



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Bureau of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures

Rome, Italy

18–20 and 26 October 2022

IPPC Secretariat

IPPC Secretariat. 2022. Report of the meeting of the CPM Bureau **18–20 and 26 October 2022**. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, [2022]



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: “This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original [Language] edition shall be the authoritative edition.”

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

Third-party materials. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting	5
2.	Meeting arrangements	5
2.1	Adoption of the agenda	5
3.	Administrative matters	5
3.1	Document list	5
3.2	Participant list	5
3.3	Local information	5
4.	Follow-up actions from CPM Bureau meeting, September 2022	5
5.	Preparation for the Strategic Planning Group meeting, October 2022	5
6.	Updates from CPM focus groups	6
6.1	Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 development agenda items	6
6.2	Climate change and phytosanitary issues action plan	7
6.3	Communications strategy	7
6.4	Sustainable funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution	8
6.5	Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid	9
6.6	Sea containers	10
6.7	Pest outbreak alert and response systems	11
7.	Discussion on future oversight of dispute settlement	12
8.	Development of observer policy	12
9.	Preparation for CPM-17 (2023)	13
9.1	Agenda	13
9.2	Identification of keynote speaker or speakers	14
9.3	Side-session proposals and preparations	14
10.	Updates from CPM subsidiary bodies	15
10.1	Update from the Standards Committee	15
10.2	Update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee	15
11.	Finance, budget and workplan	16
11.1	Discussion on workplan and budget of the IPPC Secretariat 2023	16
11.2	Discussion on future mode of operating – lessons learned from virtual meetings ...	16
12.	Updates from IPPC Secretariat	17
12.1	Update from the IPPC regional workshops	17
12.2	IPPC partnership framework	18
12.3	Update on legacies of International Year of Plant Health	19
13.	Any other business, part 1 (20 October)	19
14.	Debrief from Strategic Planning Group meeting 2022	20
15.	CPM-17 (2023) side-session discussion	22
16.	CPM Bureau meeting schedule for 2023	22

17. Any other business, part 2 (26 October).....	22
17.1 CPM-16 (2022) decisions that have financial implications	22
18. Next meeting	23
19. Close of the meeting.....	23

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 01 – Provisional Agenda	24
APPENDIX 02 - Documents List	26
APPENDICE 03 – Participants List.....	27

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The Chairperson of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), Lucien KOUAMÉ KONAN, and the IPPC Secretary, Osama EL-LISSY, welcomed all participants and opened the meeting. The meeting was the first bureau meeting to be held in person since the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- [2] The first part of the meeting (sections 2–13 of this report) was held at the offices of the Italian national plant protection organization (NPPO), the Ministry of Agricultural, Food and Forestry Policies. The second part of the meeting (sections 14–19) was hosted by FAO.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Adoption of the agenda

- [3] The CPM Bureau (hereafter referred to as “the bureau”) adopted the agenda (Appendix 1).

3. Administrative matters

3.1 Document list

- [4] The list of documents had been circulated and is attached to this report as Appendix 2.

3.2 Participant list

- [5] The list of participants is attached to this report as Appendix 3. Fuxiang WANG (Asia) and Ahmed Kamal EL-ATTAR were not able to attend the meeting. Diego QUIROGA (replacement member for Latin America and Caribbean) attended in place of Francisco Javier TRUJILLO ARRIAGA.
- [6] The bureau noted that Greg WOLFF would be attending part of the meeting, to report on agenda item 6.6 and as an observer in his capacity as the replacement member for North America.

3.3 Local information

- [7] A document providing local information had been shared with bureau members.¹

4. Follow-up actions from CPM Bureau meeting, September 2022

- [8] The bureau reviewed the actions points from their September 2022 meeting and noted that all actions had been completed.²
- [9] The bureau:
- (1) *noted* the progress of actions arising from the September 2022 bureau meeting.

5. Preparation for the Strategic Planning Group meeting, October 2022

- [10] The CPM Vice-Chairperson, John GREIFER, and the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”) gave an update on preparations for the SPG meeting, to be held in person on 24–26 October 2022 in Rome.³
- [11] The bureau:
- (1) *noted* the update on preparations for the 2022 SPG meeting.

¹ Local information for meeting participants: Rome, Italy: www.ippc.int/en/publications/1034

² CPM Bureau report, September 2022: www.ippc.int/en/publications/91616

³ SPG agenda: 01_SPG_2022_Oct; SPG, October 2022: www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/strategic-planning-group/2022-spg

6. Updates from CPM focus groups

6.1 Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 development agenda items

- [12] The bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 Development Agenda Items, Peter THOMSON (Southwest Pacific), outlined the main features of the draft implementation plan drawn up by the focus group,⁴ referred the bureau to the accompanying SPG paper,⁵ and took questions from the bureau during his presentation.
- [13] **Finalizing the implementation plan.** The bureau representative emphasized that there was still much work to be done on the implementation plan before it would be ready for submission to CPM-17 (2023). This would include checking that the scheduling of activities and the associated budget for those activities were full aligned, and testing the report with CPM subsidiary bodies and other relevant IPPC groups. The chairperson of the Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPOs), Diego QUIROGA, suggested that the focus group consult regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) and commented that the draft implementation plan could be added to the agenda of the next (virtual) meeting of the TC-RPPOs, to which the bureau representative on the focus group could be invited.
- [14] **Diagnostic laboratory networks.** The secretariat confirmed that, although the strategic development agenda item (SFDAI) on diagnostic laboratory networks was listed as “not started” in the draft implementation plan, it was progressing, albeit slowly. The secretariat was in the process of engaging a consultant to gather information, analyse it and make some recommendations, with the aim of submitting a report to the SPG in 2023 and then to the CPM in 2024. The bureau representative on the focus group clarified that this stage was still considered as “not started”, but that the information gathered by the consultant was needed for the “scope and plan” phase. The secretariat recalled the call by the TC-RPPOs to be given the opportunity to input to SFDAIs at an early stage, and the bureau representative said this could happen during the scoping phase.
- [15] The bureau representative clarified that in the “scope and plan” phase the aim was to plan what the deliverables would be, and that this would then be submitted to the CPM for approval to proceed. However, for six of the SFDAIs (all except diagnostic laboratory networking and global phytosanitary research coordination) there was no such “go/stop” decision for CPM because these activities had already started when the focus group started its work.
- [16] **Finance and budgeting.** The bureau representative explained that different sources of funding were not distinguished in the implementation plan, because of the uncertainty about funding sources later in the period covered by the plan. He emphasized, however, that discipline would be needed so that activities were not started until funding was in place, and that the focus group had thought it was important to determine the level of secretariat support needed and to budget for that, to avoid just adding to the secretariat’s workload.
- [17] The bureau considered a suggestion that the monetary issues could be resolved by renegotiating the IPPC (i.e. the text of the convention) to include a mandatory budgetary contribution from contracting parties, given that there is already precedence for mandatory or quasi-mandatory contributions in other arenas (e.g. Codex Alimentarius and the World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH, formerly OIE)). The bureau representative acknowledged that this could be included as an option, but anticipated that contracting parties would reject this idea as they can already increase their contribution to FAO if they choose to do so, without making contributions to the IPPC secretariat mandatory. The bureau representative confirmed that he would include a section on the budget needed and the funding challenges in the paper to the CPM, but he emphasized that the cost estimates still needed to be finalized. The secretariat clarified that although development of commodity standards would not incur costs over-

