



***REPORT***



Rome, Italy  
6 & 10 Oct. 2014

# **CPM Bureau**

## **October, 2014**



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

## Contents

1.	Opening of the Meeting and Secretarial Update.....	3
2.	Adoption of the agenda.....	3
3.	Housekeeping .....	3
4.	Report of last meeting.....	3
4.1	Review of the standard setting process .....	3
5.	Preparation for SPG.....	4
5.1	General review of the SPG Agenda .....	4
5.2	Implementation of IPPC Strategic Objectives on environment .....	5
6.	Operational issues.....	5
6.1	Financial Committee .....	5
6.2	Implementation .....	6
6.4	Framework for standards.....	7
6.5	Translation of standards .....	8
6.7	CDC review.....	9
6.8	Selection of new CDC members .....	10
6.9	Dispute settlement.....	10
6.10	IPPC Recommendation on sea containers.....	11
6.11	IPPC recommendations (criteria) .....	11
6.12	CPM-10 (including special topics, session on successes and challenges; side sessions, training session and other preparation) .....	12
8.	Other Business.....	12
8.1	Allocating upcoming budgets.....	13
8.2	Removal of recognition of 2 inactive RPPOs .....	13
9.	Next Meeting .....	13
10.	Close of Meeting .....	14

## Appendices

Appendix 1: Agenda.....	15
Appendix 2: Documents list.....	16
Appendix 3: Participants list .....	17
Appendix 4: Criteria for topics for CPM recommendations .....	20

## 1. Opening of the Meeting and Secretarial Update

- [1] The IPPC Secretary opened the meeting and wished the Bureau members a fruitful meeting.
- [2] He noted that a meeting will be arranged between the CPM Chairperson and the ADG-AG, Mr Ren WANG during this week.
- [3] He highlighted a few activities of importance that have taken place since the last Bureau meeting: The IPPC has been included in the Biodiversity Liaison Group; the Framework for Standards meeting and OEWG on implementation have taken place; Regional workshops are ongoing and preparations seem to be improving; IPPC is providing support for a dispute settlement; and 19 countries have newly registered for the ISPM 15 mark.
- [4] The IPPC Secretary informed the Bureau that he will leave the Organization at the end of December 2014.
- [5] The CPM Chairperson, Ms Kyu-Ock YIM (Republic of Korea), welcomed the participants and thanked the Secretary for his work these past years.

## 2. Adoption of the agenda

- [6] The Bureau adopted the Agenda (Appendix 1).

## 3. Housekeeping

- [7] The IPPC Coordinator introduced the Documents list (Appendix 2) and the Participants list (Appendix 3). Local arrangements were discussed briefly.
- [8] The IPPC Coordinator noted that the newly hired Communications expert is currently at FAO and that he will contact Bureau members to set up brief interviews.

## 4. Report of last meeting

- [9] The CPM Chairperson introduced the report of the 2014-06 Bureau meeting<sup>1</sup>, summarizing the main discussions. She informed the Bureau that the Republic of Korea has confirmed funding for the Global ePhyto Symposium.
- [10] She recalled the areas for liaison between Bureau members and the IPPC Secretariat:

Mr John GREIFER - Communications, SBDS, FC	Mr Peter THOMSON – ePhyto, Implementation
Mr Lucien Konan KOUAME - NRO	Ms Kyu-Ock YIM - Evaluation/Enhancement Study
Mr Mohamed REFAAT RASMY - SC	Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN - CDC

### 4.1 Review of the standard setting process

- [11] The Standards Officer introduced a paper on the draft terms of reference for a focus group to review the standard setting process<sup>2</sup>. This was also in response to the June 2014 Bureau request that when reviewing the IPPC standard setting procedure, particular attention should be focused on how to improve the development of PTs, including how to facilitate the submission of historical evidence to support a PT.

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.ippc.int/sites/default/files/documents/20140814/final\\_bureau\\_report\\_2014\\_08\\_14\\_posted\\_201408140908--455.61%20KB.pdf](https://www.ippc.int/sites/default/files/documents/20140814/final_bureau_report_2014_08_14_posted_201408140908--455.61%20KB.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> 10\_Bureau\_2014\_Oct

- [12] Due to the many diverse issues to be addressed in the review, the Secretariat deemed that a focus group would be needed, because there would not be enough time during an SC meeting to discuss sufficiently all the issues at hand.
- [13] Some of the major issues that will need to be examined are how the SC will decide to progress with recommending PTs for adoption when these have previously received formal objections, and where consensus in the SC cannot be reached to put them forward to the CPM; and whether the current consultation periods should be changed.
- [14] The Bureau agreed to not have mention of historic data being included in the review of PTs because the Bureau felt that this was an issue that needed discussions, but not as part of the review of the SSP.
- [15] The Bureau discussed whether to have a focus group, noting that several of the changes to the SSP adopted at CPM-7 were proposed at an evening session that did not leave much time for considering the consequences. However, at the same time, the Bureau felt that an alternative solution to an international meeting be found and suggested that the SC consider using the SC-7 (which represents the seven FAO regions) for this work.

