



REPORT

Rome, Italy
8-11 October
2013

Strategic Planning Group Meeting October 2013



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the meeting	3
2. Adoption of the agenda	3
3. Housekeeping	3
4. Selection of a Rapporteur	3
5. Secretariat Update	3
6. Bureau Update.....	5
7. Strategic Topics.....	6
8. Additional Items for Discussion.....	11
9. Other business	13

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1 – Provisional Agenda.....	14
APPENDIX 2 – Documents list	16
APPENDIX 3 – List of participants	17
APPENDIX 4 – CPM Recommendations	22
APPENDIX 5 - ePhyto Feasibility Study.....	25

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The IPPC Secretary, Mr. Yukio Yokoi welcomed the SPG members to the meeting, and thanked Mr. Francisco Gutierrez (Belize) for taking the chairmanship. He also noted that the SPG is transitioning to be more strategic in nature and that the call for SPG topics should work better in the future while the first attempt this year did not received many proposals.
- [2] The Chair welcomed the members of the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) and noted that the SPG would be dealing with very important topics this year.

2. Adoption of the agenda

- [3] The Agenda was adopted as originally proposed (Appendix 1). There were questions about the status of the Communications Work Programme, as well as requests to see the draft needs assessment survey to get a better understanding of the progress on this matter. A brief overview of the status of IRSS issues was also requested. The Secretariat agreed to comply with these requests and to discuss these items under the relevant points on the Agenda.

3. Housekeeping

3.1 Documents list

- [4] The Secretariat confirmed that there will be an updated document list on the second day of the SPG. The Documents List (Appendix 2) and Participants List (Appendix 3) were reviewed and noted.

3.2 Participants list

3.3 Local information

4. Selection of a Rapporteur

- [5] Mr. Corné van Alphen (Netherlands) was selected as the Rapporteur.

5. Secretariat Update

5.1 Secretariat Update

- [6] The Secretary presented a paper¹ and noted the importance of the transition of the IPPC Secretariat to the direct supervision of the Assistant Director General (ADG). This is expected to be a positive transition, offering more visibility for the IPPC and its activities.
- [7] Relating to the development and documentation of new FAO Strategic Objectives, the IPPC Secretariat has been working on Strategic Objectives 2 and 4. The status of IPPC in the framework of the review of Article XIV bodies within FAO was defined last year in the FAO Financial Committee report mostly as a management issue and it is now under the direction of the ADG.
- [8] The Secretary highlighted key meetings for emerging issues that have taken place since CPM-8, focusing on the meeting with the CBD Secretariat in Montreal, Canada, the ePhyto Steering Group in New Zealand, the meeting of the Task Force to develop a framework for standards and meetings with the World Customs Union (WCO) and the European Union in Brussels.

¹ SPG 2013/04

- [9] The CBD meeting served to identify many potential issues for collaboration on invasive alien species as well as other issues regarding biodiversity. The CBD Secretariat would initiate the process to invite the IPPC to the existing group of conventions concerned with international issues on biodiversity. The two secretariats discussed the possibility of working together to produce a work plan that allows sensible and practical ways forward, which will require resources. The IPPC Secretariat emphasized that collaboration proposals would need review under IPPC governance process as well.
- [10] The Secretary mentioned the current cut in funding for IT-support in the ongoing FAO reform and its consequences for the Online Comment System, explaining that the system can still be accessed but further development to address user requests for new developments in the system and other improvement may not be satisfied until necessary resources are secured.
- [11] The ePhyto Steering group met in New Zealand in September to discuss the progress and ways forward and it was productive for pushing the work plan forward. There will be a PowerPoint presentation on the feasibility study for a hub later in the agenda.
- [12] Regional Workshops are under way and have been a good way to foster discussions on draft standards and other relevant topics. These workshops allow IPPC staff to meet with contracting parties to gain a deeper level of understanding on issues of concern.
- [13] The Secretariat is waiting for three missing nominations for the National Reporting Obligations Advisory Group (NROAG) and would like to push this forward.
- [14] The IPPC engaged in an exploratory meeting with the World Customs Organization (WCO) to create awareness of one another's activities in standard setting, ePhyto, the WCO single window, and WCO coordinated border management.
- [15] The Secretary also noted that the IPPC Secretariat had met with the Secretariat of the WTO-SPS Committee and discussed how to improve National Reporting Obligations (NRO) and communication for further cooperation in the standard setting processes.
- [16] IRSS related activities would be discussed in further detail at a later time in the meeting.
- [17] The Secretary noted that the IPPC is collaborating with CABI, moving forward to allow transparency and consistency in information sharing. The two groups are exploring ways to enhance the quality of the data on phytosanitary issues. One member raised concerns about the unofficial distribution of information on the pest detection in countries. In response to these concerns the Secretariat emphasized that the IPPC is proceeding cautiously.
- [18] The SPG:
- (1) *requested* a deeper understanding of the exchange with the CBD Secretariat on our strategy for working with them, what we want to achieve, and how that work plan will be implemented.
 - (2) *commented* that the IPPC should be exploring the possibility that CBD may help provide resources for this work plan.

5.2 ISPM 15 Registration and renewal

- [19] The Secretary presented a paper² providing an update regarding the new registration and renewals for the ISPM 15 symbol. EU countries have had their ISPM15 registration renewed and countries' registration under the Madrid system (approx. 60 countries) has been renewed under one application. There are still many contracting parties that need to have the symbol registered and this process is expected to start shortly. Possible reimbursement has been discussed and while this is not an obligation, the Secretariat will inquire if countries are prepared to provide reimbursement to the IPPC. The Secretariat will present additional information on this process of reimbursement later in the meeting.

