



REPORT

Rome, Italy
24-27 June 2014

CPM Bureau Meeting June 2014



Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations

1.	Opening of the meeting	3
2.	Adoption of the agenda.....	3
3.	Housekeeping	3
4.	Report of last meeting.....	3
5.	Updates on CPM Work Program.....	4
5.1	National Reporting Obligations	4
5.2	Standard Setting	4
5.3	International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP).....	8
5.4	Cooperation and Partnerships.....	8
5.5	ISPM15 mark registration	9
5.6	ePhyto.....	9
5.7	IRSS	10
5.8	Implementation	11
5.9	Capacity Development	11
6.	Broader IPPC Issues	12
6.1	Enhancement Study Update	12
6.2	Trade Facilitation Agreement Update	13
6.3	Guidance for CPM presentations on implementation successes and challenges.....	13
6.4	The SPG	14
6.5	Review of Operational Plans / Budgets.....	14
6.6	Communication	15
6.7	Resource Mobilization	16
6.8	Dispute settlement.....	16
6.9	Review of CPM 9.....	17
6.10	Preparation of October Bureau/ SPG Agenda.....	17
6.11	Organization of CPM-10 (2015)	19
6.12	Dates of meetings for 2014-2015	20
7.	Other business.....	20
8.	Next meeting.....	20

Commission on Phytosanitary Measures

Bureau Meeting

24-27, June 2014

FAO, Rome, Italy

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The Secretary of the IPPC opened the meeting and welcomed everyone to FAO. He mentioned the Committee on Forestry Convention (COFO) that is currently occurring at Headquarters and expressed his desire to be more active in taking part of these larger meetings in the future, in the capacity of a side event or awareness-raising table of publications etc. Assistant Director General Ren Wang was unfortunately not able to attend the Bureau session, but sent his regards to the Bureau and best wishes for a productive meeting.
- [2] Regarding the Secretariat Evaluation, the Secretariat looks forward to hearing from the Bureau for the way forward.

2. Adoption of the agenda

- [3] It was suggested that a representative for Global Environmental Facility (GEF) could meet with the Bureau Wednesday at 5 pm, to discuss potential funding. While the IPPC has never been eligible for GEF funding in the past, it is possible that the IPPC, as it may shortly become a recognized biosecurity convention, may qualify for such funding in the future. The Bureau agreed that this was worth exploring with the GEF representative.
- [4] It was also proposed that a review of proposals for IRSS be added to 5.7.
- [5] Under 6.10, the Bureau agreed to discuss leads for topics for the SPG meeting.
- [6] The Bureau
- (1) *adopted* the agenda

3. Housekeeping

- [7] The Documents list (Appendix 2) and Participants list (Appendix 3) were reviewed and noted.
- [8] Mr John Greifer was selected as Rapporteur.

4. Report of last meeting

- [9] The March 2014 Bureau meeting was discussed and leads on various activities were announced.
- [10] The Bureau
- (2) *requested* that the CPM Report be posted sooner than the previously decided 6-week deadline.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Lucien Konan KOUAME – NRO • Mr Mohamed REFAAT RASMY - SC • Mr Peter THOMSON – ePhyto • Mr. Corné VAN ALPHEN - CDC • Mr John GREIFER - Communications • Mr John GRIEFER - SBDS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Peter THOMSON - Implementation • Ms Kyu-Ock YIM - Evaluation/Enhancement Study • Mr John GREIFER - Financial Committee
---	---

5. Updates on CPM Work Program

5.1 National Reporting Obligations

5.1.1 *Update on National Reporting Obligations Programme and ToRs for the National Reporting Obligation Advisory Group*

5.1.2 *Status of National Reporting Obligation Advisory Group preparations*

- [11] The Secretariat presented a paper with updates on the NRO Advisory Group (NROAG) 3-day meeting scheduled for 1-3 July with a full agenda and full participation. The Chair of the SC will not attend but will send a substitute in her place. The group intends to design the first NRO work programme for submission to the SPG and subsequently to CPM-10.
- [12] After the Bureau suggested that the NROAG ToRs be re-circulated at the March Bureau Meeting, European members of the NROAG made proposals for revision of the ToRs. Some Bureau members expressed concerns with the proposed changes and noted the need to identify key gaps, priority areas, and directions for a future program of work in the information exchange area.
- [13] The Bureau:
- (3) *noted* the update on the plans for the NROAG meeting plan.
 - (4) agreed that the NROAG should revert to the TOR attached to the CPM9 paper, and
 - (5) *agreed* that the NROAG will work together between their NROAG meeting sessions to complete the draft work programme for SPG review and CPM consideration.

5.2 Standard Setting

5.2.1 *Voting for Standards*

- [14] The concept of voting for standards was discussed, and after analyzing specific cases it was agreed that it mainly relates to adopting treatment standards. This discussion was focused on the efficacy of voting procedures as it relates to adopting phytosanitary treatments, if it is the best approach, and why the SC and contracting parties are unable to reach consensus on these specific treatment standards.
- [15] Other international conventions' voting procedures were discussed, noting that OIE and CODEX have similar procedures in which they try to reach a consensus and when they cannot they also revert to voting. It was acknowledged this has caused controversy, especially in the Codex context where a slim majority vote (51%) can result in the adoption of a controversial standard.
- [16] It was noted that as a consensus-driven organization, the IPPC should strive to reach consensus as much as possible on all decisions including standards. In the end there should be pressure to move decisions out of the Standards Committee oversight and to the CPM to be discussed and decided. It was noted that the technical panels are in fact reaching consensus on draft documents, which they recommend to the SC. It is at the SC and at the CPM where these highly technical standards are being blocked. It was mentioned that consensus on treatments and other ISPMs may be more attainable if contracting parties submitted their inputs and concerns on draft standards earlier in the standard setting process. It was noted that this issue, along with other issues related to the general standard setting process, would be discussed at the November SC meeting.
- [17] One Bureau member also presented a letter from a contacting party which expressed opposition to voting for a standard, stating that ISPMs should be technically rather than politically based. The letter emphasized the importance of basing standards on science.

