



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

STRATEGIC PLANNING GROUP (SPG) MEETING

**Rome, Italy
8-10 October 2019**

Secretariat

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the Meeting	4
2. Meeting Arrangements.....	4
2.1. Review of arrangements for SPG meetings as per June Bureau meeting.....	4
2.2. Adoption of the Agenda	4
2.3. Election of the Rapporteur	4
3. Meeting Arrangements.....	5
3.1. Documents List	5
3.2. Participants List.....	5
3.3. Local information.....	5
4. Important updates.....	5
4.1. Update from the CPM Bureau.....	5
4.2. Update from Secretariat	5
5. Report of the last SPG meeting	6
6. Governance and Strategy	6
6.1. Finalization of IPPC Strategic Framework for 2020-2030.....	6
6.2. Consider structuring future CPM agendas after CPM-15 around the Strategic Framework	7
6.3. Monitoring and Evaluation of the IPPC Community and the Secretariat	7
6.a. Closed Door Session	8
6.4. Framework for Standards and Implementation	11
6.5. Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) Terms of Reference (ToR) and updating the Implementation and Capacity Development Strategy	12
6.6. Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for an IPPC Stakeholder Advisory Group	13
7. Sustainable funding and resource mobilization.....	14
7.1. Leveraging contracting parties for resource mobilization	14
7.2. IYPH-related resource mobilization outcomes and success indicators	15
7.3. Private sector partnerships (pros, cons, feasibility, how, etc.)	15
7.4. ePhyto and ISPM-15 based resourcing	16
7.5. Fully funded 2021 work plan	16
7.6. Constraints to participation in and response to IPPC activities	18
8. Communications	19
8.1. Review of IPPC Communications Strategy	19
9. International Year of Plant Health	20
9.1. IYPH Progress Report.....	20
9.2. IYPH Funding	21
10. Key issues for CPM-15	21
10.1. Ministerial-level segment.....	21

10.2. Draft Ministerial declaration	22
11. Standards and Implementation	22
11.1. Commodity and Pathway Standards	22
11.2. CPM recommendation – Facilitating safe trade by reducing the incidence of contaminating pests associated with traded goods	23
11.3. Draft action plan for a Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System	24
11.4. Dispute avoidance and settlement	24
11.5. Update on surveillance activities.....	25
11.6. Draft CPM recommendation on antimicrobial resistance	25
12. Trade facilitation conference in 2021	26
13. Any other business	26
14. Next Meeting	26
15. Close of the Meeting	26
Appendix 01 – Agenda	27
Appendix 02 – List of Documents	30
Appendix 03 – List of Participants.....	32
Appendix 04 – Action points	38
Appendix 05 – Revision of Implementation and Capacity development Committee (IC) Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure.....	39

1. Opening of the Meeting

- [1] Mr Lucien KOUAME KONAN, Chairperson of the SPG, opened the meeting and welcomed participants underlining that the SPG provides strategic perspectives to the work of the IPPC and provides advice to the Commission for the implementation of the Convention.
- [2] Mr Jingyuan XIA, IPPC Secretary opened the meeting welcoming the 36 participants from 27 countries, including CPM Bureau members, chairpersons of the IC and SC and IYPH ISC and a representative of the Standard and Trade Development Facility (STDF). He also introduced Mr Arop DENG, the new IPPC Integration and Support Team Leader.
- [3] He recalled the importance to initiate planning the implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework for 2020-2030 and five-year investment plan of the Secretariat (2021-2025), as endorsed by CPM-14 (2019), specifying the importance of developing a communication plan accordingly. He discussed the relevance to plan for the organization of CPM-15, inclusive of its Ministerial segment and declaration. He further recalled the importance to deal with emerging pests and early response system.

2. Meeting Arrangements

2.1. Review of arrangements for SPG meetings as per June Bureau meeting

- [4] Mr Greg WOLFF presented the item of review of arrangements for SPG meetings, as decided at the June 2019 Bureau meeting. The Chairperson clarified that this review was made in view of increasing the effectiveness of the SPG. He recalled section 14 on page 22 of the 2019 June CPM Bureau Report¹.
- [5] For the SPG, he recalled the decision to have a closed session, with only members of the SPG and the Secretariat report writer present, to be able to identify key items that SPG participants would like to discuss in a less formal context. He also recalled the importance to provide Secretariat updates in writing in order to devote more time to strategic discussion.

The SPG:

- (1) *Noted* the review of arrangements for SPG meetings as per the 2019 June Bureau meeting.

2.2. Adoption of the Agenda

- [6] The SPG reviewed the agenda and requested to include two new agenda items:
- Doc. 29: CPM recommendation on antimicrobial resistance (as a new agenda item 11.6), as proposed by the European Commission; and
 - Doc. 30: Rationale for updating the capacity development strategy (as agenda item 6.5, now reading “Implementation and Capacity Development Committee Terms of Reference and updating the capacity development strategy”), as proposed by the IC chairperson.
- [7] Mr Ralf LOPIAN also proposed to include the issue of the recent inception workshop for establishing a system to evaluate the global burden of pests under agenda item 13 – any other business.
- [8] The SPG Agenda was approved as included in Appendix 1 to this report.

2.3. Election of the Rapporteur

- [9] Mr Marco TRAA (Netherlands) was elected as Rapporteur for the SPG meeting.

¹ Ref. 2019 June CPM Bureau report: https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2019/07/Report_Bureau-2019-June-2019-07-31.pdf

3. Meeting Arrangements

3.1. Documents List

- [10] All meeting documents are posted on the IPPC website. The Secretariat introduced the documents and participants lists, and provided local information. They also informed about the seminar on plant health and capacity development to be held on 8 October at 1:00 pm at FAO HQs.

3.2. Participants List

- [11] The documents list is attached to this report as Appendix 02.

3.3. Local information

- [12] The participants list is attached to this report as Appendix 03.

4. Important updates

4.1. Update from the CPM Bureau

- [13] Mr Javier TRUJILLO, Chairperson of the CPM Bureau, provided an update. He informed about the current budget gap for IYPH, which he hoped would be filled and stressed that it should not be a justification not to have a successful IYPH. He also highlighted the need to finalize the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030.
- [14] He recalled that the Secretariat is not responsible for field-level response to emergencies. Some Members agreed but also stressed the fact that the Secretariat may have a role, recalling section 8.4 on page 9 of the CPM Bureau Report². Mr Lucien KOUAME KONAN underlined that such a role may exist especially in terms of coordination, advocacy and possibly partnerships but not at all for field-level response. Mr TRUJILLO shared the view regarding the CPM Bureau June meeting decision but highlighted the fact that FAO does have a functioning mechanisms for emergencies and the Secretariat should acquire a better understanding of it, hence field-level response to emergencies is not an IPPC priority. The IPPC Secretary agreed and reiterated that IPPC first priority is prevention of spread of plant pests through trade.
- [15] He mentioned the need to decide on the programme of the Ministerial segment and Ministerial declaration.
- [16] One member recalled that conclusions related to the surveillance project are not limited to financial constraints and further details can be found in the evaluation report.
- [17] The SPG discussed the IPPC role in field-level response to emergencies, concluding that it has a coordination role, but not a field-level role.
- [18] The Bureau informed that the IPPC role in field-level response to emergencies is related more to communication, coordination activities, and providing guidance, with no active role in the field.

The SPG:

- (2) *Noted* the update from the CPM Bureau.

4.2. Update from Secretariat

- [19] The IPPC Secretary provided an update on resource mobilization. He informed about the progress of extra-budgetary funding, the IYPH budget gap and the way forward.

² Ref. 2019 June CPM Bureau report: https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2019/07/Report_Bureau-2019-June-2019-07-31.pdf

- [20] In relation to extra-budgetary funding, he informed that in 2019 the Secretariat has received about 1 million USD from 8 countries in the IPPC multi-donor trust fund, with additional pledges in the range of 200 000 USD. He also informed that 40% of this amount was for ePhyto, 35% for IYPH, and 25% for other technical activities. He further noted about IPPC projects for 2019: one funded by the European Commission's DG Trade, one by the EC's DG SANTE (total 1.3 million USD). He also acknowledged IPPC in-kind contributions from Canada, China, France, the United States and COLEACP. In relation to sustainable funding, he informed about an allocation of 500 000 USD for 2019 and a potential increase of 1 000 000 USD to IPPC regular programme funding for the 2020-2021 biennium.
- [21] He also informed that the current gap for IYPH funding is around half a million, to cover communications-related expenses and the co-funding of the International Plant Health Conference. He also reassured that staff resources would be secured.
- [22] In relation to interpretation for SC meetings, he informed that additional funding has been secured in the 2020 budget.
- [23] The IPPC Secretary also encouraged participants to refer to the new IPPC mission, and particularly reference to safe trade, along with the three new core activities: standard setting; implementation and capacity development; and communication and international cooperation. He further recalled the eight development agendas of the IPPC Strategic framework 2020-2030 and their relations to the various IPPC core activities.
- [24] He informed that the CBD is now working towards the post-2020 biodiversity framework and related resource mobilization strategy, and asked the IPPC to follow the same path.
- [25] Various participants noted that the FAO should be sensitized to increase the IPPC budget at the same level of Codex Alimentarius. They highlighted the importance not to rely on underspent funds, but have a more sustainable funding increase of at least two million USD, as previously requested.
- [26] Two members recalled that the EU funding for IYPH is subject to co-funding, and if the amount is not co-funded the pledged amount would not be granted.

The SPG:

(3) *Noted* the Secretariat update.

(4) *Noted* the 500 000 USD one-time allocation provided by FAO to the IPPC for 2019.

(5) *Requested* IPPC contracting parties to inform respective permanent representatives to FAO about the importance of increasing the IPPC regular programme funding on a sustainable basis in the upcoming FAO governing body meetings.

5. Report of the last SPG meeting

- [27] The Chairperson listed the main points that were discussed at the SPG 2018. No further points or questions were raised by participants about the points and decisions made during the last meeting.

The SPG:

(6) *Noted* that all main actions arising from the last SPG meeting have been fulfilled.

6. Governance and Strategy

6.1. Finalization of IPPC Strategic Framework for 2020-2030

- [28] The Secretariat presented the revised version of the IPPC Strategic Framework for 2020-2030. He noted that changes compared to the previous version were made in accordance with observations made at

CPM-14 (2019).³ He noted that among them a certain degree of flexibility to propose modifications to the Strategic Framework throughout its implementation.

The SPG:

(7) *Noted* the finalization of the IPPC Strategic Framework (2020-2030)

(8) *Invited* the Secretariat to make the necessary editorial improvements as needed, in view of presenting the final version to the CPM-15 (2020).

6.2. Consider structuring future CPM agendas after CPM-15 around the Strategic Framework

[29] Mr Greg WOLFF presented the discussion upon the anticipated adoption of the new Strategic Framework for the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) 2020–2030 at CPM-15. A proposal has been made to consider structuring future CPM agendas according to the elements of the Strategic Framework, oriented around the three strategic objectives and the eight development agenda themes. He suggested that such an approach should facilitate organization, also involvement of potential donors and other agencies. He invited the SPG to consider options for future CPM agendas that would be linked to the Strategic Framework and, if appropriate, support continued efforts to further develop along the lines proposed or suggest an alternative approach to developing future CPM agendas.

[30] SPG Members appreciated the idea whilst observing that the CPM agenda contains items currently not included in the current proposal. The Secretariat clarified that structuring CPM future agendas around the Strategic Framework shall not limit or hinder the flexibility to include other items, underlining that this is an improvement combining continuation with innovation about the future work of the CPM.

The SPG:

(9) *Welcomed* the proposal to structure future agendas of the CPM on the Strategic Framework, provided that there will be room for additions and inclusion of items as deemed necessary.

6.3. Monitoring and Evaluation of the IPPC Community and the Secretariat

[31] Ms Cecile KUSTER (Wageningen University) presented the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the IPPC Community and the Secretariat via conference call. It was explained that there is an Secretariat Task Force on Monitoring and Evaluation (TFME) that is following this topic.

