



***REPORT***

Rome, Italy  
26-27 March and  
04 April

# **CPM Bureau Meeting March-April 2014**



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

**CONTENTS**

**PRE CPM-9 (2014) SESSION** .....3

1. Opening of the meeting and update from the Secretary .....3
2. Adoption of the agenda and selection of a Rapporteur.....3
3. Review October 2014 Bureau and December 2014 Bureau report.....3
4. Information on the organizational arrangements for CPM-9 (2014) .....4
5. Discussion of the CPM-9 (2014) Agenda and papers.....4

**POST CPM-9 (2014) SESSION**..... 11

1. Handover to new Chairperson ..... 11
2. Issues arising from CPM-9 (2014) requiring Bureau actions ..... 11
3. Resource impact of CPM-9 (2014) decisions and prioritization ..... 12
4. Calendar of upcoming meetings ..... 12
5. June Agenda ..... 12
6. Other business..... 13
7. Closure of the meeting..... 13

**APPENDIXES**

Appendix 1 - Agenda ..... 14

Appendix 2 - ToRs for CDC evaluation..... 16

**COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES:****BUREAU MEETING**

*26-27 March 2014*

*10:00 to 17:00 Wednesday*

*9:00 to 17:00 Thursday*

*Pakistan Room (A127)*

*4 April 2014*

*10:30 to 12:00 Friday*

*Canada Room (A356/7)*

**PRE CPM-9 (2014) SESSION**

*26-27 March 2014, Pakistan Room (A127)*

**1. Opening of the meeting and update from the Secretary**

- [1] The Chairperson of the Commission of Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) opened the meeting.
- [2] The Secretary of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) thanked everyone for attending. He noted the progress made by the Secretariat in distributing documents for CPM more punctually than before and thanked the Bureau for their efforts in reviewing documents quickly.
- [3] The following Bureau members were present: Mr Steve Ashby; Chairperson, Mr Peter Thomson , Mr. Lucien Konan Kouamé , Mr. Francisco Gutierrez , Ms Kyu-Ock Yim and Mr John Greifer .
- [4] It was noted that Mr Mohammad Katbeh Bader was not able to attend.
- [5] The following Secretariat staff were present: Mr Yukio Yokoi (Secretary), Mr Brent Larson (Acting Coordinator-Standards Officer), Mr David Nowell (National Reporting Officer), Mr Orlando Sosa (IRSS Officer), Ms Sonya Hammons, Mr Marko Benovic and Ms Francesca Crozier-Fitzgerald.

**2. Adoption of the agenda and selection of a Rapporteur**

- [6] An updated agenda was reviewed and adopted as presented in Appendix 1
- [7] Mr John Greifer was selected as Rapporteur.

**3. Review October 2014 Bureau and December 2014 Bureau report**

- [8] The Bureau followed up on some requests for information from the October 2014 Bureau report. The acting Coordinator informed the Bureau that there would be no extra costs incurred if the OCS was to be used to collect comments on draft recommendations. There was a concern expressed that use of the OCS for collecting comments on recommendations needs to ensure that the impression is not given that the recommendations were developed under the standard setting process.

[9] The acting Coordinator presented some modifications to the December 2014 Bureau report; the Bureau accepted these changes and requested the Secretariat to replace the report posted on the IPP. It was also agreed that the reports should be circulated to the Bureau prior to being posted.

[10] The Bureau:

- (1) *noted* that the whole Bureau and Secretariat should see and sign off on all Bureau reports before they are posted.
- (2) *noted* that the process for consultation on draft recommendations could use the OCS system, that other strategic considerations should be taken into account and there should not be additional costs.

#### **4. Information on the organizational arrangements for CPM-9 (2014)**

[11] The Secretariat distributed the CPM schedule and noted that any adjustments made at this meeting would be recorded and an updated version would be distributed to the Bureau and Secretariat.

#### **5. Discussion of the CPM-9 (2014) Agenda and papers**

[12] The CPM-9 (2014) Schedule was discussed in detail.

##### *1. Opening of the session*

[13] It was noted that Assistant Director General, Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department, Mr Ren WANG will welcome CPM members to FAO. His welcome will be followed by a video presentation from Mr Nathan Guy, the Minister for Primary Industries, New Zealand. The Secretary of the IPPC will also welcome CPM members.

