



*REPORT*

Rome, Italy  
7-10 Oct. 2014

# Strategic Planning Group October, 2014



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

## Contents

1. Opening of the Meeting .....	3
2. Adoption of the Agenda .....	3
3. Housekeeping .....	3
4. Selection of a Rapporteur .....	3
5. Secretariat Update.....	3
5.1 General update .....	3
5.2 Framework for Standards .....	3
5.3 ePhyto study .....	5
6.1 Bureau update.....	6
6.2 Implementation .....	6
7. Strategic Topics .....	8
7.1 The IPPC in 20 years.....	8
7.2 Resource mobilization – next steps to implement the IPPC strategy.....	13
7.3 Communications update.....	14
7.4 Programme review of National Reporting Obligations.....	15
7.5 Strategic issues on diagnosis.....	17
7.6 Diversion from intended use .....	18
7.7 Traceability in phytosanitary context.....	19
7.7 Concepts of an ISPM .....	19
7.9 CDC review.....	20
8. Topics Proposed by Contracting Parties and RPPOs.....	20
9. Other Business .....	20
10. Next Meeting .....	20
11. Close of Meeting. ....	20

## Annexes

Annex 1 – Documents list .....	21
Annex 2 – Agenda.....	23
Annex 3 – Participants list.....	25

## 1. Opening of the Meeting

- [1] Mr Peter THOMSON (New Zealand), Chairperson of the Strategic Planning Group (SPG), welcomed the participants. He informed the SPG that the IPPC Enhancement team would be observing parts of the meeting.
- [2] The IPPC Secretary also welcomed the participants noting that he looked forward to the discussions on the 20 vision of the IPPC. He invited the participants to introduce themselves.

## 2. Adoption of the Agenda

- [3] The SPG adopted the agenda (Appendix 1).

## 3. Housekeeping

- [4] The IPPC Coordinator introduced the Documents list (Appendix 2) and the Participants list (Appendix 3). Logistic arrangements were clarified.

## 4. Selection of a Rapporteur

- [5] Mr Josiah M. SYANDA (Kenya) was elected as the Rapporteur.

## 5. Secretariat Update

### 5.1 General update

- [6] The IPPC Secretary gave an update on the activities of the Secretariat the past year<sup>1</sup>.
- [7] The IPPC Secretary informed the SPG that, for personal reasons, he had decided to leave the Organization by the end of December 2014.
- [8] The SPG thanked Mr Yukio YOKOI for his contributions to the Secretariat and wished him the best of luck in his future endeavours.

### 5.2 Framework for Standards

- [9] The Standards Officer introduced the report from the meeting on the framework for standards and implementation, held in Punta Leone, Costa Rica, 25-29 August 2014, and explained in detail the framework developed<sup>2</sup> including how to read it
- [10] The draft framework highlights and prioritizes areas of the Standards where guidance was needed and the gaps that exist. There was some confusion expressed by participants related to the chart itself.
- [11] He recalled that originally a Task Force on the Framework for IPPC standards met in Ottawa in September 2013 and the report of this meeting was presented to the SPG and the Standards Committee (SC). In November 2013, the SC established a subgroup of the SC to continue work on the development of the IPPC framework for standards and perform a gap analysis. The SC was urged by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) at CPM-9 (2014) to finalize the IPPC Framework for standards gap analysis and present it to the CPM once finalized. The SC in May 2014 revised and approved the Terms of Reference for the development of the Framework for IPPC standards and a gap analysis.
- [12] SPG comments on the framework for standards report and framework would be communicated to the SC through the SPG report. Comments from other subsidiary bodies would be solicited directly by the IPPC Coordinator. The final recommendations, with the feedback from the other subsidiary bodies, would be presented to the CPM as a narrative.

---

<sup>1</sup> 14\_SPG\_2014\_Oct Rev.1

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/publications/2014-08-report-framework-standards-and-implementation>

- [13] As to the presentation of the Framework, SPG members found the blank spaces may be confused with gaps, and they made suggestions as how to present the gaps in a different manner (e.g. by presenting gaps in red text and incorporated into the other columns; providing additional information above the table on how to read it or inserting “no gap” in the relevant column). Additionally, it was suggested that the table may be presented in different manners according to the audience because it was felt that the current format might be good for internal purposes, but that it may benefit from being modified for external presentation, and in that case also used for communication efforts.
- [14] Several members sought clarifications regarding the purpose of the framework. The SPG discussed whether the framework should be used solely for standards, or should be broadened to include all areas of the IPPC. Most members felt that on one hand the Framework could assist in leading the IPPC in its transition towards increased collaboration between the IPPC areas, on the other that the Framework had not been developed with full participation of all these areas. Since the original task to revise the Framework (which arose in connection with revision of the standard setting procedure), the strategy for implementation has been agreed to by CPM and hence, the SPG agreed that implementation should be considered in the Framework.
- [15] The SPG discussed the way forward. One member suggested that two products could be extracted from the framework: (i) the original purpose of identifying gaps in standards (for CPM presentation); (ii) the broader picture on implementation which would include the full CPM programme (which would need more dialogue and work). The SPG discussed this two step approach, and felt that the Framework would be a good starting point for a full gap analysis, where all groups would be needed to input. The SC Chairperson, however, noted that pulling out the standards only from the framework would not contribute to an integrated IPPC work programme. The SPG finally agreed to keep the Framework as one product only encompassing all areas of the IPPC. The SPG also suggested that the Secretariat finalize the Framework, after SC discussions and after having received input from the other subsidiary bodies (National Reporting Obligations Advisory Group -NROAG and Capacity Development Committee - CDC).
- [16] One member raised the issue that the Framework did not address climate change and he suggested that guidance on how to address these uncertainties would add value. Updating ISPM 11 to include guidance on climate change (either by amending the core text or by adding an appendix on where to retrieve reliable information on the subject), he felt, would address a gap. The Chairperson of the Framework meeting, Mr Bart ROSSEL (Australia) explained that the group had considered this issue but had not been able to identify opportunities for harmonization. The meeting had agreed that this issue could be discussed further.
- [17] The member further expressed concern that economic analysis in PRA had not been identified as high priority. He stressed the fact that contracting parties (CPs) have difficulties in conveying the economic importance of implementing and applying IPPC standards and guidance. For communication purposes, conveying the cost benefits of implementing the IPPC and its standards would be valuable and of assistance to CPs. Hence, economic analysis (in pest risk analysis –PRA- or elsewhere) should be a key priority for the IPPC. The SPG agreed that this issue should be a priority. The IPPC Coordinator noted that it could be discussed further with the recently hired communications expert.
- [18] The SPG discussed whether it would be appropriate to delay the call for topics until the Framework had been fully developed, and the gaps of the full work programme had been identified. Several members supported a delay. They noted that the delay would not be linked to the identification of a second priority topic on implementation, and that CPM-9 (2014) had considered blocking additions to the list of topics until the framework had been developed and adopted, hence CPM-11 (2016) may not wish to add new topics in any case. Additionally, the SC Chairperson recalled that the SC may continue to propose urgently needed topics.
- [19] Several other members did not support the delay because they felt the work on standards should not be affected by the work on implementation. They also found that the call is a way of understanding what

standards CPs feel as necessary. Calling for topics does not imply they will be immediately be included in the list of topics by the CPM, but this should not be a deterrent from making a call.

[20] The SPG finally agreed to support a call for topics in 2015 and in this call, proposals for revisions to existing standards could also be submitted.

[21] The SPG:

- (1) *asked* the Secretariat to solicit comments from all IPPC subsidiary bodies, produce a full Framework for IPPC standards and implementation for presentation to the next SPG meeting (2015) and then present it for adoption by CPM-11 (2016).
- (2) *supported* a call for topics in 2015.
- (3) *suggested* the SC may consider the outputs from the Framework for standards meeting, but did not feel the Framework was finalized enough to be used as a basis for prioritising topics.
- (4) *invited* contracting parties to send written comments on the report of the Framework for standards meeting, and on the Framework for standards to their SC members from their region.

### 5.3 ePhyto study

[22] The IPPC Coordinator provided an oral update. He noted that a successful meeting had been held in Wageningen, The Netherlands, 30 June – 3 July 2014.

[23] On this occasion, several technical issues were discussed and it was found that many of these will need further examination. The group also discussed a STDF project proposal related to the development of specific protocols for ePhyto and capacity development. The proposal will be developed in October for submission in December 2014 and if approved, would likely open up interest from other donors when they learn about the STDF interest in ePhyto.