[18] The Bureau discussed the use of historical data to justify the adoption of treatments and noted that the historical use of and experience with treatments is a form of data and validation as regards their efficacy however it was noted that a treatment based on such evidence would not meet all the requirements laid out in ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) and different requirements might be needed.

[19] The Bureau:

- (6) *referred* to issues related to voting for phytosanitary treatment standards to the SC for further discussion.
- (7) agreed that the current standard setting process continue until new changes are considered and adopted by CPM.
- (8) *suggested* that a focus group be established for 2015 to review the standard setting process and consider issues related to phytosanitary treatments (including voting and historical use).
- (9) *recommended* that the Secretariat produce a terms of reference for a Focus Group (proposed to be held in 2015); to address issues related to Phytosanitary treatments and other issues related to the last revision of the IPPC standard setting procedure.
- (10) *noted* that the historical use of and experience with treatments is a form of data and validation as regards their efficacy.

5.2.2 Update from Standard Setting Group

[20] Updates from the SC and SC-7 meetings were provided. Three ISPMs, 6 PTs and 4 DPs have been approved by the SC for member consultation. It was noted that there will be a new member consultation period in 2015 specifically on DPs (beginning 1 Feb). It was proposed that the CPM consider pausing with development of new DPs after the system is flushed of current work. This will make time for the TP and DPs work to evaluate the general process. *The Secretariat emphasized the demands on the budget to cover the high costs associated with the translation of the high volume of DPs, which will come up for adoption in the next few years.*

[21] A paper on the current and proposed SS workflow was presented. The Secretariat would like to complete the development of the current DPs on the list of topics, either accepting or rejecting all DPs, before taking on DPs. A similar process should be applied for PTs, allowing time to work on the new treatment requirements.

[22] The recent expert working group on cut flowers just met and produced a draft ISPM. The TPPT have also been meeting this week, reviewing 19 draft treatments. An EWG on Wood-handicrafts will meet in September. Two expert working groups will be convened in 2015 on the following topics: the revision of ISPM 6 (*Guidelines for surveillance*) planned to be held in Cote d'Ivoire and the international movement of grain planned to be held in Australia.

5.2.3 Engaging experts in the standard setting process

[23] It was noted that the questionnaire completed by NPPOs and RPPOs regarding engaging experts in the standard setting process has gleaned contradictory results. Many of the things that responders would like to be more involved with in the standard setting process are restricted by membership and limited resources (e.g. SC and expert drafting groups). They want to engage more in the process but are constrained by limited financial and human resources. While results indicated that when experts participated in the process it helped members to better understand the process and its benefits, more participation and funding for participation continue to be requested.

[24] It was suggested that it would be beneficial to evaluate other Secretariat business models in order to identify potential alternative approaches.

[25] The Bureau:

- (11) *noted* the results of the survey.
- (12) *suggested* that a background paper be prepared for the discussion on the “IPPC in 20 years” by the Secretariat, to emphasize the reasons and benefits in looking ahead 20 years for planning purposes.
- (13) *suggested* that all SPG participants prepare a 1-2 page discussion paper regarding the ways they hope to see the IPPC improve and grow over the next 20 years. This should also include a strategic discussion with prioritized list of things that could be engaged and worked on immediately.
- (14) *suggested* that a joint thank you letter be sent from the Chair of the SC each time a new member is selected for the SC or an expert drafting group, to emphasize the importance of their role.
- (15) *decided* to remind NPPOs that they can nominate suitable experts from outside their institution.

5.2.4 Framework for Standards

- [26] Costa Rica has confirmed their offer to host the meeting on the framework for standards, invitations have been sent. This meeting will use the report from the last meeting and take a different approach to try to generate new ideas. There is an intention to do a gap analysis to help determine what further core work is needed for standards in the future.
- [27] As addressed at CPM-9, this Standards Framework meeting should take an integrated approach; allow for diverse perspectives as regards long term strategic issues facing the IPPC, and focus on the analysis of gaps in the current suite of IPPC standards. It was noted that implementation procedures should also be a part of this discussion.
- [28] Participation by the Chairs of Subsidiary Bodies is becoming a demanding issue in consideration of the financial implications of a chair’s participation at every meeting. The Bureau agreed that in such cases other representatives of these bodies could participate in the meeting.
- [29] The Bureau:
- (16) *agreed* that this meeting would generate useful information for the broader strategic SPG discussions regarding the vision of the “IPPC in 20 years”.
 - (17) *suggested* that the Framework on Standards meeting focus primarily on gap analysis, especially as it relates to foundational or key core standards.
 - (18) *suggested* that meeting discussions take a more integrated approach with more diverse perspectives, ensuring that standards are addressing global concerns.

5.2.5 Questions on Standard Setting for the SPG

Strategic issues associated with pest diagnosis

- [30] The EU announced at CPM-9 the wish to have a discussion on strategic issues regarding pest diagnosis in the SPG in October. The European representative in the Bureau agreed to update the Bureau on the development of this paper.