[32] One member commented on the difficulty in developing baselines against which to measure the effectiveness of IPPC Community's actions.

[33] Another member questioned about the feasibility to apply an M&E framework to the IPPC Community, given the scarce response to IPPC-related surveys from contracting parties.

[34] The Secretariat informed that the TFME is working on developing relevant indicators to try to measure the impact of the IPPC Strategic Framework and some of these will not be limited to data gathered in a general survey.

[35] Ms KUSTER highlighted the need to ensure IPPC contracting parties' take ownership of this M&E system so they will gain an understanding of the importance of this work and as a result will increase their efforts to provide accurate and relevant data.

[36] One member commented that this is about implementing the Convention and the IPPC Strategic Framework, not measuring the Secretariat's effectiveness.

³ Ref. CPM-14 (2019) report, Appendix 4: https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2019/07/CPM-14_Report_withISPMs-2019-07-31.pdf

[37] The Secretariat also suggested that the IPPC Theory of Change could be presented to policy makers to show the benefits of implementing the IPPC and activities of the IPPC Community link to the IPPC Strategic Framework, FAO strategic objectives and ultimately the UN SDGs.

[38] The SPG considered whether presenting the IPPC Theory of Change in conjunction with the presentation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030, and decided that this should not be the case to avoid confusion.

The SPG:

(10) *Noted* progress on the ongoing work on the Secretariat in regards to Monitoring and Evaluation.

(11) *Requested* the Secretariat to provide a further update at their next meeting in October 2020.

6.a. Closed Door Session

[39] The SPG resumed discussions in a closed-door session. The Bureau informed that the purpose of this session is to look at the whole agenda and consider all issues that the SPG thinks are of sensitive nature and need to be discussed and then brought up to the Secretariat.

[40] One member noted that having these closed-door sessions is a brilliant idea that facilitates frank and open discussions.

[41] This is also to ensure that every SPG participant has the chance to reflect and engage in strategic discussions on IPPC key issues, and to discuss about the Secretariat's role and support on certain items.

[42] One participant shared his view regarding the fact the IPPC governance has become more Secretariat oriented, whereas the Convention should be Country-driven. He stated this SPG closed-door session is an opportunity to clarify what IPPC governing bodies would like the Secretariat to implement, in particular about sustainable funding, in view of the coming FAO Governing Bodies meetings. He also discussed about formality of the meeting, and suggested to consider SPG meetings outside of FAO HQs as per the SPG meeting in 2015. He noted that an informal setting is key to trigger strategic thinking, beginning with the seating arrangement that should foster discussions and not giving impressions that Bureau Members, IC and SC Chairs are different groups from other SPG Members.

[43] One participant underlined that the Secretariat and Governing Bodies have the tendency to lose track of their respective roles and it is often the case that SPG agenda include items that do not belong to the SPG, and that dilutes the everybody's work. She concluded the SPG should revert to its original mandate.

[44] Another member agreed that the SPG should think strategically and not be process-oriented, should not entertain unconventional discussions and consider methods to improve current processes instead of immerge itself in them keeping in mind the purpose of safe trade. He stated that strategy is linked to innovation; hence, the SPG needs to think outside the box in view of safeguarding safe trade. He concluded stressing the importance of improving processes and suggested the CPM Bureau should develop the SPG agenda, whilst the SPG should play a prominent role in providing arguments in favour of IPPC increased funding as a general objective while providing innovative strategic guidance on specific IPPC activities such as the IYPH, ePhyto, etc.

[45] One member requested to discuss the IYPH scope, reporting that the IYPH ISC chairperson received a message from FAO proposing a completely new IYPH definition two months ago. He further elaborated it and has become evident that various departments in FAO had suddenly laid claim of plant health. He underlined that the Secretariat is part of FAO, which generates friction and pressure when called to resist against proposals coming from FAO management on IYPH-related matters.

[46] One member commented the situation regarding FAO's attempt to modify the scope as regrettable but recognised the necessity to find a compromise for IYPH's sake and to continue cooperating with FAO.

- [47] The SPG expressed its strong views that plant breeding, resistance, nutritional factors, pesticides should be excluded from the IYPH scope. The FAO request to expand the IYPH scope was deemed as not timely.
- [48] The SPG discussed the skill set the Secretariat should have and one member requested to have a Professional project manager on a permanent basis. On the IPPC work plan and budget, he stressed the need to develop appropriate Key Performance Indicators.
- [49] One member informed that the IPPC Financial Committee (FC) would receive a hypothetical fully funded work plan for 2021. Various SPG Members noted that level of details provided by FC is also a cause for concerns because the presented budget is too broad and does not provide sufficient details to develop a logic and potential Key Performance Indicators. The SPG agreed that the Bureau would go line by line to review the work plan and budget during its June meetings, to ensure that everything is clear, transparent and appropriate.
- [50] Several members discussed the opportunity of reverting the SPG agenda to when it had few clear items and papers, with engaging discussions on relevant strategic issues. Another member underlined how such a debate has been a recurring one and the SPG should take a decision on whether to strategize and test the waters on some matters before CPM or have in depth discussion on selected topics.
- [51] One member noted that the SPG has been the forge of successful initiatives, like ePhyto and IYPH. Now that the strategic framework for the coming ten years has been adopted, the SPG will meet to discuss its implementation from a strategic perspective through more in-depth discussions: e.g. IPPC involvement in pest response systems (e.g. pros and cons); having a communications plan from 2021 and its benefits. If the Bureau drafts the SPG agenda, there should be room for the inclusion of other strategic items: the SPG's mandate is to think strategically and not interpreting a defensive role.
- [52] One member suggested SPG first item on the agenda should be a short discussion based on a think piece that each member should submit to kick-start the discussion on strategic issues.
- [53] He observed there are currently many mixed issues in the agenda, some of them operations-oriented: this is an issue that should have been solved through the IPPC evaluation and implemented by the Secretariat. The Bureau has to be the one close to the Secretariat, asking the appropriate questions especially in relation to budget. This is a member-driven organization, not a Secretariat-driven one: the Bureau represents CPM between sessions, especially in liaising with the Secretariat.
- [54] One member noted the FAO Finance Committee and the proposal to increase the IPPC funding. The Bureau was surprised to hear that the Secretariat could not collate and gain cooperation to prepare papers on the IPPC budget in view of the FAO governing body meetings. There is a problem with the expectations between contracting parties and the Secretariat. He suggested that the Secretariat draft an important document in agreement with the SPG in view of the upcoming FAO governing body meetings.
- [55] Another member reflected on key aspects for the next SPG meeting, proposing it as a first potential agenda item: environmental scan on what happened around the world about phytosanitary matters; what it means for IPPC and SPG in particular. He noted the most productive meetings occurred when SPG received questions on a particular topic two months prior to the meeting and had to prepare position papers on them.
- [56] In relation to the **IYPH scope**, the SPG stressed the need to keep the original one as adopted by CPM, not trying to compromise it with convenient interpretation. Many SPG Members agreed about the serious risk to dilute the original message of the IYPH. The SPG suggested that the Bureau would decide on what to do on this matter during its Friday meeting.
- [57] The IYPH ISC chair clarified that FAO based its proposal to modify the scope on the lack within the Resolution of the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) of an explicit reference to the definition of Plant Health agreed by CPM. He elaborated that some divisions in FAO claimed IYPH ownership on this basis and acted as FAO were the sole decision-making body for the IYPH, modifying the action

plan and key messages as deemed necessary. He explained the UNGA Resolution specifies that FAO is called to facilitate the implementation of the IYPH in collaboration with the IPPC⁴, including *de facto* IPPC Governing Bodies and Secretariat in the decision-making process. He concluded that the SPG should recommend the Bureau to take a strong position on this matter to prevent any other attempt to strip the IPPC from its role.

- [58] Many members recognised the need for a potential compromise with FAO but noted that the UNGA Resolution is the result of the negotiation the Secretariat and the current IYPH ISC Chairperson supported in the past five years, stressing the fact that the narrative used to reach consensus in the UNGA revolved around the IPPC and not FAO. The SPG recognised that the IYPH is the occasion to raise the IPPC profile and provide evidence-based arguments for its budget increase and to fulfil the IPPC Strategic Framework objectives.
- [59] One member noted that there was a process to get to the IYPH proclamation. During the proclamation there was a scope discussed at the UNGA, which is different from the one currently proposed by FAO.
- [60] The SPG concluded that the Bureau would take a decision on the IYPH scope on Friday.
- [61] Another member noted that the IPPC seminar was not valuable use of the SPG time.
- [62] One member suggested giving SPG participants (IPPC contracting parties) the opportunity to provide to the Bureau some agenda topics with relevant justification short after CPM meetings, deciding their inclusion at the June Bureau meeting. Upon approval of the agenda by the Bureau, those proposing approved topics would prepare relevant papers.
- [63] One member said that the 2019 SPG invitation letter did not include mention of the possibility to provide suggestions for topics or papers.
- [64] The SPG discussed to include the following topics to the 2020 SPG agenda: environmental scan to share insights, contaminating pests, safe food aid, implementation of the IPPC enhancement evaluation.
- [65] One member noted the need to update the SPG rules to incorporate the new suggested process on the development of the agenda, but decided not to update them to allow for the necessary flexibility.
- [66] The SPG asked the CPM Bureau to ensure that a qualified process is in place to address a proper financial management.
- [67] One member noted that for the surveillance project, the Secretariat shifted priorities towards different topics, and thus failed. Several members discussed the need on project management.
- [68] Another member noted that the IPPC Secretary had shared a Secretariat organogram, where a project manager is included. The SPG noted the need to align the work of the Secretariat with the actual needs identified by the SPG.
- [69] One member suggested the financial information be provided beforehand to SPG members, so they could come prepared to discussions, especially on how to bridge gaps. He also noted the budget is noted by the CPM as *fait accompli*, thus diminishing its ability to influence it: despite his understanding that there must be some pre-agreed expenses, he stressed that some discussion among the Bureau, SPG and FC prior to its adoption would provide better strategic implementation, increased transparency, evaluation and monitoring.
- [70] Other members agreed on this point but also clarified the IPPC budget comes from FAO Regular Programme and that is why the CPM does not have a mandate to approve it but only to adopt it.

⁴ Source document: [UNGA Resolution A/RES/73/252](#)

- [71] Some comments were made on the possibility to have a more in depth revision of the expenses covered by the Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) and possibly keep them separate when presenting the budget to the CPM.
- [72] One member stated that the Secretariat is also delivering positive results and suggested the outcome of this debate result not in the micromanagement by the SPG or any other governing body, which would create tension and potential antagonism between Secretariat and Governing Bodies. He concluded that the Secretariat should be accountable for those items on the budget that fall under its direct responsibility.
- [73] One member noted that the FC only meets for few days during the year, and the only occasion to go through it is the FC meeting in June. The accountants should not take decisions, but propose a budget.
- [74] Activity-based budget should be the object of the FC and CPM Bureau review. One member noted that the CPM does not adopt the IPPC work plan and budget, which is decided by FAO. He suggested to hold a strategic discussion on taking the IPPC outside of FAO, based on the fact that it is felt that the IPPC is not supported sufficiently by FAO. Another member opposed to this proposal.
- [75] One member stressed the need to understand gaps in order to take appropriate actions in financial management.
- [76] One member recalled that in the FAO Finance Committee there was a request to carry out an independent interim review of how Secretariat enhancement evaluation is being implemented.
- [77] One member noted that there is still good value being delivered by the Secretariat, and highlighted the need to work together towards achieving the IPPC objectives.
- [78] Another member noted that the SPG should project a positive view of where the IPPC wishes to go with the various projects.
- [79] The SPG requested the CPM Bureau to consider the following conclusions of discussions under this agenda item:
- 1) to take a decision on whether broadening the IYPH scope.
 - 2) Secretariat to collect proposals by contracting parties on topics to be included in the 2020 SPG agenda starting soon after CPM-15 (2020) and until early June 2020, to be reviewed by the CPM Bureau at their 2020 June Bureau meeting.
 - 3) Those proposing topics to be added to the 2020 SPG agenda should do so by providing a justification, and upon confirmation of the CPM Bureau after their June Bureau meeting.
 - 4) Consider hiring a project manager on a permanent basis to take management pressure off people from delivering and chase staff to deliver on time, in view of increasing confidence that the IPPC budget is being used wisely and transparently.
 - 5) The FC and CPM Bureau at their June meetings to take decisions on the IPPC work plan and budget as presented by the Secretariat.
 - 6) Include following topics to the 2020 SPG agenda: environmental scan to share insights, contaminating pests, safe food aid, and implementation of the IPPC enhancement evaluation.