##### *2. Adoption of the agenda*

[14] The Bureau agreed that “any other business” points would need to be added under agenda item 20 but would propose these items be discussed under different agenda points:

- The IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Study (item added by Canada/USA) will be discussed under a new agenda point 10.2.3, just after the item on Resource Mobilization
- The Agreement on Trade Facilitation (item added by the IPPC Secretariat) will be discussed after the agenda item on the Report of the SPS Secretariat (agenda item 14.3)

[15] Agenda 15 adoption of CPM recommendations will be discussed before Agenda 10.

##### *3. EU Statement of competence*

[16] The Secretariat informed the Bureau member from Europe that the EU statement of competence had not yet arrived and he agreed to follow up and ensure it was sent to the Secretariat promptly.

##### *4. Election of the Rapporteur*

[17] There has been a proposal from Canada to provide a Rapporteur. The Bureau noted that he should be nominated by CPM members. The Chair noted that he has attempted to get developing countries involved in this position and has not been successful.

##### *5. Establishment of the Credentials Committee*

[18] The Secretariat requested Bureau members to liaise with their regions and highlight the importance of nominating their credentials committee representative as soon as possible. It was agreed that the IRSS officer would provide the Secretariat support for this committee.

[19] The Bureau:

- (3) *agreed* the CPM Chairperson should inform regions at the opening of the session that a credentials committee member would be needed from their region.

6. *Report by the Chairperson of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures*

- [20] The Chairperson will make a power point presentation. He would highlight that written reports of the Bureau meetings as well as reports of the Financial Committee meetings are also posted on the IPP.

7. *Report by the IPPC Secretariat*

- [21] The Secretariat presented the new format for the Secretariat report, noting the report will be translated into languages and printed after CPM-9 (2014). The Bureau noted the new format and welcomed the fact that it was less bureaucratic and more appealing to a wider audience.

8. *Governance*

a) *Partnerships*

- [22] The Bureau discussed the need to clarify the different types of relationships, making it more transparent how the Secretariat interfaced with various organizations.

The Bureau:

- (4) *noted* that the list is important to present to the CPM for the sake of transparency and that the June Bureau meeting should review and update the list as well as develop criteria for each type of relationship: partnership, cooperation and liaison.

b) *Process for adopting recommendations*

- [23] The Chair was reminded to clearly differentiate that this item was dealing with the process for developing and adopting recommendations and agenda item 15 was dealing with the adoption of currently proposed recommendations. The Secretary noted that the paper on recommendations for CPM is important to be adopted. Once adopted, it can be mentioned that the OCS will be used for accepting comments on recommendations.

9. *Standard setting*

9.1. *Report on the activities of the Standards Committee*

- [24] It was noted that there were formal objections to 8 standards (7 on phytosanitary cold treatments and 1 fruit fly standard dealing with responding to outbreaks). These standards will now go back to the SC. This experience has made it clear that some of the wording in the IPPC Standard setting process needs to be clarified. The Secretariat also expressed the importance of timely engagement from contracting parties as if some of this information would have been presented earlier in the standard setting process, the standards could have been adjusted to address the concerns.

9.2 *Adoption of International Standards*

- [25] In addition to the three standards that will be adopted, one diagnostic protocol, adopted by the SC on behalf of the CPM will be noted.

9.3 *Adjustment to the translations of ISPMs*

- [26] Translation issues still exist and many complaints have been submitted to the Secretariat about the poor translations provided. The Standards Officer noted that he is considering some creative solutions to providing better translations, however the cost may increase. He informed the Bureau that he will present a more detailed proposal to the June Bureau meeting.

[27] It was also noted that the Language Review Group (LRG) coordinator for Russian had retired midway in the LRG process and not all of the standards adopted in Russian had been reviewed.

#### 9.4 *Topics for IPPC Standards*

##### 9.4.1 *List of Topics*

[28] No points of discussion

##### 9.4.2 *Update on the topic: International movement of grain*

[29] There may be some further discussion on how to address diversion from intended use and traceability but it was noted that these discussion do not relate only to grain but have a broader application.

##### 9.4.2 *Update on the topic: Minimizing pest movement by sea containers (2008-001)*

[30] The Secretariat noted that members have diverse views on how to proceed on this topic but the SC would need to do a detailed review of member comments at their May SC meeting.

#### 9.4 *Framework for Standards*

[31] No particular points were raised.