Concept and mechanism of traceability in the phytosanitary context and deviation from intended use

- [31] The IRSS officer offered to include among the IRSS activities a stocktaking study on the current practices associated with “traceability” or “trace back” and activities among NPPOs, including where the concept of “trace-back” occurs in existing ISPMs. No decision was reached on this proposal. The SPG discussion should focus on determining the need for future guidelines or recommendations in this area bearing in mind the differences between “traceability” and “trace back” concepts currently used in ISPMs. It was noted that “traceability” is a food safety term and does not have an equivalent application in a phytosanitary context.

[32] The Bureau:

- (19) *noted* that a discussion paper would be provided by North America for the SPG discussion to help frame the issues.
- (20) *agreed* that the Secretariat would complete a scan of the term “trace back” and its use in current ISPMs.

Purpose, status and content of ISPMs

[33] The SC did not have time to consider the Concept Note on Purpose, Status and Content of ISPMs and plans to review this issue at its’ next meeting.

[34] The Bureau:

- (21) *noted* the draft document and the ongoing discussion in the SC.
- (22) *agreed* to provide comments on the document and present those to the Standards Setting officer.
- (23) *noted* that the Concept Note on Purpose, Status and Content of ISPMs should be presented to the Framework on Standards meeting and comments should be considered by the SC in November.

Standard setting as an activity

[35] The Secretariat presented a paper to address the need to reflect on the current status of standards and encourage the Bureau to discuss the importance of a way forward. It was noted that it might be prudent to slow the process in a thoughtful pragmatic way, not to terminate progress on things that are moving forward. It might be more fruitful to update existing standards rather than constantly developing new standards for which there is not a clearly established or sufficient need.

[36] It was discussed that it would be helpful to send this document to Framework for Standards meeting for their consideration.

[37] The Bureau:

- (24) *noted* the document regarding the status of standard setting.
- (25) *suggested* that the Implementation Working Group meeting and the Framework for Standards working group meeting consider this document and present comments to the SPG in October.
- (26) *noted* that in addition to results from the Framework of Standards gap analysis, a discussion paper would also be provided by at the next SPG; this paper would draw on key strategic points in the IPPC Strategic Framework document and be used to help frame discussions at SPG on the “IPPC in 20 years” visioning exercise.

Capacity for processing diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments

[38] The Secretariat presented statistics to demonstrate the high volume of DPs coming through the standard setting process in the next few years which would have a potential exponential impact on IPPC resources over the next few years. These are costs that are mainly associated with translating these technical standards in to multiple languages (estimated 25,000 USD per DP).

[39] The Bureau:

- (27) *requested* the Secretariat to propose options to address this resource pressure for DPs over the next few years.

5.3 International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP)

5.3.1 Update on information management

- [40] The Secretariat presented a paper to update the Bureau on the status of information management. The IPPC uses IT extensively across all its teams, e.g., Standard Setting (including the online comment system), Capacity Development in the Phytosanitary Resources page, NRO, etc. and resources are minimal.
- [41] The Secretariat is exploring options on how to meet this need, including outsourcing the work, but it's a complicated, expensive, much slower, less flexible process and at least one in-house member with IT expertise will most likely be necessary. It might be wise to do an "outsourcing test-run" to see how this process would work on a small scale, and move forward from there.
- [42] The Secretariat asked the Bureau to provide suggestions on how to proceed.
- [43] The Bureau:
- (28) *noted* the paper on the update on information management.
 - (29) *suggested* that the Secretariat perform a simple analysis to first determine the key problems, prioritize IT activities, and consider options for addressing these needs.
 - (30) *suggested* that the initial analysis be outsourced by member countries that may have the resources.

5.4 Cooperation and Partnerships

5.4.1 Criteria for Partnerships Development

- [44] The Secretariat presented a paper on IPPC relationships with other organizations. It was noted that at this point, it is important to specify and agree upon the most important criteria for deciding on the top strategic partnerships. It was emphasized that a full partnership should reflect a full sharing of risks, resources, and responsibilities.
- [45] It was noted that the CPM had approved the IPPC Secretariat's proposed flexible system of use of model for partnerships, based on the FAO Strategy for Partnerships. Also, it was noted that IPPC Partnerships should seek to enter into partnerships that are financially sound and improve the global awareness of the IPPC.
- [46] The Bureau:
- (31) *noted* the paper, approved the criteria specified in the paper regarding relationships, and gave other general feedback on the paper.
 - (32) *agreed* that the Secretariat should enter into all relationships or potential partnerships with a clear sense of CPM's top priorities to ensure that these relationships support and advance the needs of CPM.
 - (33) *noted* that IPPC relationships are best managed by the IPPC Secretary and Coordinator, but *requested* that relationships with potential financial and programmatic implications be presented to the Bureau for approval.

5.4.2 Letter from the wood packaging industry (Global Forum Wooden Pallet and Packaging Industry)

- [47] The Secretariat presented a letter from the Global Forum Wooden Pallet and Packaging Industry.
- [48] The Secretariat stated that the IPPC only engages with international organizations and as it appears to be a regional organization, it may not be prepared for observer status yet. It seems that they are trying

to form themselves as an international organization, and they have been encouraged to contact the IPPC once that process is complete.

[49] It was mentioned that this letter brings up broader issue related to resource mobilization, and the criteria for securing observer status to the CPM. It was noted that it would be helpful if Article 14 bodies could be permitted to decide these issues in the future.

[50] The Bureau:

(34) *noted* the letter from the wood packaging industry.

(35) *advised* that a paper be presented to CPM-10 to clarify criteria on observer organizations.

(36) *advised* that this example be considered by the focus group on Standard Setting to be formed in 2015 to clarify CPM policy and procedures for accepting comments on draft ISPMs from entities other than contracting parties or RPPOs.