[24] He mentioned that some members of the steering group had wished to further explore point-to-point with harmonized terminology and environment instead of a hub, because it is sometimes perceived as fairly low cost whereas a hub would add some costs.

[25] The SPG discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the two systems and generally found that a hub would best address IPPC needs because it would ensure harmonization in the longer-term and could provide an opportunity for cost recovery. Point-to-point would not allow for IPPC to cost recover for maintaining ePhyto harmonization of terms and codes.

[26] Several developing country members also noted advantages of a hub from their perspective, namely that a unified holistic approach could prove an opportunity for developing countries because the IPPC would be able to provide standard training and assistance. A point-to-point would not allow for this approach as easily and countries would have to rely on their own resources.

[27] The SPG further discussed how the cost recovery could effectively been done, noting concerns from some members due to challenges at a national level. Ideally, industry would carry the cost of both the issuance of the phytosanitary certificates and the IPPC cost, but in many cases it may not be possible to charge industry with additional IPPC cost unless it is directly related to maintaining harmonized terms and codes, as countries may only be able to charge actual issuance costs. The SPG Chairperson, and member of the ePhyto Steering group, clarified that various charging options are being discussed.

The IPPC Coordinator further noted that the steering group is investigating having a web-based interface. This would allow countries that do not have their own internal system to still use the hub, thereby broadening the use of the hub to more countries.

[28] He concluded that activities on ePhyto are moving quickly, that countries express continued support and interest, and that the group is making good progress on its tasks. Most likely, a concrete ePhyto proposal will be made to CPM-10 (2015), although it depends on whether it is possible at this time to assess the cost of the system. Additionally, other activities on ePhyto to be carried out in the near future, include presentations in regional workshops to create ePhyto awareness, potentially a regional

African workshop on ePhyto, and a CPM side session to explain what is intended with electronic certification and to get a joint understanding from CPs.

[29] The CPM Chairperson reiterated the strong interest from countries and the need for moving forward with ePhyto. To this effect the Republic of Korea will make a donation to hold a Global ePhyto symposium probably in late 2015.

[30] The SPG:

(5) *noted* the update from the ePhyto Steering Group.

(6) *supported* the idea of an ePhyto hub.

(7) *thanked* the Republic of Korea for the generous donation to hold a global ePhyto symposium.

## 6.1 Bureau update

[31] The CPM Chairperson, Ms Kyu-Ock YIM (Republic of Korea), gave an oral update on the Bureau June 2014 and October 2014 meetings.

[32] She referred to the reports and updates posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP)<sup>3</sup>.

[33] In June, the Bureau discussed the framework for standards, the concept of a standard, how to tackle the large number of diagnostic protocols forecasted to be finalized soon, and the Enhancement study among other things. The discussions included interest in a vision of the IPPC in 20 years, which was included on this SPG agenda. Additionally, she noted that the Bureau had confirmed the urgent need for a communications expert to be hired by the Secretariat, and thanked the USA for providing funding for this.

[34] She informed the SPG on the participation of the Bureau members in several IPPC meetings during the past months, noting that the Bureau will also be present in the Technical Consultation among regional plant protection organizations (TC-RPPO). The Bureau is also making efforts to strengthen linkages with FAO, e.g. by meeting with senior management of the Agriculture and Consumer Department when at FAO.

[35] She recalled that the Enhancement study will provide a first draft for Bureau comments by end December 2014 and that a questionnaire will be sent out soon for national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) to provide their input. The Chairperson highlighted the need for swift collaboration in providing responses to these. The final study will be presented to CPM-10 (2015).

[36] Lastly, she recalled that success stories and concerns should be submitted soonest for showcasing at CPM. The Secretariat will add a note on this on the IPP.

[37] The SPG:

(8) *noted* the Bureau 2014 update.

## 6.2 Implementation

[38] The IRSS Officer summarized the main outcomes of the Open-ended Working Group on Implementation<sup>4</sup>. He noted that the group developed a high level pilot project on surveillance which would run for 5-7 years, and that before the end of that programme, 1-2 other priorities should be identified and agreed to by the CPM. He also highlighted the main desired outcomes from the implementation programme; what will be presented to CPM, and; how it was envisaged that the programme would interact with other IPPC priorities.

[39] He clarified that the group had wished a balance between a transparent programme and ability to progress on the activities swiftly.

<sup>3</sup> CPM Bureau reports are available at: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/governance/bureau>

<sup>4</sup> [OEWG Implementation 2014 August Report; CRP\\_02\\_SPG\\_2014\\_Oct](#)

- [40] He solicited discussion from the SPG on the expectations, possibilities and resources needed and available for the pilot programme.
- [41] Several members expressed concern that the report did not emphasize creating synergies between standard setting and implementation.
- [42] It was clarified that creating synergies between all IPPC areas was the underlying principle of the discussions and had not been spelled out in the report because it had seemed evident to the group. The SPG asked that this be emphasized in the presentation of the pilot to the CPM, specifying that the Secretariat, in developing the pilot programme work plan and budget, would work across all areas and in consultation with all subsidiary bodies to have a holistic implementation approach and programme.
- [43] The SPG discussed the resource aspects in detail.
- [44] Several members sought clarifications regarding resource allocation to the implementation priorities that will be set by CPM and if some of the resources will still be allocated to the specific current activities.
- [45] In response to this, it was clarified that considering implementation was adopted as a priority by CPM, and if additional extrabudgetary resources are not identified, a shift from standard setting and governance (the areas with the highest IPPC RP allocation), or any other area of work, towards implementation could be necessary. Capacity development and IRSS funds are typically extra-budgetary and are earmarked for specific activities that are decided on in discussion with the donor. As to the future budget, it was clarified that the intent was to have a substantial focus on implementation, but that the IPPC budget should also allocate funds to other areas not directly related to the implementation topic.
- [46] The Standards Officer expressed concern about potential cuts in the standard setting programme because a potential shift in focus from standard setting may come at a cost of not facilitating the development of standards. For instance it may influence the adoption of DPs (28 forecasted for 2015-16). The DPs are surveillance tools and therefore fit the implementation programme perfectly, but with cuts they would not be submitted for adoption. This would also have a negative effect on engaging experts.
- [47] The SC Chairperson queried how the implementation programme linked to all the surveillance work already done. She was concerned that current surveillance activities within standard setting would be put on hold until the pilot work programme would be adopted. Also, she noted, significant resources had already been budgeted for the surveillance activities. It was clarified that the existing work would feed into the pilot and that it would not be held up while waiting for CPM adoption of the work programme. Hopefully, the pilot programme would be able to gather and coordinate the work already carried out, and identify potential gaps which may need additional resources.
- [48] The Standards Officer noted that the links between the areas are already present and that it is likely more a question of focussing clearly on these links. He agreed that the implementation programme could be used to achieve this. He also stressed the fundamental role of IRSS which, through its reviews, can assess if there are issues that should be addressed by, e.g. the SC or the CDC.
- [49] The Secretariat informed the possibility of applying for STDF funds is being investigated, however, it should be appreciated that STDF already provides funding to IPPC capacity development projects, and does not have unlimited funds.
- [50] The SPG discussed next steps for the pilot.
- [51] Members queried whether the pilot would contain a mission statement, an operational plan to realize the mission, and a budget. A budget would be paramount to have informed discussions about the resource situation. It was also queried whether the pilot envisaged a monitoring and evaluation programme to measure its impact.