6.4. Framework for Standards and Implementation

- [80] The Secretariat presented the latest version of the Framework for Standards and Implementation, which was modified based on input from the IC and SC. The Framework had been reformatted to align to the IPPC SF 2020-2030.
- [81] The proposed additions, deletions and changes were explained.
- [82] Several members noted that the new format is a big improvement, making the Framework more readable and understandable. One member suggested to have a format that is also searchable to further facilitate consultation.

- [83] Another member informed that he had been working on a new, even more readable format.
- [84] The SC chairperson noted that now the topics and gaps are listed separately. Now the topics that are not under the work programme are included in the gaps section.
- [85] The Secretariat noted that the *list of topics* and *framework for standards* are maintained in six languages simultaneously, which causes duplication and costs additional resources. Having a database format would facilitate the reading and contribute saving resources.
- [86] One member noted the need to start looking at the identified gaps rather than the format for strategic discussions. The Secretariat noted the gaps could be addressed through the responses to the Call for Topics submitted by CPs.
- [87] Another member suggested to use the framework for different purposes including resource mobilization, making it a more live document.

The SPG:

(12) *Recommended* the Framework for Standards and Implementation for endorsement by CPM-15 (2020).

(13) *Recommended* the IC and SC consider how to combine the Framework for Standards and Implementation with the list of topics in order to avoid duplication.

6.5. Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) Terms of Reference (ToR) and updating the Implementation and Capacity Development Strategy

- [88] The Secretariat presented the proposed revisions to the IC ToRs, to add clarity and to align them with the SC ToRs while keeping relevant differences in approaches. The proposed changes reviewed by the IC in May 2019, had been presented to the CPM Bureau in June 2019, where further modifications were added.
- [89] The new ToRs clarify that there are 14 members with seven selected by seven FAO regions, five experts nominated by the IPPC official contact points and selected by the Bureau, and one each as an SC and RPPO representatives, selected by the SC and TC-RPPOs respectively. Alternate members' selection was included. The Bureau agreed to have the IC proposing IC Sub-groups to the CPM rather than having the IC establishing them by their own, basing its decision on legal advice.
- [90] The SPG had a discussion regarding the status of experts as well as SC and RPPO representatives in the IC. Many members raised issues of compatibility to take part to the decision making process while others discussed the opportunity of experts being employed by the NPPO at the moment of their nomination.
- [91] The SPG decided that all 14 members should take part to the decision making process.
- [92] The IC chairperson then presented the rationale for updating the IPPC National Capacity Development Strategy. The rationale for updating is to align it with the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030.. The IC chairperson highlighted three reasons for the update: the IC will establish priorities for the implementation of the Convention and ISPMS; considering limited resources of the Secretariat dedicated to Implementation and Capacity Development (ICD) activities; since 2017 the Secretariat has been restructuring, which has impacted on ICD work and delivery, so the new IC role must be acknowledged; there is a need to ensure sustainability and there is a need to foresee implementation activities linked to SF, and link ICD activities with the list of topics, alignment with the call for topics, and ongoing projects like South-South Cooperation. Since the creation of the IC, there has been very little resource mobilization to support ICD activities, which requires a need to set a vision and establish priorities for ICD in view of attracting partners and donors.

- [93] She noted that this would ensure accountability and resource prioritization. A well-defined ICD direction reflects the fact that all IPPC bodies and community are working together to achieve defined goals. This will enable the Secretariat and IC to reject initiatives not aligning with the strategy, and maximize use of limited available resources. The strategy would provide a platform to focus and not expand the scope of submitted topics.
- [94] She also highlighted the importance to communicate a message, which is critical to support the implementation of the SF. There is a need to increase the awareness of the IPPC SF for 2020-2030, so a communications plan in this regard is critical.
- [95] One member commented that the use of the term “strategy” is overused, suggesting considering the usage of a different term, such as plan of action.
- [96] The Secretariat also commented on the need to include a global phytosanitary coordination role for the Secretariat.

The SPG:

- (14) *Recommended* the TORs of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee to the CPM-15 (2020) for adoptions (Appendix 05 to this report).
- (15) *Asked* the Bureau to consider how to extend the membership of outgoing members to ensure continuity.
- (16) *Endorsed* the IC efforts to develop the Implementation and Capacity Development Strategy.
- (17) *Encouraged* the general involvement of members of the CPM Bureau, SC and IC when called upon to contribute to the drafting of the ICDS.
- (18) *Encouraged* the CPM Bureau to avail resources to engage a technical specialist to assist in developing the Implementation and Capacity Development Strategy.

6.6. Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for an IPPC Stakeholder Advisory Group

- [97] The Secretariat presented the paper on the establishment of an IPPC Stakeholder Advisory Group. He noted the need for flexibility based on the provision that the Secretariat is already cooperating with various partner organizations in different ways. He further noted that any formalization of partnerships should be analysed by the FAO Legal Office.
- [98] One member questioned why this discussion was necessary if the Secretariat is already engaging with various partner organizations in different ways.
- [99] Another member noted that ToRs should not provide constraints to participation and ability to function but rather facilitate the work of any body they wish to implement.
- [100] The Secretariat further asked whether there is a need to develop a broad group, considering differences in scope of existing partnerships.
- [101] One member noted the need to avoid constraining things unnecessarily (e.g. on the maximum length of meetings), but also give the possibility to consult electronically.
- [102] Another member highlighted that we are trying to get together different sectors with different approaches. There is a more practical and pragmatic approach. The US submitted a paper layout out a different approach.
- [103] Some issues we deal with at CPM are very complicated, and we will have to involve stakeholders in a particular area (e.g. for sea containers, ePhyto, seed industry). Not every issue we deal with will need consultation with the private sector or all existing partners. Some criteria in considering whether

establishing a partnership, factors to be considered by CPM are: what are the specific objectives; what are the benefits of putting a group together; which private sector entities would be involved, and how are they organized; what is the added value of the specific organization; legal implications.

[104] One member highlighted the need to involve stakeholders in the IPPC work.

[105] Importance to clarify the purpose and scope of this advisory group.

[106] Another member noted that this advisory group should not be under the IPPC responsibility. If industry would like to have such a body, this should be developed independently, without IPPC secretariat involvement.

[107] Another member commented that an advisory group of organizations attending CPM as observers might be of value.

[108] The Secretariat suggested that there is not a need to have a formal stakeholder advisory group, but a suggested template for future groups of this type. Every stakeholder advisory body should be developed ad-hoc, possibly based on a proposed template.

The SPG:

(19) *Concluded* that stakeholder's engagement in IPPC activities is valued, but there is not a need to develop a prescriptive and formal IPPC stakeholder advisory group.

(20) *Recommended* that stakeholders themselves should handle any stakeholders' initiative.

(21) *Suggested* that for IYPH there may be a bigger, high-level grouping of stakeholders.

(22) *Recommended* developing generic terms of reference for future partnerships, and asked Ms Hellen LANGAT MWAREY and Mr Stephen BUTCHER to present a draft at the next SPG meeting.

7. Sustainable funding and resource mobilization

7.1. Leveraging contracting parties for resource mobilization

[109] The Secretariat presented the paper on leveraging contracting parties for resource mobilization.

[110] He noted that the IYPH is an opportune time to increase emphasis on plant health and the work of NPPOs. Initiatives are being taken to send a positive message to donors and policy makers about the importance of plant health.

[111] NPPOs have scarce opportunities to have real communication efforts to increase their profile. The Secretariat should reinforce the NPPO capacity in addressing policy makers through high-level discussions, aided by a plan implemented professionally. There is a need to have clear and concise informational materials, and strengthen social media for this purpose as well as strengthening basic NPPO communication and negotiation skills. NPPOs should then push for national and global figures to emphasize the need to advocate for IPPC work.

[112] One member noted that an IPPC communications strategy would be discussed and that we should take account of the importance of resource mobilization and, to that end, developed draft talking points, to be expanded and adjusted as necessary. He requested also to update the paper as follows:

- Deletion of third paragraph, which is unnecessary.
- The title should be changed, taking off "leveraging", which has a negative connotation.

[113] One member noted the importance of promoting NPPOs with ministerial leadership and in the context of IYPH. Japan hosted the G20 in 2019, with a Ministerial Agricultural meeting issuing a declaration

on agriculture, with an annex on plant health with a mention of ePhyto and IYPH. This can be utilized to advocate at the national level.

- [114] One member noted that the matching contribution request by the European Commission for the IYPH was useful for New Zealand to leverage additional funds.

The SPG:

(23) *Noted* the important role of NPPOs in increasing their profile.

(24) *Encouraged* contracting parties to take on board the proposed recommendations as part of their procedures.

7.2. IYPH-related resource mobilization outcomes and success indicators

- [115] Ms Marica GATT presented this open-ended item, as a follow-up of discussions held at the June Bureau meeting. It was noted that IYPH will be a once in a life opportunity where the whole IPPC community would be able to raise their profile and possibly increasing financial resources. It was noted that many efforts are being done by the IYPH ISC and Secretariat, and a tangible outcome should be envisaged as part of the IYPH legacy.

- [116] In particular, there is a need to develop clear targets related to the IYPH outcome, possibly with SMART indicators. She noted that the draft IYPH action plan referred to outputs and outcomes, without tangible indicators. She requested to discuss types and responsibilities of expected IYPH outcomes and indicators.

- [117] One member indicated that a wide range of indicators could be included. The core objective of IYPH is to raise the importance of plant health and the role that the IPPC plays in plant health. So this should result in additional resources for IPPC, including FAO regular programme and extra-budgetary contributions.

- [118] Future work plans of the IPPC to include potential revenue increasing resulting from IYPH. In this way, it would be possible to identify the activities that are not going to be carried out if additional funding is not secured.

- [119] The IYPH ISC chair recalled the outputs and indicators established in Appendix 4 of the IPPC IYPH Steering Committee Meeting held in Rome on 23-25 April 2018.⁵

- [120] New Zealand noted that they had developed national indicators to indicate the IYPH success. Two main initiatives will be measurable: encouraging farmers or horticulturalists to have on-farm biosecurity plans; biosecurity business pledge for private sector entities to be an active part of NZ's biosecurity system, committing them to take concrete actions.

The SPG:

(25) *Recommended* to consider the following indicators for the IYPH success as part of the IYPH legacy: increased resources for the IPPC, regional and national plant protection organizations, more donors, more plant health-related curricula, establishing 6 December as the World Plant Health Day.

7.3. Private sector partnerships (pros, cons, feasibility, how, etc.)

- [121] This item was discussed under agenda item 6.6.