(37) *advised* the Secretariat to remind contracting parties when draft ISPMs are distributed for country consultation that NPPOs could contact their industry for any input.

5.5 ISPM15 mark registration

5.5.1 Update of CPM-9 (2014) follow-up activities

[51] The Secretariat presented updates to the Bureau, noting that the primary focus is currently on new registrations

[52] (first time registrants) covering almost 90 countries. Based on discussions in the CPM-9, the Secretariat prioritized 20 countries to start and has begun the registration process. For these twenty countries, the Secretariat is using 50,000 USD of the 70, 000 USD budget allocated for new registration. Depending on the success of this process, the Secretariat will move forward with future registrations in a similar way. Ten countries have agreed to reimburse the IPPC for the registration.

[53] The high-level letter to countries from the Director General has been prepared by the Secretariat and the Secretariat is waiting for the letter to be sent by the Office of the DG.

[54] The Secretariat requested that each Bureau member continue to encourage their NPPOs to register for ISPM 15.

[55] The Bureau:

(38) *suggested* that the Secretariat publicly acknowledge the countries that have expressed their intent to reimburse their costs for registration as a way to encourage others to consider reimbursement.

5.6 ePhyto

5.6.1 Update on ePhyto activities – including oversight

[56] The Secretariat provided an update, noting that an in-person meeting of the ePhyto Steering Group will take place next week in the Netherlands to discuss a work programme to cover technical, policy, and legal issues surrounding harmonization, maintenance, hub design, financial implications and work stream, capacity development, communications, and resource mobilization for the ePhyto Hub. The Steering Group will continue to explore and get answers to questions posed by contracting parties at CPM-9. The ePhyto Steering Group is hoping to begin the development of a blueprint of a Hub system before CPM-10 as a way to get a firm CPM decision on whether to proceed with the actual development of a global ePhyto system. However, there are costs to hire a contractor to design and develop this blueprint.

[57] A presentation was made to the CDC meeting (June 2014) and was well received. The Secretariat noted significant interest by the STDF in the global ePhyto Hub concept and STDF encouraged IPPC

to submit an proposal for funding for this ePhyto project. In addition, nine countries in the OIRSA regions expressed their interest in participating in the test-run and would be capable of funding their own participation in this trial run. For this reason the CDC suggested that focus be placed on writing the project proposal and submitting it to the STDF. The Korean Government remains interested in supporting and hosting a Global ePhyto Symposium in 2015 but efforts to identify funding are pending.

[58] The ePhyto Steering group plans to discuss the possibility of hiring a consultant to assist in the design process and will also consider funding sources to cover the costs for that consultant.

[59] The legal issues (liability for FAO as regards the ePhyto Hub) have been discussed with the FAO Legal office. Discussions will continue to ensure security from a legal standpoint. Participation and maintenance of the hub was discussed, and it was clearly stated that participation in a hub system would be voluntary.

[60] The Bureau discussed that there are many advantages that the system can have for trade facilitation, security, and reducing costs. These issues should be presented as leverage in the document description and proposal for STDF funding.

[61] The scope for the future of the ePhyto project should be very clear when the project is being written.

[62] The Bureau:

(39) *agreed* in principle to hire a consultant to assist in the work programme, particularly the design of hub system. Once it is clear how much this would cost, the Steering Group will present it to the Bureau and an e-decision can be made whether or not the multi-donor Trust Fund can be used for this.

(40) *noted* that expenditures will be needed in this interim period to develop the project before it can be presented at the STDF meeting, where the project, if approved, hopes to receive further funding.

(41) *requested* that the Feasibility Study be posted on the IPP as soon as possible.

(42) *noted* that the writing of the project proposal would need to distinctly specify all procedures, and scope for the future.

(43) *requested* that a drafting group meet in October to develop the project proposal that will be given to the STDF in December.

5.7 IRSS

5.7.1 Study of indicators on measuring implementation

[63] The IRSS officer gave an oral presentation with the updates on progress with the IRSS. Based on the decision at CPM-9 to focus on the positive and negative experiences of implementation of ISPMs, the SC requested a possible IRSS survey to evaluate the effects of implementation on ISPM 18 irradiation. It would also cover general user requirements and guidance on how to apply treatments.

[64] It was mentioned that ISPM 18 was already addressed in the general survey last year, so the plan is to survey the experiences of those countries that are in fact, implementing. Other issues to consider for the IRSS work programme may be a study on “the efficacy of measures”, “traceability or trace-back,” (i.e., scan of the ISPMs with references to trace-back issues), and a review report of the first cycle of IRSS work.

[65] The Bureau was asked to determine if this survey of ISPM 18 would be necessary and if it was a high priority for the IRSS work programme. The Bureau deferred a decision on this issue until after the meeting of the open-ended working group on implementation.

[66] The Bureau:

- (44) *agreed* that more information needs to be gathered regarding the survey on implementation, and two-weeks after the Implementation meeting in August, the IRSS work programme can be circulated amongst Bureau members
- (45) *agreed* that the selection of IRSS projects wait until after implementation working group meeting for other possible projects that are suggested at that meeting;
- (46) *agreed* that conclusions from the Framework for Standards gap analysis also be considered by the IRSS when it identifies and proposes future IRSS projects.
- (47) *noted* that it will receive the first draft of the IRR in two weeks from the conclusion of the June Bureau meeting, have two weeks time to provide comments and submit to the IRSS Officer. Once comments are integrated on the IRR, the draft will be considered by the SPG in October.

