9 Capacity Development

See report from Appendix XX providing the updates from the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) and the 2nd meeting of the CDC in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia 27-31 May 2013. Some of the highlights and decisions follow:

- The CDC discussed the approach for selecting participants for future PCE facilitation training and training-of-trainer activities under specific projects. The selection process for the forthcoming training for PCE facilitators under project STDF 402 will include an interview, questionnaire, and psychological evaluation. The Bureau expressed some surprise at this but was assured it was necessary.

- A representative from the STDF Secretariat attended the May 2013 CDC meeting as an observer. During the discussions, he expressed interest in having the STDF fund a project on the implementation of ePhyto and indicated that development and pilot-testing of a toolkit related to e-certification is considered an innovative approach to facilitate safe trade in agricultural commodities.

-The CDC has been asked to present a list of potential candidates to perform the evaluation of the CDC work plan and progress. The results from this evaluation will be presented at CPM-10 for review.

_The CDC plans to meet twice in 2013, at least once outside Italy. The second meeting for 2013 is being proposed for Bari, Italy on 25-29 November 2013; this will include a field visit to a facility for dielectric heating treatment.

_The Bureau was presented with information on a candidate for alternate to the CDC for the Europe region.

IPPC Regional Workshops

The Secretariat presented the Regional IPPC Workshop Draft Agenda, found in Appendix XX. All workshops organizers have been asked to consider several points listed by the Secretariat as possible topics to be covered during the workshops. They need to discuss with the Secretariat which points pertain to their regional needs.

The Bureau:

- *selected* Ms. Karin Nordin as an alternate to the CDC for the Europe region, and continues to wait for nominations for alternate members from Africa, the Near East, and North America,

- *agreed* to extend the existence of the CDC for one more year, asserting that the CDC will now report results from extended activities to CPM-10, spring 2015.
- *requested* the Secretariat to provide several names of candidates and the terms of reference for the CDC evaluation.

5.10 IRSS Recommendations

The IRSS presented an update related to the issue of IRSS recommendations. As of the Bureau meeting, the Secretariat had only received comments from China, USA, and Canada regarding aquatic plants, although the comments from the EU had gone through a different route and not been taken into account. This highlights the issue that the process for providing comments is not being utilized to its fullest potential, despite the fact that members should be aware of the process and how it should be utilized. In response to a question concerning the use of the Online Comment System for providing comments on IRSS recommendations, the Secretariat considered that option, but was concerned that the recommendations could have been confused with a proposed standard.

The process for receiving and processing recommendations was discussed and revised. Going forward, recommendations will be issued with the rest of the papers prepared for CPM. The proposed process is for review by contracting parties to begin in June, with the closing of the period for comments being the beginning of September. The SPG will clear the recommendations at the October meeting. In addition, whoever proposes a recommendation will be required to prepare the draft.

The Bureau:

- *requested* that the revised recommendation process timeline occur as follows:
 - 1 June opening for contracting parties to comment on recommendations,
 - 1 September closing date for comments to the Secretariat,
 - Secretariat draft prepared for SPG review,
 - final draft completed by the end of December
 - submitted to the subsequent CPM for consideration.

5.10.1 Aquatic Plants and internet trade

There were no substantive conflicts or issues presented by the comments received. Regarding comments on the need for a definition for the term *aquatic plants*, the Bureau agreed that IPPC covers aquatic plants, and noted that the TPG under the direction of the SC is the body to work on any possible definition. If IPPC members wish to have this term defined, they could make a submission in response to the biennial call for topics for IPPC standards. Any proposal for a new term and definition in ISPM 5: *Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms* (1994-001) should then follow the standard setting procedures. The Bureau was also informed that, following the SC's request, the TPG had considered a revision of the scope of ISPM 5 to state that "Within the context of the IPPC and its ISPMs, all references to plants should be understood to extend to algae and fungi, consistent with the International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants". This modification is part of the Draft amendments to ISPM 5: *Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms* (1994-001) approved for member consultation by the 2013 May SC.

The Secretariat will revise the recommendations for Bureau review with final comments due back to him by July 31. These will then be prepared for SPG review.

The Bureau:

- *agreed* that the IPPC covers aquatic plants
- *Noted* that the SPG will provide a final review and check of the recommendations before being submitted to CPM for adoption.

6.1 Review of Operational Plans/Budgets

6.1.1 Rules of Procedure for IPPC Trust Fund

The IPPC Secretariat presented a report on the financial situation for the current year. At the time of this Bureau meeting, Secretariat funds are in surplus, and they are projected to end the year with a small surplus. The Secretariat noted that it had a high degree of confidence in these projections as the greatest expenses for the Secretariat occur within the first four months of the year.

The Bureau:

- *requested* the Secretariat to prepare a short paper editing the current financial guidelines and scope for the CPM Rules of Procedure,
- *requested* the Secretariat to maintain a table of the budget that will be monitored quarterly.
- *requested* the Secretariat to produce guidelines for the multidonor trust fund that will be edited and circulated to the Bureau.