⁵ Ref. Report of IPPC IYPH Steering Committee meeting on 23-25 April 2018: https://www.ippc.int/static/media/uploads/iyp/2018/05/17/Report_IPPC-IYPHStC_Fourth_Meeting-2018-05-16.pdf

7.4. ePhyto and ISPM-15 based resourcing

- [122] Mr Stephen BUTCHER presented the paper on ePhyto funding, informing the SPG that the system is currently being used by an increasing number of Contracting parties. He stated ePhyto is an opportunity for IPPC to raise potential funds not simply to maintain the hub but to convert it into a source of revenues for other IPPC activities. He also pointed out that this must be done carefully not to modify its nature and make sure Contracting parties are transparent regarding its funding. The IPPC should also consider which actions to take towards countries that do not honour their contributions to ePhyto in a timely manner.
- [123] The Secretariat informed the SPG about a number of other international institutions and organizations expressing their interest towards ePhyto. He addressed some concerns about ownership raised by some members by stating that the system belongs to the IPPC and other parties may use it without the possibility of modifying its core compositions. The only technical requirement is the coding of an *ad hoc* type of certificate by the parties interested in exchanging that type of information through the hub. The Secretariat reassured the SPG that there is no risk of private sector penetration of the system.
- [124] Many members expressed their appreciation for ePhyto while some others noted the asymmetries in potential implementation by their governments due to the necessity to modify the current legislation, which may be a lengthy process. There was consensus on ensuring sustainable funding for the ePhyto and not relying on uncertain revenues as this may cause some Contracting parties to delay its implementation at the national level. Some members noted that an opportunity is being missed with ISPM-15, with the IPPC having to pay for trademark registration, rather than the opposite, and encouraged exploring the feasibility of retrieving some funds also from ISPM-15 usage. The Secretariat suggested considering a consultancy firm to investigate possible funding solutions.

The SPG:

- (26) *Noted* the update on ePhyto.
- (27) *Considered* ways of how the solution could be funded sustainably.
- (28) *Recommended* that the IPPC does not give up ownership of the ePhyto solution.
- (29) *Urged* the Secretariat to ensure that if charging for the ePhyto solution is envisaged, it is communicated well in advance.
- (30) *Recommended* the Secretariat to consider contracting a consultancy firm or business professional to investigate ePhyto sustainable funding options.
- (31) *Requested* the Secretariat to develop a paper on ePhyto sustainable funding, governance and consideration on how to develop the capacity of countries to generate or recover funds, identifying possible options for the CPM-15 consideration.

7.5. Fully funded 2021 work plan

- [125] Mr Greg WOLFF informed that much had been done for ensuring full funding of the Secretariat, without demonstrating the FAO what this additional funding would be used for.
- [126] The Secretariat presented the 2021 work plan and budget of the Secretariat to be presented to CPM-15 (2020) for adoption. The initial intention was to double the current IPPC regular programme allocation by additional 3 000 000 USD; additional 2 000 000 USD were requested in FAO governing bodies. He noted that the 2021 work plan and budget for the first time takes account of the IPPC strategic framework for 2020-2030. He informed that out of the 7 700 000 million USD budget, only 2.945 million USD are currently funded by the current FAO Regular Programme allocation.
- [127] The SPG reflected on what the additional funding could be used for. Ideas included: ePhyto, IPPC communications, surveillance, capacity development, standard setting workshops.

- [128] The FAO Finance Committee will convene in November 2019, and the true needs were estimated in 5 000 000 USD rather than 3 000 000 USD. This information can be channeled with FAO Permanent Representatives, with common talking points and messages to be delivered to the FAO Finance Committee.
- [129] A full work plan of the Secretariat can also be developed to show activities for which additional resources are needed. A strong case must be put forward to ensure that the FAO Finance Committee understands the needs.
- [130] One member noted that strong messages were already made at the last FAO Council and Conference and should be re-used, and that those members present in the SPG with FC members should consult with their FAO Permanent Representatives, including Australia, Brazil, Japan, Mexico and the USA. He also proposed to have one member of the CPM Bureau attending the FAO Finance Committee, as experts invited for the relevant agenda item.
- [131] The SPG further discussed the IPPC sustainable funding and the need to increase the IPPC regular programme budget allocation on the grounds of increasing challenges and opportunities.
- [132] The SPG came up with the rationale to increase IPPC funding, and came up with the following points.
- [133] The IPPC is the premier international framework for protecting agriculture and the environment from pests and diseases. This ensures global food security and fosters trade and economic growth opportunities for all member countries.
- [134] Countries are expressing the need for standards to facilitate the movement of products, while at the same time ensuring safe trade and protection from pests and diseases.
- [135] The work of the IPPC has evolved immensely in the last fifteen to twenty years: it is not only about setting standards - now a lot of the work of the IPPC is about ensuring that these standards are implemented effectively.
- [136] There are also opportunities created by new technologies that could be harnessed and deployed to modernise current systems.
- [137] The IPPC funding from FAO has been at 3 000 000 USD per year. This budget has not changed much over the past 15 years; yet during this time, IPPC membership has increased by 64 countries (53 percent) and global trade has expanded and become more complex, resulting in the IPPC's increased operating costs.
- [138] There is an urgent need to strengthen the funding at the IPPC. In our view, FAO permanent funding is the only sustainable source to maintain and improve the IPPC's effectiveness and credibility going into the next decade.
- [139] We urge the FAO to increase its biennial allocation to the IPPC and increase its investment in this area by 2 000 000 USD per year.
- [140] Again, this is an area which directly and significantly impacts and supports the FAO's overarching core goals associated with enhancing global food security and economic growth. This is a good investment.
- [141] The additional 2 000 000 USD will:
1. Effectively support the increased participation of countries in standard setting (reflecting the growth of countries joining the IPPC) and thus bring more countries under a harmonized global framework of standards and rules in international commerce and trade.
 2. Provide expanded and robust implementation support programs which will ensure that standards are effectively and widely understood, utilized, operationalized, and implemented by contracting parties.

3. Establish and maintain the new global ePhyto hub system which will modernize the international exchange of plant health certificates via electronic means.

4. This will allow the IPPC to advance other key plant health initiatives which will enable the IPPC to sustain a work program to prevent the spread of pests and ensure safe, science based trade. These twin objectives contribute directly to the world's overarching goals associated with food security, safe trade, and economic growth, and protection of natural habitats.

[142] This will enable to achieve FAO strategic objectives 2 and 4.

[143] Another key issue would be increasing support to address concerns of developing countries, including increased capacity development and work on antimicrobial resistance.

[144] The need for increased work on partnerships should also be highlighted.

The SPG:

(32) *Recommended* that FAO ensure IPPC sustainable funding in view of IPPC's increasing role by increasing the FAO Regular Programme budget allocation for the IPPC by 2 million per year.

(33) *Committed* to engage FAO Permanent Representatives that are members of the FAO Finance Committee.

(34) *Asked* the Chairpersons of the CPM Bureau and SPG to share the conclusions of this agenda item with the FAO permanent representatives.

7.6. Constraints to participation in and response to IPPC activities

[145] The Secretariat, as requested by the Bureau in June 2019, prepared and presented a paper on this topic stressing the lack of participation in various activities such as calls, submission of topics and nominations in general. He informed the SPG that a brief consultation among Secretariat staff was conducted on this matter to obtain some feedback on the presented issues and potential solutions.

[146] Some SPG members replied that the current lack of participation should not be put entirely on Contracting Parties and mentioned a noticeable drop in participation within the EU as well. One member recognised the Secretariat is active in its efforts to engage Contracting parties (CP) but the CPs may not be fully prepared to respond due to different priorities at the national level or lack of capacity to participate in IPPC activities which have expanded considerable over the past two decades.

[147] Another member underlined how some Contracting parties come to meetings in Rome but remain often inactive and the Secretariat could try to engage them more. He also noted the IYPH is the opportunity to have Contracting parties' priorities realigned with the ones in the SF.

[148] One member pointed out that the Secretariat had previously organised training sessions prior to CPM, and these sessions proved to be extremely beneficial to CPs in her region and wished for more such initiatives to take place. She also suggested that such activities could be carried out through virtual means on a regular basis, and engage different stakeholders such as academia to organise awareness-raising activities in different venues to broaden participation and engagement by various stakeholders.

The SPG:

(35) *Noted* the discussion.

(36) *Invited* Contracting parties and the Secretariat to increase cooperation to foster active engagement.

(37) *Encouraged* the Secretariat to make use of virtual tools to increase engagement

(38) *Suggested* the Secretariat considering holding awareness-raising activities in different venues, such as university campuses.

8. Communications

8.1. Review of IPPC Communications Strategy

- [149] During the June 2019 Bureau meeting it became apparent that the IPPC does not have a current IPPC Communications Strategy, with the last one expired in 2018. FAO has a strong communications group; hence, the Secretariat should also have a strong communication team that focuses on IPPC work and plant health, based on the new Strategic Framework, and with the potential participation of someone from the FAO Office for Corporate Communication (OCC), aiming to the establishment of a Communication Advisory Group.
- [150] One member noted the need to have a robust approach to communication, focused messages, proactive approaches and flexibility to adapt to emerging situations. He also underlined how the IPPC has been largely working around themes, so a communication plan could be anchored around that.
- [151] One member stressed the fact that the IPPC is in a weak position without a communication plan.
- [152] Objectives, target audiences, channels and implementation are to be identified. This is not a draft communications strategy, but it is to trigger discussion.
- [153] One member noted the importance to develop an IPPC communications plan, with the IYPH being a key opportunity to learn and inform on what should be improved in a communications strategy. In relation to the advisory group, it was deemed a very good idea to have communication professionals to learn about the IPPC mission and support the development of the communications strategy.
- [154] Another member also strongly supported the development of a new IPPC communications plan, which is a pre-condition of a successful IYPH and to convince stakeholders outside IPPC Community circles about the added value of the IPPC. In relation to target audiences, he voiced concerns that we may overcharge the communications plan if we have too many target audiences, so there might be few rather than many audiences identified to communicate to stakeholders that may be decisive to implement the IPPC Strategic Framework for 2020-2030.
- [155] One member noted the need of an IPPC communications strategy. He noted that a communications strategy and plan were already developed in the context of the IYPH, so it could serve as a basis of the new communications strategy.
- [156] Another member highlighted the importance of communication for resource mobilization. He noted the importance of social media and communication with social leadership. The communications plan should relate to resource mobilization too.
- [157] One member raised concerns over developing an additional group, which may strain resources of contracting parties, which already have challenges in participating to IPPC activities.
- [158] In relation to a communications strategy including resources, one member noted the importance to include an evaluation component.
- [159] Another member noted the importance of learning from IYPH and go from there. The current IYPH communications strategy could then be the basis for the IPPC communications strategy.

The SPG:

(39) *Agreed* with the proposal to develop an IPPC communications strategy, however decided to delay its development after the IYPH 2020.

(40) *Considered* the establishment of a communications advisory group to develop the IPPC communications strategy, composed of one member of the Secretariat, one member of the FAO Office for Corporate Communication, and communication professionals working for IPPC contracting parties.

(41) *Recommended* to take a decision on its establishment at the next SPG meeting after learning from the IYPH experience, and asked the Secretariat to develop a paper on the development of communications strategy for the SPG meeting in 2020.