### **Replacement of standards**

- [16] The Standards Officer updated the Bureau on the actions taken to investigate the issue of replacing standards when new revised versions are adopted. Currently all versions of standards are valid, and FAO Legal has advised that CPM should formally revoke all previous versions. However, in order to do this, all references to other standards would need to be checked, so that revisions would not refer to revoked versions and this was not always straightforward.
- [17] He noted that a paper with this analysis will be prepared by SC November 2014 for the CPM-10 (2015).
- [18] The Bureau:
- (1) *reviewed and revised* the Focus Group's terms of reference (TOR) developed by the Secretariat and *invited* the SC to discuss this at the November 2014 meeting, and
  - (2) *encouraged* the SC to discuss the main challenges and practical problems with the current standard setting process, and provide a recommendation on the way forward (focus group meeting, extending the SC-7 meeting by one day, or another alternative).

## **5. Preparation for SPG**

### **5.1 General review of the SPG Agenda**

- [19] The Bureau discussed the agenda for the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) meeting, 7-9 October 2014<sup>3</sup>.
- [20] The IPPC Coordinator introduced the agenda point for the SPG on the 20 year vision for the IPPC. He noted that the overwhelming positive acceptance of this task had prompted the Secretariat to suggest a standing agenda item on future trends.
- [21] The Bureau discussed which approach to take in the discussions and agreed that focus should be on how the IPPC ensures to remain relevant in a changing world. A list of topics of importance should be drawn up and prioritized, and based on this an analysis should be undertaken to understand if these priorities were currently being addressed, or if adjustments would be needed to the work programme.
- [22] The Bureau also discussed whether a 20 year vision may be practical for prioritizing, and decided that it would be strategically important to think 20 years ahead, but for practical purposes, a strategic plan should extend to the next 10 years only.

---

<sup>3</sup> SPG 2014/01

- [23] The Bureau considered what the concrete outcomes of the discussions should be. One member suggested that a desired outcome would be priorities on activities that measure the IPPC's economic impact. Others should be related to resource mobilization –also within FAO (for regular programme funding). This would be in line with what the FC had considered earlier, namely that the major themes that the IPPC should focus on should be identified, prioritized and all go towards the International Year of Plant Health because the latter would capture well many of the points brought forth by CPs.
- [24] The CPM Chairperson suggested that the outcomes could be transformed into a narrative for the CPM to consider.

## 5.2 Implementation of IPPC Strategic Objectives on environment

- [25] The IPPC Coordinator introduced the paper<sup>4</sup> highlighting the actions taken by the Secretariat to fulfil the IPPC Strategic Framework (2012-2019) objective related to *Protecting the environment, forests and biodiversity*. One of the major steps taken is that IPPC became the seventh member of the Biodiversity-related Conventions Liaison Group (BLG) during the 16 August 2014 meeting of the BLG. This inclusion, he explained, foresees a number of challenges and opportunities, and the IPPC will have to consider strategically, among other things, which proposals for funding to propose; which other environmental organizations to reach out to, and how NPPOs can interact with environmental agencies in their countries.
- [26] The Bureau stressed that any actions should be taken in full correspondence with the overall priorities of the CPM, and the Secretariat would therefore be expected to identify areas within surveillance that would link to biodiversity, and ensure that the work the IPPC has already undertaken is used in any collaboration with the other organizations. As an example, forest surveillance was mentioned as significant because invasive alien pests are important also outside of the agricultural sector.
- [27] The Bureau suggested that an immediate action to gain value from this collaboration should be to provide NPPOs information on the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and guidance on how to make proposals for the funds available through GEF. The Secretariat encouraged this because the CBD had previously stated that the GEF funds could be used to implement other Conventions.

- [28] The Bureau:

- (3) asked the Secretariat to provide NPPOs with information on the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and guidance on how to make proposals for the funds available through GEF.
- (4) asked the Secretariat to examine areas of the current work programmes that would benefit from the BLG collaboration and look for possible cooperation opportunities, especially for resources.

## 6. Operational issues

### 6.1 Financial Committee

- [29] Mr John GREIFER presented a summary of the outcomes from the Financial Committee meeting, held on the morning of 6 October 2014.

- [30] Key points were:

- [31] Financial situation of the IPPC. Regular programme funding is on track (no overspending is foreseen), the multi-donor trust fund has a surplus of approximately USD 800 000. He recalled that budgets are approved in FAO on a biennial basis and that the IPPC budget for 2015 therefore will be the same as for this year. In June 2015, the FAO Council will decide on the FAO budget for 2016-17, and the FC had discussed possibilities for influencing the discussions to increase the RP allocation. These discussions would start by meeting with the AG-ADG and highlight the future IPPC activities that would link to FAO's mandates. Contemporaneously, he suggested that the Bureau members contact their foreign affairs and FAO permanent representatives to explain the need for additional resources.

<sup>4</sup> 11\_Bureau\_2014\_Oct

[32] The Bureau agreed that the CPM Chairperson should prepare a letter to all CPs outlining the vision of the IPPC, the forthcoming activities and highlighting how the IPPC aids FAO in meeting its goals. This should help the CPs in their discussions with their governments.