- [52] The Secretariat clarified that the final pilot proposal will present also a budget, and that this will include potential financial implications for the Secretariat budget allocation. Hence, when the CPM adopts the overall pilot programme work plan and budget, it will also agree to the the possible budget implications for the other activities of the IPPC. As to the monitoring and evaluation, it was explained that this was encompassed in the indicators of success and risks that might cause the programme not to succeed.
- [53] The Secretariat also clarified that the detailed workplan of the pilot will be initiated by the Secretariat, and the CPM informed of the outcomes. The CPM will not be asked to adopt any further detailed workplans. At CPM-11, when the initial outcomes will be reported, a plan for setting future priorities topics will be also presented for adoption.
- [54] The OEWG had suggested that the Secretariat should devise a model for coordinating the programme. The SPG acknowledged that very strong coordination (Secretariat and subsidiary bodies) was important for carrying out the implementation programme successfully while the Bureau would provide overall guidance. The SPG recommended the Secretariat to modify the “Proposed steps for development” to ensure this was emphasized for presentation to CPM. The SPG encouraged the Secretariat to have an Implementation Team with representatives from all areas of the Secretariat and also devise a coordinated programme.
- [55] The SPG strongly supported the idea that the Secretariat develop a combined work programme in the future.
- [56] The SPG:
- (9) *noted* the update on the Pilot programme for implementation.
  - (10) *noted* that, if additional extrabudgetary resources are not identified, it may be necessary to shift regular programme funding from standard setting and governance to implementation.
  - (11) *noted* that extrabudgetary funding possibilities are being investigated by the Secretariat, and encouraged CPs to provide resources for the implementation programme.
  - (12) *recommended* the Secretariat to have a very strong coordination (Secretariat and subsidiary bodies) of the implementation programme, as this would be imperative for its success, and asked the Secretariat to modify the “Proposed steps for development, approval and management of a strategic work plan development<sup>5</sup>” to ensure this was emphasized for presentation to CPM-10 (2015).
  - (13) *noted* that the Bureau would provide overall guidance to the Secretariat for the coordination of the implementation programme.

## 7. Strategic Topics

### 7.1 The IPPC in 20 years

- [57] The IPPC Coordinator informed the SPG that thirteen papers expressing the vision for IPPC in 20 years had been submitted<sup>6</sup> following the SPG October 2013 suggestion that members submit a two-page paper to the Secretariat to be presented to this meeting. The intention of this exercise was to provide a perspective on the potential role of the IPPC in the next 10 years and beyond, both in terms of consideration of the relevance of the IPPC in the future and major challenges and trends for its work. He expressed gratitude for the many contributions because this also validated SPG’s role in providing horizontal strategic guidance.
- [58] He suggested that a standing agenda item “future-casting” be added to the SPG agenda for the group to regularly make horizontal scans for future threats and opportunities (identify what has changed the

<sup>5</sup> CPR\_02\_SPG\_2014

<sup>6</sup> 06\_SPG\_2014\_Oct A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I/J/K/L/M



past year, and choose one item to drive forward). The SPG agreed that this would be a positive result of the discussions. This should be done with reference to the IPPC strategic framework.

[59] The SPG agreed that the main outcomes of the discussions should be:

[60] –a prioritized list (5-10) of likely future scenarios for the IPPC that can be investigated further in the coming years with first key actions that would need to be taken to address these.

[61] – identifying current processes that could be modified to address urgent needs for change.

[62] The SPG Chairperson suggested that the discussions should focus around the themes that members had identified. He also reflected on the task noting there is no right answer as to what the future may bring, because thinking back 20 years, a number of things in the world have not changed significantly, while others have changed dramatically. For this reason, he started the discussions by asking the group reflect on the major changes within IPPC and plant health the past 20 years.

[63] The SPG identified the following changes (numbers to not indicate priority):

- (1) Changes in technology enhanced and real time communication thus resulting in better cooperation between contracting parties (latest e.g. ePhyto). This helps trade because misunderstandings or problems can be resolved more quickly.
- (2) More standards developed - In 1994, there was only one IPPC standard, whereas there are numerous today and countries use them in a natural way.
- (3) Growth in IPPC membership - Has had a positive effect on inter-country communication and trade leading to globalization.
- (4) Increase in membership from the developing countries has added value by aiding the countries' economies, their capacity in implementing the standards and their ability to understand the importance and value of IPPC.
- (5) Diversity and complexity of the trading environment: Countries trade globally, 20 years ago trade was often limited to specific regions; great increase in the types of products traded internationally; market access has improved globally; trade has changed from trade between individual countries to trade between trading blocks.
- (6) SPS and environmental conventions have increased.
- (7) IPPC has strengthened its role in the international phytosanitary community, and mention of IPPC is now frequent.
- (8) The cooperative approach within the IPPC has improved, from prevalent mistrust to constructive dialogues, coordination and solutions.
- (9) CPM sessions have facilitated dialogue and harmonization (previously FAO Conference would meet every two years, and the participants would not be plant health persons).
- (10) RPPOs have been formed and grown in strength, being able to proficiently assist NPPOs.
- (11) Common language of plant health issues have aided international dialogue.
- (12) IPPC has increased attention to communication and capacity development to the benefit of countries.
- (13) The IPPC has helped break down trade barriers and the implementing the IPPC standards in national legislation has become more common.
- (14) Seasonality is a thing of the past; trade has expanded with the consequence of increased pest risks.
- (15) Globalization - Greater awareness of what goes on in the world; the world is becoming smaller and there is more participation in IPPC activities.
- (16) IPPC Secretariat has matured and increased the services provided.
- (17) Countries have established NPPOs which has greatly influenced the countries' work on plant protection.

(18) The IPPC has become more inclusive and transparent in its consultation on standards.

[64] With this in mind, the SPG brainstormed on future challenges and opportunities and collected more than 60 points for reflection<sup>7</sup>. The SPG grouped these points in eight main themes and discussed them in detail in three breakout groups (2-3 themes per group) with the purpose of understanding what IPPC wishes to achieve and how it will achieve these goals.

[65] The SPG agreed that all the themes should feature in Secretariat and SPG considerations for short term activities, because they expressed strategic directions the IPPC should consider.

[66] The SPG agreed to elaborate a one-page narrative for all of the themes to present to the CPM-10 (2015) and individual SPG members volunteered for this task (these are mentioned below each theme, with the first name being lead). For the next SPG, more elaborated analysis and action plans for in-depth discussion of themes B and C would be developed because Resource mobilization and Advocacy, communication and awareness were selected as the main priorities which the IPPC should initiate immediately. The SPG acknowledged that discussing all themes in one SPG meeting would not be feasible.

[67] A member recalled that the current strategic framework would end in 2019 and therefore suggested that a strategic vision should be developed to be adopted at a ministerial conference in conjunction with an International Year of Plant Health (IYPH).

[68] The following text for the themes was developed by the small groups, modified in plenary and reflects agreed draft wording.

#### **A. Technology, innovation and data**

[69] (Mr Jan Bart ROSSEL, Australia and Sr Diego QUIROGA, Argentina)

[70] *What*

[71] IPPC (including contracting parties and Secretariat) takes advantage and instigates the development of new technologies and innovations for the purpose of identifying, assessing and responding emerging risks, and exchanging information, data management and communication. Development of new standards, tools and guidance material including pest diagnostic methods and treatments, e-Phyto, bar coding.

[72] *How*

- Perform continual reviews of existing information systems, with full participation of RPPOs.
- Providing recommendations
- Establish a quick response system

[73] Notes: The purpose of the goal is to enhance credibility, efficacy and efficiency in a changing global environment. The Secretariat should enquire with organizations that use similar systems to understand advantages and disadvantages. The vision is that IPPC could tap into other systems to become the main global plant health player.

[74] Visions included are 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31, 38, 40, 48, 52, 54, 60.

#### **B. Resource Mobilization**

[75] (Mr Ralf LOPIAN, Finland and M Lucien KOUAME KONAN, Côte d'Ivoire)

[76] *What*

[77] Effective operation of NPPOs and international cooperation under the IPPC require sustainable resources (staff, cooperation and financial resources) to operate key priority programmes. Resource

---

<sup>7</sup> CRP\_01\_SPG\_2014

mobilization requires increasing public awareness and influencing political decision and the development of policies to support IPPC. Effective and efficient administrative management procedures and clear demonstration of value compliments resource mobilization.

[78] *How*

- ePhyto as a potential funding source (should be included in 18)
- voluntary contributions
- Succeeding in having an International Year of Plant Health (2020) with ministerial and donor conferences.

[79] Notes: Visions included are 1, 3, 9, 10, 19, 29, 30, 36, 50, 51, 56, 61, 62.

### **C. Advocacy and awareness through strong communication**

[80] (Gregory WOLFF, Canada and John HEDLEY, New Zealand)

[81] *What*

[82] An effective IPPC will be promoting itself externally on an ongoing basis to ensure public and political support, and sound and effective phytosanitary policies around the world. All IPPC programmes will benefit from a strong advocacy and awareness programme.

[83] *How*

- Communication is central part to many themes
- Providing advocacy material that links to global food security, environment and economic impacts is essential.

[84] Notes: Visions included are 3, 15, 17, 24, 28, 34, 35, 36, 39, 42, 47, 50.