6. Bureau Update

- [20] The Chair of the CPM Bureau, Mr. Steve Ashby (UK), gave a brief update of the June 2013 and October 2013 Bureau meetings. Discussions in the October meeting proposed several revisions to the report of the June meeting, and the final report will be updated and posted shortly on the IPP.
- [21] The Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the National Reporting Obligations Advisory Group (NROAG) were discussed and agreed, and the Secretariat is still waiting for three nominations for this group. The Bureau decided that the NROAG will schedule a meeting in February, with or without the other nominated representatives while a virtual meeting is planned to take place by the end of this year.
- [22] The Bureau noted the difficulty in dealing with commodity based standards (such as the *International movement of grain*). They also noted the Secretariat's concern regarding the lack of availability of some experts that have been nominated and selected, even though they had signed a statement of commitment. The issue has been raised during Technical Panels meetings and Standards Committee (SC) meeting and the IPPC Secretariat is planning to send a questionnaire to NPPOs and RPPOs to try to identify their constraints.
- [23] The Bureau discussed elements of the Communication Strategy to increase global awareness of the IPPC. The Bureau awaits progress on the needs assessment which will aid in developing the Communications Work Programme expected to be presented to CPM-9.
- [24] The Bureau discussed the issue of the roles of RPPOs, including the rules regarding the recognition or withdrawal of RPPOs and that a letter to the regions has been drafted. Currently the Bureau is providing comments on this letter before it is distributed.
- [25] The Bureau agreed that CPM-9 March 31-April 4 2014 will contain only 8 interpreted sessions to reduce costs. This means that there will be no evening sessions with interpretation.
- [26] The Financial Committee, which reports to the CPM Bureau, met in June and October and has made a great deal of progress in only a year and a half since its initiation. They have discussed the possible impact of FAO reform and of the transition to supervision under the ADG. The FC, which currently monitors the budget on a quarterly basis, noted that the full amount of the FAO regular budget is expected to be used very soon according to the approved budget plan. This budget cannot be carried over into the next year. For the multilateral Trust Fund a carry-over of part of the budget to next year is envisaged.
- [27] A list of contribution from countries and organizations has been drafted and approved by the FC for publication on the IPP, and a wish list to express contribution needs for IPPC activities will be posted shortly. The FC is currently working on an update of the guidelines for the IPPC Trust fund which will

² SPG 2013/13

be submitted to CPM-9 and developing an action plan for the implementation of the Resource Mobilization strategy. The report of the FC meeting will be posted shortly.

- [28] The issue was raised on unfair use of the Friends of Chair meetings during last CPM, where relevant issues were discussed in small meetings without interpretation while they should be widely discussed. The Chair acknowledged this concern and hoped that the use of Friends of the Chair meetings in future CPM meetings could be minimized.
- [29] One member requested that the IPPC Secretariat investigate how to make sure the IPPC is at the top of the list when one inserts “IPPC” into an on-line search engine, given there are similar terms.
- [30] The SPG:
- (1) *noted* the update of the Bureau.
 - (2) *requested* that the IPPC Secretariat investigate the IT capacity to make sure the IPPC is at the top of the list when one inserts “IPPC” into an on-line search engine.

7. Strategic Topics

7.1 Addressing issues within the Convention

- [31] The Secretariat presented a paper³ on the possible revision of the Convention and the procedure regarding this matter. Since the current text was adopted in 1997, many new activities have been added to the work of the IPPC. The Bureau met with FAO Legal to discuss potential amendments to the Convention and found that there are alternatives to revision. The Bureau considered that it would be prudent for the SPG to discuss whether a possible revision was of interest or not. If it was, a specific legal process would need to be followed, that would require careful coordination with FAO Legal department, FAO Council, and the CPM.
- [32] Several SPG members noted that a revision would be a large task and a complex operation, and thus, ample preparation and investigation would be necessary before turning to the text for revision. The SPG noted that currently, there aren't any compelling reasons for the revision of the Convention. The SPG noted therefore that it would be more helpful to identify possible problems are found with the current text of the Convention to find alternative ways to tackle these. This would allow for other activities in the IPPC to continue moving forward in a positive direction.
- [33] The SPG:
- (1) *agreed* that the Convention text did not need revision at this time.

7.2 Engaging Research Institutes and Universities

- [34] The Secretariat presented a paper⁴ on the update of IPPC-related university courses. This topic was initiated last year when there was a proposal for the establishment of university-level training courses that could link academia and NPPOs and educate about the IPPC, its aims and goals. It was noted that this would require a strong communications and awareness raising effort to promote the IPPC. A table cataloguing costs of these training courses was provided, as well as conclusions on the availability of these courses.

³ SPG 2013/12

⁴ SPG 2013/05

- [35] SPG members noted that the catalogue of the English language IPPC-related university courses was thorough and impressive and that next steps may include collaborating with RPPOs or creating online courses to offer a practical global solution. Also, members offered the possibility of using the manuals currently being produced by the Secretariat under the STDF-funding as future training material for possible courses, i.e. the manual text could be conceptualized as learning material and didactic elements for learning could be integrated within the text. This text could then be used in the future to create an online training course.
- [36] The SPG:
- (1) *noted* the thorough catalogue of the available IPPC-related courses and suggested that the RPPOs might examine it further.
 - (2) *proposed* that the current manuals being produced should be finished and approved. Once these are approved, they could be analyzed as potential future learning tools.