[33] International Year of Plant Health and Donor Conference. The FC discussed these initiatives noting that 2020 would be a realistic year to schedule it as the approval process is long. The Secretariat will prepare a paper for the CPM for the approval of the concepts, and for the setting up of a steering group. He noted that Mr Ralf LOPIAN (Finland) had volunteered to be on the steering group and that the FC asked that a Bureau member should also participate.

[34] Sensitize CPM members to assure that proposed activities will require funding. Often CPM will add new proposals for activities and topics for the IPPC Secretariat to work on but without identifying budgets for them. This may result in activities being adopted for which there is not funding. The FC will be tracking any new proposals during the CPM session and discussing with the Bureau (during the CPM week) if funding is available. The CPM would be informed of the cost and from where funding would come (e.g. it may be from reallocation of funds from a different activity). This would be done in an effort to highlight the budget implications new activity proposals may have on the overall IPPC Secretariat and sensitize CPs to identify additional extra-budgetary funding.

[35] The Bureau:

(5) *noted* the update on the FC meeting, 6 October (am) 2014.

## 6.2 Implementation

[36] Mr Peter THOMSON highlighted outcomes and recommendations of the Open-ended working group (OEWG) meeting on Implementation, held in Rome, 4-7 August 2014<sup>5</sup>.

[37] The implementation pilot programme on surveillance was supposed to be presented to CPM-10, but it was not clear if this deadline could be met. The OEWG had discussed what level of detail would be needed in the work plan. If the work plan will not have to be very detailed, it may be possible to present it to CPM-10 (2015).

[38] The Bureau discussed options for supporting the programme in terms of resourcing to ensure that the CPM can take a concrete decision on this issue and to identify the consequences for other work areas and budgets. These considerations would need to take account of the current IPPC activities related to surveillance, which could be included in the pilot.

[39] The CPM Chairperson mentioned that it may be necessary to reallocate RP funds, currently budgeted to other activities, to the pilot. It was noted that some IRSS funds could also potentially be reprioritized towards implementation.

[40] Regarding the SPG recommendation for enhancing cross-secretariat collaboration on the implementation programme, the Bureau reviewed an initial draft proposal on what would be needed in terms of staff expertise, management framework and what surveillance related activities are ongoing already. The Bureau thought it was a good starting point and encouraged it be discussed in detail within the Secretariat. The Bureau also stressed the need to link the existing IPPC work areas, and not to build a new pillar. The Secretariat would need to assess how to modify its organizational structure to effectively and efficiently focus on implementation.

[41] The CPM will need to address the pilot programme holistically to consider the resources needed and to make informed decisions as to whether there are other topics on the IPPC work programmes that would need to be given a lower priority.

[42] The Bureau:

(6) *firmly supported* the cross-secretariat collaboration on implementation.

---

<sup>5</sup> Report available at <https://www.ippc.int/publications/report-open-ended-working-group-implementation-2014>

- (7) *asked* the Secretariat to prepare an integrated budget proposal including existing and ongoing activities on surveillance to CPM-10 (2015).
- (8) *supported* that there be a Secretariat focal point for implementation, but stressed that this would be to coordinate and ensure an integrated approach with input from each area.
- (9) *noted* the recommendations from the Open-ended working group (OEWG) meeting on Implementation.
- (10) *asked* the Secretariat to prepare a budget for the implementation program in 2015 to be circulated to the Bureau before the next Bureau meeting (December 2014), and present the draft work plan for the pilot program including a proposed budget to the CPM-10 (2015)

### **6.3 IPPC Secretariat enhancement evaluation**

- [43] Ms Kyu-Ock YIM updated the Bureau on the Enhancement study, which was initiated at the end of September 2014 through confidential interviews of all IPPC Secretariat staff. She also recalled that the Enhancement study team set up interviews with the Bureau members to understand fully the expectations and desired outcomes of contracting parties. The Team will also be observing parts of the SPG meeting. Lastly, a questionnaire is being prepared to be sent out to contracting parties.
- [44] The results of the Enhancement study will be presented to the Bureau in draft format by the end of December. The final analysis will be presented to CPM-10 (2015).
- [45] The Bureau discussed briefly the selection of a new Secretary, stressing that it would be appropriate that the Bureau be involved in the selection process as much as possible (from the job description to the interviews).
- [46] The CPM Chairperson and FC Chairperson reported on a meeting with the ADG-AG, Mr Ren WANG, who agreed that the Bureau will be consulted informally on the selection of secretary. As to the timeframe, the office of the AGD is working to issue the vacancy announcement by end November, in order to have the selection concluded by June 2015.