5.8 Implementation

5.8.1 OEWG on Implementation

- [67] Planning has commenced to design a pilot for implementation which would focus on ISPM 6. Additional resources are being sought, but not yet identified. It is hoped that the OEWG Meeting in August can support this process, identify gaps in the implementation process and provide a way forward.
- [68] The Secretariat also presented a high level plan for sustainable funding of IPPC implementation activities which would culminate in a donor meeting in 2017.
- [69] The Bureau:
- (48) *noted* the importance on unifying implementation across the Secretariat and create globally applicable ways forward.

5.9 Capacity Development

5.9.1 Updates of CDC Review

- [70] The Secretariat provided a paper explaining the progress of the CDC Review to date. Six individuals have been selected to conduct the review of the CDC.
- Mr Masato Fukushima: lead reviewer
 - Ms Parul Patel
 - Mr Ralf Lopian
 - Mr Francisco Gutierrez
 - Ms Renata Clarke
 - Mr Sankung Sagnia

5.9.2 CDC Activities

- [71] The Secretariat presented a paper with updates on CDC activities. A new Chair for the CDC was elected at the end of the meeting (June 2014) and is waiting for an official approval from her government. A new mechanism for procurement and contracting issues has been established, which will expedite project management on many of the CDC projects (naming authors, contributors, and reviewers; disclaimer text to be included in future materials; new material proposed on invasive species/pests; photos; next steps for products; coaching updates).
- [72] Invitation models and confirmatory mails have been sent by the Secretariat for regional workshops. The CDC continues to work to integrate issues that are of more interest to the developing countries into its workshop agenda.

[73] The Bureau:

- (49) *noted* the progress of the CDC Review.
- (50) *suggested* that the list of interviewees contain 1-2 members from other subsidiary bodies, donors, RPPOs, members from CDC project staff, as well as beneficiaries of those projects. It would also be helpful to have a representative that works with another capacity development team within FAO.
- (51) *noted* the status of CDC activities and congratulated the CD group on the work that has been performed thus far.
- (52) *noted* the call for new members or continuance of existing members scheduled for June or July 2014 .
- (53) *agreed* that the October Bureau will be in a position to discuss the results of the review.

6. Broader IPPC Issues

6.1 Enhancement Study Update

[74] An update was provided regarding the IPPC Enhancement Study. TORs have been sent regarding the study and feedback from the Secretariat has been provided. The Bureau believed that the study should focus on the organization, management and working procedures of the IPPC Secretariat rather than its technical programs and functions. In addition, the evaluation should not be restricted by the current FAO administrative system and should include Article XIV body status. There was also a request for the specific time commitments that Secretariat members should expect in order to be properly prepared and efficient. Concern was raised regarding the changes made from the TORs agreed to by CPM and the new TOR by FAO Evaluation.

[75] The FAO Office of Evaluation proposed two potential consultants and the cost and focus of those chosen seemed slightly out of initial intentions; the goal is to find a third consultant with expertise on the management and organization elements of the enhancement.

[76] Australia has engaged in formal contractual agreements with the Secretariat and the US has committed money, totaling 70,000 USD. Currently, the Bureau expects that the total costs for the evaluation should be around 100,000 USD.

[77] The Bureau met privately with the Senior Evaluation Officer from the FAO Office of Evaluation to review and finalize the TORs, clarify cost, timetable, concept of an expert panel, and methodology. It was agreed that there will be three consultants to complete the evaluation. The cost is projected at 110,000 USD and the projected timetable is to have a draft evaluation report to the Bureau by early December. A revised document will follow with the hope of a finalized draft by January 2015. The Bureau supported the concept of an expert panel at no additional cost, which will operate as a peer-review and quality check on the evaluation report. This expert panel still needs to be completely formed but the evaluation team is agreed. Some Bureau members agreed to suggest names for the panel.

[78] The Bureau:

- (54) *agreed* that the evaluation is intended to focus on the organization, management and working procedures of the IPPC Secretariat rather than its technical programs and functions, also noting that barriers and constraints to performance would also be an important element in the evaluation
- (55) *agreed* that the evaluation team can now be established and the evaluation can proceed with agreed TORs with the only pending matter of finalizing the expert panel
- (56) *agreed* that Bureau members could recommend experts for the expert panel

6.2 Trade Facilitation Agreement Update

[79] It's critical that contracting parties or NPPOs have strong coordination with their respective customs organizations that operate at their national borders. It was mentioned that most NPPOs simply do not have the capacity to monitor and address this new Trade Facilitation agreement. Due to the importance of the relationship between NPPOs and their respective customs operations, it was agreed that some basic awareness raising about the new emerging Trade Facilitation Agreement and obligation contained therein should be shared at regional workshops.

[80] The Bureau:

(57) *noted* some potential implications of the newly emerging trade facilitation agreement for NPPOs and their customs operations.

(58) *noted* that it would be useful to provide some awareness-raising information about this trade facilitation agreement to contracting parties during regional workshops

(59) *requested* that the Secretariat keeps them informed on the developments as it relates to the trade facilitation agreement and its future implementation

GEF

[81] Ulrich Apel, from GEF, was invited to discuss the potential of establishing future collaboration relationships in the future.

[82] Bureau members introduced themselves and expressed specific environmental concerns, namely pest free areas and global movement of invasive species, forest pests, and particularly the benefits of our partnership with CBD and their concentration on eliminating pest risk. It was noted that the IPPC expects to be recognized for the first time as a biodiversity convention this year and hopes to enter into a deeper exchange with environmental organizations, emphasizing the importance of implementation of the Convention.