⁴ 06_SPG_2022_Oct.

⁵ 07_SPG_2022_Oct.

and-above the normal costs for the standard setting programme, the implementation of commodity standards would require funding.

[18] **Future of the focus group.** The bureau representative confirmed that if CPM-17 (2023) adopts the implementation plan, the focus group would be dissolved. The view of the focus group was that the secretariat should then employ a professional project manager to manage implementation.

[19] **Governance.** The secretariat confirmed that focus groups reported to the bureau. The bureau representative therefore undertook to amend the governance diagram in the draft implementation plan to refer to work programmes rather than focus groups. The bureau agreed that although the resourcing of the secretariat is a matter for CPM decision, how the secretariat organizes itself to deliver the strategic framework is a matter for the secretariat to decide. The bureau therefore suggested that the secretariat give serious thought to this between now and CPM-17 (2023).

[20] **Action plans for individual development agenda items.** The bureau noted that the role of this focus group was to draw together an overall implementation plan, but that the preparation of a detailed, specific plan for each SFDAI would be the responsibility of the groups responsible for the respective items. The bureau noted that, in addition to the periodic reviews of the plans conducted by the groups responsible for the SFDAs and by the bureau, the CPM would have the opportunity to review each SFDAI and adjust budgets accordingly on an annual basis.

[21] The CPM chairperson thanked the bureau representative on the focus group for his presentation and the focus group for their work and the excellent report.

[22] The bureau:

- (1) *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 Development Agenda Items.

6.2 Climate change and phytosanitary issues action plan

[23] The bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues, Samuel BISHOP (Europe), referred the bureau to the relevant SPG paper.⁶ He reported that the work of the focus group was very well developed and presented some highlights on behalf of the focus group chairperson.

[24] The CPM chairperson thanked the bureau representative for the update and the focus group for their work, and invited comments.

[25] One bureau member suggested that the focus group be asked to report against the actions identified in the focus group's action plan for this year. The bureau representative agreed that this could be done.

[26] The secretariat informed the bureau that the NPPO of Canada is considering funding both the IPPC guide on climate-change impacts on plants pests and the International Phytosanitary Portal landing page on climate change that is being established.

[27] The bureau:

- (1) *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues; and
- (2) *invited* the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues, when reporting to CPM-17 (2023), to report against the actions identified in its 2022–2025 action plan.

6.3 Communications strategy

[28] The secretariat presented this agenda item on behalf of Fuxiang WANG (Asia), the bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on Communications. The secretariat explained that the SPG paper provided an update on the work of the focus group, together with a draft communication strategy as an appendix.⁷ Following the bureau and SPG meetings, the focus group planned to conduct further

⁶ 17_SPG_2022_Oct.

⁷ 11_SPG_2022_Oct.

consultation to gather input from RPPOs and NPPOs by means of a simple survey. The final draft communications strategy and workplan would be prepared in January, for submission to CPM-17 (2023).

[29] The CPM chairperson thanked the secretariat for the update and the focus group for their work, and invited comments.

[30] **Suggested amendments to the text.** One bureau member suggested that external stakeholders be added to the list of parties for which a structure for collaboration and engagement would be established, and that the strategy should seek to enhance IPPC engagement with and support from external stakeholders, including industry, non-governmental organizations, civil society, and academic groups.

[31] One bureau member suggested that the formatting of the strategy be improved to make it easier to follow. The member also suggested that the strategy identify key messages for each stakeholder (e.g. what is the key message for industry about how they can participate and how the CPM will communicate with industry?).

[32] **Next steps.** The bureau discussed the potential use of the Online Comment System (OCS) to gather input, as an alternative to a survey. They recalled the low level of response to previous IPPC surveys and the prevalence of “survey fatigue”, but also acknowledged that the OCS is designed for gathering feedback on the precise wording of documents, rather than on more general questions, and the OCS is also not very intuitive to use. The bureau therefore concluded that it was best to proceed with a survey (although later modified this conclusion: see agenda item 14). Bureau members suggested that the survey ask questions in such a way that conveyed the value of the exercise to the target audience.

[33] The bureau noted that the role of the focus group is to deliver a strategy; after the strategy has been delivered, the focus group would end and the strategy would be handed to the secretariat to implement.

[34] The bureau:

- (1) *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on Communications;
- (2) *recommended* the amendments to the draft IPPC communication strategy as discussed at this meeting;
- (3) *agreed* to review questions for the survey about the communications strategy that will be drafted by the focus group at their meeting on 2 November 2022; and
- (4) *recommended* that the focus group be dissolved once the communications strategy has been adopted by the CPM, and that the implementation of the strategy then be handed to the secretariat to deliver.

6.4 Sustainable funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution

[35] The bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution, Peter THOMSON (Southwest Pacific), referred the bureau to the relevant SPG paper.⁸ He explained that the group had considered the principles that would need to be applied when evaluating funding options, identified three components of a sustainable funding mechanism (the scope of the costs to include or exclude, how to apportion costs across users, and the need for the payment system to be efficient and effective) and had considered options for each component.

[36] The bureau considered the implications of the options presented in the paper.