### **6.4 Framework for standards**

- [47] The Standards Officer summarized the main outcomes of the framework for standards and implementation meeting held in Punta Leone, Costa Rica, 25-29 August 2014<sup>6</sup>.
- [48] He clarified that the recommendations of the meeting would be presented to the SC November 2014 meeting, modified by the SC and following presented to the CPM. He noted that the framework would help align the IPPC priorities with the new topics that would be proposed with the overall strategic objectives.
- [49] The Bureau suggested that only some of the recommendations be presented to the CPM-10 (2015), because there were recommendations which had a wider impact, i.e. outside of standard setting, and it could be difficult to obtain the proper input quickly.
- [50] There were a number of concerns and discussion from the Secretariat on the scope of the recommendation and communication with other work areas. In particular, some concerns were expressed about the outcomes of the meeting which may have been outside of the scope of the framework's TORs. The suggestion for a standard on NPPO set up, could be considered inappropriate because the Capacity Development section is already producing manuals on this topic and because it could be used to measure non-compliance. Lastly, the Secretariat highlighted the need for all sections of the Secretariat to comment on all parts of the framework to provide input on the gaps related to implementation issues.

---

<sup>6</sup> Report available at <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/framework-for-standards-task-force>

[51] The Bureau agreed that the CPM had several streams of communications to identify gaps for standards, guidance and similar material. It was stressed, however, that there is a need for a mechanism to analyze the information and conclude on the actual gaps through consultation and coordination. This would facilitate collaboration across the IPPC areas. To facilitate this, it was queried how subsidiary bodies interrelate because they may make recommendations to one another and it was not clear if these recommendations could be communicated directly or should be presented to the CPM. The Bureau confirmed that subsidiary bodies should communicate with each other and that the Secretariat (through the IPPC Coordinator) should facilitate this communication.

[52] The Bureau:

- (11) *supported* the SPG 2014 comments and recommendations on the framework for standards and implementation.
- (12) *asked* the Secretariat to solicit comments on the framework for standards report from other IPPC bodies to ensure full inclusiveness from all areas of the IPPC.
- (13) *asked* the Secretariat and the SC to produce a simpler table of the framework for standards and implementation, and again solicit comments from the other subsidiary bodies.
- (14) *agreed* to re-discuss the framework once the other subsidiary bodies have provided their input.
- (15) *noted* that the Secretariat will report to CPM-10 that work on the framework is ongoing and a final framework will be presented to CPM-11 (2016).

## 6.5 Translation of standards

[53] The Standards Officer presented an overview of the costs related to the translation of ISPMs and provided options for translation of the standards that are likely to be processed for adoption in the forth coming years, as requested by the Bureau June 2014<sup>7</sup>.

[54] The challenges related to translation, he explained, are multi-faceted because not only will the costs for translation inevitably increase due to the larger expected number of diagnostic protocols being processed for adoption the next few years, but contracting parties have also expressed concerns about the quality of translations. The options presented outlined the various costs to address these various concerns.

[55] The Standards Officer explained the various options in detail (e.g. outsourcing to private translators, using the current process but recruiting phytosanitary experts as reviewers throughout the process, adding translations for various steps of the standard setting process).

[56] He also explained that standards did not have to be translated by FAO, as only official FAO documents must be translated in-house (e.g. CPM documents).

[57] The Bureau discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the various options. The Bureau acknowledged the importance of having all draft ISPMs in all official languages throughout the consultative process, as well as the concerns raised about the quality of ISPMs. However, the Bureau stressed that funds are not available at the moment to resolve all the issues at hand. Additionally, the Bureau noted that translations of such technical documents will inevitably be subject to critique because of differences in style and terminology preferences.

[58] The Bureau suggested tackling what seems to be the most imminent issue, the quality of translations. The Bureau recommended that the ADG-AG, Mr Ren WANG, be asked to raise the concerns of the quality of translations at a higher level noting also the challenges in reaching consensus between the FAO Spanish translation group and the LRG for Spanish.

[59] The Bureau also stressed the need for CPs to send concrete examples of translation issues (besides what is indirectly presented via the LRG process) to the Secretariat, and encouraged Arabic speaking countries to form an LRG for Arabic.

---

<sup>7</sup> 07\_Bureau\_2014\_Oct

- [60] As to the budget for translations in view of the increase in costs, the Bureau thought it would be important to present the budgeted costs for translations when CPM adopts the work programme.
- [61] Additionally, the Bureau suggested the Secretariat to consider that each area of the IPPC could have a fixed level of funding for the regular programme. For translations (including increase in quantity of words, languages, or periods) *this would mean that CPM, in adopting the List of topics for IPPC standards, would recognize that not all standards would necessarily be translated immediately, or that other activities on the work programme should be identified and cancelled.*
- [62] Lastly, the Bureau suggested the Secretariat investigate possible sponsorship of translations.
- [63] The Bureau:
- (16) *asked* the Secretary to raise the translation issues formally with the ADG-AG, Mr Ren WANG.
  - (17) *encouraged* Arabic speaking countries to form an LRG for Arabic and asked the Bureau member for the Near East to facilitate this.
  - (18) *encouraged* CPs to send the IPPC Secretariat comments on translations including suggestions for corrections, if these issues may create confusion or impede the correct implementation of the standards.
  - (19) *asked* the Secretary to consider the effective ways to manage the limited budget with consultation with FC.