[83] It was noted that while GEF funding is typically allocated to the countries and their implementing agencies (14) there is now the funding available from GEF is for invasive species related activities. The Bureau stated that it would be very interested in benefitting from this funding to bring the IPPC's sixty years of experience in plant protection, standard setting, trade facilitation, an involvement in knowledge to the conversation, monitoring projects to protect countries from invasive species. It was proposed that the IPPC has the capacity to be one of the 6 conventions or an implementation agency, but it is most important for the IPPC to increase activity with GEF because it is a question of efficacy in international coordination.

[84] The Bureau:

(60) *appreciated* the opportunity to gain awareness of GEF and will continue to consider ways to enhance the IPPC's interaction and relationship with GEF, realizing the importance of continued partnership with CBD as a basis for potential future funding opportunities

(61) *established* an understanding on ways forward with the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) and noted the potential for developing further relations with GEF

6.3 Guidance for CPM presentations on implementation successes and challenges

[85] The Secretariat requested that the Bureau offer guidance for how to manage this new standing agenda item in the CPM meetings, regarding contracting parties' presentations on implementation successes and challenges.

[86] It was noted that it's important to keep this as a standing agenda item to allow countries to have the opportunity to share their experiences in implementation. It will be necessary to specify criteria and parameters for papers and oral presentations (e.g., length, format, and content). It was noted that presentations should focus on issues of broad global impact and relevance to other contracting parties.

Over time, we should track the issues in the presentations to identify any recurring issues or themes that might be solved through a new standard setting work, capacity development, or other IPPC activities.

[87] It was mentioned that the Secretariat should notify countries of the opportunity to share their experience on implementation challenges and successes and for those interested to submit a short paper or abstract to the Secretariat. The Secretariat will review, select and translate 2-3 submissions before CPM-10. Those selected will provide a short introduction of their paper in CPM-10 Plenary and there will be brief discussion regarding these successes and challenges.

[88] The Bureau:

- (62) *agreed* that in the interest of time, it will be helpful to limit the number of submissions for the agenda item on “implementation successes and challenges”.
- (63) *agreed* that a notification would be sent to NPPOs and RPPOs with specific criteria, objectives, and rules for these presentations regarding length, format, and content, keeping in mind that presentations should address issues of broad global impact and relevance.
- (64) *agreed* that it be made clear that interested parties must submit one-page abstracts to the Secretariat with ample time review, select, and translate them before the CPM; the deadline for submissions will be 3 months prior to CPM-10.
- (65) *agreed* that this new standing agenda item would be evaluated by the Bureau to determine its value to CPM discussions.

6.4 The SPG

[89] The Secretariat presented a paper to discuss the current role and purpose of the SPG. The Secretariat was of the view that no real strategic planning takes place at the SPG, and that it has been essentially a mini-CPM to debate contentious issues with insufficient developing country representation. The Bureau noted that the SPG is an advisory not a decision-making body and that it has a history of initiating and progressing significant strategic issues that have been of great value to the IPPC.

[90] The Bureau also noted that the SPG serves as a forum where key ideas are developed, reviewed, and tested before CPM. The lack of developing country participation is a concern given the IPPC is composed of nearly 140 developing countries. However, this concern about representation and participation exists in the case of all the other CPM bodies, committees, working groups, etc. There were concerns regarding the cost associated with an expanded SPG.

[91] The Bureau:

- (66) *noted* the benefit of the discussions and specific initiatives that have been successfully developed through the SPG meeting.
- (67) *suggested* that more methods for increasing the participation from developing countries be explored.
- (68) *suggested* that after the Secretariat makes the call for participation in the SPG, Bureau members may be informally consulted to help identify appropriate participants from their respective regions; these participants should have strategic perspectives and be capable of contributing to SPG discussions.

6.5 Review of Operational Plans / Budgets

6.5.1 Report of Finance Committee meeting

[92] Updates from the June Financial Committee (FC) meeting were given, summarizing key issues of the discussion such as the general budget for IPPC, IPPC trust funds, and ways to generate additional donations and create more flexibility to the Multi-donor Trust Fund were explored.

- [93] Resource Mobilization efforts were discussed, especially with regard to the potential establishment of an international day, week, or year for plant protection that could be combined with a donor conference, to better integrate our work with the goal of raising funds for the IPPC. The FC agreed to explore the process for requesting an international day/week/year of this sort.
- [94] It was noted that a task force or steering group might need to be established to advance international day/week/year on plant health and concept of a donor conference. The FC discussed the need to continue exploring strategies including the potential for revenues to be generated by a future global ePhyto Hub system, potential sponsorship of meetings by specific countries, and less costly and more efficient means for translations and interpretations.
- [95] The FC plans to distribute a document (general financial outlook) to the Bureau, which provides a succinct and clear understanding of the current status of the FC.
- [96] The Bureau:
- (69) *noted* the discussions from the June FC meeting.
 - (70) *noted* the importance of the communications strategy needed to support the resource mobilization efforts.

6.5.2 Follow up actions from CPM-9 (2014) including the financial implications of CPM decisions

- [97] The Secretariat presented a paper on the financial implications of CPM decisions. The Bureau noted the usefulness of producing a document of this nature after CPM. The point was raised that this document should also reflect the human resource or staffing implications (staff resource and time requirements) of new CPM initiatives or other decisions made by CPM.
- [98] This year, the Open-ended working group on implementation, the IPPC Enhancement study, translation and interpretation costs, and the potential planning toward an international plant health day/week/year are considered the largest costs for the immediate future.
- [99] The Bureau:
- (71) *welcomed* the Secretariat paper as a useful tool to assess and monitor the financial implications and consequences of decisions made at CPM.
 - (72) *noted* that the FC should be the lead on the review of funds that carry out the activities of these decisions.
 - (73) *agreed* that in the event that the FC needs further guidance on financial decisions, they will consult the Bureau.
 - (74) *agreed* that the Chair to CPM will remind the Commission that every decision has a financial, human resource, and time implication, as well as mention that the Bureau will play a roll in prioritizing and aligning the CPM decisions to match existing resources.