[37] **FAO funding.** The bureau noted that it was important, if approaching FAO for funding for the ePhyto Solution, not to jeopardize the regular-programme funding of other secretariat activities. If the FAO funding route were to be pursued, bureau members suggested that it could be explored in parallel with the other options, as the FAO route may take some time to explore. They also suggested that the case for funding may be stronger if the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat were a partner in it (to make the case

⁸ 09_SPG_2022_Oct.

for food security), if it were championed by an FAO member, and it were delayed until usage of ePhytos (electronic phytosanitary certificates) was higher.

[38] **Timescale for moving to a new funding solution.** The secretariat confirmed that the current funding from donors would last until the end of 2023, but it was unlikely that the funding would completely stop after that. The bureau recognized that it would take time to put a funding solution in place and so the IPPC ePhyto Solution would need to be supported by continued donations in the early stages, perhaps together with an apportionment of costs to countries.

[39] **Private enterprise.** The bureau noted that, although ePhytos facilitate trade, contracting parties are unlikely to accept the ePhyto Solution operating as a private business, because of concerns over the security of information that is commercially sensitive.

[40] **Increasing ePhyto usage.** To increase the number of countries using the ePhyto Solution, the bureau noted the importance of explaining the benefits of the system, so that people can see the value of it to them, and then helping people learn how to use it. One bureau member suggested holding further ePhyto workshops in the regions.

[41] The CPM chairperson thanked the bureau representative for the presentation and the focus group for its work. He commented that it would not be easy to choose a funding option but highlighted the need to encourage more countries to get involved and noted the proposal to have more ePhyto workshops.

[42] The bureau:

- (1) *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution.

6.5 Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid

[43] The secretariat presented this agenda item on behalf of the bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and other Humanitarian Aid, Lucien KOUAMÉ KONAN (Africa).⁹ The group had only met once, but it was hoped to hold an in-person meeting in Fiji, for which partial funding had already been secured.

[44] **Membership of the focus group.** The secretariat confirmed that efforts had been made to solicit a nomination from the Latin America and Caribbean region via the RPPO (the Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency), but with no success. However, if a nomination were received from the region, then it would be in the gift of the bureau to select that person to join the focus group. The secretariat also confirmed that there were no actions to deliver to CPM-17 (2023) other than an update and possibly the nomination of an expert from the Latin America and Caribbean region.

[45] The secretariat confirmed that they had contacted the World Food Programme regarding participation in the focus group but had not yet had a response. The bureau noted the value in involving the World Food Programme in terms of communicating the messages about safe provision of aid, but also recognized that there was still a lot of scope for NPPOs to work with the aid programmes of their respective countries.

[46] **Developing guidance.** The secretariat emphasized that, in their work, the focus group should avoid trying to “reinvent the wheel” if there was relevant guidance already in existence in adopted standards. The bureau noted, however, that in emergency situations countries may need to import commodities that they do not normally import and for which they do not have a pest risk assessment. The onus therefore needs to be on the exporting country to do what they can in advance to prepare for the possibility of providing aid and what they can do to minimize risk. So, what is missing is guidance for donor (i.e. exporting) countries. It would still, however, be a decision for the importing country to determine the level of risk they were willing to accept. One bureau member suggested that the exporting country should state what pests might be associated with the commodities being exported and then the importing country could then decide whether to accept the commodities. The bureau also recognized,

⁹ 13_SPG_2022_Oct.

however, that in emergency situations, decisions about what to accept and what to refuse may be beyond the authority of just the NPPO, so the situation is more difficult.

[47] The bureau:

- (2) *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and other Humanitarian Aid.

6.6 Sea containers

[48] Greg WOLFF, the bureau representative on the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers, presented an update on the work of this focus group, including the outcomes of the *International workshop on reducing the introduction of pests through the sea container pathway* that had been held on 19–20 September 2022 in London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.¹⁰ The workshop had made good progress, with the main outcome being the emergence of a promising systematic approach to sea-container cleanliness. Mr WOLFF emphasized, however, the enormity of the challenges in addressing this issue and the grave risk, if the IPPC community gets this wrong, of damage not only to the global economy but also to the reputation of the IPPC community. He also noted the very short timeframe for the focus group to do its work, as it had only just started and yet needed to complete its work by the end of 2023 so that it could report to the CPM in 2024. The next meeting of the focus group was scheduled to take place on 27–28 October 2022, with mostly virtual meetings in 2023.

[49] **Emerging technological solutions.** The secretariat informed the bureau about a recent visit from a global shipping representative who presented an app that was designed to help track sea-container safeguarding activities and might be supported by industry.

[50] **Timescale and phasing of implementation.** One bureau member suggested that it might be better to think of the ultimate solution being phased in rather than implemented all at once. This would then allow time to build industry responsibility for sea-container cleanliness through the Code of Practice for Packaging of Cargo Transport Units. However, if the solution were to have multiple components, phased in over time, the duration of the focus group may need to be extended, so that it could steer this process.

[51] The bureau representative acknowledged that an extension would be needed, but he also commented that the focus group should still press ahead to complete its tasks by the end of its current term.

[52] **Type of output.** One bureau member commented that it was not yet clear in what form the solution would be eventually presented, as the emerging systematic approach would not be suitable for a standard, and a CPM recommendation would not be strong enough. However, a further bureau member suggested that a standard may only be one part of a broader solution.

[53] **Need for pragmatism.** One bureau member emphasized the need for a pragmatic solution, as it was impossible to achieve zero risk and so the aim should be to look for practical ways of reducing risk without imposing destructive costs on industry. The member supported the suggestion that the focus group identify three or four things that could be done (e.g. container redesign).

[54] **Animal and human health.** The bureau considered the possible status of guidance and practices directed at protecting animal and human health in the context of sea containers. The bureau representative on the focus group commented that measures to protect food safety were presumably well advanced, but he was not sure about the situation with animal health – hence he suggested that the secretariat contact the WOAHA secretariat, as perhaps a WOAHA representative may be interested in engaging with the CPM focus group. The secretariat confirmed that the terms of reference for the focus group allowed invited experts to participate and that the secretariat would find out who the relevant personnel are in WOAHA (and in the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat).

¹⁰ 07_Bureau_2022_Oct.

[55] **Industry Advisory Group.** The bureau considered whether the terms of reference for the Container Cleanliness Industry Advisory Group needed to be amended, as the current terms of reference had made it difficult to find a chairperson. The secretariat clarified, however, that the group had been set up by industry, not by the CPM, so the terms of reference are at the discretion of industry, not IPPC bodies.