## 6.6 Communication

- [64] The IPPC Coordinator highlighted the main points presented in the paper on the ongoing efforts to enhance the Secretariat's external communication efforts<sup>8</sup>, namely that priority should be given to (i) a new approach to information technology; and (ii) the production and publication of success stories from IPPC contracting parties to enhance resource mobilization efforts.
- [65] To meet these goals, professional support for communications is needed and targeted funds should be dedicated to this effect. Additional funds will be needed for travel for resource mobilization.
- [66] He also noted that the finalized work plan for communications (developed by Green Ink together with the Secretariat) will be presented to CPM-10 (2015). Currently, a communications expert, Jeremy CHERFAS, has been recruited as a short term consultant. He will contact Bureau members for success stories.

## 6.7 CDC review

- [67] The Senior Capacity Development (CD) Officer introduced the paper<sup>9</sup> outlining issues related to the current ongoing informal evaluation of the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) and to the status of the Committee. She noted that the CPM-7 (2012) established the CDC as a Technical Committee, with the intention of reviewing its status after two years. There was some disappointment that the review was not being carried out as efficiently as had been hoped.
- [68] She noted that CPM can only create bodies, so although the CPM created a Technical Committee, in reality the CDC is a subsidiary body (overseen by CPM). The Legal office advised that due to this, the CPM should review the status of the body within two years. She recalled that the original idea had been to have a more organic but still formal group compared to other subsidiary bodies, e.g. in relation to the way of selecting members.
- [69] The CPM Chairperson noted that after the SPG presentation of the CDC review, it was clear that results would be presented to the CPM-10 (2015), and that further discussions could be had after that, so the recommendations for type of body and the further review process would be fully considered.

---

<sup>8</sup> 04\_Bureau\_2014\_Oct

<sup>9</sup> 09\_Bureau\_2014\_Oct

- [70] The Bureau:
- (20) *encouraged* the CDC review be presented to the CPM-10 (2015).

## 6.8 Selection of new CDC members

[71] The Senior CD Officer, referring to the TORs for the CDC as to how CDC members are selected, noted that the Bureau had been provided with a score sheet and CVs of all candidates for the CDC member selection. Two of the candidates were retiring within the next year, but had received full commitment from their governments that they would be able to sit on the committee for the two-year duration.

[72] She also noted that in one case a candidate had also been included in the rooster of experts, and that there may be a conflict of interest.

[73] For Europe and the Near East only one candidate had been submitted for each, and replacement members should be identified.

[74] The CDC members' terms ended in September, so the selection of new members was needed urgently.

[75] The Bureau *selected* the following members and alternate members of the CDC:

Africa	Stella Noeym ORAKA (member), Nigeria Kenneth Kajarayekha MSISKA (alternate member), Zambia
Asia	Haw Leng HO (member), Malaysia Xingxia WU (alternate member), China
Europe	Samuel John BISHOP (member), United Kingdom
Latin American and Caribbean	Magda González ARROY (member), Costa Rica Alavro Sepul veda LUQUE (alternate member), Chile
Near East	Nagat Mubarak El TAYEB (member), Sudan
North America	Mark GILKEY (member), USA Claire Wilson O'DRISCOLL (alternate member), Canada
Pacific	Sally JENNINGS (member), New Zealand Chris DALE, (alternate member), Australia

## 6.9 Dispute settlement

[76] The National Reporting Officer informed the Bureau of the current dispute between South Africa and the European Union (dispute no. 10ZAF01), and the review of the Dispute Settlement body. In brief, South Africa claims the strength of phytosanitary measures required by the EU were inconsistent with the level of risk posed by the introduction of Citrus black spot (caused by the fungus *Guignardia citricarpa*) on fruit that is imported into the EU.

[77] The parties held an informal meeting facilitated by the Secretariat to resolve the dispute, but to no avail. Subsequently, South Africa had requested a dispute settlement expert panel. The IPPC Secretariat is working closely together with FAO legal on all steps of this, and a call for experts for Citrus black spot has been made. The Expert panel should be able to meet in the beginning of January 2015, provided that the parties can agree on the TORs.

[78] The Secretariat also noted that dispute settlement procedures and documents are being updated and additional guidance being produced. This new guidance will also include a point on how not to arrive at a dispute because the Secretariat provides a space for facilitated dialogue. The Secretariat stressed that it is spending significant time working on the review and production of procedures and guidance, without additional staff to help. The Secretariat is investigating the possibility of collaborating with FAO legal on the support of a legal intern for this dispute. The Bureau suggested the Secretariat keep well track of the hours spent on the dispute.

- [79] The Bureau:
- (21) *noted* the update on dispute settlement, and

(22) *asked* that the Secretariat keep well track of the man hours spent on the dispute.

## 6.10 IPPC Recommendation on sea containers

[80] Mr VAN ALPHEN introduced the paper on a proposal for a CPM recommendation on sea containers<sup>10</sup>. He recalled that CPM-9 (2014) had agreed that a draft CPM recommendation be prepared with the objective to encourage national plant protection organizations, the Secretariat, the Convention on Biodiversity and the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) to support awareness raising and the implementation of the revised IMO/ILO/UNECE Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units.