7.3 Strategic Framework for Standards

- [37] The Secretariat presented a paper⁵ providing the outcomes of the Framework for Standards Task Force Meeting, held in Ottawa, Canada, from 18 to 20 September 2013. The Secretariat reminded the SPG that CPM-7 (2012) had decided that, “A task force should be formed to develop a Framework for Standards, funded by extra budgetary resources.” The Secretariat explained the approach that was followed by the Task Force to develop the Framework for Standards and mentioned that the Task Force’s recommendations together with the meeting report will be presented to the 2013 November SC meeting for their consideration.
- [38] Several SPG members that attended the Task Force meeting noted that the Task Force analyzed several methods with which to approach the framework structure. The method chosen by the Task Force as most effective was to ground the Framework for Standards on the IPPC Convention and its provisions, rather than on the four objectives of the IPPC Strategic Framework. The Task Force had recommended that this Framework for Standards is a framework for the implementation of the IPPC and that standards are to assist this implementation through harmonized concepts and practices. The Framework for Standards could also be used for resource mobilization. The Task Force reviewed all 36 adopted ISPMs, the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, IPPC manuals, IRSS surveys and discussion papers submitted by the participants to develop the framework and to identify gaps where guidance would be beneficial.
- [39] The Framework for Standards seeks to give support a long-term vision for IPPC Standards (over next 20 years) and could assist in the planning, providing both visibility of the standards needed to deliver the Convention objectives, and a vision for prioritizing their development and future review.
- [40] The SPG noted that this Framework for Standards represents a great progress as it includes an initial gap analysis and would help identify some areas where IPPC standards would be needed in the future and a way to set priorities. Some SPG members also noted that there is potential for this framework to assist contracting parties in identifying crucial gaps in their country and assessing which standards they may need to implement.
- [41] The SPG supported that the Framework for standards should be used to do further gap analysis but recognized that the SC will not have enough time to complete the gap analysis at their 2013 November meeting. They also noted that it would benefit from a supplementary set of explanations regarding its end of use. Noting that the SC will consider the Task Force report and recommendations, the SPG

⁵ SPG 2013/06

agreed it would be useful that the SC provide an analysis on how the tool should be used and what would be the next steps, for presentation to CPM-9 (2014). It was suggested that the Framework for standards and the gap analysis could be used by the SC and CPM in the future when considering adding new topics on the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and prioritizing topics.

[42] The SPG:

- (1) *recommended* that the SC consider the Framework for standards to do further gap analysis
- (2) *recommended* that the 2013 November SC meeting consider analyzing how the Framework for Standards should be used in the future and what would be the next steps (including the gap analysis) and presenting their analysis to CPM-9 (2014).
- (3) *recommended* that the Framework for Standards Task Force Meeting report be also presented to the Capacity Development Committee for their consideration.

7.4 Implementation

[43] New Zealand SPG members presented a paper⁶ and a supplementary power-point presentation on Implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs. This paper was a follow up of the paper presented at CPM-8 (2013). Key topics were posed to guide the discussion, focusing on incentives to reevaluate implementation procedures, recommendations for an implementation programme, future benefits of such a programme and the best possible ways forward.

[44] SPG members discussed the need to use existing standards to their greatest potential and encourage contracting parties to implement standards and make use of IPPC supporting documents to fully achieve the IPPC implementation.

[45] It was noted by the SPG that the implementation of IPPC should rely on a strategic work plan, which is different from but would need to be aligned with the IPPC strategic framework. It was also noted that the IPPC would benefit from a strategic work plan that would cut across all IPPC efforts as well as require the commitment from all contracting parties to fully achieve implementation.

[46] The SPG recognized that another key part of an implementation programme is the ability to measure the impact; if we are not seeing the intended results, this is an indicator that we need to revise the way that we are implementing standards. It was emphasized that implementation is not the work of the Secretariat, but a process that needs to be driven by contracting parties. For this reason, it would be helpful to thoroughly assess and analyze implementation issues that may arise through multiple sources of information (such as IRSS, CPM comments, standards feedback, capacity development needs).

[47] The SPG noted that a long-term sustainable resource model for the implementation programme effort would be necessary and that in order to attract funds, tangible benefits would need to be communicated.

[48] To accompany discussion, the Secretariat presented a diagram on Indicators of Implementation of the IPPC, developed under the IRSS. At a recent meeting the Secretariat discussed progress with IRSS, ideas for the second phase, and international cooperation on ISPM implementation to demonstrate how this contributes to broader goals (securing food supply, maintaining market access, improving capacity development). That meeting covered ways to assess the impact of implementation processes and why this evaluation matters (leveraging resource mobilization, increasing NRO response rates).