[56] **Quantifying the benefits of measures.** The bureau noted the concerns expressed at the workshop about the need for a quantified justification of measures and recognized that it may be beneficial to gather relevant information into a paper that could be published. The bureau representative on the focus group suggested that it might be helpful to look at the papers prepared during the development of ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*), to see what approach was used for that standard. The secretariat speculated that it might also be helpful to highlight to industry the economic benefits of taking measures to reduce contamination in terms of avoiding the losses in time and money that occur if a regulated pest is intercepted in or on a sea container.

[57] The CPM chairperson thanked the bureau representative for his presentation and the focus group for their work.

[58] The bureau:

- (1) *noted* the update from the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers; and
- (2) *recognized* the need to engage stakeholders and therefore *recommended* that a second workshop on sea containers be held in 2023, provided that funding can be secured from donor organizations (see also agenda item 14).

6.7 Pest outbreak alert and response systems

Nominations of members to the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems Steering Group

[59] The secretariat presented the outcome of a call for experts for the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS) Steering Group.¹¹ Sixteen nominations had been received. The secretariat had reviewed the CVs and expertise provided in the nominations against the selection criteria specified in the terms of reference and provided a summary of this evaluation to the bureau, together with recommendations on the experts to select.

[60] The bureau noted that there appeared to be an emerging pattern of a low response rate from developing countries to calls for experts for focus groups. One bureau member suggested that “shadowing” on focus groups could be introduced, whereby appropriately qualified experts could attend focus group meetings without any obligation to actively participate, so that they could learn about how focus groups operate. Another member suggested that the bureau could ask the POARS focus group to consider how to engage developing countries. The secretariat also pointed out that the focus group included a representative from the RPPOs, and the RPPOs would have an important role to play in engaging developing countries within their regions.

Role of regional plant protection organizations in pest outbreak alert and response systems

[61] The secretariat confirmed that the SPG paper prepared by the Thirty-Fourth TC-RPPOs on the roles of RPPOs in POARS had been submitted as a discussion paper on the agenda of the SPG.¹² The bureau noted how important it was to consider this issue.

[62] The bureau:

- (3) *agreed* to the selection of the following experts as members of the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS) Steering Group:
 - Stephanie BLOEM (RPPO representative)
 - Hector Emilio MEDINA (Argentina NPPO)
 - Matthew EVERATT (United Kingdom NPPO)

¹¹ 08_Bureau_2022_Oct; 08_SPG_2022_Oct.

¹² 08_SPG_2022_Oct.

- Amanda C. KAYE (United States of America NPPO)
 - Eunice KAGENDO LINGEERA (Kenya NPPO)
 - Panagiota MYLONA (European Commission)
 - Roger DAY (CABI, international organization)
 - Walther ENKERLIN (International Atomic Energy Agency, international organization)
 - Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Standards Committee representative)
 - Ringolds ARNITIS (Implementation and Capacity Development Committee representative);
- (4) *selected* Lucien KOUAMÉ KONAN (Africa) as the bureau representative for the POARS Steering Group; and
- (5) *encouraged* the POARS Steering Group to consider how to engage developing countries in the development of POARS.

7. Discussion on future oversight of dispute settlement

[63] Samuel BISHOP (Europe) introduced this agenda item, referring to the SPG paper and thanking the secretariat for producing the simplified, graphical representation (diagram) of the IPPC Dispute Settlement Procedures as requested by the bureau.¹³

[64] The bureau considered the diagram and agreed that it should be amended to omit any reference to the World Trade Organization process and to make it clear that contracting parties should inform the Director General of FAO (in compliance with the IPPC) when first approaching the office of the IPPC Secretary. They also agreed that the diagram should make it clear that the Dispute Settlement Oversight Body would only become involved if conciliation were chosen and an expert committee was therefore needed, and that it should include a key of the colours used in the diagram.

[65] The bureau:

- (1) *requested* that the secretariat modify the diagram of the IPPC Dispute Settlement Procedures according to the discussions at this meeting.

8. Development of observer policy

[66] The CPM vice-chairperson referred to the discussions at the bureau meetings in June and September and explained that the purpose of the proposed policy was to provide guidance on who can attend Friends of the Chair meetings at CPM sessions and the nature of their participation.¹⁴

[67] The bureau noted that where the policy statement refers to the CPM chairperson being able to consider organizations other than NPPOs and RPPOs as participants in Friends of the Chair meetings, this could include trade organizations; however, these organizations would be considered case-by-case, based on the value they would bring to the meeting through their participation and in consultation with the bureau, and as observers to the CPM they would also have to be validated as recognized international observers. So, such participants would not include “industry” in the broad sense. The bureau acknowledged the sensitivities of this issue, however, and so suggested that this section of the policy statement be reviewed to see whether any improvements could be made to take account of these potential sensitivities.

[68] The bureau clarified that the policy was merely reflecting current practice so would not affect practices at CPM-17 (2023).

¹³ 15_SPG_2022_Oct.

¹⁴ 18_SPG_2022_Oct.

[69] The bureau:

- (1) *agreed* that Samuel BISHOP (Europe) and Diego QUIROGA (Latin America and Caribbean) would review the policy statement in the light of the discussions at this meeting before presenting it to the SPG.

9. Preparation for CPM-17 (2023)

9.1 Agenda

[70] The CPM chairperson invited Greg WOLFF (replacement member for North America) to introduce the SPG paper on restructuring the CPM agenda around the objectives of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030.¹⁵ Mr WOLFF explained that the main purpose of the proposal was to help the IPPC community maintain its focus on implementation of the strategic framework by embedding it within the standing agenda of the CPM. The proposal had originally been suggested in 2019, but progress had stalled because of disruption to CPM meetings from 2020–2022 caused by the COVID pandemic.

[71] **CPM agenda.** The bureau agreed that the reports from the Standards Committee (SC) and the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) should be taken before the section on implementation of the strategic framework.

[72] The secretariat presented a modified version of the example agenda that incorporated some of the standing CPM agenda items that would still be needed but were missing from the example agenda in the SPG paper.