[81] According to the current procedure for adopting IPPC recommendations, contracting parties get 90 days for commenting, but the European Union wished this period diminished to only 60 days. This request was based on the short time between the end date of the process and CPM-10 (2015) which could mean it would not be possible to translate the recommendation in time. Also, he noted, many countries had been fully involved in the process of developing the recommendation. Lastly, he stressed that it would be imperative that the recommendation be adopted at CPM-10 (2015).

[82] The Bureau did not feel there was justification to make an exemption to the CPM procedure, and the Secretariat confirmed that there should be sufficient time for presenting the Recommendation to CPM-10 (2015) in languages.

[83] The Bureau discussed briefly the content of the IPPC Recommendation, including whether it was appropriate that it was directed at bodies outside of the IPPC mandate. Specific comments should be submitted to the Secretariat via the normal process.

[84] The Bureau:

(23) *asked* the Secretariat to ensure that the IPPC Recommendation on sea containers be processed in languages for the CPM-10 (2015).

## 6.11 IPPC recommendations (criteria)

[85] The IPPC Coordinator introduced the issue regarding the need for setting criteria for IPPC recommendations<sup>11</sup>. He recalled that the current format of CPM recommendations was adopted by CPM-4 (2009), and that the process for adopting recommendations was adopted by CPM-9 (2014).

[86] He noted that while ISPMs and IPPC recommendations carry almost the same weight and validity<sup>12</sup>, there are differences in their characteristics and for this reason criteria should be set up, against which to determine the need for a specific recommendation.

[87] The Bureau, in its June 2009 meeting, discussed some criteria, but these were never formally adopted by the CPM. Furthermore, the Secretariat deemed there was a need for an additional criterion so that CPM recommendations could also concern issues that “must be addressed urgently in the area of plant protection, by all contracting parties”.

<sup>10</sup> 05\_Bureau\_2014\_Oct

<sup>11</sup> 08\_Bureau\_2014\_Oct

<sup>12</sup> From the paper CPM 2009/17: [2] “The comments during the CPM-3 included a request to consider the name “Recommendation”, as under the WTO-SPS Agreement, recommendations appear to have the same level of importance as standards and guidelines, but the proposal for Recommendations did not suggest an equally rigorous approach for their development and review as what was in place for standards. Other comments included the need for a legal review of the approach to Recommendations and the legal status of Recommendations.” [6] “The SPTA allayed the concern raised by a member at CPM-3 related to the term “recommendation” by clarifying that the WTO-SPS Committee, in case of a dispute, would consider all decisions and adopted documents from the CPM, irrespective of their title or format. The SPTA rejected a blanket statement restriction on the scope of an IPPC recommendation.”

- [88] The Bureau discussed the current and proposed criteria noting the need to be clear on why a recommendation would be proposed instead of a standard.
- [89] The Bureau did not find it appropriate that CPM recommendations be directed at the Secretariat, because actions that the Secretariat would need to take could be recommended by CPM decisions. The Bureau deleted one and added two criteria.
- [90] The Bureau:
- (24) *agreed* to recommend the Criteria for topics for IPPC recommendations, as modified in this meeting, for adoption by CPM-10 (2015) (Appendix 4).

## **6.12 CPM-10 (including special topics, session on successes and challenges; side sessions, training session and other preparation)**

- [91] The Bureau discussed the preparations for CPM-10 (2015).
- [92] Sessions on special topics (new technologies for diagnostics, new methods for pest control, risk-based inspection systems). It was recalled that each session would have only one presentation. The Secretariat will open a call to identify speakers, but also asked if the Bureau could play an active role in this. Mr Peter THOMSON will contact his government to identify a possible speaker for the session on risk-based inspection systems. For new pest control, the Secretariat had contacted colleagues in AG but found that most views were directed at IPM and insects whereas the IPPC would wish for a broader view inclusive of all pests. Mr John GREIFER will consult with US experts to see if they would be able to provide a speaker. As to the new technologies for diagnostics, Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN will contact EPPO and FERA. It was also suggested that a speaker could be found within a non-plant health area that has technologies which could be valid for the phytosanitary context.
- [93] Development of CPM documents. The Bureau encouraged the Secretariat to produce the decision documents sooner than the information documents to allow CPs sufficient time to discuss the papers with their governments.
- [94] The Bureau also discussed an easier way of integrating comments on CPM documents, and discussed the use of Google Docs instead of emails.
- [95] IPPC Merchandise. The Bureau agreed that the Secretariat pursue efforts in organizing IPPC sponsored merchandise for distribution at CPM.
- [96] CPM Activities. As to the Photo competition discussed at the Bureau June meeting, no action had been taken because it was deemed that there was not enough time to organize the competition.
- [97] The Secretariat informed the Bureau that it is investigating holding a marketplace on pests of relevance.

- [98] The Bureau:
- (25) *asked* the Secretariat to open calls to collect stories of success and challenges and to identify key note speakers for the special topics sessions for CPM-10 (2015)

## **7. Follow up of SPG discussions**

- [99] The CPM Chairperson expressed gratitude towards the SPG for the active and productive discussions.
- [100] Other specific follow up actions from the SPG discussions will be reported under the individual agenda items concerned.