9. International Year of Plant Health

9.1. IYPH Progress Report

- [160] The IYPH ISC Chairperson updated the SPG. He elaborated on the progress of the IYPH programme regarding some of the recent discussions during the previous IYPH ISC meetings, the draft plan for the launch events on 2nd December in Rome, such as the expected speakers and the agenda, the special ambassadors and potential additional events during 2020, as well as a launch event at UN Headquarters in NYC.
- [161] He also updated the SPG about the International Plant Health Conference (IPHC) in Helsinki about speakers and call for papers, informing that the venue has been booked and 500 to 700 participants are expected to attend.
- [162] He informed that the programme has been adopted by the IYPH ISC and that proposals are being gathered for consideration by the IYPH Technical Advisory Body.
- [163] Finland has committed 300 000 EUR and the United Kingdom 75 000 USD, as well as by the EU Commission has committed 300 000 EUR as a co-funding initiative to be matched by other donors.
- [164] He reiterated that the IYPH scope is currently under discussion and that there are segments of FAO pushing to broaden it, which has caused some friction. It is unclear what consequences may bring in terms of participation and donations by Contracting Parties.
- [165] He informed that the IYPH ISC has at its second meeting rejected the broadening of the scope, however it is to a certain degree unsure if the scope broadening can be rejected if FAO has a different approach. He also informed that this is having an impact on IYPH key messages, which are being re-formulated to extend their scope.
- [166] One member noted that the issue of the late broadening of the IYPH scope is perceived as really unfortunate. EU member states are very concerned about the possibility to broaden the scope to limit to areas which would dilute the IYPH messaging. Plant Health as defined by CPM should remain the focus. It is about preventive actions and the added value that the IPPC brings to protecting plants. This would bring chaos and frustration of people working at various levels on the IYPH proclamation and implementation. He also highlighted that both IPPC and FAO should be implementing the IYPH, not only FAO.
- [167] One member questioned how CPM decisions can be overthrown. He further noted that this is a bad timing for changing the scope.
- [168] Another member highlighted enormous contributions from IPPC contracting parties (financial, time and in-kind). Changing the scope could cause a shift in IPPC Contracting Parties' agendas and modifications to future pledged and future contributions.
- [169] One member noted that we cannot accept the FAO proposed definition. As a compromise, in the wider programme of IYPH activities, we may consider including agricultural tools that we all use as integrated pest management, pest control technologies used by NPPOs and others to protect and promote plant health.

- [170] The Secretariat also requested the SPG to consider proposals for IYPH ambassadors, and to contribute to the ongoing call for human-interest stories related to plant health.

The SPG:

(42) *Noted* the update provided by the IYPH ISC chairperson.

(43) *Reminded* that the whole point of proposing and proclaiming the IYPH was to sustain IPPC and its sustainable funding.

(44) *Recommended* that FAO keeps the IYPH original scope and definition of plant health as adopted by CPM, possibly broadening to related concepts like integrated pest management.

9.2. IYPH Funding

- [171] The Secretariat presented the IYPH financial situation. Finland informed that they are planning to provide a Junior Professional Officer to support the IYPH implementation, subject to discussions on the IYPH scope.
- [172] In relation to co-funding of the International Plant Health Conference (IPHC), the EU called on contracting parties to support the organization of the IPHC, including via supporting the participation from developing countries.
- [173] Kenya suggested having a marathon runner as IYPH ambassador.
- [174] The US pledged 50 000 USD for the IPPC MDTF to contribute to the IYPH funding.

The SPG:

(45) *Noted* the update on IYPH funding.

(46) *Acknowledged* the call by the EU to contribute to fill the IYPH budget gap, including the co-funding of the International Plant Health Conference in Helsinki.

(47) *Thanked* Finland for their pledge to provide in-kind the expertise of a Junior Professional Officer, and the USA for pledging 50 000 USD as a financial contribution for the IYPH.

10. Key issues for CPM-15

10.1. Ministerial-level segment

- [175] The CPM chairperson presented ideas related to the CPM-15 Ministerial-level segment, inclusive of a three-hour session with the adoption of the IPPC Strategic Framework for 2020-2030, and talks by seven Ministers by various regions, followed by a reception hosted by the FAO Director-General and Minister of Agriculture and Forestry of Finland.
- [176] The CPM chairperson noted the time and procedural constraints related to developing and approving a ministerial declaration.
- [177] The chairperson of the IYPH ISC noted that the Finnish President would be present on 30 March 2020, while the Finnish Minister would be present on 2 April 2020. He further suggested having a full day dedicated to the CPM-15 Ministerial Segment on 2 April 2020, with all Ministers being able to speak. He also asked the Secretariat and CPM chairperson to submit an invitation to the President of Finland to attend CPM-15.
- [178] One member agreed with the proposal.
- [179] Another member recommended Italy's Prime Minister to attend the opening session together with the President of Finland.

The SPG:

(48) *Recommended* that the Ministerial segment of CPM be held on 2 April 2020 for the full day, with participation of ministers.

(49) *Noted* the need to have a balanced programme for speakers from various regions.

10.2. Draft Ministerial declaration

[180] Mr Stephen BUTCHER informed on the background of the process used to draft the declaration. An early draft was prepared by New Zealand for comments via the OCS. These were consolidated by the Secretariat based on comments and a further review by New Zealand.

[181] The SPG considered whether there are significant areas for improvement in the current draft; whether they would endorse; and the preferred process to finalize consultation on the current draft.

[182] One member noted that there is scarce time to have Ministers endorsing a Ministerial declaration, but we may look at other options, including Ministerial statements and adoption of the IPPC Strategic Framework for 2020-2030.

[183] Another member agreed to promote the IPPC Strategic Framework for 2020-2030 as one of the most innovative papers revolutionising plant health worldwide.

[184] One member suggested providing a summary of changes compared to the previous version of the Ministerial declaration sent for consultation.

[185] Another member suggested alternative ways such as a joint statement, a FAO press release, etc.

The SPG:

(50) *Acknowledged* that adopting a ministerial declaration at CPM would be difficult to achieve at this point in time.

(51) *Invited* the IYPH ISC members representing FAO regions to share and promote the current text of the Ministerial declaration with respective Ministers in order to secure its approval.

(52) *Recommended* the CPM Bureau to review possible alternative options such as a joint statement, FAO press release, etc.

11. Standards and Implementation

11.1. Commodity and Pathway Standards

[186] The CPM Bureau member presented recommendations arising from the second Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards⁶, highlighting that the group had drafted the “concept over-arching standard: draft ISPM on “Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)” and the draft specification for a new technical panel: “Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS) (2019-009)”, under the remit of the SC.

[187] One participant queried about resource implications on the creation of new groups, i.e. a new technical panel. The EU Commission mentioned that they are currently in the process to mobilize resources for the commodity standards. He stressed that it would be very helpful if the group could be extremely focused at the beginning, provided there right people are sitting at the table, noting that the EU may provide funds for three, maybe four years.

⁶ 13_SPG_2019_Oct; 2nd Focus Group on commodity meeting report at <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87506/>

[188] It was explained that, creation of a new technical panel would fall under the remit and work of the SC, something that the experience had demonstrated to be a success example for developing standards. Moreover, the SC not necessarily has the expertise to deal with all the commodity standards and all types of measures, which is now the key point in this process.

[189] Some participants provided specific comments to the draft text of the ISPM and on the standard setting process. The Secretariat also briefed on the status of the draft ISPM, explaining that the SC in its November 2019 meeting will discuss in detail the draft ISPM and the draft specification to the new technical panel, and then the CPM Bureau will review these documents for presenting them to the CPM-15 (2020) for approval for consultation period, along with other recommendations from the Focus Group. It was also mentioned that the SC-7 (SC working group) in 2020 will have time allocated to strategize on the standard setting process.

The SPG:

(53) *Considered* whether the Standards Committee, the SC-7 or an ad-hoc group should initiate the development of commodity standards.

(54) *Noted* that the Technical Panels are key groups for the development of ISPMs.

11.2. CPM recommendation – Facilitating safe trade by reducing the incidence of contaminating pests associated with traded goods

[190] Australia presented the draft CPM recommendation on “Reduce the incidence of contaminating pests associated with regulated articles and unregulated goods to protect plant health and facilitate trade (2019-002)” and some comments gathered so far from a virtual working group, to be presented to CPM-15 for approval for consultation.

[191] Australia is inviting CPs to attend a symposium in Australia on 3-5 March 2020 to further discuss this topic.

[192] One member noted that CPs do not have a legislative mandate to control vehicles, containers, etc. It was suggested that it would be worth encouraging CPs to have a mandate to manage regulated articles.

[193] One member supported the recommendations in the draft text. However, he pointed out that there is a mix of obligations and new activities, noting that some are already existing obligations of the Convention and proposed a slight modification in the chapeau, adding: “In addition to existing obligation”, which was included by the drafters with the consensus of SPG Members.

[194] Another member suggested that measures to counter contaminating pests must be based on scientific information and data. This may affect the export of vehicles, so measures should be technically justified.

[195] Another member noted that some obligations are already included in the Convention, and suggested to separate those from new obligations foreseen in the recommendation.

[196] One member highlighted that the work of the sea containers task force may complement the messages included in this recommendation and ensure alignment and consistency.

The SPG:

(55) *Provided* comments on the draft CPM recommendation.

(56) *Recommended* CPM to consider the CPM recommendation in view of its approval for consultation.

11.3. Draft action plan for a Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System

- [197] A video⁷ on banana fusarium wilt (TF4) was shown, this video was developed by the NPPO of Nicaragua
- [198] The SPG reviewed the action plan and budget proposed for the 5th IPPC development agenda 2020-2030 “Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System”.
- [199] The action plan presented at CPM-14 (2019) was modified with additional activities defined in the IPPC SF and was presented to the SPG.
- [200] In terms of budgeting, some activities are flagged as internal projects, external projects (depending on external donors) and FAO regular programme – so the budget was developed on the basis of internal project and FAO regular programme allocation.
- [201] It was noted that the IPPC secretariat would coordinate activities, but not be involved in field-level work.
- [202] The Secretariat is liaising with various FAO units on this, and plans to connect with the WHO too.
- [203] Another member highlighted the importance of activities undertaken to improve the capacity of countries to implement the Convention.
- [204] Two members noted that the workload planned for 2020 is very ambitious, and suggested developing a focus group first, and to involve RPPOs and FAO regional offices more to help refine the plan.
- [205] Two members noted the need to keep the IC informed about the project.
- [206] One member noted that this is a well-structured project, and would support its implementation. However, all development agenda items are dependant on availability of funds. He recalled that the EU pledged 300 000 EUR to support it. He highlighted the importance to promote this project during IYPH, especially in the IPHC in Helsinki.
- [207] Another member stressed the need for specific expertise in the group and ensuring links to the IC.

The SPG:

(57) *Recognized* the need for extra budgetary resources for CPM-14 (2019) noted activities and costed by the financial committee for at least 75 000 USD for 2020-2022 (3 years).

(58) *Recommended* to delay some activities in the project and promote it during IYPH in 2020 to mobilize additional resources.

(59) *Recommended* to establish a CPM focus group on “Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems”, and recommended the CPM Bureau to review its draft terms of reference.

(60) *Recommended* the IC consider an IRSS survey be conducted in 2020 for NPPOs and RPPOs to identify key impediments to reporting.

(61) *Recommended* CPM-15 (2020) to add an implementation topic for a guide on contingency plans as a priority 1 to the list of topics for implementation.

11.4. Dispute avoidance and settlement

- [208] The Secretariat presented a paper with history on how the CPM and Secretariat have been involved in dispute settlement. He recalled the current procedures, the development of a manual, and one ongoing dispute between the European Union and South Africa.

⁷ Available at <https://www.ipsa.gob.ni/NOTICIAS/itemid/157/SIMULACRO-IPSA-ANTE-UN-POSIBLE-BROTE-DE-LA-MARCHITEZ-POR-FUSARIUM>

- [209] He mentioned that the IC had developed TORs for an IC dispute avoidance and settlement sub-group, but only two nominations were submitted in response to a call for experts.
- [210] The SPG noted the voluntary nature of the dispute settlement mechanism of the IPPC and suggested to compare it with the one enforced by the SPS Secretariat.
- [211] IC Chair clarified that the implementation should provide inputs to provide disputes but the dispute settlement body was set up as Dispute Avoidance primarily; in any case the procedures for dispute settlements are not clear and require a legal review.
- [212] The FAO Legal Office and Secretariat may revise the dispute settlement procedures, to be presented to CPM for approval. She commented that they noted three sets of provisions when asked to look at the dispute settlement request. The issue revolves around three different sets of rules regulating the dispute settlement body. Suggested solutions are to revise these sets of rules to create an updated set of rules or modify the convention.
- [213] He also informed that the WTO SPS Secretariat had requested the Secretariat to get involved in a new dispute on plant health issues, which signals that IPPC contracting parties skipped the IPPC process.
- [214] Another member noted that the system was designed for technical resolution of disputes, but involving legal aspects is unavoidable.
- [215] It was noted that the development of the IPPC dispute settlement procedures was supposed to be the first “cold case” before being brought to the WTO SPS.
- [216] One member noted that the IPPC dispute settlement system is voluntary and non-binding. In terms of priorities, with 2020 being a big year for us, we should not engage in dispute settlement work and not invest any other resources, time and effort until after 2020.