6.1.2 Finance Committee Report

The Chair of the Finance Committee provided a report of the June Finance Committee meeting to the Bureau. There was a consensus that the current financial reporting format is acceptable, although it will be improved with a chart showing a financial comparison over time: the previous year's results, the current year and the future projection. In addition, future efforts in the area of IPPC finances will include a wish list for funding proposals and a list of potential donors. The Financial Committee Report can be found in APPENDIX XX.

The Bureau:

- *noted* the report of the Finance Committee, and
- *recommended* a process for better recognition of donor contributions, potentially through a news item on the IPPC website.

6.1.3 Follow up actions from CPM-8

The Secretariat reviewed key decisions emanating from CPM8 (2013). There was some concern expressed regarding the role of RPPOs in IPPC-related activities, specifically in the SPG, although it was noted that members of RPPOs could participate if they were deemed to be representing contracting parties. Some of the highlights included the adoption of the new 7-4-7 rule for Bureau chairmanship, new rules of procedure for the

CPM and SPG, the decision to move forward with an ISPM for sea containers, and the inclusion of the regional IPPC workshops. The Bureau also discussed whether or not people are reading the Bureau updates and if they appreciate receiving them. It was reported that during capacity development activities participants have reported that they are useful.

The Bureau:

- *encouraged* the use of social media involvement for awareness raising purposes in each of the regions,
- *proposed* that a list of action points be delivered to all contracting parties at the end of each CPM so that deadlines are respected and strong focus,
- *requested* that a list of key items be circulated to all contracting parties before the upcoming CPM, to encourage preparation and focus at CPM, and,
- *proposed* that the rules of procedure for the SPG be reviewed to reconsider the roles of RPPOs.

6.2 Communications The Secretariat reported that it has made steps to finalize the communications work plan, following the approval of the new communications strategy at CPM-8. As a part of this effort, the Secretariat is working actively with USDA APHIS, which has provided solid support, to develop a communications needs assessment. A professional firm contracted by USDA APHIS will conduct the needs assessment and determine which materials should be distributed to which audiences in developing and developed regions. A small, virtual support group will also be established once the IPPC has its work plan established, and this group will work to improve global awareness. The IPPC plans to have a dedicated staff resource under contract in very near future and will continue to work with the FAO communications unit to promote the IPPC.

The Bureau:

- *noted* the update on IPPC Secretariat communications efforts
- *requested* the Secretariat to continue its active efforts with APHIS and looked forward to receiving the results of the IPPC communications needs assessment and the names of the members of the support group.

6.3 Resource Mobilization

The Secretariat provided an update on the implementation of the IPPC resource mobilization strategy. As a part of this effort, the Secretariat asked Bureau members to provide a list of brief examples of successes and failures of phytosanitary actions from their respective regions to aid in the creation of a brochure. This brochure will be used to encourage non-traditional donors to increase their involvement with the IPPC as they will be able to see best practices and areas in need of funding for improvement. An additional significant issue discussed by the Bureau regarded the possibility of partnering with a donor for the development of a specific standard.

The Secretariat has been requested to develop a parallel resource mobilization plan that will coincide directly with the standards to show the impacts of standard implementation. The Secretariat was requested to provide a chart which can define donors and their geographical region to demonstrate where there is the greatest need. From here, contact with the representative will occur to establish resources. The Secretariat plans to present a draft implementation plan for Resource Mobilization, complete with an action plan for 2013 and a request for the creation of a webpage that can be updated when contributions to the IPPC are received.

The IPPC reiterated that it is receiving adequate funding but is having extreme difficulty in hiring staff due to FAO regulations and the current employment freeze. To sustain the Secretariat, the IPPC requires a long term succession plan to begin.

This contribution table is posted and will be updated for 2012, 2013. It will continue to be updated and posted regularly with report from each contact point.

The Bureau discussed possible topics for IPPC standards to be used as a flagship for Resource Mobilization (such as *Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood* (2008-008), and the *Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood* (2006-029)) and agreed that the chair of the Financial Committee would also consult with the SC on this issue.

The Bureau:

- *recommended* that the Secretary and Coordinator begin considering a process of resource mobilization focusing on ensuring sufficient staffing resources to support any new or existing projects to be funded,
- *requested* the circulation of the preliminary Financial Report for 2013 and 2014 budget for review before presentation at the SPG,
- *requested* each Bureau member to compose the list of successes and failures of phytosanitary actions in their region by mid-July to be included in the donors brochure, and
- *requested* that letters of appreciation be sent from the Secretariat to donors once the money is received.
- *noted* that there could be potential conflict between IPPC matters and FAO oversight, and that this could be resolved through continued dialogue within FAO about the complex responsibilities of the IPPC that can be fulfilled with adequate staff resources.
- *agreed* that the chair of the Financial Committee would consult with the SC to decide on possible topics for IPPC standards to be used as a flagship for Resource Mobilization

6.4 Dispute Settlement

The Information Exchange officer provided the Bureau with an update on the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement. The Secretariat is currently waiting for responses to the

survey on SBDS which is due at the end of June. Following the closure of the response period, the SBDS will conduct a virtual meeting in July to discuss the Survey results. The Bureau was asked to remind their respective regions that the IPPC Dispute Settlement process a lower cost option for resolving disputes on trade.