### **D. Implementation, Participation and Collaboration**

[85] (Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN, The Netherlands and Mr Similo George MAVIMBELA, Swaziland)

[86] *What*

[87] Through IPPC activities, all IPPC contracting parties implement the Convention and IPPC standards, fully participating in IPPC related meetings and collaborating together.

[88] *How*

- Developing a sustainable implementation program which has gone through at least 5 cycles, engaging RPPOs as active partners
- At least 10 PCEs are completed on annual basis
- A network of IPPC recognized centers of expertise (e.g. diagnostics, eradication programmes, treatments) has been established and CPs contribute to and use them.
- All CPs have a clear understanding of their obligation to: mentor, interact and develop collaborations and agreements with other organizations, RPPOs, non-CPs and industry.

### **E. The IPPC is a center of excellence and innovation**

[89] (Peter THOMSON, New Zealand and Mr Damas MAMBA MAMBA, Dem. Rep. of Congo)

[90] *What*

[91] The IPPC is a center of excellence and innovation, including expanding the role of the Secretariat (services and functions)

[92] *How*

- Establish a global network of expertise that is coordinated by the Secretariat

- Edequately resourced Secretariat
- Build relationships with IPPC recognized institutions
- Establish a system for IPPC recognition of institutions
- Increase the number of IPPC secretariat staff to coordinate these activities (e.g. entomologists, plant health experts...)
- Set up a training program to increase staff expertise.
- Establish a means for communicating the expectations and accountabilities across the IPPC functions (accountability)

#### **F. The IPPC contribution to food security, environmental protection and economic prosperity**

[93] (Mr Josiah M. SYANDA, Kenya, Ms Mable MUDENDA, Zambia and Ms Ines Maria ARES ALONZO, Uruguay)

[94] *What*

[95] It is widely recognized that global food security and the protection of the environment is essential for the future of humanity. (i) It is well know that the IPPC plays a critical role in ensuring global food security. (ii) The IPPC also protects the environment. (iii) In addition, the IPPC plays a key role in the economic success of plant-based industries worldwide.

[96] *How*

- Topics for standards and guidance will be prioritized and developed based on their impacts in relation to the above
- Capacity development will be prioritized targeting the above three issues.
- Implementation targeting the above three issues.
- Communication targeting the above three issues.

[97] Notes: Visions included are 10, 13, 33, 34, 35, 39, 40, 41, 44, 53, 57, 58, 59, 64)

#### **G. Simplify regulatory environment for the complexities of future global trade**

[98] (John GREIFER, USA and Jane CHARD, United Kingdom)

[99] *What*

[100] Simple and harmonized regulatory systems are in place for global trade.

[101] *How*

- International standards are followed to build harmonized systems that CPs trust.
- Develop more commodity/pathway standards where the appropriate level of protection is determined globally and equivalent phytosanitary measures are agreed to (e.g. ISPM 15).

[102] Notes: Visions included are 2, 4, 6, 7, 15, 18, 19, 23, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 39, 43, 44, 48, 53, 55, 60, 61, 62, 63.

[103] The SPG:

- (19) *agreed* to include a standing agenda item on “future-casting” for the SPG meetings.
- (20) *agreed* to elaborate a one-page narrative for each of the eight above themes to present to the CPM. The narratives would be written by individual SPG members (see themes) and all SPG participants would be invited to comment. The narratives would follow the same format and would note that they were draft proposals and additional discussions were envisaged. By 21 November the lead shall have circulated the narrative for comments from the SPG, incorporated comments and sent the final narrative to the Secretariat for presentation to CPM-10 (2015).

## 7.2 Resource mobilization – next steps to implement the IPPC strategy

- [104] The IPPC Coordinator summarized the efforts within resource mobilization that the Secretariat is currently undertaking, and introduced the paper outlining the strategy for implementing resource mobilization<sup>8</sup>. He recalled that the first step in the strategy had been to increase transparency in the financial reporting of the IPPC, which had been achieved. The second would be to focus on communication, and increase the role of IPPC globally.
- [105] The strategy presented a proposal for defining a mechanism and arrangement for voluntarily assessed contributions from contracting parties. The contribution could be USD 50,000 per contracting party, which, if provided by only 50 contracting parties, would be the equivalent of the annual FAO regular programme contribution. Projecting future needs of the IPPC it is clear that additional sustainable funding is necessary to carry out the work programme.
- [106] This would be complimentary to the increased efforts in resource mobilization activities, for instance through the new opportunities that have become available because IPPC has been included in the Biodiversity Liaison Group.
- [107] The IPPC Coordinator stressed the need for these new actions if the IPPC was to guarantee sustained funding that would ensure delivering the results set out by the CPM. This becomes ever more necessary considering that the resources available through FAO tend to diminish.
- [108] He explained that the current guidelines for making voluntary contributions mean that countries sign an agreement with FAO in which they fund specific activities. At CPM-6 (2011), it was proposed to set up a procedure to address this issue. The IPPC Secretariat clarified that it would be more appropriate that the funds received be put into a trust fund and that CPM decide how the funds would best be engaged, considering the overall priorities and needs of the IPPC<sup>9</sup>.
- [109] One member queried how the \$50,000 were calculated, and whether the amount was based on specific financial needs. The Coordinator explained that the amount had been calculated based on the current work programme, but should the RP funding allocation not decrease, the additional funds would, among others, be used for additional capacity development activities, enhancing the IT infrastructure, translations, sustainable human resources to support IPPC activities and Convention implementation related activities.
- [110] The SPG discussed the proposal, being generally in favor of it, but raising the following main points:
- [111] - Having the assessed mandatory contributions. Some developing country participants deemed that if donations would be voluntary, many developing countries would not wish to contribute, whereas mandatory contributions would be better and would emphasize the importance of IPPC.
- [112] – Proposing assessed contributions only when a strong message can be created to ensure political buy-in, which would be possible at a ministerial conference during an IYPH. Because, as a member recalled, the issue had been discussed several times before in SPG, and on those occasions some countries would revert stating that it was not possible to implement. Also, countries may find it difficult to justify an additional IPPC contribution, when they are already contributing to FAO.
- [113] The SPG agreed that assessed contributions should be part of a long-term strategy of resource mobilization and only proposed when political will would be in favor of it. When drawing up the draft agreements all points discussed in this meeting should be considered.
- [114] The SPG discussed resource mobilization efforts generally, thinking of other opportunities.
- [115] International Year of Plant Health (IYPH). The IPPC Coordinator noted that the Secretariat is still looking into having an IYPH, during which to host a Donor and Ministerial conference, and that he

---

<sup>8</sup> 12\_SPG\_2014\_Oct

had got confirmation from FAO Legal that a proposal for an international year would have to be submitted and driven by a country. It was suggested to propose an international week of plant health which could be a front runner of an IYPH.

[116] An economic value analysis of applying IPPC standards. A member proposed that this sort of analysis would assist NPPOs and the Secretariat in mobilizing resources. So far, an analysis of the economic benefits from avoiding the spread of pests has not been carried out, because it is by definition challenging to determine what the cost would have been, had there been spread of a pest. However, it would be an important study and analysis to undertake to stress the importance of IPPC, and demonstrate the financial cost of spread of pests vs for instance an assessed contribution to the IPPC. It was suggested that an economist be hired to undertake a study that could showcase the economic impact of implementing IPPC standards. However, the SPG believed this would be the responsibility of all CPs and suggested that they assist the Secretariat in providing the necessary information for the analysis. The IPPC Coordinator noted that the Communications Expert recently hired by the IPPC could use the material to draw up advocacy and awareness raising material.

[117] Hybrid approach for the short and long-term funding by developing supplementary voluntary agreements for contributions to complement the long term solutions, as these would not require agreement from any IPPC body. This is what is already being done by CPs donating funds to the Multi-donor trust fund.

[118] The SPG:

- (21) *supported* the use of donor agreements with individual countries, or groups of countries or organizations and the Secretariat to ensure stable and sustained support for the work of the Convention and encouraged contracting parties to make multi-year donations.
- (22) *Encouraged* a nominal contribution of USD 50,000 per year from contracting parties or groups of contracting parties able to do so, using supplementary agreements, with the option for larger or smaller amounts depending on an individual contracting party's economic circumstances
- (23) *acknowledged* the intention of individual contracting parties to take part in this resource mobilization initiative in CPM and in communication materials.
- (24) *agreed* that long term suggestions of sustainable funding for the IPPC would be for presented at the IYPH and Donor Conference (2020) for adoption.
- (25) *Noted* that an IYPH will have to be suggested and driven by a country, and the Secretariat cannot legally be the driving force for this.
- (26) *encouraged* contracting parties to identify and document the economic benefits of applying IPPC standards together with the work of NPPOs to the national economies and submit the findings and analyses to the IPPC Secretariat by 31 December 2014.