### 10. *IPPC Strategic Framework and Resource Mobilization*

#### 10.1 *Report on the activities of the SPG*

[32] No points of discussion

##### 10.2. *Implementation Paper presented by NZ*

###### 10.2.1. *Implementation process*

[33] The pilot work plan on implementation and projected costs should be discussed during the CPM as well as who will lead the development of a draft work plan.

[34] The Bureau:

(5) *suggested* that the Secretariat be the lead on developing the work plan.

###### 10.2.2 *Resource Mobilization Efforts and Results*

[35] The Bureau noted that in-kind contributions for 2013 should be presented to the CPM as a CPM paper, the Secretariat agreed to develop an INF paper based on the information provided on the IPP to be reviewed by both the Secretariat and Bureau before being posted.

#### 10.3. *Financial Report 2013—Budget and Operational Plans 2014/2015*

[36] The Secretariat presented the progress of the Financial and Planning Committee and noted their work to align Secretariat financial planning in concordance with the FAO Strategic Objectives.

[37] The Bureau:

(6) *thanked* the Secretariat for the clear financial report and budget

#### 10.4 *Implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs*

- [38] The Secretary offered an update on the registration and renewal of the ISPM15 symbol. The 2013 renewals are complete. The high-level letter from the DG to senior foreign affairs counterparts and permanent representatives in the countries without registration should be sent within the week.
- [39] In the coming months, the Secretariat is focusing on establishing criteria for prioritizing countries for new registration and on methods to help ensure reimbursement from countries where the symbol has been registered.
- [40] The FAO Legal Office suggests that they would like to avoid noting the risk of non-registration and rather, to encourage the importance of intellectual property protection.

#### 10.4.2 *ePhyto and ePhyto Hub Feasibility Study*

- [41] The ePhyto Steering Group provided a report for the CPM-9 (2014) and a report of the Feasibility Study was recently submitted to the Secretariat. As there was insufficient time to do a proper review of the feasibility study it was decided to provide the CPM with a brief update and overview of the recommendations and to request the CPM to allow the ePhyto Steering Group to work in this area to continue under the oversight of the CPM Bureau.
- [42] There was some discussion on exploring the possibility of a global symposium but it was decided to wait until solid recommendations could be presented before trying to get agreement on this idea.
- [43] The Bureau:
- (7) *advised* the ePhyto Steering Group / Secretariat to update CPM-9 (2014) on progress in two separate documents to the CPM. One should be an INF paper which provides some background, an executive summary and a list of proposed recommendations coming from the feasibility study and the other should be a summary of the work of the ePhyto Steering Group which also requests the CPM to allow work to continue under the oversight of the Bureau.

#### 10.5 *IRSS*

- [44] The Secretariat provided an update on the first phase of IRSS, the review of ISPM 17 and ISPM 19, now posted on the IPP. They noted that there is a draft work plan in the report and the Bureau was requested to comment on the draft work plan.
- [45] The Bureau:
- (8) *noted* their invitation to comment on the draft work plan

#### 10.6 *Contracting Parties' Reports of Successes and Challenges of Implementation*

- [46] This agenda item would include two reports: one from the Central African project and one from Canada, discussing the successes and challenges of implementation. The IPPC Coordinator would explain the nature of this new agenda item, to encourage contracting parties to share positive and challenging experiences, and would note that a form would be sent out before CPM-10 (2015) to elicit interventions.
- [47] The Bureau:
- (9) *agreed* to distribute a format for making these types of interventions on implementation successes and challenges and request these be submitted to the Secretariat one month prior to the CPM meeting.

#### 11. *Capacity development*

- [48] The Secretariat shared two updates with the Bureau and asked for decisions on three items. The first update was to highlight that most of the CD updates would take place at side sessions of CPM

including new products, publications, and activities. Bureau members were strongly encouraged to attend these side events.

[49] Second, it was noted that after approval last year of the project STDF-401 Training of Facilitators of the PCE, the project has been incorporated into the FAO system and is now being implemented.