⁶ SPG 2013/07

- [49] SPG members agreed that gaps need to be identified as well as the needs of contracting parties in each of the four Strategic Objectives. They noted the Framework for standards (see section 7.3) could be used. Then, the necessary materials could be produced to support implementation.
- [50] The diagram of the proposed Implementation framework is intended to communicate that an integrated program will require a great deal of collaboration across all work areas. They noted the implementation programme should be CPM directed. If the CPM could direct the programme for work and agree to this implementation programme (including steps of action, how it would be coordinated and resourced), it would be a good starting point. CPM would then need to agree the area on which topic it wants to concentrate first. In terms of the overall goal of implementation, all the IPPC teams would necessarily be linked.
- [51] It was noted that the IPPC Secretariat is capable of coordinating the implementation process but will need full commitment from contracting parties. The Secretariat is not currently able to undertake a programme such as this in the absence of additional resources.
- [52] The SPG noted that the implementation programme should initially focus on 1 or 2 priority areas. They discussed priority topics for evaluating implementation and members noted that the first step could be to focus on an area where implementation is lacking, such as a pilot project to show potential progress on implementation. They agreed that the implementation of ISPM 6 (Surveillance) would be a good pilot project and that a paper should be prepared to present the implementation program for ISPM6: Surveillance.
- [53] The SPG:
- (1) *recommended* that a paper be drafted and presented to the CPM that would provide a thorough explanation of the implementation discussion held at the SPG meeting, including suggestions made for coordinating and resourcing the implementation program.
 - (2) *suggested* that the topic of implementation could be added as a topic in the next round of regional workshops and integrated as part of the communications work programme.

7.5 IPPC Recommendations

- [54] The Secretariat presented a revised document⁷ containing draft CPM Recommendations on 1. Aquatic Plants and 2. Internet trade (E-commerce) that incorporates comments and suggestions made at CPM-8, by contracting parties and by the Bureau. The Secretariat noted that comments from contracting parties after CPM have been very limited.

- [55] The SPG:

- (1) *suggested* editorial changes to the draft CPM Recommendations for Aquatic Plants and internet trade (E-Commerce). These are in Appendix 4.

7.6 Recommendation Process

- [56] A paper⁸ presented by the CPM Chair noted that discussions at CPM-8 addressed the potential reconsideration of the CPM Recommendations process. At the June Bureau meeting, the Bureau discussed a possible timeline to provide adequate timing for consultation, comments, and agreement of

⁷ SPG 2013/08

⁸ SPG 2013/11

draft recommendations to be given to CPM-9. At their October meeting, the Bureau agreed that this procedure should allow for flexibility in the case of a need for emergency recommendations.

[57] Canada presented a paper⁹ proposing that the CPM Recommendations procedure be reviewed and clarified to allow flexibility for contracting parties to consult on issues addressed through CPM recommendations. This could ultimately facilitate the adoption of future CPM Recommendations.

[58] Several SPG members were concerned about applying too rigorous a procedure to a process that was intended to be flexible. There was concern that a strict process may discourage contracting parties from submitting issues of concern as recommendations for the CPM. Based on the discussion following revised proposal for a procedure was drafted and approved by the SPG.

[59] SPG Members agreed that a proposal for a CPM Recommendation may be identified by a contracting party, the Bureau or the Secretariat. The entity proposing a CPM Recommendation should prepare a first draft, accompanied by appropriate contextual information to support consideration of the need, and submit it to the Secretariat as a CPM paper. The following procedure will be proposed to the CPM:

- the need for a new recommendation should be discussed and agreed in a CPM meeting
- a draft recommendation accompanied by a rationale or justification for its need should be circulated for comment for a period of 3 months following the CPM meeting
- the Secretariat will revise drafts on the basis of comments received, then submit the revised draft to the Bureau for finalization and preparation for potential adoption at the subsequent CPM
- the final draft is submitted to the CPM for adoption

[60] The SPG:

- (1) *recommended* that the revised proposal be presented to CPM for discussion.
- (2) *noted that* the CPM may wish to respond more quickly to an emerging issue and so may agree to draft and approve a recommendation within a shorter period, including within a single CPM meeting, as necessary and appropriate.
- (3) *suggested* that the “Consideration of CPM Recommendations” become a standing item on CPM agenda

7.7 Pests of National Concern

[61] A discussion paper¹⁰ prepared by COSAVE on pests of national concern was presented to the SPG. It specified that these are not regulated pests or trade-related pests, but other pests that are present in a country and cause economic, social or productive critical impact (examples include locusts, soybean rust, ants) to that nation. This scenario would reinforce the need for new elements of international cooperation and technical assistance to strengthen national capacities in addressing the issues of pests of national concern. The paper proposed actions for the IPPC.

[62] COSAVE requested that the SPG provide suggestions on how to address the issue of pests of national concern on an international level to facilitate cooperation and collaboration in the planning, execution and management of control programs. COSAVE also requested suggestions on how to best engage NPPOs to share expertise on management of pests of national concern. This could give NPPOS and

⁹ SPG 2013/10

¹⁰ SPG 2013/09

IPPC more visibility for stakeholders, government and RPPOs, which can offer a great amount of support on this matter.

[63] The SPG agreed that this is an issue to be handled strategically. Several members commented that this is an issue that requires careful investigation before taking action. Before initiating international involvement, all pros and cons must be evaluated from a strategic point of view, considering legal and financial implications of international cooperation on the issue.

[64] The SPG:

- (1) *recommended* that the issue of pests of national concern is presented to CPM as part of the SPG report
- (2) *recommended* the formation of an informal group to further investigate the ways that the paper on pests of national concern could be integrated strategically into the work of the IPPC
- (3) *recommended* that discussions on this specific topic be presented to RPPOs and the TC-RPPO.

7.8 The IPPC in 20 years

[65] The Secretariat presented a paper¹¹ inviting members of the SPG to start a conversation on the future of the IPPC.

[66] Members of the SPG agreed to begin considering a long-term perspective, including the changes occurring in technology, trade pathways, and new phytosanitary threats that might affect the relevance of the IPPC. To facilitate conversation on this topic, members agreed to collect their thoughts on the future of the IPPC Secretariat for review following the SPG. A further discussion on this issue could then take place at the next meeting of the SPG (2014).