### 7.3 Communications update

[119] The IPPC Coordinator provided an update on the communication activities<sup>10</sup>. He introduced Mr Jeremy CHERFAS, from Green Ink, who has been recruited as communication specialist. He also noted that the next step would be for the CPM to approve the Communications workplan<sup>11</sup>.

[120] Mr Jeremy CHERFAS informed the SPG how he would approach the task of communicating IPPC to persons very familiar with the IPPC and to a broader audience. He also noted that one of the main points that CPs had stressed in the communication needs assessment was the need for timely communication.

<sup>10</sup> 11\_SPG\_2014\_Oct

<sup>11</sup> See this [link for the Communication strategy, adopted by CPM-7 \(2012\)](#)



[121] The SPG expressed appreciation for the communication approach taken and highlighted that there is a great need to communicate the benefits of the IPPC within NPPOs, national governments and Industry because in a globalized trade system, IPPC needs to cement its role as a global plant health leader.

[122] The SPG suggested the following specific communication products:

- Communication work should be directed at creating short effectful statements to highlight the IPPC's work ("elevator chat statements").
- Donor specific information, e.g. translating the IPPC aims and objectives from the point of food security.
- Adding IPPC to university curricula to sensitize people on IPPC issues from early on.
- Developing brief and succinct success stories that could be used to showcase the benefits of the IPPC work.
- Tying RPPOs communication efforts to the IPPC communication strategy (NAPPO's plant health week 2015; RPPOs' plant health day).

[123] Additionally, Mr Diego QUIROGA informed the SPG that a few Latin American countries, through their communication teams in NPPOs, have expressed interest in contributing to the communication efforts by aiding the Secretariat. He will liaise directly with Mr Jeremy CHERFAS, who can coordinate the communications team. The SPG thanked Mr Diego QUIROGA for this contribution.

[124] The SPG:

- (27) *noted* the Secretariat efforts in the area of communications.
- (28) *thanked* the Latin American countries for volunteering to be part of an IPPC communication network.
- (29) *encouraged* contracting parties join the IPPC communication network (coordinated by the Secretariat).
- (30) *supported* the IPPC Secretariat to develop communication material according to the audience e.g. donor, advocacy, industry, governments.
- (31) *encouraged* contracting parties to provide brief and succinct success stories that could be used to showcase the benefits of the IPPC work.
- (32) *encouraged* RPPOs to inform the IPPC Secretariat when they have a plant health day or week scheduled, so the IPPC Secretariat may provide due notice of this on the IPP.

#### **7.4 Programme review of National Reporting Obligations**

[125] The National Reporting Officer presented an update from the National Reporting Obligations Programme, noting that the Advisory Group met in July 2014<sup>12</sup>. He also solicited input from SPG on the draft strategic programme 2014-2023 which, when finalized by the NROAG, will be made available for country comments in October or November 2014 and then presented to CPM-10 (2015). Lastly, he introduced Ms Dorota Buzon who was hired in 2014 full time to help the NRO programme.

[126] The SPG made the following comments and suggestions:

[127] The Secretariat should create a classification of obligations to explain which are specific (e.g. commercial partners) and which are public (IPPC).

[128] There is a need to show advantages of meeting the reporting obligations. This was requested during the SPG 2013 meeting, and the NRO officer explained that the report will contain appendices that list the benefits, and the consequences.

---

<sup>12</sup> 09\_SPG\_2014\_Oct; The draft NROAG Report is available here: <https://www.ippc.int/publications/report-first-meeting-nroag1-draft>



- [129] Whether “Complete pest reorting through RPPO tool” had been completed? It was explained that the prototype has been developed and is being tested with EPPO at the moment. When a pest report is submitted on the EPPO site, the IPPC gets an automatic copy of the report via email. Currently, the format varies between RPPOs and implementing the system would mean standardizing the RPPO systems with XML schemes. RPPOs need to ensure that IPPC has the necessary permission from countries that the information can be provided via RPPOs. Countries will have the choice between reporting directly or through the RPPO.
- [130] As to the list of CPM decisions and the work plan priorities, the SPG made some specific comments to the wording, and queried some of the priorities (Appendix 2, 1 of the paper). Regarding the tasks for the TPG, revision of standards and similar, the SC Chairperson recalled that pest list and list of regulated pests had been reviewed by the TPG (and taken off the List of topics for IPPC standards), just as revision of ISPM 19 had been added to the Framework for standards. She also recalled that new topics should be submitted to the CPM after a call for topics.
- [131] Lastly, the SPG pointed out that the workplan should also have a budget in order for CPM to clearly be able to decide which activities to carry out, and what other activities of the Secretariat may have to be delayed if some NRO activities are considered by CPM to be a priority.
- [132] The Secretariat asked guidance from the SPG in relation to the Secretariat’s role in correcting the reporting information when they would find simple errors (scientific names, spelling, terminology etc.). The SPG generally agreed that the Secretariat should quality check the information because it is fundamental that the information available on the IPP is as correct as possible. This would add value to pest reporting and to the IPPC, as countries may otherwise find alternative sources of information (e.g. CABI) or simply choose to not report via the IPPC. The SPG, however, did not feel in a position to clearly determine the extent of the Secretariat’s role.
- [133] The SPG, however, also expressed concern that this may be a huge task and that there would not be sufficient resources available. The NRO Officer suggested that with a step-wise approach, as suggested in the NROAG programme, it would not be a too large a task to undertake, although additional resources would have a positive effect on the work. In this context, a member asked if the NROAG had considered which of the reporting items were the most important, mentioning as an example the contact point information. The NRO Officer confirmed that this was also viewed a priority by the NROAG and that was why they had proclaimed this year the international year of official contact points.
- [134] The Secretariat clarified that they would firstly contact a country asking them to correct an error, and only take direct action, should the country not act. The Secretariat also stressed that it would not verify the accurateness and correctness of a report, e.g. whether or not a pest had actually been eradicated or not.
- [135] The SPG:
- (33) *agreed* that the Secretariat would have a role in quality checking the information posted on the IPP. What this role should entail more precisely, would need to be further discussed.
  - (34) *agreed* with presenting the list of decisions for CPM consideration as suggested by the NROAG, and including sufficient context for the CPM to make informed decisions. The SPG, however, did not feel it appropriate to use the term “operational” and asked that the NROAG find a different term.
  - (35) *thanked* the NROAG and the Secretariat for the work carried out.

## 7.5 Strategic issues on diagnosis

[136] Ms Jane Chard (United Kingdom) introduced the paper<sup>13</sup>. She recalled that a topic had been submitted in the 2013 Call for topics on *General principles for operation of laboratories*, which had not been agreed to by the SC with the reason that there was no need for a harmonized approach to the operation of official laboratories.

[137] However, she noted, there remains an issue that importing countries do not always have confidence in the methods or procedures being used by exporting countries. In this context, she referred to the IRSS surveys that have identified that there is a wider capacity issue associated with the ability of countries to undertake pest diagnosis. She also recalled that CPM-9 (2014) requested that the SPG have a discussion on strategic issues associated with pest diagnosis.

[138] Lastly, she highlighted links to the previous discussions in relation to IPPC's 20 years vision, the Framework of standards and the implementation pilot on surveillance.

[139] The SPG generally echoed that there is a need for emphasizing wider capacities within diagnostics, although some questioned whether this should be through standardizing requirements for laboratories, because it was pointed out that proficiency tests for all pests would require many resources. Ms Jane Chard explained that the idea would be that of sharing, i.e. that proficiency tests developed in one country could be shared through a network and hence not require additional resources. This would match the current trend that since not all countries have well functioning diagnostic laboratories, countries share. Setting up common principles could be helpful for this reason.

[140] The Secretariat thanked EPPO for taking the initiative to address this topic, but noted that it had a few comments on the topic. First, the paper was written from the perspective of a small segment of IPPC Contracting Parties, so while it is a useful not all of the ideas are able to be implemented by the majority of IPPC Contracting Parties. The Secretariat also recommended the development of a specific trust fund dedicated to support the development of diagnostic capacities in developing Contracting Parties with strong participation from RPPOs and the Capacity Development Committee.