The Bureau:

- *noted* the request to remind their respective regions to complete the survey distributed by the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement.

6.6 Preparation of October Bureau/ SPG Agenda

SPG Agenda

The Bureau discussed the upcoming SPG meeting and recommended items for the agenda. The Bureau also decided on the chair for the meeting. The proposed agenda items for the upcoming meetings are listed below with a priority of 1 to 3, 1 being the highest:

1. Implementation Priority 1
2. University courses for Phytosanitary Measures Priority 2
3. Addressing current issues with the convention - Priority 1
4. NRO update – Priority 3
5. ePhyto update – Priority 3
6. ISPM 15 Update – Priority 3
8. Communications Needs Assessment update– Priority 3
7. Strategic Framework for Standards - Priority 1
9. IRSS update – Priority 3
10. Engaging experts in standard setting- Priority 1
11. Recommendations-2 - Priority 1
12. Process for adopting Recommendations - Priority 2
13. Guidelines for the trust fund - Priority 2
15. Article 14 Body Implications – Priority 3
16. IRSS pest Categorization / listing– Priority 3

The Bureau:

- *confirmed* that the Chair for the October 2013 SPG will be the vice-chair of CPM, Francisco Gutierrez, the Latin American region representative.

7. Update within Secretariat and FAO

The Secretariat noted significant concerns with being forced to get involved in issues for which it is not directly involved under the new strategic objective framework. The Secretariat seeks to emphasize that the IPPC work programme is owned by contracting parties and that funds must be protected for future programmes. In addition, the Secretariat lamented the lack of a suitable human resources programme within FAO and that the sustainability of the Secretariat staff is in jeopardy for the long term without a proper plan in place for staffing continuity.

The Bureau:

- *acknowledged* the need for staff retention and succession planning and *requested* the Secretariat to begin succession planning activity and to engage FAO management in these discussions. .

6.7 Organization of CPM-9

The Bureau discussed the organization of CPM-9, focusing specifically on the ability to provide opportunities for the greatest amount of technical education and interaction with a minimum of time demand. There is a continuing concern on the part of the Bureau that the number and extent of activities taking place during CPM week is too extreme and diminishes the quality of the CPM experience. The Bureau noted concerns expressed about the number of “Friends of the Chair” meetings and that these were not seen as democratic given the lack of interpretation. Bureau members were requested to consider potential ministerial candidates for the opening of the next session.

The Bureau:

- *agreed* to eliminate evening sessions and removed the extra session reserved for Friday evening,
- *agreed* to have 8 interpreted sessions at CPM-9, starting on Monday afternoon, and continuing Tuesday , Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday afternoon and capacity development training sessions will take place on Monday and Friday morning.
- *agreed* that the science session for CPM9 would cover new developments in PRA; new inspection technologies; and, experiences in e-phyto.
- *agreed* that the FAO process for side sessions will continue to be followed (no direct industry activity), and this year the Bureau will be more engaged in the process of determining side sessions. First priority will be given to side sessions related to the development of capacities of members as this is an opportune time to communicate and train contracting parties,
- *requested* that an updated list of each member of subsidiary bodies with their status and place in their term be circulated throughout the Bureau
- *requested* that Bureau members from regions with a larger number of developing countries research the possibility of having a rapporteur from developing countries in CPM-9, *suggested* that the Secretariat investigate the potential of having a rapporteur with experience as well as a rapporteur in training, and
- *agreed* that the incoming chair should give a brief presentation to the CPM on the final day of CPM to indicate what they would like CPM to achieve and to emphasize that their role begins on the last day of the CPM.

6.8 Dates of Meetings in 2013-2014

The Secretariat reviewed upcoming meeting dates, noting that those dates have been posted on the IPP.

The Bureau:

- *requested* that the list of meetings be circulated with the most significant meetings highlighted.

8. Other Business

- (1) The Secretariat requested guidance on how the TPPT could review treatment guidelines or other material related to providing guidance on PTs prior to the final approval by the CDC as well as guidance on CDC's involvement in the development of standards.

The Bureau:

- *agreed* that the capacity building manuals related to standards need to be reviewed by the appropriate expertise, and that this might mean the involvement of experts from Technical Panels and other external experts, and
- *noted* that CDC members are all representatives of contracting parties and so have the opportunity to participate in the standard setting process through their NPPOs.
- *urged* the Secretariat staff to work in an internally integrated, cooperative and consultative basis in order to assure the best possible outputs and products for CPM.

9. Next Bureau meeting

The next meeting of the CPM Bureau will take place in an evening dinner on Monday, October 7 and continue on the morning of Tuesday, October 8.