[67] Members of the SPG thought that this would require them to collect concerns and uncertainties about the Convention in their respective countries.

[68] The SPG:

- (1) *suggested* that all SPG members submit a two-page paper to the Secretariat by mid-July 2014. This will then be presented to the next SPG to provide a perspective on the potential role of the IPPC in the next 10 years, and beyond. It should include consideration of the relevance of the IPPC in the future, as well as major challenges and trends for its work.

8. Additional Items for Discussion

8.1 SBDS Review

[69] The Secretariat provided an oral report to the SPG on the review of the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement. A survey launched at CPM-8 (2013) regarding the procedures and activities of the SBDS received only 9 responses, and thus, feedback is minimal. Due to logistical problems, it was difficult to organize a quorum for the meetings in June and September. It was reported that in addition to the ongoing EU-South Africa dispute, there is one other serious inquiry from a member.

[70] Several members of the SPG agreed that the absence of disputes is a positive thing for the IPPC, as long as such disputes are not being taken elsewhere. SBDS is a service provided by the IPPC so if it is not utilized, IPPC activities such as standard setting and capacity development are apparently functioning sufficiently in member countries.

¹¹ SPG 2013/14

[71] The SPG:

- (1) *noted* the report by the Secretariat

8.2 ePhyto study

[72] The ePhyto Steering Group met in New Zealand in September 2013 and discussed the initial progress on the ePhyto Hub feasibility study and ways forward. The consultant for the study has conducted a number of interviews in member countries and is working to prepare a paper for CPM-9 (2014). In addition to raising awareness and understanding about ePhyto systems, the feasibility study seeks to determine the most cost-effective, managerially sustainable and fraud resistant approach for an ePhyto system.

[73] A presentation from the consultant working on the study explained the ePhyto system as the secure transmission of a secure set of data (conforming to ISPM 12) between the NPPOs of exporting and importing countries. Both ends of the transaction must accept the transmission for the certificate to be processed.

[74] The ePhyto Steering Group is currently working to develop a mechanism that can be used by all member countries, and noted that a toolkit will be required. The feasibility study will examine a point-to-point system as well as a single point system (hub) for the transmission of certificates, considering the accessibility, schema (codes, fields, rules), operations, and management of the two types.

[75] The ePhyto Steering Group is currently working with FAO Legal to establish the necessary foundation for ownership and confidentiality of the data between the exporting and importing country. The ePhyto hub (if accepted and recommended for implementation by the CPM), will probably be hosted by a third party contractor and the ePhyto Steering Group's role might be to establish the business rules, and the IPPC Secretariat will manage the finances of the ePhyto hub. The ePhyto Steering group could serve as the governing body and contact point between the IPPC and the eventual third party management, but this should all be decided by the CPM.

[76] The next steps to be taken will be to continue the interview process with member countries, review legal considerations with the IPPC, develop a cost analysis of the hub system, determine security needs, and draft recommendations to the Steering group.

[77] Several members of the SPG suggested that the feasibility study should consider the fact that many developing countries experience power outages for extended periods of time, and that could limit their access to the hub. It was also requested that the study seeks to clarify liability issues (i.e. who would be responsible for damages of perishable products in case of unexpected system shutdown or other troubles, etc.). The SPG discussed the possible financial aspects of the ePhyto system.

[78] Related to this discussion the FAO Legal office provided comments on the possibility of establishing a user fee for the service and whether it would be possible for CPM to decide on that. The FAO Legal office noted that such a proposal for ePhyto will not be the usual business of the CPM. Therefore there would be a need to prepare a document on ePhyto with clear decision points, and every country present should be clear on what is decided. The FAO Legal office would suggest that based on a detailed and thorough explanation of ePhyto from the IPPC Secretariat they could draw up a draft legal decision document.

[79] The SPG:

- (1) *recommended* that the defined time frame be followed, in order to present it to CPM-9
- (2) *asked* for the power point presentation to be posted in the report and can be found in Appendix 5.

8.3 Policy on partnerships

- [80] The Secretariat presented a paper¹² to define IPPC liaison, cooperation, and partnerships and the ways in which the IPPC interacts with other bodies under these arrangements. The paper also included a table to clarify the various IPPC partnerships and the legal arrangements, work plan status, and duration of each partnership.
- [81] The purpose of this paper was to demonstrate the need for a procedure, which considers the examination and approval of different levels of agreement with other organizations toward working on issues of common interest. It suggests to CPM that a flexible system be established for use of models for partnerships, which would be based on the FAO system. It also suggests the approval of new partnership agreements on a case-by-case basis and requests that the Bureau and Secretariat to examine and approve each proposed partnership. This would not include the contractual, liaison or cooperation relationships required for capacity development work plan activities.
- [82] It was noted that Capacity Development activities were excluded from this chart because they need different relationships for developing and delivering projects.
- [83] The SPG:
- (1) *recommended* that the IPPC be careful in entering into partnerships due to the potential financial commitments that could arise.
 - (2) *recommended* that the language of the document be modified to clarify the reasons that Capacity Development projects have different relationships so follow a different process, rather than just stating that they are not included.

9. Other business

9.1 Topics proposed by the TC-RPPOs

- [84] The IPPC Secretariat noted key points from the latest Technical Consultation among RPPOs. Discussions were productive, focusing on implementation issues that contracting parties are facing and potential topics for future scientific sessions. It was noted that considering suggestions for topics from RPPOs is a critical practice for the IPPC, as they are working directly with their regional countries' concerns.
- [85] Key topics discussed included the difficulty that contracting parties have with providing lists of regulated pests, creating lists of priority pests by region, and a draft standard on the deviation of intended use.
- [86] The report from this meeting will be posted shortly on the IPP.