[141] The SPG noted the importance of maintaining diagnostic capacities, supported that work be done to this effect and encouraged a broad range of CD activities (both EPPO and the Secretariat), but did not support that harmonized guidance be prepared on laboratory requirements including quality assurance.

[142] The SPG supported the idea that a CPM recommendation be developed.

[143] The SPG:

- (36) *acknowledged* the importance of maintaining diagnostic capacities and supported that work be done to this effect and thanked EPPO for preparing the paper outlining the issue.
- (37) *supported* that a CPM Recommendation on the importance of pest diagnosis in underpinning phytosanitary activities be prepared and *asked* EPPO/EU to prepare the statement for presentation to the CPM, and which could be used to encourage contracting parties to devote appropriate resources to pest diagnostic activities.
- (38) *encouraged* a broad range of CD activities on diagnostics (both EPPO and the Secretariat)
- (39) *encouraged* the TC-RPPO November to discuss any concerns they may have on the issue presented here in their regions.
- (40) *endorsed* initiatives such as:
  - Establishment of mechanisms to support developing countries to establish functioning labs with appropriate resources and staff.
  - Sharing of information on pest distribution.
  - Training courses for diagnosticians, including remote training courses.

---

<sup>13</sup> 04\_SPG\_2014\_October

- Creation of networks of diagnosticians.
- Remote identification via digital microscopy.
- Low cost rapid diagnostic methods.
- Establishment of proficiency testing arrangements with inclusion of labs run by NPPOs in developing countries.

## 7.6 Diversion from intended use

[144] Mr John GREIFER (USA) introduced the paper<sup>14</sup> jointly prepared by USA and Canada. The paper described what diversion from intended use is and why it is an issue in trade; why harmonized guidance would be beneficial; elements that could be considered in a standard (or annex); examples of products that are used for other purposes than those intended; and possible courses of action for the SPG to consider.

[145] He recalled that a topic had been submitted in the 2013 Call for topics on *diversion from intended use*, which had not been agreed to by the SC. However, the SC still found the issue important and tasked an SC subgroup to modify the submission into a discussion paper to be further discussed at a future SC meeting. The CPM-9 (2014) decided that the issue be discussed by the SPG and also the SC May 2014 found that the concept of *traceability* in the phytosanitary context and *diversion from intended use* should be considered further by the SPG.

[146] The Framework for standards meeting had considered the issue but had not come to a conclusion as to the format (standard, manual or other type of guidance).

[147] The SPG acknowledged that *diversion from intended use* is a practical and real problem and discussed the need for harmonized guidance.

[148] Members recognized this is a difficult issue and there are many reasons to support guidance being developed but also noted there are many challenges:

- Recent disputes underlined a need for guidance on intended use be developed to assist NPPOs regulate appropriately.
- Measures for preventing diversion could be part of a systems approach: Import requirements in combination with domestic requirements.
- Measures are necessary because diversion may favor unfair trade (e.g. seed potatoes are more expensive than table potatoes, and importers may therefore import the latter but use it for growing).
- It would be difficult to appropriately evaluate the impact of risk of intended use, e.g. by unintentional actions. Measures applied on this basis would not be commensurate to the risk, and therefore would not be in conformity with the SPS agreement.
- Diversion from intended use was thought more a question of importers not respecting national regulations, than a phytosanitary issue. National enforcement of the importers' responsibilities should be a responsibility of the importing country.
- The importing country should be informed about the risk of unintended use, e.g. by quantifying the amount of the product that may divert from the intended use. This should be part of a PRA.

[149] The SPG discussed a way forward, including (i) hold a scientific session on diversion on intended use at CPM-11 (2016); (ii) hold an OEWG meeting to discuss practical solutions, or; (iii) include an analysis in the IRSS programme.

[150] The SPG:

(41) *acknowledged* there is a global and practical issue in relation to diversion from intended use.

---

<sup>14</sup> 05\_SPG\_2014\_Oct

(42) *asked* the Secretariat to explore the possibility of including an analysis of diversion from intended use assessing the economic impact with proposed solutions to manage the risks, to the IRSS work programme and noted that the paper here presented should serve as a basis for the IRSS analysis.

### 7.7 Traceability in phytosanitary context

[151] Mr John GREIFER (USA) introduced the paper on traceability in the phytosanitary context<sup>15</sup>. He recalled that CPM-9 (2014) tasked the SPG to discuss the concept and mechanism of *traceability* in the phytosanitary context<sup>16</sup>.

[152] He outlined the current industry practices and perspectives as well as the key considerations on traceability (from a North American view point and experience).

[153] He noted that detailed guidance on the concept of traceability is not a newly emerged practical need, requiring an urgent response by the IPPC to prevent the spread of pests. However, there would be a need to agree on a harmonized definition of the term as well as building a shared understanding on the role of traceability in the plant protection area.

[154] He suggested that the Technical Panel for the Glossary be tasked to review and harmonize key terms that may be associated with trace-back and trace-forward actions that can be found in existing ISPMs. Moreover, he suggested a small group be set up to prepare a paper on the concept for presentation to the CPM. This paper could build on this SPG paper and should be aimed at clarifying, informing and building a shared understanding.

[155] The SPG generally agreed that traceability is a tool, and not a phytosanitary measure. It does not mitigate risk but may help to understand the physical origin of the spread of a pest. In this context, the SPG felt that traceability is inherent to phytosanitary management (when signing off a PC, it is necessary to be sure that the product is what it is assumed to be, cf. ISPM 7 and ISPM 12) and related activities would be record keeping, information on the place of production. This is all necessary documentation to be able to trace back the origin of the spread of a pest.

[156] The SPG discussed whether it would be necessary to develop guidance on traceability, and whether it would need to have a specific definition in a phytosanitary context (the TPG only develops definitions for terms which have a specific phytosanitary meaning).

[157] The SPG did not find there was enough information currently to support developing guidance, but did agree that there may be a need for guidance (likely not a standard) to explain the meaning of the term in a phytosanitary context and the different circumstances that traceability is applied.

[158] The SPG:

(43) *supported* a review of the use of the term *traceability* (and related terms) in ISPMs and asked the SC to consider this proposal.

(44) *invited* the SC to consider whether additional guidance on traceability would be needed after the review of the use of the term traceability (and related) in ISPMs.

### 7.7 Concepts of an ISPM

[159] The SC Chairperson summarized the main points laid out in the paper<sup>17</sup> on the purpose, status and content of ISPMs. She explained this paper had been presented to the SC May 2014 meeting, but that

---

<sup>15</sup> 08\_SPG\_2014\_Oct

<sup>16</sup> CPM-9 (2014) report, [49]

<sup>17</sup> 07\_SPG\_2014\_October

the SC found that due to the importance and the extent of implications of this document, it should be presented to the SPG for review and then reviewed by the FAO Legal office<sup>18</sup>.

[160] The SPG thought it was an interesting document but felt that also other subsidiary bodies should input to get a fully holistic view of the purpose, status and content of ISPMs. Some members queried specific terminology and statements of the paper, particularly in relation to “‘rules of interaction’ for individual contracting parties,” “moral obligation” and “measures of domestic concern only” (referring here to post entry quarantine stations).

[161] The SPG discussed whether it would be appropriate to present the document for adoption by CPM, but recommended against it because it may limit future types of standards.

[162] The SPG:

- (45) *suggested* the SC solicit comments the concept of a standard from other subsidiary bodies
- (46) *invited* SPG members to provide comments on the document through their SC regional member.
- (47) *did not support* the document be presented for adoption.

## 7.9 CDC review

[163] The Lead of the CDC review, Mr Masato FUKUSHIMA (Japan), updated the SPG on the progress of the review<sup>19</sup>. He clarified that the draft report would be shared with the IPPC Secretariat, who was welcome to invite CDC comments if time permitted (the report will be finalized by the end of December 2014). He informed the SPG that the final report will be made available for CPM-10 (2015).

[164] The SPG suggested to interview also NPPOs. The CDC Review team would discuss this further.

[165] The SPG:

- (48) *noted* the update.

## 8. Topics Proposed by Contracting Parties and RPPOs

[166] Nothing to report.

## 9. Other Business

[167] No other business.

## 10. Next Meeting

[168] The next meeting of the SPG is scheduled for 30 September to 2 October 2015.

## 11. Close of Meeting.

[169] On behalf of the SPG, a member thanked the SPG Chairperson for his firm and professional leadership in guiding the group through the discussions, and the Secretariat for their support.