6.6 Communication

6.6.1 Communications Work Plan

- [100] The Secretariat presented a paper on the updates on the Communications Work Plan. The Green Ink report provided a draft work plan with key points to consider for the development of a final work plan. Ways forward should focus on addressing the key results from the communication needs assessment—such as revising the IPPC website, ensuring a consistent message from the IPPC along all networks, and reporting success stories of the IPPC.
- [101] The Bureau noted that it is the responsibility of the Secretariat to be in communication with all contact points, as identified in the Communication Needs Assessment. It was noted that a full-communication work plan is best implemented with a full-time communications professional on the Secretariat.

[102] Despite reaching consensus that Communications is high priority, resources are limited. This highlights the need to reevaluate and to focus our attention on resource mobilization.

[103] The Bureau:

- (75) *noted* the strategic importance of a sound communications strategy and work plan for the IPPCs goal to create a more unified global awareness and resource mobilization
- (76) *suggested* that the Secretariat evaluate the work plan set forth by Green Ink, to set clear ways forward by prioritizing the key findings of the assessment
- (77) *suggested* that in the interim that the Secretariat continue to produce as many success stories possible to continue awareness raising of the IPPCs role in global plant protection
- (78) *suggested* that members identify potential communications experts from their organizations who may be available to help support CPMs communication needs agenda; the Bureau will return to this issue at their next meeting

6.7 Resource Mobilization

[104] The Secretariat presented a paper that highlights some of the key questions regarding resource mobilization. It was noted that the IPPC is embarking on many new activities with potential for great successes, and the need to acknowledge this. The paper also set forth a visionary plan for establishing a year of plant protection combined with a donor's conference, awareness-raising events, and other supportive activities for 2017 or 2018. A steering group would be required to plan and orchestrate such an event. It's also important that in the meantime, CPM continue to seek ways to effectively communicate IPPC successes in a unified, consistent manner, as a way to build towards the launching of a year of plant protection and a successful donor's conference. The Bureau was informed that FAO procedures exist for petitioning the United Nations to consider establishing a day, week, or year of global plant health.

[105] The Bureau:

- (79) *supported* the proposed concept of a year of plant health/donor's conference in 2017 or 2018.
- (80) *agreed* that this plan (Secretariat paper) be further developed and shared with the SPG for further discussion and input and then proposed to CPM-10.
- (81) *agreed* that a steering group or task force would be needed to realize this event.
- (82) *noted* that FAO procedures exist for petitioning the establishment of a year/day/week of plant health and the Secretariat will discuss the topic with FAO Legal for more information and guidance on these procedures.

6.8 Dispute settlement

6.8.1 Updates

[106] The SBDS Officer provided an oral report on the general activity and issues in the area of dispute settlement and noted the ongoing dispute involving South Africa and the EU and the possibility that this case will be formalized later this year. The upcoming meeting of the SBDS and the problem of attendance by some regions was also noted. There was discussion about the actual involvement of the SBDS in the South Africa EU case that is pending and it is unlikely that the SBDS would play any role in that mediation or dispute settlement.

[107] The Bureau discussed the option of retiring the SBDS as a standing CPM body in light of the lack of clear ongoing activities and function, and that instead the Secretariat continue to serve as the point of contact for members seeking dispute settlement assistance. The Bureau emphasized that the SBDS played a vital role in establishing the dispute settlement procedures and system but at present the SBDS role appears vague and inactive. It was suggested that the dispute settlement services continue on an as-needed basis managed by and through the Secretariat.

[108] The Bureau:

- (83) *shared* the view that this subsidiary body be possibly retired as a standing body because of its inactivity and the appropriate dispute settlement support services be activated when requests actually occur
- (84) *noted* the need to consult FAO Legal on the general matter of how formal subsidiary bodies are deactivated
- (85) *agreed* that the concept of “dispute avoidance” be explored at the upcoming SBDS meeting

6.9 Review of CPM 9

Adjustment to the translations of ISPMs

[109] The Secretariat presented a paper to explain the current and proposed costs and work flow for translations of draft ISPMs. Currently, the drafts are released in three languages (English French Spanish) and a proposal has been made to expand this to six languages. This raises challenges associated with increasing costs, timeliness in terms of FAO translation, and the quality of the translation.

[110] It was noted that FAO Translation Services have missed deadlines and alternative options are being explored. Increasing from three languages to six implies cost increases, of an estimated 100,000 USD. It was also noted that the language review process is not cost-neutral and has given rise to further concerns about eroding quality of translations.

[111] The Bureau:

- (86) *noted* the concerns related to the translations for draft ISPMs and technical standards, noting time constraints, financial implications, and quality of standard implications
- (87) *noted* the importance of the issue of translation in producing high-quality standards
- (88) *requested* that the Secretariat explore alternative options to publish ISPMs in the most efficient way, including possible outsourcing translation work (e.g. current system with member consultation (MC) in 3 languages, MC in 6 languages, and possible adjustments to volumes and timing).

CPM draft recommendations on sea containers

[112] The Secretariat presented an update on the CPM draft recommendations on sea containers. The European delegate to the Bureau agreed to follow-up with more information given that the EU had volunteered to draft an initial text of a recommendation. It was understood that a draft would be sent for country review in July with three months to comment. Comments would be the basis for a revised draft recommendation that will be sent to the Bureau in October for clearance. Bureau members would have an opportunity to engage their regions in a final review of the draft before it goes to CPM.