[50] Three areas were raised for decision:

- All participants of regional workshops funded by IPPC had been required to send at minimum one comment per draft ISPM as a condition for future funding to participate in workshops. This requirement had been raised in the CPM papers on regional workshops, the CPM-8 report, letters of invitation to the workshops and during the workshops themselves. Many participants funded by the IPPC did not submit any comments and the Secretariat requested guidance from the Bureau as to whether fund participants from these countries for the 2014 workshops.
- The Bureau recognized that the workshops have broader benefits beyond developing comments on draft ISPMs and encouraged developing a different policy in the future. They noted that the Secretariat should continue working on the expanded scope of the regional workshops and that this new direction and their discussions of the workshops' value would be useful inputs to the development of a future funding policy.
- TORs for the CDC Evaluation were presented to the Bureau for their approval. The review would be used to help guide the CDC in the future and determine the pros and cons of continuing with the CDC as a committee, converting it to a CPM subsidiary body or some other option. The CVs of several types of consultants were circulated in order to give the Bureau a better understanding of the different types of expertise that could be sought. The Bureau revised the TORs to focus on a review of the CDC's processes instead of a broader assessment of the impact of the CDC and other capacity development activities that have taken place since the CPM adopted the IPPC capacity development strategy.
- The Secretariat highlighted that the IPPC has a CPM-adopted capacity development strategy, work plan, and funding to implement CD activities. However, the staff to implement these activities is extremely short term and unstable, with several upcoming mandatory contract breaks. The CDC had asked for the Secretariat and Bureau to pursue more stable options to implement these activities. The Secretariat asked the Bureau to consider this when discussing the budget.

[51] The Bureau:

- (10) *Instructed* the Secretariat not to apply the policy of not funding future participants from countries who did not submit comments on draft ISPMs in 2013.
- (11) *Agreed* on the revised terms of reference for the evaluation of the CDC and for the IPPC Secretariat to select the service provider to conduct the review.
- (12) *Noted* the concerns of the Secretariat and CDC in terms of the need for a reliable staffing situation to implement the capacity development strategy, work plan and activities.

## 12. *National Reporting Obligations*

[52] The Secretary noted that the National Reporting Obligations Advisory Group (NROAG) had their first teleconference in March 2014 and will have their first face-to-face meeting in July 2014. The NROAG is responsible for analyzing and debating country obligations, legal responsibilities, and presenting a prioritized list for the Bureau meeting in June.

[53] The Secretariat is finalizing the P-2 staff position available for the NRO group, decision to be made in April.



[54] It was noted that the benefits of National Reporting and consequences of not reporting should be made very clear at CPM-9 (2014).

[55] The Bureau:

- (13) *suggested* that there be a proposal to CPM-10 (2015) regarding the necessary revisions for the NRO work programme.
- (14) *suggested* that the NRO at CPM-9 (2014) should urge members to return to their countries and stress the importance of providing support.
- (15) *noted* the importance of organizing a meeting during CPM-9 (2014) and asked Bureau members to liaise with their regions to nominate representatives.

### 13. *Communications*

[56] The Secretariat presented the results of the Communications Needs Assessment delivered by Green Ink. It was noted that although delays in the process pushed back deliverable dates, this time was utilized to circulate and collaborate on the design of the general stakeholder survey, incorporating comments and necessary input from the Bureau and Secretariat core group members. This was to ensure that all effective channels for communication could be evaluated.

[57] The assessment yielded a good response rate as well as additional feedback regarding countries' needs for the future communications work plan. Additional comments, statistics, and recommendations for ways forward gleaned from the needs assessment report were discussed. Key findings focused on the need for more internal cooperation utilizing cross-departmental communication strategies, a need for palatable and accessible language by which to communicate the IPPC's relevance to the public, and a complete restructuring and redesign as soon as possible with new architecture.

[58] The Secretariat distributed a proposed draft work plan from Green Ink, which identified possible ways forward as explicitly noted in the needs assessment report. The Secretariat also noted that a final work plan can be delivered, after a communications advisory group (which was proposed in the report) prioritizes the needs for the way forward.

[59] The Bureau

- (16) *noted* the delivery of the communications needs assessment and draft work plan.
- (17) *requested* that results from the Needs Assessment Report should be made public in connection with the work plan, once finalized.
- (18) *noted* that a communications advisory group will liaise with the Secretariat to prioritize the recommendations from the Needs Assessment Report.