¹² SPG 2013/15

APPENDIX 1 – Provisional Agenda**Strategic Planning Group (SPG) Meeting****08-11 October 2013****FAO, Rome, Italy***(Start time: 14:00)***Provisional Agenda**

Agenda item	Document No.	Presenter
1. Opening of the meeting		
Welcome		Yokoi/Gutierrez
2. Adoption of the agenda		
	SPG 2013/01	Gutierrez
3. Housekeeping		
3.1 Documents list	SPG 2013/02	Fedchock
3.2 Participants list	SPG 2013/03	Fedchock
3.3 Local information	https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110798&frompage=1110514&tx_publication_pi1[showUId]=2184224&type=publication&L=0	Fedchock
4. Selection of a Rapporteur		SPG
5. Secretariat Update		
5.1 Secretariat Update	SPG 2013/04	Yokoi
5.2 ISPM 15 Registration and renewal	SPG 2013/13	Yokoi
6. Bureau Update		Ashby
7. Strategic Topics		
7.1 Addressing issues within the Convention	SPG 2013/12	Yokoi
7.2 Engaging Research Institutes and Universities	SPG 2013/05	Peralta
7.3 Strategic Framework for Standards	SPG 2013/06	Germain
7.4 Implementation	SPG 2013/07	Thomson/Hedley
7.5 IPPC recommendations	SPG 2013/08	Sosa
7.6 Recommendation Process	SPG 2013/10 and SPG 2013/11	Ashby/Wolff
7.7 Pests of National Concern	SPG 2013/09	Cosave
7.8 The IPPC in 20 years	SPG 2013/14	Fedchock
8. Additional Items for Discussion		
8.1 SBDS Review	Oral Presentation	Nowell

Agenda item	Document No.	Presenter
8.2 ePhyto study	SPG 2013/xx	Fedchock/Bryant
8.3 Policy on partnerships	SPG 2013/15	Fedchock/Peralta
9. Other business		
9.1 Topics proposed by the TC-RPPOs	SPG 2013/xx	Peralta
10. Next meeting		

APPENDIX 2 – Documents list**Strategic Planning Group (SPG) Meeting****DOCUMENTS LIST***(Updated 2013-30-9)*

DOCUMENT NUMBER	AGE NDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED
SPG 2013/XX			
--	--	Local Information (https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110798&frompage=1110514&tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=2184224&type=publication&L=0)	30-09-2013
01	2	Provisional agenda (<i>updated regularly</i>)	30-09-2013
02	3.1	Documents list (<i>updated regularly</i>)	30-09-2013
03	3.2	Participants list	30-09-2013
04	5.1	Secretariat Update	30-09-2013
05	7.2	Engaging Research Institutes and Universities	30-09-2013
06	7.3	Strategic Framework for Standards	30-09-2013
07	7.4	Implementation	30-09-2013
08	7.5	IPPC Recommendations	30-09-2013
09	7.7	Pests of National Concern	2-10-2013
10	7.6	CPM Recommendations Canadian Paper	2-10-2013
11	7.6	CPM Recommendations Chair Paper	2-10-2013
12	7.1	Revision of the Convention	3-10-2013
13	5.2	ISPM 15 Symbol Registration and Renewal	3-10-2013
14	7.8	The IPPC in 20 Years	4-10-2013
15	8.3	Liaison Partnership Cooperation Policy	7-10-2013

APPENDIX 3 – List of participants**STRATEGIC PLANNING GROUP (SPG) MEETING****LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****(Rome, 8-11 October 2013)**

Role	Name, address, telephone	Email address	FAO region/Country
Member	Mr. Steve ASHBY International Plant Health Policy, Safeguarding Plant and Animal Health Directorate DEFRA Sand Hutton York - YO41 1LZ Tel: (+44) 0 1904 465633	steve.ashby@defra.gsi.gov.uk	Europe/ United Kingdom
Member	M Lucien Konan KOUAME' Direction de la Protection des Végétaux, du Contrôle et de la Qualité Ministère de l'agriculture 01BP944 (Immeuble CAISTAB) Abidjan Tel: (+225) 07903754 Fax: (+225) 20 212032	l_kouame@yahoo.fr	Africa/Côte d'Ivoire
Chair Person	Mr. Francisco GUTIERREZ Director of Plant Health Plant Health Department Belize Agricultural Health Authority Central Farm, Cayo District Tel: (+501) 824-4899 Mobile: (+501) 604-0319 Fax: (+501) 824-3773	frankpest@yahoo.com	Latin America and Caribbean/ Belize
member	Mr. John GREIFER Assistant Deputy Administrator Plant Protection and Quarantine Animal Plant Health Inspection Service U.S. Department of Agriculture RM 1128 South Building, USDA 1400 Independence Ave. Washington DC 20250 Tel.: (+1) 202 799-7159 Fax: (+1) 202 690-0472	john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov	North America/ USA
Member			
Member	Dr Jan Bart ROSSEL Director, International Plant Health Programs Australian Government Department of Agriculture GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 Phone: +61 2 6272 5056 Email: bart.rossel@daff.gov.au	bart.rossel@daff.gov.au	Southwest Pacific/ Australia