## **8. Other Business**

- [101] Based on the outcomes of the NROAG meeting 2014, the NRO Officer asked the Bureau consider the general IPPC obligations in their next meeting.

## 8.1 Allocating upcoming budgets

[102] The IPPC Coordinator introduced the proposal for allocation of upcoming budgets<sup>13</sup>. The proposal had been discussed in detail by the SPG and the Bureau agreed with the conclusions reached.

[103] The Bureau expressed concern about the coming year's TF donations.

[104] The Bureau:

- (26) *endorsed* having a joint meeting between the IPPC Financial Committee and the Bureau, to be held the week before CPM-10 (2015), to review the budget, expenditures and make any adjustments to the budget as necessary.
- (27) *agreed* that any adjustments from this meeting shall be reported to the CPM-10 for noting.
- (28) *agreed* to seek CPM authorization in order to inter-sessional financial management of IPPC funds, in consultation with the IPPC Secretariat and the IPPC Financial Committee.

## 8.2 Removal of recognition of 2 inactive RPPOs

[105] The Secretariat noted that, as per Bureau suggestion, it had sent out a note to all RPPOs asking them to respond within a specific timeframe to understand if they were active. The proposal of removal of recognition for two RPPOs will be presented to the TC-RPPO, FAO legal and for CPM-11 (2016) for adoption.

[106] There is interest from other actors in getting recognition to create an RPPO for the Caribbean. The Secretariat will forward the report from the Regional workshop, Caribbean, to the Bureau for details.

[107] The Bureau:

- (29) *noted* the updated information.

## 9. Next Meeting

[108] The following meetings are scheduled for the Bureau:

- Virtual meeting on 2 December.
- Face-to-face meeting 11 March (PM) and 12 March 2014 (the IPPC Financial Committee will meet on 11 March, AM).
- Face-to-face meeting 8-12 June 2015.

[109] As to the IPPC' participation in other meetings: Ms Kyu-Ock YIM and Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN will participate in the CDC meeting in December 2014.

[110] The IPPC Coordinator will participate in the SPS meeting in October.

[111] The IPPC Coordinator and the Senior CD Officer will participate in the SDTF meeting.

[112] Ms Kyu-Ock YIM, the Senior CD Officer and the CD Officer will participate in the TC-RPPO.

[113] Mr Mohamed Refaat Rasmy ABDELHAMID will be attending the SC November 2014 meeting.

[114] The NRO Officer will participate as a speaker in a side event on biodiversity and food security, 14 October 2014 at FAO HQ.

[115] Mr Peter Thomson, Ms Kyu-Ock YIM and the IPPC Coordinator will participate in the APPPC ePhyto workshop from 28-30 October.

[116] The Standard setting team will participate in the Expert Consultation on Phytosanitary treatments for *Bactrocera dorsalis* complex to be held from 1 to 5 December 2014 in Okinawa, Japan, and the TPG meeting, to be held in Rome from 8 to 12 December 2014.

<sup>13</sup> 06\_Bureau\_2014\_Oct

[117] The Bureau:

- (30) *asked* the Secretariat for all tentative meeting dates to be added to the IPP Calendar.
- (31) *asked* the Secretariat to set a time during the afternoon (Rome time) for the 2 December 2014 virtual meeting.

## 10. Close of Meeting

[118] The CPM Chairperson noted that she was looking into hosting the CPM session in 2016 and asked that the Secretariat send her an estimated budget and requirements for the meeting costs. It is not certain that it will be feasible, but she hoped so because of the awareness that would be raised in her region and because it may provide an opportunity for other CPs to host in the future.

[119] She thanked the Bureau members and the Secretariat for their contributions. She again encouraged the Secretariat to work together and express the responsibility of presenting coordinated efforts for productive discussions.

## Appendix 1: Agenda

Agenda item	Document No	Presenter
<b>1. Opening of the meeting and Secretarial Update</b>		YOKOI
<b>2. Adoption of the agenda</b>	01_Bureau_2014_Oct	YIM
<b>3. Housekeeping</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents list</li> <li>• Participants list</li> <li>• Local information</li> </ul>	<a href="#">02_Bureau_2014_Oct</a> <a href="#">03_Bureau_2014_Oct</a> <a href="#">Local information</a>	
<b>4. Report of last meeting</b>	<a href="#">CPM Bureau June 2014 Report</a>	YIM
4.1 Review of the standard setting process	10_Bureau_2014_Oct	LARSON
<b>5. Preparation for SPG</b>		
5.1 General review of the SPG Agenda (including those proposed by Contracting Parties and RPPOs)	01_SPG_2014_Oct	YIM
5.2 Implementation of IPPC Strategic Objectives on environment	11_Bureau_2014_Oct	
<b>6. Operational issues</b>		
6.1 Financial Committee	(oral report)	GREIFFER
6.2 Implementation	<a href="#">OEWG Implementation 2014 August Report</a>	THOMSON/SOSA YIM
6.3 IPPC Secretariat enhancement study	(oral report)	YIM
6.4 Framework for Standards	<a href="#">2014 Framework for Standards Meeting Report</a>	LARSON/SOSA
6.5 Standards translations	07_Bureau_2014_Oct	LARSON
6.6 Communication	04_Bureau_2014_Oct	FEDCHOCK
6.7 CDC Review	09_Bureau_2014_Oct	PERALTA
6.8 Selection of new CDC members	(oral report)	YOKOI PERALTA
6.9 Dispute settlement		NOWELL
6.10 IPPC Recommendation on sea container	05_Bureau_2014_Oct	VAN ALPHEN
6.11 IPPC recommendations (criteria)	08_SPG_2014_Oct	FEDCHOCK/SOSA
6.12 CPM-10 (including session on successes and challenges; side sessions, training session and other preparation)	(oral report)	FEDCHOCK
<b>7. Follow up of SPG discussions</b>		YIM
<b>8. Other business</b>		FEDCHOCK/YUKIO
8.1 Allocating Upcoming Budgets	06_Bureau_2014_Oct	FEDCHOCK
8.2 Removal of recognition	-	FEDCHOCK
<b>9. Next meeting</b>		YIM
<b>10. Close of meeting</b>		YIM