### 14. *Liaison and Partnership of the IPPC and cooperation with relevant regional and international organizations*

#### 14.1 *Report of the 2nd Technical Consultation among RPPOs*

#### 14.2 *Reports from Observer Organizations with joint work programmes*

##### 14.2.1 *Report by the Secretariat of the SPS Committee*

##### 14.2.2. *Report by the Secretariat of the STDF*

##### 14.2.4 *Report by the CBD Secretariat*

[60] The WTO's Agreement on Trade Facilitation (ATF) was discussed and the proposed Secretariat's paper was reviewed. It was noted that the ATF would be undergoing a legal review in the near future

and the Secretariat wished to request observer status at this meeting. . It was not clear how the ATF would be implemented or if there would be additional obligations. It was also not clear what was the relationship between this agreement and the SPS agreement or if the ATF would have any impact on the role of ISPMs . A position paper developed by the US was presented and discussed, this paper identifies some of the issues that should be investigated further, and provides analysis that could communicate the specific issues in the ATF that may need to be addressed.

[61] The Secretary provided a chart to explain how trade facilitation has progressed over time and how the SPS Agreement was initiated. The legal discussion is crucial in order to fully understand how the protocol texts will be implemented.

[62] The FAO Legal Office was consulted on the paper and is preparing a written response. They have identified potential concerns from an international law viewpoint regarding the processes of implementation.

[63] A member from the Bureau suggested that the presentation of the ATF to CPM-9 (2014) must be for the purpose of awareness-raising, to encourage NPPOs to talk to their WTO delegation, and then prepare for the results of the legal review. They should study the text and discuss with their WTO delegation the possible impacts on this agreement.

[64] The Bureau:

(19) *agreed* to present the Secretariat's paper to CPM-9 (2014) pointing out clearly that there are possible concerns and advise NPPOs to discuss this nationally and identify possible consequences.

## 16. *Effective dispute settlement systems*

### 16.1 *Report on the activities of the Subsidiary body on Dispute Settlement (SBDS)*

[65] The SBDS will meet on Monday during CPM-9 (2014) week to check on progress and the Chair of the SBDS will present their work to CPM-9 (2014) and request them to respond to the recommendations.

### 16.2 *Review of the SBDS*

## 17. *Scientific session*

[66] The Secretariat announced that the session will take place on Thursday afternoon as usual, during Plenary. The Bureau noted that timing must be monitored to keep everyone on track.

### 17.1 *New Inspection*

### 17.2 *Pest Risk Assessment Techniques*

### 17.3 *Experiences in ePhyto*

## 18. *Election of the CPM: Chair, Vice Chair, other Bureau members and potential replacements*

### 19. *Membership and potential replacements for CPM subsidiary bodies*

#### 19.1 *Standards Committee*

#### 19.2 *Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement*

[67] The Secretariat explained the paper and tables, which presents the nominations received and those that are missing.

[68] The Bureau:

(20) *noted* the importance of following formal process for recommendations.

- (21) *requested* Bureau members to help ensure nominations for agenda points 18 and 19 were submitted to the Secretariat in a timely manner.
- (22) *suggested* that the rotation and nomination process should be explained and CPM-9 (2014) could benefit from this reminder.

20. *Other business*

- [69] There was a proposal for IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Study. The Bureau noted that if an agreement is reached by CPM on conducting an Enhancement Study, steps forward need to be established and terms of reference developed and agreed.
- [70] The Bureau mentioned that the study, to be well structured, needs to bring in all the necessary terms of reference such as the external evaluation done by FAO, as well as the experiences of Secretariat members.
- [71] The Bureau will meet with the CPM-9 (2014) Report writer, David Massey, on Friday, March 28 at 3:30. Finally, the Secretariat discussed details regarding the Thursday evening cocktail.

**Friday April 4, 0930**

**POST CPM-9 (2014) SESSION**

*04 April 2014, Friday, 10:30 – 12:00, Canada Room (A356/7)*

**1. Handover to new Chairperson**

- [72] Mr Steve Ashby opened the meeting and welcomed the new CPM chairperson Ms Ky-Ock Yim. The Chair was passed to Ms Yim who thanked the former Chairperson for his contributions over the past years as both a Bureau member and as the CPM Chairperson of the past two years. The Chairperson welcomed the new Bureau members.

- [73] The following Bureau members were present:

- Current: Ms Kyu-Ock Yim (Chair) Mr Peter Thomson (Vice Chair), Mr. Lucien Konan Kouamé, Mr John Greifer, Mr Cornelius Antonius Maria Van Alphen and Mr Diego Quiroga.
- Past: Mr Steve Ashby, Chair, Mr Francisco Gutierrez

- [74] It was noted that Mr Mohamed Refaat Rasmy had not been informed of the meeting and did not attend.