Role	Name, address, telephone	Email address	FAO region/Country
Confirmed	<p>Mr. Ralf LOPIAN Senior Advisor International Affairs Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry of Finland Food Department Mariankatu 23 Helsinki FI-00023 Tel.: (+358) 295 16 2329 GSM: (+358) 405965698 Fax: (+358) 916052443</p>	ralf.lopian@mmm.fi	Europe/ Finland
Member	<p>Mr. Corné A.M. VAN ALPHEN Coordinating Policy Officer Plant Health Ministry of Economic Affairs Directorate-General for Agro Plant Supply Chain and Food Quality Department Tel: (+31) 703785552 Mobile: (+31) 618596867</p>	c.a.m.vanalphen@minez.nl	Europe/ Netherlands
Member	<p>Mr Peter THOMSON Director - Plants, Food & Environment, Ministry for Primary Industries 25 The Terrace, Pastoral House PO Box 2526, Wellington Tel: (+64 4)8940353 Mobile: (+6429) 8940353</p>	peter.thomson@mpi.govt.nz	South West Pacific/ New Zealand
Member	<p>Ms Jane CHARD Head of Branch - Plant Biosecurity & Inspections Science and Advice for Scottish Agriculture (SASA) Roddinglaw Road, Edinburgh, EH12 9FJ, Tel: (+44) 131 244 8863 Fax: (+44) 131 244 8940</p>	Jane.Chard@sasa.gsi.gov.uk	Europe/ United Kingdom
Member	<p>Ing. Agr. Diego QUIROGA DIRECTOR NACIONAL DE PROTECCION VEGETAL SENASA - ARGENTINA Paseo Colón 315 Piso 4º Dpto. B Tel. +5411 4121 5495/5176</p>	dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar	South America/Argentina
Member	<p>Mr John HEDLEY Principal Adviser, International Organisations International Policy Ministry for Primary Industries Pastoral House 25 The Terrace PO Box 2526 Wellington Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0736 Mobile: (+64) 29894 0428</p>	john.hedley@maf.govt.nz	Southwest Pacific/ New Zealand

Role	Name, address, telephone	Email address	FAO region/Country
Member	Mr. Masato FUKUSHIMA Director of Plant Quarantine Office Plant Protection Division Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (Maff) 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku Tokyo Tel: (+81) 3 3502 5978 Fax: (+81) 3 3502 3386	masato_fukushima@nm.maff.go.jp	Asia/ Japan
Member	Masahiro AOKI (Mr.) Section Chief, International Affairs, Food Safety and Consumer Policy Division, Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau, MAFF Address: 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, JAPAN Tel: +81-3-3502-8732 Fax: +81-3-3507-4232	masahiro_aoki@nm.maff.go.jp	Asia/ Japan
Member	Mr Gregory WOLFF Chief Plant Health Officer, Plant Biosecurity & Forestry Division Canadian Food Inspection Agency, 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, ON CANADA K1A 0Y9 Tel: (001) 613-773-7727	Greg.Wolff@inspection.gc.ca	North America/ Canada
Member	Dilli Ram SHARMA Program Director, Plant Protection Directorate National Coordinator, National IPM Programme in Nepal Country Contact point of IPPC Head of NPPO Ph. No. 00977-1-5521597/5535844 Fax No. 00977-1-5010512/5535845 Mob. No. 9841369615	director@ppdnepal.gov.np	Nepal/Asia
Member	S. C. WANIGASURIYA Additional Director/ Plant Quarantine Head/ NPPO Country Contact Point Personnel/ IPPC National Plant Quarantine Service, Canada Friendship Road, Katunayake Tel:+94 11 2252028/29 (Office), +94 77 7787557 (Mobile) Fax: +94 11 2253709	wanigasuriya231@gmail.com	Sri Lanka/Asia

Role	Name, address, telephone	Email address	FAO region/Country
Member	Mr. Sang-Han BAEK Export Management Division Dept. of Plant Quarantine Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency, MAFRA Rep. of 82-31-420-7665	ignis@korea.kr	Korea/Asia
Member	Mr Debie RADJENDREKOEMAR M.Sc Coordinator of the Plant Protection and Quality Control Department. Kankantrie #9 +597 402965	radebie@hotmail.com	Suriname/South America
Member	Ms Kyu-Ock YIM Export Management Division Department of Plant Quarantine, Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency/ MAFRA 433-1 Anyang-b dong, Manan-gu, Anyang City (430-016) Gyunggi-do Republic of Korea Tel.: (+82) 31-420-7664 Fax: (+82) 31-420-7605	koyim@korea.kr	Korea/Asia
Member	Mr Ebbe NORDBO Senior Consultant Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Danish AgriFish Agency Nyropsgade 30, DK-1780 Copenhagen V Ph. +45 45263891	eno@naturerhverv.dk	Denmark/Europe
Member	Ms Rebecca A. BECH Associate Deputy Administrator Plant Protection and Quarantine Animal and Plant Health Service U.S. Dept. of Agriculture Rm, 302E Whitten Bldg. 1400 Independence Ave. Washington, D.C. 20250 Tel: (202) 799-7163 Mobile: (240) 472-5619 Fax: (202) 690-0472		
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Craig FEDCHOCK IPPC Coordinator	Craig.Fedchock@fao.org	N/A