[170] The IPPC Secretary also took the opportunity to express his profound thanks to the SPG participants.

[171] The SPG Chairperson expressed his gratitude for the participants' valuable contributions and active participation, and closed the meeting.

---

<sup>18</sup> SC May 2014 report, [120-21]

<sup>19</sup> 03\_CRP\_SPG\_2014\_Oct

**Annex 1 – Documents list****Commission on Phytosanitary Measures****Strategic Planning Group (SPG) Meeting***07-10 October 2014**FAO, Rome, Italy**(9:30-18:00 on Tuesday / Wednesday-Thursday 9:00-18:00 / Friday 9:00 -12:30)***Agenda**

<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Document No.</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
<b>1. Opening of the meeting</b>		
		YOKOI/THOMSON
<b>2. Adoption of the agenda</b>		
	01_SPG_2014_October	THOMSON
<b>3. Housekeeping</b>		
3.1 Documents list	02_SPG_2014_October	FEDCHOCK
3.2 Participants list	03_SPG_2014_October	FEDCHOCK
3.3 Local information	<a href="#">Link to the local information</a>	FEDCHOCK
<b>4. Selection of a Rapporteur</b>		
		THOMSON
<b>5. Secretariat Update</b>		
5.1 General update	14_SPG_2014_October	YOKOI
5.2 Framework for Standards	<a href="#">2014 Framework for Standards Meeting Report</a>	LARSON/SOSA
5.3 ePhyto study	(Oral)	FEDCHOCK
<b>6. Bureau Update</b>		
6.1 Bureau update (including IPPC Secretariat enhancement evaluation)	(Oral)	YIM
6.2 Implementation	<a href="#">OEWG Implementation 2014 August Report</a> 02_CPR_SPG_2014_Oct	THOMSON/SOSA
<b>7. Strategic Topics</b>		
7.1 The IPPC in 20 years	06_SPG_2014_October A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I/J/L/M  13_SPG_2014_October  01_CPR_SPG_2014_October	PARTICIPANTS  FEDCHOCK
7.2 Resource mobilization – next steps to implement the IPPC strategy	12_SPG_2014_October	FEDCHOCK
7.3 Communications update	11_SPG_2014_October	FEDCHOCK
7.4 Programme review of National Reporting Obligations	09_SPG_2014_October	NOWELL
7.5 Strategic issues on diagnosis	04_SPG_2014_October	VAN ALPHEN

<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Document No.</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
7.6 Traceability in phytosanitary context and diversion from intended use	05_SPG_2014_October 08_SPG_2014_October	GREIFER
7.7 Concepts of an ISPM	07_SPG_2014_October	CHARD
7.8 CDC review	03_CPR_SPG_2014_Oct	YOKOI/FUKUSHIMA
<b>8. Topics proposed by Contracting Parties and RPPOs</b>		
8.1 (as proposed and selected)		Proposing participants
<b>9. Other business</b>		
<b>10. Next meeting</b>		



**Annex 2 – Agenda****Commission on Phytosanitary Measures****Strategic Planning Group (SPG) Meeting***07-10 October 2014**FAO, Rome, Italy*

DOCUMENT NO.	AGEND A ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
<b>Other Documents</b>				
01_SPG_2014_Oct	2	Draft Agenda	<i>All</i>	2014-09-16
02_SPG_2014_Oct	3	Documents list	<i>All</i>	2014-09-16
03_SPG_2014_Oct	3	Participants list	<i>All</i>	2014-09-16
04_SPG_2014_Oct	7.5	Discussion paper on Pest Diagnostic	<i>All</i>	2014-09-16
05_SPG_2014_Oct	7.6	Discussion paper on Diversion from Intended use	<i>All</i>	2014-09-16
06_SPG_2014_Oct ➤ A ➤ B ➤ C ➤ D ➤ E ➤ F ➤ G ➤ H ➤ I ➤ J ➤ K ➤ L ➤ M	7.1	IPPC in 20 Years <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• prepared by Canada</li> <li>• prepared by Venezuela</li> <li>• prepared by Ms. Chard</li> <li>• prepared by Australia</li> <li>• prepared by New Zealand</li> <li>• prepared by Nepal</li> <li>• prepared by USA</li> <li>• prepared by Netherlands</li> <li>• prepared by Zambia</li> <li>• prepared by Mr. Syanda</li> <li>• prepared by Rep. Korea</li> <li>• prepared by Finland</li> <li>• prepared by Swaziland</li> </ul>	<i>All</i>	2014-09-17 2014-09-17 2014-09-17 2014-09-17 2014-09-17 2014-09-17 2014-09-18 2014-09-19 2014-09-22 2014-09-30 2014-09-30 2014-09-30 2014-10-08
07_SPG_2014_Octo	7.7	Concept note: purpose, status and content of ISPMs	<i>All</i>	2014-09-25
08_SPG_2014_Oct	7.6	Traceability in the Phytosanitary Context	<i>All</i>	2014-09-30
09_SPG_2014_Oct	7.4	Programme review of NRO	<i>All</i>	2014-10-01
11_SPG_2014_Oct	7.3	Communications Update	<i>All</i>	2014-10-02
12_SPG_2014_Oct	7.2	Resource Mobilization – next steps	<i>All</i>	2014-10-02
13_SPG_2014_Oct	7.1	IPPC in Twenty Years – IPPC Secretariat Proposal	<i>All</i>	2014-10-02
14_SPG_2014_Oct	5.1	IPPC General Update	<i>All</i>	2014-10-02

DOCUMENT NO.	AGEND A ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
01_CPR_SPG_2014_Oct	7.1	Brainstorming – IPPC challenges and opportunities	All	2014-10-09
02_CPR_SPG_2014_Oct	6.2	Summary of OEWG Report	All	2014-10-09
03_CPR_SPG_2014_Oct	7.8	Update of CDC Review	All	2014-10-10

LINKS:	Agenda item	Content
<a href="#">IPP link to local information</a>	3	FAO Rome meetings: Local information
<a href="#">2014 Framework for Standards Meeting Report</a>	5.2	Framework Report
<a href="#">OEWG Implementation 2014 August Report</a>	6.2	OEWG Implementation Report

**Annex 3 – Participants list****Commission on Phytosanitary Measures****Strategic Planning Group (SPG) Meeting**

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates confirmed attendance at the meeting.

	<b>Role</b>	<b>Name, mailing, address, telephone</b>	<b>Email address</b>
✓	Bureau Member	<b>M Lucien KOUAME KONAN</b> Inspecteur Direction de la Protection des Végétaux, du Contrôle et de la Qualité Ministère de l'Agriculture B.P. V7 Abidjan, <b>COTE D'IVOIRE</b> Phone: (+225) 07 903754 Fax: (+225) 20 212032	<a href="mailto:l.kouame@yahoo.fr">l.kouame@yahoo.fr</a>
✓	Bureau Member	<b>Ms Kyu-Ock YIM</b> Senior Researcher Export Management Division Department of Plant Quarantine Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs 178 Anyang-ro Manan-gu Anyang city, Gyunggi-do <b>REPUBLIC OF KOREA</b> Phone: (+82) 31 4207665 Fax: (+82) 31 4207605	<a href="mailto:koyim@korea.kr">koyim@korea.kr</a>
✓	Bureau Member	<b>Mr Corne VAN ALPHEN</b> Coordinating Policy Officer Phytosanitary Affairs Plant Supply Chain and Food Quality Department Ministry of Economic Affairs P.O. Box 20401 2500 EK - The Hague <b>THE NETHERLANDS</b> Phone: (+31) 618 596867	<a href="mailto:c.a.m.vanalphen@minez.nl">c.a.m.vanalphen@minez.nl</a>