[73] One bureau member commented that even though commodity standards were one of the SFDAIs, these would be addressed as part of the agenda items on standards (the SC report and the adoption of standards), not under the section on the strategic framework. Another member commented, however, that including it under the latter would allow input on implementation.

[74] **Focal points and groups responsible for strategic framework development agenda items.** The bureau noted that in some cases it was clear who was responsible for an SFDAI, but in others it was not clear (e.g. the SFDAI on use of third-party entities). One bureau member suggested that, as the standard setting stage of the SFDAI on use of third-party entities had been completed with the adoption of ISPM 45 (*Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions*), the focal point now needed to be moved from the Standard Setting Unit to the Implementation and Facilitation Unit. However, the bureau recognized that this was for the SC to recommend, not the bureau. The bureau noted that, where there is no body assigned to an SFDAI, as is the case for the SFDAI on third-party entities, then the bureau must take the lead, with support from the secretariat.

[75] **Reporting progress on implementation of the strategic framework.** One bureau member suggested that an annual, overarching report to the CPM be published on progress towards the eight strategic priorities. This idea was welcomed by the bureau. The bureau considered two options: one option being to have one overarching report including all the recommendations for CPM decision, and for the CPM agenda to follow each of the sections of this report; and the other option being to have an overarching report to give the general picture, plus (where needed) more detailed papers prepared by the relevant groups, which would include the recommendations for CPM decision relevant to those items. The bureau did not reach a conclusion on which option would be best, but supported the concept of having an overarching report.

[76] The bureau:

- (1) *supported* the restructuring of the CPM agenda around the implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030, based on the example agenda modified by the secretariat;

¹⁵ 04_SPG_2022_Oct.

- (2) *supported* the concept of an annual, overarching report to CPM on implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030, with NPPOs being given the opportunity to comment upon it during the CPM session; and
- (3) *accepted* the offer by Peter THOMPSON to work with the secretariat on developing this proposal further.

9.2 Identification of keynote speaker or speakers

[77] The bureau discussed possible keynote speakers for CPM-17 (2023). They noted that, as there is no current IPPC theme, the speaker or speakers would be expected to give a broad address focusing on the importance of plant health and facilitating safe trade, perhaps in the light of emerging or urgent issues.

[78] The bureau:

- (1) *agreed* that Samuel BISHOP (Europe) would approach Lord Benyon, who had given an address to the International Plant Health Conference, Lucien KOUAMÉ KONAN (Africa) would approach the African Union about the possibility of inviting a government minister from Africa, and the secretariat would approach the Director General of FAO and the Head of the World Food Programme.

9.3 Side-session proposals and preparations

[79] The bureau considered proposals and ideas for side sessions at CPM-17 (2023).

[80] The secretariat informed the bureau that the International Seed Federation (ISF) had expressed an interest in holding a side session but had not elaborated on what the side session would focus upon.

[81] The bureau noted that normally side sessions are an hour long. The secretariat informed the bureau, however, that the plenary sessions would be shorter and so the lunches may be longer than previously, as FAO interpretation services were now limited to a maximum of 2.5 hours for the morning and 2.5 hours for the afternoon. The bureau expressed concern about the impact that this would have on the time available for CPM business and the secretariat agreed.

[82] The bureau considered suggestions for side sessions and noted that it may also be helpful for the secretariat to provide orientation for heads of NPPO delegations.

[83] Regarding the request from ISF, the bureau noted that there was no precedence for a trade organization organizing a side session at a CPM session and it was important that the CPM maintain its independence and avoid any perception of endorsing any particular trade body or sector. It was not therefore feasible for the CPM to accommodate requests from trade organizations to organize side sessions or hold trade exhibits.

[84] Before leaving agenda item 9, the bureau also considered a question from the secretariat, who noted that the gap between CPM discussions and adoption of the report over the last two years of virtual CPM sessions had allowed more time for preparation of the report and had therefore improved its quality. One bureau member commented that their region, however, preferred the report to be adopted at the CPM session rather than after it.

[85] The bureau:

- (1) *agreed* to share their suggestions for side sessions (sea containers, ePhyto, strategic issues, and guides and training materials) with the SPG, with the recommendation that the SPG select three;
- (2) *agreed* to include a science session on the use of biotechnology in plant protection on the Thursday of the CPM agenda (however, see also agenda item 14); and
- (3) *requested* that the secretariat respond to the request from the International Seed Federation to reflect the bureau's discussion on such requests at this meeting.

10. Updates from CPM subsidiary bodies

10.1 Update from the Standards Committee

- [86] The secretariat presented an update from the SC.¹⁶ The secretariat drew the attention of the bureau to two decisions of the SC: the first was to increase the number of Spanish language experts on the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) by one, as a result of an increased workload; the second was to decline a request from ISF to be allowed to comment through the OCS on three of the draft ISPMs submitted for second consultation in July 2022, because the SC considered that these draft ISPMs were not of sufficient direct relevance to ISF. The SC had also noted some ambiguity in the wording of the procedure for consultations and so had agreed to clarify the procedure at its meeting in November 2022.
- [87] The bureau discussed the issue of external bodies seeking to provide input to the consultation process. The consensus was that official IPPC contact points should be the sole inputters of comments to OCS during consultations, because the IPPC is an inter-governmental treaty and so comments on IPPC documents should be submitted by the official government contacts. The bureau noted that if relevant international organizations other than NPPOs and RPPOs wished to express concerns about draft documents under consultation, they could approach their respective NPPO, who could submit those comments if they agreed with them, or the organization could write a letter to the secretariat. The bureau noted that this policy of restricting access to official IPPC contact points was consistent with the bureau's approach on sea containers.
- [88] The secretariat noted the importance of having a clear procedure so that the secretariat could respond to requests without the need to refer to the SC.
- [89] The bureau:
- (1) *noted* the decision of the SC to increase the number of TPG members for the Spanish language by one (bringing the total number of Spanish language experts to two);
 - (2) *noted* the decision made by the SC to decline the request from the International Seed Federation that it be allowed to comment through the IPPC Online Comment System (OCS) on three of the draft ISPMs submitted for second consultation in July 2022, and *noted* that the frequency of such requests from trade bodies is likely to increase as commodity standards are developed; and
 - (3) *recommended* that the SC update the *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting* to clarify the procedure for commenting on drafts submitted for consultation, and *noted* that organizations without access to the OCS could potentially raise any concerns they have about drafts with their NPPO or by letter to the secretariat.