- [75] The following Secretariat staff were present: Mr Yukio Yokoi (Secretary), Mr Craig Fedchock (Coordinator), Mr Brent Larson (Standards Officer), Ms Ana Peralta (Capacity Development Officer), Mr David Novell (National Reporting Officer), Mr Orlando Sosa (IRSS Officer), Mr Marko Benovic (Finance) and Ms Francesca Crozier Fitzgerald (Communications).

**2. Issues arising from CPM-9 (2014) requiring Bureau actions**

- [76] The Bureau discussed and assigned leads for upcoming IPPC activities. The assigned members are as follows:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr Lucien Konan KOUAME - NRO</li> <li>• Standard Committee - (proposed) Mr Mohamed REFAAT RASMY</li> <li>• ePhyto- Mr Peter THOMSON</li> <li>• CDC - Mr. Corné VAN ALPHEN</li> <li>• Communications - Mr John</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation - Mr Peter THOMSON</li> <li>• Evaluation/Enhancement Study - Ms Kyu-Ock YIM</li> <li>• Financial Committee: Mr John GRIEFER - Chair, Mr Lucien Konan</li> </ul>
---	---

GRIEFER • SBDS - Mr John GRIEFER	KOUAME, Ms Kyu-Ock YIM and Mr Ralf LOPIAN
-------------------------------------	---

### 3. Resource impact of CPM-9 (2014) decisions and prioritization

[77] Discussion on this point was deferred to the June 2014 Bureau meeting.

### 4. Calendar of upcoming meetings

[78] The following meetings are schedule for the upcoming months:

<b>May</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5-9 SC</li> <li>• 12-16 SC-7</li> </ul>	<b>July</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1-3 NRO</li> <li>• 7-11 Implementation</li> <li>• 8-10? SBDS / TPPT</li> </ul>
<b>June</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2- 6 CDC</li> <li>• 23 FC</li> <li>• 24-27 Bureau</li> <li>• 30 June to 2 July ePhyto</li> </ul>	<b>October</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 FC</li> <li>• 7-9 SPG</li> <li>• 10 Bureau</li> </ul>

### 5. June Agenda

[79] The Bureau discussed many agenda items and agreed that the following would be put on the agenda for the June 2014 Bureau meeting:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATF</li> <li>• Communications</li> <li>• Contributions, Raising the IPPC profile</li> <li>• CPM 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary in 2015</li> <li>• CPM-10 (2015): agenda, side sessions, Science session topics, paperless</li> <li>• Engaging experts in the standard setting process</li> <li>• IPPC Enhancement evaluation</li> <li>• Framework for IPPC standards</li> <li>• Implementation pilot work plan and OEWG</li> <li>• NRO progress</li> <li>• Analysis of financial implications of CPM decisions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oversight of the ePhyto steering group</li> <li>• Plant health day/year</li> <li>• Regional nomination process</li> <li>• Resource impact of CPM-9 (2014) decisions and prioritization</li> <li>• Review FAO events</li> <li>• Review of the Secretariat's annual report</li> <li>• Review of the Standard setting process</li> <li>• SBDS</li> <li>• Sea container recommendation</li> <li>• SPG agenda and representation</li> <li>• Successes and challenges</li> <li>• Traceability</li> <li>• Language/Translation issues</li> </ul>
---	--

[80] The Bureau discussed the need to examine the procedure for adopting Standards. The Standards Committee agreed to discuss the specific issues in the procedure for adopting standards and agreed to present this list of issues to the June Bureau meeting. Traceability and intended use should also be part of the discussion at the June Bureau in preparation for the SPG.

[81] Regarding the revision of the IPPC Procedural Manual, the Bureau requested the Secretariat to ensure the IPPC Procedural Manual is updated immediately and posted on the IPP.

[82] The Bureau mentioned that in the June meeting, they should discuss the preliminary planning for 10<sup>th</sup> year anniversary of the CPM and the IPPC International day or year of Plant Health. The Bureau discussed the importance of hosting side sessions during FAO Conferences to attract attentions from

donors. The interest of regional FAO Officers to present the phytosanitary resources prepared by the CDC to the regional FAO Conferences was also mentioned. The June Bureau meeting should discuss the potential to operate “paperless” at CPM-10 (2015), and explore the options regarding costs and power cables in Plenary.