[113] The Bureau:

- (89) *noted* the general process and looked forward to seeing the draft text distributed to countries for a 3-month country consultation phase.
- (90) *requested* that once the text is finalized and distributed to the Bureau, final comments from the Bureau could be considered in the December Bureau teleconference

6.10 Preparation of October Bureau/ SPG Agenda

Agree Bureau Agenda

- SBDS
- implementation
- ePhyto

- NRO
- standards framework
- implementation
- SBDS
- CDC (evaluation draft)
- enhancement study
- communication professional position
- CPM-9 decisions / financial implications
- SS translations

[114] The Bureau:

- (91) suggested that the FC and Bureau meeting take place on the day prior to the SPG meeting in October, half day for the FC Meeting and half day for the Bureau. The Bureau will then meet on the Friday after the SPG.
- (92) noted that the draft agenda will be posted by 12 September and all documents will be posted on 19 September.

Agree SPG Agenda

[115] Items for the SPG agenda were discussed, and it was noted that a call would be issued to collect further issues for the SPG agenda. The call will emphasize the importance of presenting strategic issues, and should be issued on 11 July and closed on 31 August. This call will request the nomination of an SPG attendee, make a reminder to submit a concept paper for the discussion on the IPPC in 20 years, and request any IPPC-related strategic topic they'd like to propose. The call will specify that all documents be received by deadline 31 August (IPPC 20 year concept paper and any paper on proposed topic for SPG). Countries will also be reminded that the concept paper on IPPC in 20 years can be submitted in any of the 6 official FAO languages.

[116] The Bureau requested:

- the Secretariat to prepare a paper that analyzes financial, human resource, and time commitment implications will be prepared to glean strategic value from the SPG; prioritization of these implications.
- information on ePhyto and the progress on the development of the global ePhyto system
- an implementation discussion.
- an update resource mobilization/ donor conference/ international celebration on plant health.
- papers from all participants on the IPPC in 20 years (remind participants to provide short reflections).
- proposal for CPM discussions on criteria for recommendations (when is it appropriate and not to develop a recommendation).
- a discussion on strategic issues regarding diagnostics.
- discussing strategic partnership with CBD Secretariat and most efficient way to serve as a biodiversity convention.
- SBDS.
- CDC.
- traceability and diversion.
- the standards framework.

Chair for next SPG

[117] The South-Pacific delegate to the Bureau was selected to be the Chair of the SPG meeting.

6.11 Organization of CPM-10 (2015)

- 10th CPM Emphasized
- Possible draft ISPMS
- Number of interpretation sessions

[118] There will be 8 interpretation sessions

Length / Schedule

Ministerial participation

[119] The Bureau requested video or in-person ministerial participation for CPM-10. The Korean minister has been identified as a potential keynote speaker and an invitation has been sent.

Scientific topics

[120] The Bureau discussed the possibility of changing the title of this section to “Special topics” which will focus on scientific issues.

[121] The Bureau:

- (93) *agreed* that the CPM-10 Special topics would include new technologies for diagnostics, new methods for pest control, risk-based inspection systems
- (94) *agreed* that in the interest of time, one presentation be made instead of two for each topic for this agenda item

Side sessions (decision process, criteria, zero evening sessions)

[122] The CD presented the positive feedback, recommendations and evaluations performed by the CDC regarding Sunday training sessions, side events, scientific sessions, and general structure of the CPM.

[123] The Bureau:

- (95) *expressed* recognition and appreciation for the suggestions received from the CDC.
- (96) *supported* the recommendations and evaluation of the CDC on the general structure of the CPM.
- (97) *requested* that one slot for a side session be left open until December or January for any emergency side session proposal.
- (98) *agreed* to dedicate one of the first side sessions to discuss the details of the decisions to be taken at CPM on e-cert.
- (99) it was also *agreed* that at least 3 side-sessions were going to be dedicated to the release of capacity development resources and that the Sunday training session will address national reporting obligations.
- (100) the Secretariat *was requested* to explore the possible organization of side-sessions on: botanical gardens, plant shows and introduction of plants, as well as a session on food safety and security and its’ relationship with the IPPC.

Report and ISPMS as links

not discussed

Nominations to subsidiary bodies

not discussed

Rapporteur from developing countries

not discussed

[124] The Secretariat noted that the CPM Report writer has been invited back to complete the CPM Report and it might be helpful to have a developing country serve as an assistant to the Rapporteur to become comfortable with the process.

[125] The Bureau:

(101) *noted* that it would be beneficial to have a second Rapporteur from a developing country to provide a learning experience

(102) *requested* that the Secretariat explore interest from developing countries

(103) *noted* that there will be eight interpretation sessions in Plenary (Monday afternoon (only) commencement, Friday afternoon (only) conclusion of CPM-10.

6.12 Dates of meetings for 2014-2015

[126] The Secretariat distributed a paper with the list of meetings and mentioned that it would be posted and consistently updated. The Secretariat plans to participate in the food security convention in the fall in the form of an information table with selected IPPC publications.

7. Other business

[127] No other business was raised.

8. Next meeting

[128] The Chair of the Bureau thanked the Bureau members and the Secretariat for their contributions and urged their continued active engagement going forward. The Chair closed with three points 1) the need to continue with a strong focus on the resource mobilization strategy 2) the need to continue in the development of a communications strategy and work plan and consideration of establishing a professional communications specialist in the Secretariat and, 3) the need to develop a clear compelling message of the specific, high-value services that CPM would provides to the world if and when new resources come to the IPPC.