10.2 Update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee

- [90] The secretariat gave a verbal update from the IC. The secretariat referred to the activities of the IC subgroups and teams, the bi-monthly updates to the IC, the ongoing call for IC members, the latest IPPC guides and training materials to be published, the current status of draft specifications for guides and training materials, and new projects that had been endorsed by the IC.
- [91] The secretariat confirmed that implementation and capacity development projects are managed by the secretariat but with oversight by the IC, and that projects are presented to the IC at the concept stage for endorsement.
- [92] The secretariat explained that translation of IPPC guides and training materials is sometimes achieved using FAO translation services and sometimes through in-kind contributions. Regardless of who does the translation or proofreading, all translated documents are submitted to the FAO Publications Workflow System, which includes checks by the FAO publication team.
- [93] The bureau:
- (1) *noted* the update from the IC.

¹⁶ 05_Bureau_2022_Oct.

11. Finance, budget and workplan

11.1 Discussion on workplan and budget of the IPPC Secretariat 2023

- [94] The secretariat presented an update on preparations for the workplan and budget for the secretariat for 2023. The secretariat outlined the assumptions used for the workplan and budget and informed the bureau that the funding available for 2023, based on these assumptions, would be sufficient for the current IPPC work programme. A draft budget, based on the figures presented at this meeting, would be submitted to the bureau in December for the bureau to consider and recommend to CPM-17 (2023) for adoption.
- [95] The bureau considered the presentation and asked questions.
- [96] The secretariat explained that around 70% of the regular programme budget related to staffing and that, once activities and priorities are confirmed, the secretariat management would try to convert some of the positions that were temporary but inherently contractual into staff positions.
- [97] The bureau noted that although the next year appeared to be financially secure, donor funding could come under pressure in future, given the current trends in the global economy.
- [98] The bureau considered whether there was a risk in having a large proportion of money unallocated in the Multidonor Trust Fund. The secretariat confirmed that, based on experience to date, FAO respect the fact that the Multidonor Trust Fund is under the control of the CPM. The secretariat also confirmed that, in the interests of prudence, they always ensure that there are some unallocated reserves.
- [99] The secretariat confirmed that the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat received more funding than the IPPC Secretariat in both trust funds and regular-programme funds, the latter being because the Codex Trust Fund is managed by the World Health Organization and has regular contributions from donor countries.
- [100] The secretariat confirmed that 2023 would be the second year of the current financial biennium and clarified that any increase in FAO funding for the next biennium would be a matter for FAO members to pursue.
- [101] Regarding the current financial year, the secretariat confirmed that there was currently an underspend on the regular-programme budget because of vacant staff positions.
- [102] In terms of financial governance, one bureau member noted that the Financial Committee is a subgroup of the bureau, but its purpose had changed over time and so it was perhaps time for the bureau to review it.
- [103] The bureau:
- (1) *noted* the update on the workplan and budget for the IPPC Secretariat; and
 - (2) *requested* that the secretariat include in the agenda for the next bureau meeting an item for the bureau to review the Financial Committee and consider what is the best form of support for the secretariat relating to finance.

11.2 Discussion on future mode of operating – lessons learned from virtual meetings

- [104] Peter THOMSON (Southwest Pacific) opened this agenda item by inviting the bureau to reflect on the lessons learned over the COVID-19 period and on what else is happening outside of the IPPC community that may have an impact on what the IPPC community does and how it delivers its work.
- [105] The bureau discussed the pros and cons of different modes of meetings. They noted that virtual meetings may not allow the same depth of consideration, may be dominated by native or strong speakers of English, and may have fewer participants. Participants may be more distracted during the meeting by their other responsibilities. Sensitive issues are very difficult to discuss in virtual mode and it can seem as though decisions are being rushed. Hybrid meetings can also be very problematic to chair.

[106] The bureau recognized that another constraint on people attending face-to-face meetings may be that they have difficulty justifying attendance to their superiors. Strengthened guidance for participants about the value of attending may therefore be helpful.

[107] On the other hand, the bureau recognized that there are some cases whether there is less benefit in meeting in person. For example, regular virtual meetings may work better than a whole-week, face-to-face meeting for groups where an iterative process is involved that requires gaps for between-session work and reflection. In other cases, a mixture of virtual and face-to-face meetings may work best. So, the approach used may need to be tailored to what the group is being tasked to do. The secretariat informed the bureau that a combination of virtual and face-to-face meetings for the development of IPPC guides and training materials was scheduled to be discussed by the IC at its meeting in November.

[108] Regarding the financial constraints of face-to-face meetings, the secretariat highlighted the fact that it may sometimes be cheaper for a country to host a meeting than to send a participant somewhere else.

[109] During the discussion, one other issue was raised in terms of things that have changed over the COVID period. An increase in the number of physical audits had been observed in one country, which implied a lack of trust in the systems that were in place. The bureau did not, however, discuss this further.

[110] The bureau:

- (1) *recognized* the value of face-to-face meetings but *acknowledged* that virtual meetings may also have value, depending on the tasks to be achieved, and that a combination of virtual and face-to-face meetings may work best in some cases;
- (2) *requested* that the secretariat prepare a draft paper for CPM-17 (2023), mapping out the different types of IPPC meetings with proposals on the mode of operation and the frequency of meetings, for consideration by the bureau at its next meeting; and
- (3) *agreed* that the CPM vice-chairperson would inform the SPG about the preparation of this paper at the SPG meeting the following week.

12. Updates from IPPC Secretariat

12.1 Update from the IPPC regional workshops

[111] The secretariat gave an update from the IPPC regional workshops held in 2022.¹⁷ Seven workshops had been held during August and September, these being held in person, in virtual mode, or as a hybrid of the two. Preliminary feedback on the workshops had indicated that participants were satisfied with the organization of the workshops. The secretariat outlined some of the factors that may have contributed to the success of the workshops and some of the suggestions that had been made for future improvements.

[112] **Support to regions.** The secretariat explained that workshop participants had called for training in the use of the OCS to be reintroduced to future regional workshops. One bureau member suggested that training could also be provided on the role of the chairperson and rapporteur. The secretariat confirmed that training on the use of the OCS is organized every year by the secretariat on request and includes a video tutorial which lasts about an hour.