The SPG:

(62) *Recommended* that the Secretariat would minimize its involvement in dispute avoidance and settlement and asked the Secretariat in collaboration with FAO Legal Office to revise procedures related to IPPC dispute settlement in view of ensuring their clarity and consistency after the IYPH in 2020.

11.5. Update on surveillance activities

- [217] The Secretariat provided an update on surveillance activities.
- [218] One member noted that surveillance is a good topic to be promoted during IYPH in 2020 but maybe not a priority for an SPG discussion.

The SPG:

(63) *Recognized* the importance of work on surveillance.

(64) *Noted* the lack of resources to undertake additional work on surveillance.

11.6. Draft CPM recommendation on antimicrobial resistance

- [219] The European Commission presented a draft CPM recommendation proposal on antimicrobial resistance (AMR). It was recalled that the CPM-14 (2019) discussed the topic on AMR in relation to plant health.
- [220] One member recognized that the draft CPM recommendation proposal is balanced and reasonable.
- [221] Another member noted that the IPPC work is not related to AMR.
- [222] One member suggested that there is a lack of evidence on the direct link between plant health and AMR.

[223] The Secretariat recalled that the focus should be on IPPC's role in preventing pests and diseases from spreading, so that AMR are not used.

[224] One member expressed concern over this proposal, as it was deemed not in line with CPM-14 conclusions on this matter.

The SPG:

(65) *Noted* the early discussion on the links between AMR and plant health.

12. Trade facilitation conference in 2021

[225] Mr Greg WOLFF reminded that reference to a trade facilitation conference was presented in various papers, but it was never really established in terms of programme.

[226] The SPG discussed about the rationale and timing for the conference.

[227] It is hoped that after IYPH the awareness of the role of the IPPC would become very apparent, especially in relation to facilitating safe trade.

[228] One member commented that there are other priorities to work on.

[229] The Secretariat suggested considering delaying the conference until 2022, coinciding with the IPPC 70th anniversary and allowing for sufficient timing for the preparations after IYPH 2020.

The SPG:

(66) *Supported* plans to hold a trade facilitation conference subject to available funding.

13. Any other business

[230] One participant noted that WTO negotiations on e-commerce have started, supposed to be ending with an agreement similar to the SPS.

[231] One member highlighted the need to review the IPPC secretariat's structure, and the many projects and activities being undertaken by the Secretariat. He highlighting the risk of diluting the focus, and address activities being undertaken. He noted the possibility of re-looking at the IPPC secretariat business model.

The SPG:

(67) *Asked* the IPPC secretariat to investigate the possibility to address phytosanitary issues with e-commerce within the framework of the relevant WTO agreement currently being negotiated.

14. Next Meeting

[232] The next SPG meeting will be held in Helsinki in the week following the International Plant Health Conference.

15. Close of the Meeting

[233] The chairperson closed the meeting, thanking participants for their active participation.

Appendix 01 – Agenda**COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES
STRATEGIC PLANNING GROUP (SPG) MEETING***9:00 - 17:00, 08-10 October 2019**FAO HQs, Rome, Italy**German Room (C229)*

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER / Secretariat support
1.	Opening of the Meeting		XIA/KOUAME
2.	Meeting Arrangements		
2.1	Review of arrangements for SPG meetings as per June Bureau meeting	June 2019 Bureau report: section 14, page 22 June 2019 Bureau Report	KOUAME
2.2	Adoption of the Agenda	01_SPG_2019_Oct	KOUAME
2.3	Election of the Rapporteur	--	KOUAME
3.	Administrative Matters		DENG/MONTUORI
3.1	Documents lists	02_SPG_2019_Oct	
3.2	Participants list	03_SPG_2019_Oct	
3.3	Local information	Link to the Local Information	
4.	Important Updates		
4.1	Update from CPM Bureau	05_SPG_2019_Oct	TRUJILLO
4.2	Update from Secretariat	--	XIA
5.	Report of last SPG Meeting	Link to the 2018 SPG Report	KOUAME
6.	Governance and Strategy		
6.1	Finalization of IPPC Strategic Framework for 2020-2030	04_SPG_2019_Oct	FEDCHOCK/MONTUORI
6.2	Consider structuring future CPM agendas after CPM-15 around the Strategic Framework	21_SPG_2019_Oct	WOLFF
6.3	Monitoring and Evaluation of the IPPC Community and Secretariat (teleconference)	19_SPG_2019_Oct	KUSTER/LARSON
6.4	Framework for Standards and Implementation	15_SPG_2019_Oct	NERSISYAN/LARSON
6.5	Implementation and Capacity Development Committee Terms of Reference and updating the capacity development strategy	16_SPG_2019_Oct 30_SPG_2019_Oct	LARSON
6.6	Terms of Reference (ToR) and Rules of Procedure (RoP) for an IPPC Stakeholder Advisory Group	09_SPG_2019_Oct	FEDCHOCK

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER / Secretariat support
7.	Sustainable funding and resource mobilization		
7.1	Leveraging contracting parties for resource mobilization Paper for NPPOs on how to approach their aid agencies and other government bodies to seek funds Call for donations	23_SPG_2019_Oct	BENOVIC/WOLFF/FEDCHOCK
7.2	IYPH-related resource mobilization outcomes and success indicators	--	GATT/MONTUORI
7.3	Private sector partnerships (pros, cons, feasibility, how, etc.)	12_SPG_2019_Oct 26_SPG_2019_Oct	FEDCHOCK/RAMADHAN
7.4	E-phyto- and ISPM-15-based resourcing	25_SPG_2019_Oct 27_SPG_2019_Oct	FEDCHOCK/BUTCHER
7.5	Fully funded 2021 work plan	04_Bureau_2019_Oct	BENOVIC
7.6	Constraints to participation in and response to IPPC activities	17_SPG_2019_Oct	LARSON/GATT
8.	Communications		
8.1	Renewal of IPPC Communications Strategy	20_SPG_2019_Oct	WOLFF/MONTUORI
9.	International Year of Plant Health		LOPIAN/MONTUORI
9.1	IYPH Progress Report	--	
9.2	Funding	11_SPG_2019_Oct	
10.	Key issues for CPM-15		
10.1	Ministerial-level segment	06_SPG_2019_Oct	TRUJILLO/XIA
10.2	Draft Ministerial declaration	28_SPG_2019_Oct (draft declaration)	BUTCHER
11.	Standards and Implementation		
11.1	Commodity and Pathway Standards Recommendations arising from Focus Group on Commodity and Pathways Standards Draft ISPM on "commodity standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)"	13_SPG_2019_Oct	WOLFF/MOREIRA
11.2	CPM recommendation – Facilitating safe trade by reducing the incidence of contaminating pests associated with traded goods Draft CPM recommendation text Comments on draft CPM recommendation	07_SPG_2019_Oct 08_SPG_2019_Oct	CLELAND/PETERSON (Australia)/MOREIRA

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER / Secretariat support
11.3	Draft action plan for a Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems	22_SPG_2019_Oct	BRUNEL
11.4	Dispute avoidance and settlement	14_SPG_2019_Oct	LARSON
11.5	Update on Surveillance activities	18_SPG_2019_Oct	BRUNEL
11.6	CPM recommendation on antimicrobial resistance	29_SPG_2019_Oct	
12.	Trade facilitation conference in 2021	24_SPG_2019_Oct	WOLFF/FEDCHOCK
13.	Any Other Business		KOUAME
14.	Next Meeting		KOUAME
15.	Close of the Meeting		KOUAME

Appendix 02 – List of Documents

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
01_SPG_2019_Oct	02.1	Provisional agenda	2019-10-07
02_SPG_2019_Oct	03.1	Documents list	2019-10-07
03_SPG_2019_Oct	03.2	Participants list	2019-10-02
04_SPG_2019_Oct	05.1	IPPC Strategic Framework for 2020-2030	2019-09-25
05_SPG_2019_Oct	12.2	Update from CPM Bureau	2019-09-25
06_SPG_2019_Oct	09.1	CPM-15 Ministerial-level segment	2019-09-25
07_SPG_2019_Oct	10.2	CPM recommendation: Contaminating pest	2019-09-25
08_SPG_2019_Oct	10.2	CPM Recommendation: Contaminating pest: Comments	2019-09-25
09_SPG_2019_Oct	05.5	ToR and RoP for an IPPC Stakeholder Advisory Group	2019-09-25
10_SPG_2019_Oct	07.3	Private sector partnerships	2019-09-25
11_SPG_2019_Oct	09.2	IYPH Funding	2019-09-30
12_SPG_2019_Oct	07.3	Private Sector Partnerships	2019-09-30
13_SPG_2019_Oct	11.1	IPPC Focus Group on Commodity and Pathway Standards	2019-09-30
14_SPG_2019_Oct	11.4	Dispute Avoidance and Settlement	2019-09-30
15_SPG_2019_Oct	06.4	Framework for Standards and Implementation	2019-09-30
16_SPG_2019_Oct	06.5	Revision ToRs of the IC	2019-09-30
17_SPG_2019_Oct	07.6	Constraints to participation in and response to IPPC activities	2019-09-30
18_SPG_2019_Oct	11.5	Update on activities on surveillance	2019-09-30
19_SPG_2019_Oct	06.3	Monitoring and Evaluation of the IPPC Community and Secretariat	2019-09-30
20_SPG_2019_Oct	08.1	IPPC Communications Strategy	2019-10-01
21_SPG_2019_Oct	06.2	IPPC Strategic Framework for 2020-2030 - future CPM agendas	2019-10-01
22_SPG_2019_Oct	11.3	Draft action plan for a Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems	2019-10-01
23_SPG_2019_Oct	07.1	Leveraging contracting parties for resource mobilization	2019-10-02
24_SPG_2019_Oct	12	Trade Facilitation Conference in 2021	2019-10-02
25_SPG_2019_Oct	07.4	Funding of the IPPC Hub	2019-10-02
26_SPG_2019_Oct	07.3	Private Sector Partnerships	2019-10-03
27_SPG_2019_Oct	07.4	ePhyto Update	2019-10-04

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
28_SPG_2019_Oct	10.2	Ministerial Declaration on International Plant Health	2019-10-04
29_SPG_2019_Oct	11.6	Draft CPM Recommendation proposal: AMR to manage plant pests	2019-10-07
30_SPG_2019_Oct	06.5	Rationale for updating the implementation and capacity development strategy	2019-10-07
04_Bureau_2019_Oct	07.5	Revision of work plan and budget of the Secretariat for 2021	2019-10-02
LINKS			AGENDA ITEM
Link to the Local Information			03.3
Link to the SPG 2018 Report			04.