Role	Name, address, telephone	Email address	FAO region/Country
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Orlando SOSA Programme Specialist	Orlando.sosa@fao.org	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Dave NOWELL Agricultural Officer	Daave.nowell@fao.org	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Ana PERALTA Agricultural Officer	Ana.peralta@fao.org	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Celine GERMAIN Standard technical officer in Charge	Celine.germain@fao.org	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Sonya HAMMONS Consultant	Sonya.hammons@fao.org	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Adriana MOREIRA Programme Specialist	Adriana.moreira@fao.org	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Marko BENOVIC Finance and Planning Associate	Marko.Benovic@fao.org	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Francesca CROZIER-FITZGERALD Communications and Planning associate / Report writer	Francesca.CrozierFitzgerald@fao.org	N/A

APPENDIX 4: - CPM Recommendations

1. At CPM-8 the IPPC Coordinator introduced a paper presenting two proposed CPM Recommendations and reminded members that over a period of several years (2008–2009), the CPM had discussed the need for a category of decisions that are not ISPMs but would serve as lasting reference material and benefit from a higher profile than being published only within the text of a CPM report.
2. He also reminded members that CPM-4 (2009) had agreed on a process for submitting proposed Recommendations and clarified that this was the first time it was being used because existing Recommendations had been allocated to this category retroactively.
3. The Coordinator noted that the IRSS conducted two desk studies that were presented to CPM during the Scientific Session. This resulted in a fruitful discussion but CPM had not had time to act on the issues presented.
4. The Coordinator emphasized that these Recommendations were being introduced to encourage ways forward and continue the momentum from 2012.
5. At CPM-8 there were members who supported immediate adoption and others who sought additional consultation before moving forward having noted that Recommendations have a high profile.

The CPM asked the Secretariat to:

- (1) Invite members to provide comments on both Recommendations by 30 May 2013;
 - (2) Referred the Recommendations to the Bureau for consideration;
 - (3) Decided that the SPG should discuss the Recommendations at its meeting in October 2013;
 - (4) Invited the Secretariat to present the revised Recommendations at CPM - 9.
6. The Secretariat made the recommendations available for a period of 30 days following CPM-8 for contracting parties to provide additional comments. After the period the Secretariat received comments from only 4 contracting parties and the EC.
 7. The comments received at CPM-8 and after the 30 day consultation were incorporated and submitted to review by the Bureau.
 8. Following the steps outlined by CPM the two recommendations are presented to the SPG for discussion.

Recommendation on the IPPC coverage of Aquatic Plants

Background

The IPPC, having the purpose of “securing common and effective action to prevent the spread and introduction of pests of plants and plant products”, does not distinguish between terrestrial and aquatic plants and does not specifically refer to aquatic plants. Furthermore, as clarified by the CPM on several occasions, the IPPC deals with the protection of plants whether cultivated, managed or wild.

Aquatic plants may, as other plants, be infested by pests, pathways for pests or themselves be pests to other plants.

“Aquatic plants,” are mentioned in several International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) as plants that should be protected under the IPPC framework. CPM-1 (2006) noted the IPPC Secretariat’s liaison with other international organizations to clarify the mandate of the IPPC with respect to invasive aquatic plants. The IPPC Business Plan 2007 - 2011, adopted at CPM-2 (2007), identified marine and other aquatic plants as an emerging issue to be considered, and it was stated that ISPMs should be developed or modified to take aquatic invasive plants into account.

At CPM-5 (2010) a scientific session on aquatic plants was held, outlining the pest risks to and from aquatic plants. CPM members agreed that in principle aquatic plants were covered under the scope of the IPPC.

At CPM-6 (2011) it was agreed that the issue of aquatic plants (including the question on *algae*) under the IPPC should be further considered by the Bureau and SPTA and the conclusions be reported back to the CPM (CPM-6, Report, Para 193).

Accordingly, a “Scoping study on aquatic plants and their significance to the IPPC” was conducted under the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) project and presented at the IPPC Symposium at CPM-7 (2012).

This recommendation synthesizes these discussions, taking into account the findings from the IRSS study and concludes with a set of recommended actions for contracting parties (including NPPOs), RPPOs and the Secretariat.

Addressed to: Contracting parties, National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs), Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs), and the IPPC Secretariat

Recommendation:

The CPM *confirms*, that aquatic plants should be protected and invasive aquatic plants considered as potential pests under the IPPC framework.

Therefore:

Contracting Parties or RPPOs

- Contracting parties are encouraged to include assessment of pest risks to aquatic plants in their pest risk analysis processes.
- Contracting parties are encouraged to ensure that relevant government agencies, importers, exporters, shipping service companies and/or agencies (for ship ballasts and tanks) and other stakeholders are aware of the pest risks related to the import and movement of aquatic plants.
- Contracting parties are encouraged to prevent the spread of regulated aquatic plants as pests in the ornamental and other trade sectors, using appropriate phytosanitary measures, with support from other national organizations positioned to enforce such measures.
- Contracting parties are encouraged to ensure that aquatic plants, as potential pests and pathways, become subject to, or included in, pest risk analysis whenever relevant, in particular in cases where aquatic plants are intentionally imported for intended uses as plants for planting, e.g. in aquaculture or other aquatic habitats.
- Contracting parties are encouraged to ensure that, in accordance with the outcome of a pest risk analysis, aquatic plants as pathways or pests become subject to official control and that adequate phytosanitary measures such as phytosanitary import requirements, surveillance, eradication, containment etc. are established.

- RPPOs are encouraged to coordinate regional cooperative efforts on pest risk analysis for aquatic plants as pathways or pests.
- RPPOs are encouraged to coordinate communication among NPPOs and other stakeholders to strengthen regional approaches to managing risk and identifying appropriate management options for aquatic plants as pathways or pests.