[113] **Timing of workshops.** The bureau welcomed the suggestion made by workshop participants to adjust the timing of the workshops to maximize the input to consultations. The secretariat commented that, if the IPPC Secretary were to attend all regional workshops as suggested at the 2022 workshops, it would be easier if the workshops were spread over the period July to September.

[114] **Making it easier to submit comments on OCS.** The secretariat confirmed that the system is not currently set up to allow countries to submit a comment as both a country comment and a regional subcomment simultaneously: the comment has to be entered twice. The bureau noted that, in one region,

¹⁷ 06_Bureau_2022_Oct.

this duplication is avoided by the NPPOs simply saying that they agree with the RPPO comment (if they do), rather than repeating it.

[115] **Funding arrangements for regional workshops.** The secretariat explained that, according to the *Guidelines for IPPC regional workshops*, “each organizing committee and participant are encouraged to make efforts to help secure funding for their workshop”. However, this year there appeared to have been more requests from regions for financial support. The secretariat had been able to respond to these requests using surplus funds left over from travel savings from the COVID-19 pandemic in 2021, but the same level of support would not be available in future years.

[116] The bureau recognized the key role that regional workshops play in the standard setting process and the importance of ensuring that contracting parties are not excluded from participating in standard setting by funding constraints. One bureau member suggested that, as there was now more emphasis on the regional workshops being IPPC workshops, perhaps it was appropriate that the secretariat provide funding to help developing countries but with the default being that regions are encouraged to self-fund. Another bureau member suggested that the secretariat provide financial support for things like interpretation but not for travel, although acknowledged that travel costs were the major obstacle for attendance.

[117] The bureau discussed whether financial support may be available through FAO regional offices, recalling that such funding had been available in the past. The secretariat suggested that an approach could be made to the Director of the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division in this regard.

[118] The secretariat suggested that there could be a policy or guidelines stating that the secretariat can help regional organizing committees to mobilize funding resources. The secretariat also highlighted the need for effective communication to encourage organizing committees and participants to find sources of funding and to emphasize the importance of the workshops.

[119] The bureau and secretariat noted that the current *Guidelines for IPPC regional workshops* were broad enough to allow the different models of funding discussed in this meeting, but that the guidance on funding needed expanding.

[120] The bureau:

- (1) *noted* the update from the IPPC regional workshops; and
- (2) *requested* that the secretariat review the guidance on funding in the *Guidelines for IPPC regional workshops* and draft changes to reflect the discussions at this meeting, for consideration by the bureau at a future meeting.

12.2 IPPC partnership framework

[121] The secretariat referred the bureau to the SPG paper on the development of an IPPC Partnership Framework.¹⁸ This was a revised version of a paper discussed at the 2021 SPG and had been modified to take account of SPG comments on whether the document was presenting a strategy or a framework and what is defined as a high-value partner.

[122] **Relationships and partnerships.** The secretariat noted the diversity of the 47 organizations with which the secretariat has relationships and confirmed that the secretariat management team had recently discussed drawing up criteria to identify which of these organizations the secretariat should prioritize.

[123] The bureau emphasized the need to be clear about the benefit that each of these partnerships brings to the IPPC community. The secretariat commented that for some partnerships the benefit relates to branding, communication and outreach, but for others there may be a tangible benefit to core IPPC activities. The bureau noted that flagship initiatives that deliver concrete benefits can be used to leverage further partners.

¹⁸ 10_SPG_2022_Oct.

[124] The bureau noted that there is a difference between having a relationship with another organization and having a partnership with them, and that having a contract with an organization does not necessarily mean that it is a partnership. The bureau noted that the paper did describe criteria that agreements should meet to be eligible for partnership status, but that this did not mean that any agreements that met these criteria had to be partnerships. The bureau considered whether the SPG paper was clear about the distinction between relationships and partnerships but concluded that no changes were needed to the wording in this respect (but see also agenda item 14).

[125] **Approval of partnerships.** The bureau discussed whether CPM approval was needed for partnerships or whether CPM just needed to be informed. The bureau agreed to the latter, to retain the flexibility to take advantage of beneficial partnership opportunities as and when they arise. They noted that all proposed partnership agreements would, in any case, be submitted to the bureau for approval, that the bureau acts for the CPM between sessions, and that all partnership agreements would be subject to a rigorous FAO assessment process.

[126] **Terminating partnerships.** One bureau member suggested adding a paragraph explaining how to terminate a partnership, to allow for situations where a partnership does not work well. The secretariat was agreeable to this suggestion but also pointed out that there would be a detailed Memorandum of Understanding for each partnership that would be submitted to the bureau for review, and this could specify how the partnership could be terminated. FAO partnership agreements are also always for a defined period.

[127] The bureau:

- (1) *noted* the SPG paper on promoting partnerships and *requested* that the secretariat add a paragraph about termination of partnerships and amend the text about informing the first available CPM session of written agreements.

12.3 Update on legacies of International Year of Plant Health

[128] The secretariat gave an overview of two of the main legacies of the International Year of Plant Health: the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH) and the first International Plant Health Conference.¹⁹ The response rate to the post-conference survey had been low, but the feedback on the session content had been positive and a clear interest in future conferences had been expressed, with the most popular frequency for the conferences being every two to three years.

[129] The secretariat confirmed that, even though the responsibility for observance of the International Days lies with FAO, there would still be secretariat involvement with future IDPHs. It was not yet known by what process ideas for IDPHs would be gathered, but it was likely that the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division would reach out to contracting parties in any case.

[130] The bureau:

- (1) *noted* the update on legacies of the International Year of Plant Health (IYPH); and
- (2) *noted* that:
 - the CPM-16 (2022) decision to transform the former IYPH Technical Advisory Board into the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH) International Steering Committee will not be pursued, as the responsibility for observance of the International Days lies with FAO, and
 - if it is decided to hold an International Plant Health Conference in future years, the conference and the IDPH should be held as separate events (as agreed by CPM-16 (2022)).