Appendix 03 – List of Participants

(Updated 2019-10-24)

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	SPG Chairperson Bureau Africa	Mr Konan KOUAME Inspecteur Direction de la Protection des Végétaux, du Contrôle et de la Qualité Ministère de l'Agriculture B.P. V7 Abidjan, Phone: (+225) 20 218442 Mobile: (+225) 07 903754 COTE D'IVOIRE	I_kouame@yahoo.fr
✓	SPG Bureau Latin America and Caribbean <i>CPM Chairperson</i>	Mr Francisco Javier TRUJILLO ARRIAGA Director General de Sanidad Vegetal Servicio Nacional de Sanidad, Inocuidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria Sagarpa, Boulevard Adolfo Ruiz Cortines, N 5010, Piso4 Ciudad de Mexico Phone: (+52) 55 59051000 MEXICO	trujillo@senasica.gob.mx
✓	SPG Bureau Member Pacific	Mr Stephen BUTCHER Ministry for Primary Industries, P.O. Box 2526, Wellington 6140 Ph.: (+61) 262723241 Ph.: (+61) 262723241 NEW ZEALAND	stephen.butcher@mpi.govt.nz ;
✓	SPG Bureau Asia	Mr Fuxiang WANG Deputy Director General, National Agriculture Technical Extension and Service centre (NATESC) Ministry of Agriculture Room 630, Building No. Mai Zi Dian Street Chao Yang District, Beijing 100125 Ph.: 86-10-59194548 Fax.: 86-10-59194517 Mob.: 86-10-13701330221 CHINA	wangfuxiang@agri.gov.cn
✓	SPG Bureau Europe	Ms Marica GATT Director General (VPRD) Veterinary and Phytosanitary Regulation Division Office of the Director General / Abettori Street, Alberttown, Marsa HRS 1123, Malta Tel: 356 22925222 MALTA	marica.gatt@gov.mt

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	SPG Bureau North America	Mr Greg WOLFF Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive, OTTAWA, ON. K1A 0Y9 Ph.: (+1) 613 773 7060 Mob.: (+1) 613 325 2941 CANADA	greg.wolff@canada.ca
✓	SPG Bureau Near East	Mr Gamil Anwar Mohammed RAMADHAN General Director of Plant Protection Department of Yemen, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, Aden Ph.: 00967 770712209 00967 733802618 YEMEN	abuameerm21@gmail.com
✓	SPG IC Chair	Ms Olga LAVRENTJEVA Adviser on Phytosanitary Matters Plant Health Department Ministry of Rural Affairs Tel: +3726256535 ESTONIA	olga.lavrentjeva@agri.ee
✓	SPG SC Chair	Mr Ezequiel FERRO Phytosanitary International Affairs-SENASA Phone: (+54) 1141215091 ARGENTINA	eferro@senasa.gov.ar ;
✓	SPG	Mr Diego QUIROGA Director Nacional de Protección Vegetal Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria (SENASA) Avenida Paseo Colón 315, Piso 4º, Dpto. B Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires (C1063ACD) Tel. (5411) 4121-5495/5176 ARGENTINA	dnpv@senasa.gov.ar dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar ;
✓	SPG	Ms Robyn CLELAND Australia's IPPC Contact Point A/g Australian Chief Plant Protection Officer, Department of Agriculture Phone: +61 2 62724671 AUSTRALIA	robyn.cleland@agriculture.gov.au

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	SPG	Ms Sophie PETERSON (Standards Committee member) Department of Agriculture Phone: +61 2 62723769 AUSTRALIA	sophie.peterson@agriculture.gov.au
✓	SPG	Mr Carlos GOULART Director of Plant Health and Agricultural Inputs – NPPO of Brazil Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply Phone: +55(61) 991611266 BRAZIL	carlos.goulart@agricultura.gov.br
✓	SPG	Mr Dominique PELLETIER Senior International Plant Standards Officer Phytosanitary Division Phone: (+1) 6137736492 CANADA	dominique.pelletier2@canada.ca
✓	SPG	Ms Ksenija BISTROVIĆ Ministry of Agriculture of Republic of Croatia Directorate of Agricultural Land, Plant Production and the Market Phytosanitary Sector CROATIA	ksenija.bistrovic@mps.hr
✓	SPG	Mr Roman VAGNER Administrator, DG SANTE, Plant Health Unit – European Commission Rue Froissart 101 Brussels, Belgium EUROPEAN UNION	Roman.VAGNER@ec.europa.eu
✓	SPG	Mr Ralf LOPIAN Senior Adviser International Affairs Department of Food and Health Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Mariankatu 11 A, PO Box 30, Helsinki Tel.: (+358) 295162329 Mob.: (+358) 405965698 FINLAND	Ralf.Lopian@mmm.fi

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	SPG	Mr Teppei SHIGEMI Deputy director International Affairs Office Plant Protection Division Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) of JAPAN Phone: (+81) 3 35025978 JAPAN	teppei_shigemi780@maff.go.jp
✓	SPG	Ms. Natsumi YAMADA Section Chief International Affairs Office Plant Protection Division Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) of JAPAN Phone: (+81) 3 35025978 JAPAN	natsumi_yamada740@maff.go.jp
✓	SPG	Ms Hellen LANGAT MWAREY KEPHIS KENYA	hmwarey@kephis.org
✓	SPG	Mr Peter THOMSON Ministry for Primary Industries Director – Plants and Pathways PO Box 2526, Wellington 6140 Phone: (+64 298940353) NEW ZEALAND	peter.thomson@mpi.govt.nz
✓	SPG	Ms Kyu-Ock YIM Senior Researcher Export Management Division Department of Plant Quarantine Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency (APQA) Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (MAFRA) 177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do Tel: (+82) 54 9120627 Fax: (+82) 54 9120635 REPUBLIC OF KOREA	koyim@korea.kr

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	SPG	Ms Sun-Joo HWANG Assistant Director, Export Management Division Department of Plant Quarantine Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency (APQA) Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (MAFRA) 177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do Republic of Korea Tel: (+82) 54 912 0632 Fax: (+82) 54 912 0635 REPUBLIC OF KOREA	hs1420@korea.kr ;
✓	SPG	Ms. Do-Nam KIM Inspector, Youong-Nam Regional Office Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency (APQA) Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (MAFRA) Tel: (+82) 516006489 Fax: (+82) 516006488 REPUBLIC OF KOREA	dongamns@korea.kr ;
✓	SPG	Mr Wart Wickramaarachchi Additional Director National Plant Quarantine Service Tel: +011-2252028/29 SRI LANKA	wartwa@gmail.com
✓	SPG	Mr Thorwald GEUZE Senior Policy Officer Phytosanitary Affairs The Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority of The Netherlands Catharijnesingel 59 3511 GG Utrecht t.geuze@nvwa.nl Tel: +31.(0)6.51290267 THE NETHERLANDS	t.geuze@nvwa.nl
✓	SPG	Mr Marco TRAA Senior Staff Officer Phytosanitary Affairs Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality THE NETHERLANDS	m.j.w.traa@minez.nl ;

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	SPG	Mr Sam BISHOP Lead for International plant health policy, risk co-ordination, and trade Plant Health Team Animal and Plant Health Programme Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Direct: + 44 (0) 2080262506 Mobile: + 44 (0) 7827976902 UNITED KINGDOM	sam.bishop@defra.gov.uk ;
✓	SPG	Mr Osama EL-LISSY Deputy Administrator, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ), Head NPPO Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service United States Department of Agriculture 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, J.H. Whitter Bldg. 313.e Washington, D.C. 20250 USA	osama.a.el-lissy@usda.gov
✓	SPG	Mr John GREIFER Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service United States Department of Agriculture 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, rm1128 South Bldg. Washington, D.C. 20250 USA	John.K.Greifer@aphis.usda.gov ;

Others

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone, nationality	Email address
✓	Secretariat	Mr Jingyuan XIA	Jingyuan.Xia@fao.org ;
✓	Secretariat	Mr Arop DENG	Arop.Deng@fao.org ;
✓	Secretariat	Mr Brent LARSON	Brent.Larson@fao.org ;
✓	Secretariat	Ms Sarah BRUNEL	Sarah.Brunel@fao.org ;
✓	Secretariat	Mr Avetik NERSISYAN	Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org ;
✓	Secretariat	Mr Marko BENOVIĆ	Marko.Benovic@fao.org ;
✓	Secretariat	Mr Mirko MONTUORI	Mirko.Montuori@fao.org ;
✓	Secretariat	Mr Craig FEDCHOCK	Craig.Fedchock@fao.org
✓	Secretariat	Ms Adriana MOREIRA	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org
✓	Secretariat	Mr Artur SHAMILOV	Artur.Shamilov@fao.org
✓	Secretariat	Mr Riccardo MAZZUCHELLI	Riccardo.Mazzucchelli@fao.org
✓	Secretariat	Ms Masumi YAMAMOTO	Masumi.Yamamoto@fao.org
✓	Secretariat	Ms Sandra GORITSCHNIG	Sandra.Goritschnig@fao.org
✓	Secretariat	Ms Janka KISS	Janka.Kiss@fao.org

Appendix 04 – Action points

Action	Lead	Deadline
Inform respective permanent representatives to FAO about the importance of increasing the IPPC regular programme funding on a sustainable basis in the upcoming FAO governing body meetings	IPPC Contracting Parties	On going
make the necessary editorial improvements as needed to the IPPC Strategic Framework	Secretariat	CPM-15
Ask for more support through FAO's governing bodies and simplifying procedures for donors to donate to the Multi Donor Trust Fund.	Secretariat	As soon as possible
Develop draft generic terms of reference of the IPPC TAB for future partnerships	Ms Hellen LANGAT MWAREY and Mr Stephen BUTCHER	SPG 2020
Develop a paper on ePhyto sustainable funding, governance and consideration on how to develop the capacity of countries to generate or recover funds, identifying possible options for the CPM-15 consideration	Secretariat	CPM-15
Engage FAO Permanent Representatives that are members of the FAO Finance Committee	Contracting Parties	FAO Finance Committee 2019
Share the conclusions of this agenda item with respective FAO permanent representatives.	CPM Bureau and SPG Participants	FAO Finance Committee 2019
Draft and review the ToRs of a focus group on "Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems"	Secretariat (draft)/ CPM Bureau (review)	CPM-15
Request an IRSS survey be conducted in 2020 for NPPOs and RPPOs to identify key impediments to reporting	CPM-15 Members	CPM-15
Add an implementation topic for a guide on contingency plans as a priority 1 to the list of topics for implementation	CPM Members	CPM-15
Revise procedures related to IPPC dispute settlement in view of ensuring their clarity and consistency after 2020	Secretariat	By the end of 2021
Investigate the possibility to address phytosanitary issues with e-commerce within the framework of the relevant WTO agreement currently being negotiated	Secretariat	Before end of WTO negotiations
Countries were requested to establish an IYPH coordination committee and issue a press release once IYPH 2020 has officially been declared.	Contracting Parties	As soon as possible (on going)

Appendix 05 – Revision of Implementation and Capacity development Committee (IC) Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure

(Prepared by Secretariat with input from FAO legal services)

Proposed revisions to the Terms of Reference of the CPM Subsidiary Body: Implementation and Capacity Development Committee – A Subsidiary Body of the CPM⁸

Note: on interpretation

[234] References to implementation ~~mean implementation~~ of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), ~~includes~~ including implementation of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) and the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) Recommendations ~~standards, guidelines and recommendations adopted by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM).~~

1. Purpose

The IC develops, monitors and oversees an integrated programme to support the implementation of the IPPC and strengthen the phytosanitary capacity of contracting parties.

2. Scope of the IPPC Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)

The IC, under the guidance of the CPM, provides technical oversight of activities to enhance the capacities of contracting parties to implement the IPPC and meet the strategic objectives agreed by CPM. The IC:

- Identifies and reviews the baseline capacity and capability required by contracting parties to implement the IPPC.
- Analyses issues constraining the effective implementation of the IPPC and develops innovative ways to address impediments.
- Develops and facilitates delivery of an implementation support programme to enable contracting parties to meet and surpass the baseline capacity and capability.
- Monitors and evaluates the efficacy and impact of implementation activities and reports on progress which indicates the State of Plant Protection in the World.
- Oversees dispute avoidance and settlement processes.
- Oversees national reporting obligation processes.

Works with the Secretariat, potential donors and the CPM to secure sustainable funding for its activities

3. Composition

- The IC is composed of fourteen members ~~twelve experts~~ with relevant skills and experience in implementation of phytosanitary-related instruments and/or capacity development.
- Seven members will be representatives from each of the seven FAO regions.
- Five members will be experts in subjects relevant to the work of the IC ~~The Bureau, taking account of the balance of skills and experience required, and geographical representation, selects and appoints the members.~~

⁸ Report from CPM-12 (2017) see Appendix 10 to report:

https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2017/05/CPM-12_Report-2017-05-30_withISPMs.pdf

- ~~In addition~~ Two members, one representative from the regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) and one from the Standards Committee (SC).