- [83] Also at the June meeting, the Secretariat proposed providing an update on the Trade Facilitation Agreement, including information (if any) on how OIE and Codex are responding. It would be helpful to have a close analysis/joint-interpretation with sister organizations, including a legal analysis. The Bureau would like to have a confirmation from the FAO Legal Services that nothing will change in our obligations under the SPS agreement.
- [84] The June Bureau meeting should seek to assess the financial impact of decisions made by CPM-9 (2014).
- [85] In June the Bureau should discuss the development of a Communications sub-committee of the Bureau similar to the FC. The Secretariat noted that it will continue to utilize communication professionals.

## 6. Other business

- [86] The Bureau discussed and approved the TORs for the Evaluation of the CDC. It was noted that all conclusions and judgments by the consultant must be evidence-based.

[87] The Bureau:

(23) *approved* the TORs for the CDC Evaluation as presented in Appendix 2.

- [88] Regarding the Secretariat Enhancement Study, the Bureau agreed to write a letter to Mr Ren Wand, AGD AG from the CPM Chairperson, specifying the TORs for the FAO Evaluation team. The letter should note the clear goals of this enhancement and note that the CPM Bureau would be interested in overseeing the process together with Mr Ren Wang. The CPM Chairperson would request to be the recipient of the first draft of the evaluation report as well as to be allowed to participate in the review of the initial findings of this enhancement evaluation.

## 7. Closure of the meeting

- [89] The Chair noted that actions from this meeting will be summarized. She closed the meeting and encouraged the Bureau members to begin their preparations for the June Bureau meeting.

## Appendix 1 - Agenda

### Agenda

#### CPM Bureau meeting

26-27 March 2014 and 4 April 2014

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER	DOCUMENT NO.
<b>PRE CPM-9 (2014) SESSION</b> <b>26-27 March 2014, Pakistan Room (A127)</b>		
1. Opening of the meeting and update from the Secretary	YOKOI	
2. Adoption of the agenda and selection of a Rapporteur	ASHBY	Bur_2013_Apr_01
3. Review October 2014 Bureau and December 2014 Bureau report.	ASHBY	<a href="https://www.ippc.int/cor-e-activities/governance/bureau">https://www.ippc.int/cor-e-activities/governance/bureau</a>
4 Information on the organizational arrangements for CPM-9 (2014)	LARSON	Schedule to be distributed at meeting
5 Discussion of the CPM-9 (2014) Agenda and papers	ALL	CPM-9 (2014) documents
Review of papers and discussions identification of potential difficulties and Strategy for presentations and clarity on decision. <b>Specific issues identified below:</b>		
Opening of the Session (Ag 1) -arrangements	YOKOI	
Rapporteur (Ag 4) -nominations	YOKOI	
Governance (Ag 8) -partnerships -recommendation	LARSON YOKOI	
Standard setting (Ag 9) -Grain -Sea Containers	LARSON	
IPPC Strategic Framework and Resource Mobilization (Ag 10) - Implementation paper -CP reports of successes and challenges of implementation -IRSS and TRG	YOKOI  SOSA	
Capacity development (Ag 11) -side sessions	HAMMONS	
National Reporting Obligations (Ag 12) -possible response to progress	NOWELL	
Communications (Ag 13) -discuss needs assessment report	CROZIER-FITZGERALD	
Dispute settlement (Ag 16) -possible response to progress	NOWELL	

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>	<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>
Scientific session (Ag 17)	YOKOI	
Other business (Ag 20) -Agreement on Trade Facilitation -Canada: Proposal for IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Study -Translation issues	YOKOI YOKOI LARSON	
CPM report -Meeting with Report writer on Friday	CROZIER- FITZGERALD	
6. Thursday evening cocktail	YOKOI	
<b>POST CPM-9 (2014) SESSION</b> <b>04 April 2014, Friday, 10:30 – 12:00, Canada Room (A356/7)</b>		
1. Handover to new Chairperson	ASHBY	
2. Issues arising from CPM 8 9 requiring Bureau actions	NEW CHAIRPERSON	
3. Resource impact of CPM-9 (2014) decisions and prioritization	FEDCHOCK	
4. Calendar of upcoming meetings	FEDCHOCK	
5. June Agenda	NEW CHAIRPERSON	
6. Other business	NEW CHAIRPERSON	
7. Close	NEW CHAIRPERSON	

## Appendix 2- ToRs for CDC evaluation

### ToRs for CDC evaluation (comments from Bureau)

#### Background

At CPM-7 (2012)<sup>1</sup>, the CPM established the CDC to provide guidance on IPPC capacity development activities. It was agreed that after two years (at CPM-9 in 2014) the CPM would review the function of the CDC including deciding whether to establish a subsidiary body.