## Appendix 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
<b>Other Documents</b>				
01_Bureau_2014_Oct	2	Draft Agenda	Bureau	2014-09
02_Bureau_2014_Oct	3	Documents list	Bureau	2014-10-02
03_Bureau_2014_Oct	3	Participants list	Bureau	2014-10-02
04_Bureau_2014_Oct	6.6	Communication	Bureau	2014-10-02
05_Bureau_2014_Oct	6.10	IPPC Recommendation on sea container	Bureau	2014-10-02
06_Bureau_2014_Oct	8.1	Allocating Upcoming Budgets	Bureau	2014-10-02
07_Bureau_2014_Oct	6.5	New translation process for ISPMs and DPs	Bureau	2014-10-02
08_Bureau_2014_Oct	6.11	Possible Criteria for IPPC Recommendations	Bureau	2014-10-02
09_Bureau_2014_Oct	6.7	Proposal to the Bureau on CDC Evaluation	Bureau	2014-10-02
10_Bureau_2014_Oct	4.1	Terms of reference focus group to review the standard setting process	Bureau	2014-10-10
11_Bureau_2014_Oct	5.2	Implementation of IPPC strategic objectives on environment	Bureau	2014-10-03

LINKS:	Agenda item	Content
<a href="#">IPP link to local information</a>	3	FAO Rome meetings: Local information
<a href="#">CPM Bureau June 2014 Report</a>	4	Bureau June 2014 Report
<a href="#">OEWG Implementation 2014 August Report</a>	6.2	OEWG Implementation 2014 Report
<a href="#">2014 Framework for Standards Meeting Report</a>	6.4	Framework for Standards 2014 Report

### Appendix 3: Participants list

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed <sup>14</sup>	Term expires
✓	Africa 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>	2 <sup>nd</sup> term / 2 years  (2)	2016
✓	Asia Member  <i>Chairperson</i>	<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>	CPM-8 (2013) 3 <sup>rd</sup> term / 2 years  (0)	2016
✓	Europe Member	<b>Mr Corné 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>	1st term / 2 years  (0)	2016

<sup>14</sup> The numbers in parenthesis refers to FAO travel funding assistance. (0) No funding; (1) Airfare funding; (2) Airfare and DSA funding.

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed <sup>14</sup>	Term expires
✓ Latin America and Caribbean Member	<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	<a href="mailto:dquirosa@senasa.gov.ar">dquirosa@senasa.gov.ar</a>	1st term / 2 years	2016
✓ Near East Member	<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	ippc.egypt@gmail.com	1st term / 2 years (2)	2016
✓ North America Member	<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	<a href="mailto:john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov">john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov</a>	3rd term / 2 years (0)	2015
✓ Pacific Member	<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	<a href="mailto:peter.thomson@mpi.govt.nz">peter.thomson@mpi.govt.nz</a>	3rd term / 3 years (0)	2015

**Others**

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

## Appendix 4: Criteria for topics for CPM recommendations

*(Based on discussions from Bureau 2009-06 and Bureau 2014-10; for adoption by CPM-10 2015)*

The following criteria are applied to determine the need for establishing a CPM recommendation.

The topic to be developed as a CPM recommendation should be:

- something that is relevant to the ongoing activities of all contracting parties in the area of plant protection, in accordance with and within the context of the IPPC. These are activities that are carried out in the territory of the contracting parties and/or by the contracting parties.
- something that is relevant to the ongoing activities of all contracting parties and the IPPC Secretariat in the area of plant protection, in accordance with the IPPC. These are activities that are carried out by both the Contracting Parties and the IPPC Secretariat.
- something that does not contain requirements but encourages actions.
- something relevant to encourage actions with the purpose of drawing immediate attention to issues, including longstanding issues.
- something that is relevant to the ongoing activities of all contracting parties and the IPPC Secretariat in the area of plant protection, in accordance with the IPPC. These are activities that are carried out by both the contracting parties and the IPPC Secretariat.