4. Functions

The IC has the following functions:

4.1i) Technical work programme

- Identify and keep under review baseline capacity and capability required by contracting parties to implement the IPPC.
- Identify and propose strategies for contracting parties to enhance their implementation of the IPPC, including national reporting obligations, taking into account their specific capacities and needs.
- Review the ~~Secretariat's~~ analyses of contracting parties' challenges associated with the implementation of the IPPC.
- Based on an analysis of outputs from the above activities, recommend priorities to CPM.
- Identify and assess new technologies which could enhance implementation.
- Monitor and evaluate actions under the IPPC Strategic Framework, other related strategies, frameworks and work plan(s).

4.2ii) Effective and efficient management of the IC

- Develop, agree and maintain a list of priorities for Implementation and Capacity Development (ICD) activities work plan in alignment with CPM priorities.
- Provide a review function on new implementation and capacity development projects to ensure that they are aligned with the IPPC strategic objectives, have strategic value and a competitive advantage and recommend them to CPM for approval.
- Develop procedures and criteria for the production, oversight and approval of technical resources for implementation.
- Recommend to the CPM to establish and dissolve and provide oversight of IC Sub-groups, undertaking specific activities and tasks.
- Provide oversight to IC Sub-groups.
- Establish ad hoc working groups to address specific issues.
- Seek advice and/or input on matters relevant to its work programme from technical panels (through the SC) and other groups or organisations that assist the Secretariat.
- Periodically review its functions, procedures and outcomes.
- Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of its activities and products.
- Develop projects that contribute to achieving the implementation priorities agreed by CPM.

4.3iii) Working with the Secretariat

- ~~Develop and manage projects that contribute to achieving the implementation priorities agreed by CPM.~~
- Provide guidance on implementation and capacity development activities for inclusion in the Secretariat's work plan.
- Assess and prioritize web resources for inclusion in the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) or the Phytosanitary Resources website, as appropriate, technical resources that are relevant for developing capacity to implement the IPPC.
- Promote dispute avoidance as an outcome of effective implementation.

- Oversee the dispute settlement process as required.
- Contribute to the development and maintenance of links with donors, partners and other public and private organizations concerned with implementation and capacity development in the phytosanitary area.
- Contribute to the delivery of the Secretariat's Communications.

The Secretariat is responsible for coordinating the work of the IC and providing administrative, editorial operational and technical, support. The Secretariat advises the IC on the availability and use of financial and staff resources.

iv) Working with other subsidiary bodies

- ~~Work in close collaboration with the SC to make standards setting and implementation complementary and effective.~~
- ~~Review the Framework for Standards and Implementation annually and recommend changes to the CPM through the SPG.~~
- ~~Work with other subsidiary bodies and RPPOs regarding areas of mutual interest.~~

v) Actions directed by CPM

- ~~Contribute to the delivery of the IPPC Communications Strategy.~~
- ~~Provide oversight of bodies that have been established by CPM and entrusted to the IC.~~
- ~~Undertake other functions as directed by the CPM.~~
- ~~Report to the CPM on its activities.~~

5. Relationship with the Secretariat

- ~~The Secretariat is responsible for coordinating the work of the IC and providing administrative, editorial operational and technical, support. The Secretariat advises the IC on the availability and use of financial and staff resources.~~

56. Relationship with the Standards Committee

The IC collaborates with the SC to make standard setting and implementation complementary and effective on the basis of aligned prioritieswork plans for the implementation of the IPPC. This collaboration will take place at a number of levels (e.g. Secretariat, chairs, members, stewards and Ssub-groups). The IC includes an SC A representative from the SC is invited to participate in IC activities and meetingsand also selects a representative for participation in SC meetings. IC and SC~~Subjects for collaboration will include at least:~~

- Alignment of prioritieswork programmes
- Development of implementation plans for standards
- Analysis of responses to calls for topics and issues to be addressed
- Review of the Framework for Standards and Implementation jointly and make recommendations to the CPM for endorsement via the SPG
- ~~Development and implementation of joint projects.~~

67. Relationship with the RPPOs

RPPOs provide a regional perspective on issues, challenges and the region operating context impacting contracting parties and their NPPOs. RPPOs provide support to contracting parties to enhance their phytosanitary capacities and capabilities. The IC includes an A representative, selected by the RPPOs representative is invited to participate in IC activities and meetings. Areas for collaboration include:

- Exchange of ~~draft work plans~~ programmes
- Sharing of technical resources and information
- Identification and provision of experts
- Coordination of activities and events, including IPPC Regional Workshops
- ~~Development and implementation of joint projects.~~

2.2 Proposed revisions to the Rules of Procedure of the IPPC Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) – A Subsidiary Body of the CPM⁹

Rule 1. Membership

The IC is composed of ~~142~~ members.

Members will have experience in at least one of the following:

- Demonstrated experience in managing phytosanitary systems;
- Demonstrated experience in delivering phytosanitary capacity development activities;
- In depth knowledge of the IPPC, ISPMs and CPM Recommendations;
- Experience in the implementation of phytosanitary regulations;
- Other specific knowledge, qualifications and/or experience, for example in developing and delivering training

Members will also have a level of English which will allow them to actively participate in IC meetings and discussions.

~~plus one representative from the regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) and one from the Standards Committee (SC) of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).~~

~~Members are selected on the basis of a balance of expertise with at least one from each Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) region and representation from developing countries. Members should have experience of either implementation of phytosanitary related instruments and/or capacity development and will be selected and appointed by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) Bureau.~~

~~The Technical Consultation (TC) among RPPOs and the SC each appoints a representative to the IC through their own processes.~~

~~The members and representatives will serve with utmost integrity, impartiality, and independence and will prevent and disclose in advance possible conflicts of interest that may arise in the course of carrying out their duties. If they occur, the Bureau will resolve cases of a conflict of interest.~~

Members serve for a term of three years which may be renewed as recommended by CPM Bureau and confirmed by CPM. The term of membership will begin at the end of the May IC meeting.

Rule 2. ~~Qualification for membership~~

⁹ Report from CPM-12 (2017) see Appendix 10 to report:

https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2017/05/CPM-12_Report-2017-05-30_withISPMs.pdf

Nominations for members will include documented evidence of their experience in implementation and/or capacity development. This experience should include at least one of the following:

- Demonstrated experience in managing phytosanitary systems;
- Demonstrated experience in delivering phytosanitary capacity development activities;
- In depth knowledge of the IPPC and International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures;
- Experience in the implementation of phytosanitary regulations;
- Other specific knowledge, qualifications and/or experience, for example in developing and delivering training.

Nominees will also have a level of English which will allow them to actively participate in IC meetings and discussions.

Rule 2. Replacement members

Replacements should meet the qualifications for membership set forth in these Rules.

Replacements for regional representatives. A maximum of two replacements may be nominated by each region and when a region nominates two, it should indicate the order in which they would serve as replacements.

Replacements for Experts. Experts submitted in response to a call for experts may also be selected to form a pool of replacements.

Rule 3. Procedure for nomination and selection of members and replacement members

For nominations for regional representatives, each of the seven Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) regions may devise its own procedures for selecting its nominations of members and replacement members and their selection is communicated to the Secretariat through the CPM Bureau member from that region.

For nominations for experts, the Secretariat will make a call for experts. Nominations should be submitted to the Secretariat through IPPC Official Contact points for contracting parties or RPPOs. Nominations will be reviewed and selected by the Bureau. In addition to the qualifications for members outlined in these rules, the Bureau will also consider the skills and experience of the seven regional representatives and select additional experts to complement them.

Replacement members will also be selected following the above process to form a pool of replacement members.

The selection of members who are a representative of the SC or a representative from the RPPOs is described in Rule 5.

All nominations should be accompanied by a:

- letter of intent,

- CV and
- completed and signed Statement of Commitment as specified in the call.

All nominations for IC members or replacement members will be selected by the Bureau and recommended to the CPM for confirmation.

~~The Secretariat will issue a call for members when vacancies arise. Member nominations, including supporting information and a letter of commitment as specified in the call, may be formally submitted by contracting parties or RPPOs.~~

~~The CPM Bureau will review nominations against the list of requirements outlined in Rule 2.~~

~~Members serve for a term of three years which may be renewed on acceptance of the CPM Bureau.~~

Rule 4. Alternate and replacement members

~~At least one alternate for each FAO region should be appointed following the selection process detailed in Rule 3 and serves for a term of three years which may be renewed in accordance with that Rule.~~

~~An alternate may attend a meeting of the IC in place of a member who is unable to attend.~~

~~If a member resigns, no longer meets the qualifications for membership set forth in these Rules, or fails to attend two consecutive meetings of the IC, the member will be replaced. The replacement will be decided by the Bureau maintaining the balance of expertise, and the need to have at least one member from each FAO region. A replacement member will serve for a term of three years starting from the time of appointment.~~

Rule 4. Procedure calling a replacement member

A member of the IC will be replaced by a confirmed replacement member if the IC member resigns, no longer meets the qualifications for membership set forth in these Rules, or fails to attend two consecutive meetings of the IC.

For the replacement of a member who is a regional representative, the confirmed replacement member will be called upon in the order confirmed. In these cases, the Secretariat should inform the relevant regional Bureau member.

For the replacement of a member who is an expert, the Bureau will be requested to select a confirmed replacement member from the pool to complement the IC membership with a balance of skills and experience required.

A replacement will serve through the completion of the term of the original member.

Rule 5. Representatives of the SC and RPPOs

The SC and the Technical Consultation (TC) among RPPOs each selects a representative to the IC through their own processes.

Rule 65. Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

The chairperson and vice-chairperson of the IC are elected by its members and serve for the remainder of their term of three years with the possibility of re-election ~~on acceptance of the CPM Bureau.~~

Rule 76. Meetings

The IC will hold two physical meetings a year. Additional meetings may be held when necessary, subject to available staff and financial resources. Meetings of the IC may also be held through electronic means, including by video and teleconference, as necessary.

A majority of members will constitute the quorum to hold meetings.

Rule 87. Observers and participation of invited experts to IC meetings

Subject to the provisions of the below paragraph, meetings of the IC will be open, in accordance with the applicable FAO and CPM rules and procedures.

The IC may determine that certain meetings, or part thereof, be conducted without observers, in consideration of the sensitivity or confidentiality of the subject.

With the prior agreement, or at the request, of the IC members, the Secretariat may invite individuals or representatives of organizations with specific expertise, to participate ~~as observers~~ in a specific meeting or part thereof.

Rule 8. Bodies established by CPM

~~A subsidiary body established by the CPM may be entrusted to the oversight of the IC. These bodies will have their own terms of reference and rules of procedure which will have been agreed by the CPM during their establishment.~~

Rule 9. IC Sub-groups

The IC may recommend that the CPM establish IC Sub-groups to address specific implementation and capacity development issues subject to availability of financial resources. The IC will approvedetermine in their Terms of Reference (TOR) for each IC Sub-group and Rules of Procedure (ROP) for IC Sub-groups. The TOR should outline the assigned ~~the~~ tasks, duration of the Sub-group, the composition of the, membership and reporting duties ~~of these sub-groups.~~

The IC may recommend, the CPM dissolve IC Sub-groups when they are no longer required.

Rule 10. Working groups

The IC may establish ad hoc working groups to address specific issues. Working group members are selected by the IC from its membership and may, in some cases, include additional experts as agreed by the IC.

The IC may dissolve these temporary working groups when they are no longer required.

Rule ~~11~~10. Decision-making

The IC will endeavour to make decisions on the basis of consensus between members.

Situations where consensus is required but cannot be reached shall be described in the meeting reports detailing all positions maintained and presented to the CPM for discussion and appropriate action.

Rule ~~12~~11. Reporting

The IC will report to the CPM and submit recommendations to the CPM as needed.