The CPM Bureau, at its June 2013 meeting, agreed that the review of the CDC would instead take place at CPM-10 in 2015. This is because in order to arrange a review of the CDC at CPM-9 (2014), the review would have covered only the first year of CDC activities due to the time needed to conduct the review and present it as a CPM paper. The one-year extension will allow the review to cover the full initial two-year period of CDC activities.

The terms of reference for the review of the CDC will be approved by the Bureau in its March 2014 meeting. The review will then take place and be presented to the Bureau in October 2014 and to CPM-10 in 2015.

#### Terms for the Evaluation

##### 1. Basis for the evaluation

The CDC evaluation shall be independent and external, based on the capacity development activities that have taken place since the adoption of the IPPC Capacity Development Strategy (2012-2019) in 2010 (CPM-5). The evaluation will take into account that the CDC agreed on a long-term plan for capacity building work with the understanding that although the activities would not be completed within the two-year initial timespan of the CDC, they would provide useful guidance for the work of the Secretariat.

- (1) At CPM-8 (2013) the Secretariat presented a “long-term outline of work for capacity development (2012-2019)” drafted by the CDC<sup>2</sup>. This integrated relevant elements of the IPPC Strategic Framework, IPPC National Phytosanitary Capacity Building Strategy and the IPPC phytosanitary capacity development work plan. The CDC focused only on the items of this capacity development work plan associated for which the IPPC Secretariat was the activities’ lead. The IPPC Capacity Development Workplan<sup>3</sup> also includes activities to be led by entities other than the CDC and the Secretariat.
- (2) The evaluator shall take into account that CDC noted that its work was dynamic and would continuously evolve. The plan of activities for the CDC timeframe is considered a living document that the Secretariat and CDC implement and maintain collaboratively.
- (3) The consultant shall consider the results of the IPPC External Evaluation on items related to Technical Assistance and Capacity Development, the results of the first round of the Implementation Review and support System (IRSS) and the findings of the Framework for standards meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> CPM-7 (2012) report available at: <https://www.ippc.int/publications/cpm-7-report-2012-1>

<sup>2</sup> CPM 2013/21

<sup>3</sup> The IPPC Capacity Development Workplan is contained within the IPPC Capacity Development Strategy, available at <https://www.ippc.int/about/mediakit>



- (4) The ToRs and RoPs of the CDC shall constitute one of the main basis for performing the evaluation and propose recommendations.

## **2. Conditions for the evaluation**

The consultations for the evaluation should cover: IPPC contracting parties, from all regions, representing developed and developing countries.

- (1) The type of persons to be interviewed should include members of the Bureau, Secretariat and Subsidiary bodies, CDC, Regional Plant Protection Organization (RPPOs), donors, and focused groups as: countries that applied the PCE, project beneficiaries, countries that participated in CD activities, countries that never participated in CD activities, etc. (ensuring good coverage geographically).
- (2) The evaluator shall report to the IPPC Coordinator and coordinate its activities with the IPPC Implementation Officer and the IRSS officer who will provide guidance on information sources.
- (3) Means to be used for the interviews and consultation

The interviews shall be performed using preferably electronic means and in the most direct and cost effective way.

Face to face interactions shall be used only as needed and after decision by the IPPC Secretariat.

## **3. Reporting**

The final report in electronic version shall be presented to the CDC, Bureau and SPG for its consideration in their meetings in October 2014, before presentation to CPM 10 (2015).

## **4. Objectives and Tasks of the evaluation**

The objective of the evaluation is to review the functions of the CDC including considering pros and cons of whether to establish a subsidiary body to the CPM.

The tasks shall include evidence-based assessment of:

- the alignment of the CDC work program with the IPPC strategic objectives
- the efficiency of the CDC functional systems and processes
- the CDC decision making processes (transparency, efficiency, etc.)
- contracting party views on value of CDC work as well as other stakeholders as appropriate (could be small sample size)
- value for money in terms of operation
- the implications and pros and cons for maintaining or changing its status as a Committee, a CPM Subsidiary Body.

## **5. Criteria for selection (selection to be performed by the Secretariat):**

- cost
- timeliness
- absence of conflict of interest
- past experience in related evaluations