	<b>Role</b>	<b>Name, mailing, address, telephone</b>	<b>Email address</b>
✓	Bureau Member	<p><b>Sr Diego QUIROGA</b>            Director Nacional de Protección Vegetal            Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria (SENASA)            Av Paseo Colón, 315 - 4 Piso            Buenos Aires,  <b>ARGENTINA</b>            Phone: (+54) 11 4121 5176            Fax: (+54) 11 4121 5179</p>	<a href="mailto:dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar">dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar</a>
✓	Bureau Member	<p><b>Mr Mohamed Refaat Rasmy ABDELHAMID</b>            Chief            Central Department of Agricultural Quarantine            Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation            5, Nadi El Seid Street            Dokki, Cairo  <b>EGYPT</b>            Phone: (+20) 1 066643547</p>	<a href="mailto:capqoffice@gmail.com">capqoffice@gmail.com</a>
✓	Bureau Member	<p><b>Mr John GREIFER</b>            Assistant Deputy Administrator            Plant Protection and Quarantine            Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service            Department of Agriculture            1400 Independence Ave., South Building            Washington DC 20250  <b>USA</b>            Phone: (+1) 202 7207677</p>	<a href="mailto:john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov">john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov</a>
✓	Bureau Member	<p><b>Mr Peter THOMSON</b>            Director            Plant, Food and Environment Branch            Ministry for Primary Industries            PO Box 2526 Wellington  <b>NEW ZEALAND</b>            Phone: (+64) 29 894 0353</p>	<a href="mailto:peter.thomson@mpi.govt.nz">peter.thomson@mpi.govt.nz</a>
✓		<p><b>Mr Ralf LOPIAN</b>            Senior Advisor            International Affairs            Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry            Mariankatu 23, Helsinki  <b>FINLAND</b>            Phone: (+358) 295 162329            Fax: (+358) 9 16052443</p>	<a href="mailto:ralf.lopian@mmm.fi">ralf.lopian@mmm.fi</a>

	Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓		<p><b>Mr Jan Bart ROSSEL</b>            Director            International Plant Health            Department of Agriculture, Fisheries            and Forestry            GPO Box 858            Canberra ACT 2601  <b>AUSTRALIA</b>            Phone: (+61) 2 62725056            Fax: (+61) 2 62725835</p>	<a href="mailto:bart.rossel@daff.gov.au">bart.rossel@daff.gov.au</a>
✓		<p><b>Mr John Hedley</b>            Principal Adviser            International Policy Branch            Ministry for Primary Industries            PO Box 2526 Wellington  <b>NEW ZEALAND</b>            Phone: (+64) 29 8940428</p>	<a href="mailto:john.hedley@mpi.govt.nz">john.hedley@mpi.govt.nz</a>
✓		<p><b>Mr Damas MAMBA MAMBA</b>            Point de contact CIPV            Chef de Division chargé de la Protection            des Végétaux à la DPPV            Ministère de l'agriculture et            développement rural            Croisement Blvd du 30 Juin et Batetela            B.P. 8722 Kinshasa-Gombe  <b>CONGO DEM. REP</b>            Phone: (+243) 812959330</p>	<a href="mailto:damasmamba@yahoo.fr">damasmamba@yahoo.fr</a>
✓		<p><b>Ms Jane CHARD</b>            Head of Branch - Plant Biosecurity and            Inspections            Science and Advice for Scottish            Agriculture (SASA)            Roddinglaw Road, Edinburgh, EH12            9FJ,  <b>UNITED KINGDOM</b>            Phone: +44(0)131 244 8863   F:            +44(0)131 244 8940</p>	<a href="mailto:Jane.Chard@sasa.gsi.gov.uk">Jane.Chard@sasa.gsi.gov.uk</a>

	Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓		<p><b>Mr Sang HAN BAEK</b>  Assistant Director  Export Management Division  Department of Plant Quarantine  Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency  Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs  178 Anyang-ro Manan-gu  Anyang city, Gyunggi-do  <b>REPUBLIC OF KOREA</b></p>	<a href="mailto:ignis@korea.kr">ignis@korea.kr</a>
✓		<p><b>Mr Similo George MAVIMBELA</b>  Research Officer  Agricultural Research and Specialist Services  Ministry of Agriculture  Swaziland  <b>SWAZILAND</b>  Phone: 00268 2527 4095  Mobile : 00268 7605 0780  Fax : 00268 2527 4070</p>	<a href="mailto:seemelo@yahoo.com">seemelo@yahoo.com</a>
✓		<p><b>Mr Dili Ram SHARMA</b>  Program Director, Plant Protection Directorate  National Coordinator, National IPM Programme in Nepal  Head NPPO  Contact Personnel of IPPC  <b>NEPAL</b>  Ph. No. 00977-1-5521597/5535844  Fax No. 00977-1-5010512/5535845  Mob. No. 9841369615</p>	<a href="mailto:sharmadilli@yahoo.com">sharmadilli@yahoo.com</a>
✓		<p><b>Mr Masato FUKUSHIMA</b>  Director  Plant Quarantine Office  Plant Protection Division  Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau  Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries  1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku,  Tokyo  <b>JAPAN</b>  Phone: (+81) 3 35028111</p>	<a href="mailto:masato_fukushima@nm.maff.go.jp">masato_fukushima@nm.maff.go.jp</a>

	Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓		<p><b>Mr Masahiro AOKI</b>            Section Chief            Food Safety and Consumer Policy            Division            Food Safety and Consumer Affairs            Bureau            Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and            Fisheries  <b>JAPAN</b>            Phone: (+81) 3 35028732</p>	<p><a href="mailto:masahiro_aoki@nm.maff.go.jp">masahiro_aoki@nm.maff.go.jp</a></p>
✓		<p><b>Mr Josiah M. SYANDA</b>            Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate            Service (KEPHIS)            P o Box 19164 00501,Nairobi  <b>KENYA</b>            M +254 724 567873            O + 254 722 209504</p>	<p><a href="mailto:jsyanda@kephis.org">jsyanda@kephis.org</a></p>
✓		<p><b>Ms Ines Maria ARES ALONZO</b>            Asesora Técnica            Dirección General de Servicios            Agrícolas            Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y            Pesca            Millan 4703            12300 Montevideo  <b>URUGUAY</b>            Phone: (+598) 23098410            Fax: (+598) 2309840</p>	<p><a href="mailto:mares@mgap.gub.uy">mares@mgap.gub.uy</a></p>
✓		<p><b>Mr Raul Enrique FERNANDEZ            PRIETO</b>            Director Nacional de Salud Vegetal            Integral del Instituto Nacional de Salud            Agrícola Integral (INSAI).            Dirección:Urbanización El Toro, Calle            número 1, Avenida Las Delicias.            Maracay - Estado Aragua.  <b>VENEZUELA</b>            Telefono +584265136996</p>	<p><a href="mailto:nuevoinsaisaludvegetalintegral@gmail.com">nuevoinsaisaludvegetalintegral@gmail.com</a></p>
✓		<p><b>Mr Gregory WOLFF</b>            Chief Plant Health Officer / Dirigeant            principal de la protection des végétaux            Director, Plant Biosecurity &amp; Forestry            Division Canadian Food Inspection            Agency            59 Camelot Drive / 59 promenade            Camelot, Ottawa, ON K1A 0Y9  <b>CANADA</b>            Tel: (001) 613-773-7727</p>	<p><a href="mailto:greg.wolff@inspection.gc.ca">greg.wolff@inspection.gc.ca</a></p>



	<b>Role</b>	<b>Name, mailing, address, telephone</b>	<b>Email address</b>
✓		<b>Mr Osama EL LISSY</b> Deputy Administrator Plant Protection and Quarantine Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Washington, DC 20250 <b>USA</b> Tel: 202 799 7121	<a href="mailto:Osama.A.El-Lissy@aphis.usda.gov">Osama.A.El-Lissy@aphis.usda.gov</a>
✓		<b>Ms Mable MUDENDA</b> <b>ZAMBIA</b>	<a href="mailto:banji.mudenda@gmail.com">banji.mudenda@gmail.com</a>

### Others

	<b>Region / Role</b>	<b>Name, mailing, address, telephone</b>	<b>Email address</b>
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Yukio YOKOI</b> Secretary	<a href="mailto:Yukio.Yokoi@fao.org">Yukio.Yokoi@fao.org</a>
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Craig FEDCHOCK</b> Coordinator	<a href="mailto:Craig.Fedchock@fao.org">Craig.Fedchock@fao.org</a>
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Ana Peralta</b> Capacity Development Officer	<a href="mailto:Ana.Peralta@fao.org">Ana.Peralta@fao.org</a>
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr David Nowell</b> National Reporting Obligations Officer	<a href="mailto:Dave.Nowell@fao.org">Dave.Nowell@fao.org</a>
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Brent LARSON</b> Standards Officer	<a href="mailto:Brent.Larson@fao.org">Brent.Larson@fao.org</a>
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Orlando SOSA</b> IRSS Officer	<a href="mailto:Orlando.Sosa@fao.org">Orlando.Sosa@fao.org</a>
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Eva Moller</b> Note taker	<a href="mailto:Eva.Moller@fao.org">Eva.Moller@fao.org</a>