13. Any other business, part 1 (20 October)

Implementation and Capacity Development Committee membership query

[131] The secretariat informed the bureau that the Southwest Pacific representative on the IC was no longer working for an NPPO but still wished to continue as a member of the IC. The secretariat had consulted

¹⁹ 04_Bureau_2022_Oct.

the FAO Legal Office, who had pointed out that neither the terms of reference nor the rules of procedure of the IC require a person to be employed by an NPPO to be eligible to be a representative from a region. Furthermore, rules 2 and 3 of the rules of procedure indicate that decisions in connection to the nomination of members representing a region rest with that region and are communicated to the secretariat through the bureau member of that region. Moreover, rule 3 says that a region may devise its own procedures for selecting its regional representative. The FAO Legal Office had therefore advised the secretariat to ask the bureau for advice so that a consistent approach was taken with regards to the representative of the Southwest Pacific and bearing in mind that any approach or decision taken may constitute a precedent for the future.

[132] The bureau discussed the general issue of whether members of committees such as the SC and IC should be an employee of either a contracting party or an RPPO. They noted that some regions prefer their regional representatives to be government employees but other regions may wish not to exclude people who were not currently a government employee but who were otherwise highly suitable (e.g. retired NPPO employees). The bureau noted that for some committees it may be custom-and-practice for members to leave the committee if they cease to be a government employee but that, for the IC, it is a region's responsibility to decide who to nominate as their regional representative on the IC.

[133] The bureau:

- (1) *requested* that the secretariat thank the IC member representing the Southwest Pacific for raising the question about whether he could continue on the IC, and *advised* him that it is the responsibility of the region to decide who to nominate as their regional representative on the IC.

14. Debrief from Strategic Planning Group meeting 2022

[134] The bureau reviewed the outcome of the 2022 meeting of the SPG and any resulting actions for the bureau.

[135] **Sustainable funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution.** The secretariat offered to informally “test the waters” with the Director General or Deputy Director General of FAO before making any formal approach to FAO regarding ePhyto funding. The secretariat also offered to check the schedules of the relevant FAO committees, so that they would be ready to make a formal approach, should that be needed.

[136] The secretariat and bureau confirmed that there would be no actions for contracting parties before CPM-17 (2023) related to seeking FAO funding for the ePhyto Solution, but if the outcome of the informal approaches to FAO were favourable, then suggested actions for contracting parties could be outlined in the paper to CPM-17 (2023).

[137] Mindful that mandatory contributions were not possible without renegotiating the IPPC, the bureau considered the concept of a supplementary agreement that ePhyto users would sign when signing up to use the ePhyto Solution, and which would commit the user to paying the ePhyto contributions set by the CPM. This would not require the IPPC itself to be renegotiated and would only affect those contracting parties that are ePhyto users. The bureau recognized that some countries may not sign a supplementary agreement, which might affect equity of access to the ePhyto Solution, but agreed that it was still worth exploring.

[138] **Friends of the Chair (observer) policy.** The bureau agreed that there was no need to seek legal advice on this policy.

[139] **Antimicrobial resistance.** The bureau recognized that although there was a consensus that more research was needed on antimicrobial resistance (AMR), it would be too big a task to identify what research was happening on AMR and identify the gaps in time to prepare a CPM paper on this. The secretariat explained that they had asked the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) whether Euphresco could do this, but EPPO had advised that a research institution would need to be involved. One bureau member suggested that the paper to CPM on One Health could simply say that the SPG agreed that more research was needed on AMR. The bureau acknowledged, however, that

AMR was only one component of One Health and recalled that the main focus of the SPG discussion had been the relationship between the strategic activities of the secretariat and One Health.

[140] **IPPC Observatory.** The bureau and secretariat concluded that, based on the discussion at the SPG, there was still insufficient understanding within contracting parties about what the IPPC Observatory is and what benefits it can bring. It would therefore be premature to promote it. The CPM chairperson suggested that the paper could still be submitted to CPM-17 (2023) to see what response it received. Some other bureau members suggested that it needed improvement, to include a short explanation of the purpose of the observatory at the start of the paper and to address the overlaps with CPM focus groups on SFDAs.

[141] One bureau member suggested that, as NPPOs are tired of completing surveys, it would be good if the observatory could do more than surveys, for instance by conducting a major study each year or every other year. The member therefore suggested that the paper needed to be reworked with a stronger value proposition about what the observatory would bring to the IPPC community.

[142] **Communications strategy.** The bureau noted that the consensus at the SPG had been that the OCS would not be an appropriate mechanism by which to consult NPPOs and that the SPG had suggested a further option of a webinar or prerecorded presentation.

[143] The bureau recalled the various comments at the SPG about the linkages between the implementation plans related to individual SFDAs and the overarching implementation plan.

[144] **Food aid.** The secretariat confirmed that they would reach out one more time to the World Food Programme to invite them to participate in the focus group.

[145] The bureau:

- (1) *requested* that the secretariat informally explore with FAO colleagues the possibility of FAO funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution and explore the feasibility of supplementary agreements;
- (2) *supported* the plan of the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers for a second workshop on sea containers, to be held in 2023, and *agreed* that, if it were to be externally funded, there was no need for CPM approval;
- (3) *referred* the CPM Focus Group on Communications to the discussion at the 2022 SPG about the preferred mechanism to be used to consult on the draft communications strategy, and *suggested* that both a simple survey to all IPPC official contact points and a webinar be used;
- (4) *noted* that the overarching IPPC Communications Strategy needs to have a clear focus on implementing the IPPC Strategic Framework 2022–2023, and *invited* each group responsible for developing one of the strategic framework development agenda items to consider communications when drafting their annual workplan and to align the communications component with the overarching IPPC Communications Strategy; and
- (5) *agreed* that, among the papers for CPM-17 (2023), papers on the following issues would be prepared for consideration by the bureau (with leads and other information indicated below in parentheses):
 - disclaimer paragraph for CPM recommendations, IPPC guides and training materials (secretariat and Samuel BISHOP (Europe), in consultation with the FAO Legal Office),
 - policy statement on CPM Friends of the Chair (Samuel BISHOP (Europe), taking account of comments made by the SPG),
 - One Health (secretariat, short paper drawing upon discussions at SPG meeting and October bureau meeting),
 - IPPC Observatory (secretariat, taking account of the bureau's discussion at this meeting),
 - IPPC partnership framework (secretariat, clearly distinguishing the various types of relationships), and
 - oversight and administration of IPPC dispute settlement (secretariat and Samuel BISHOP (Europe), considering the comments on the diagram referred to at the SPG),

- safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid (secretariat, update only).

15. CPM-17 (2023) side-session discussion

[146] The bureau noted that the SPG had suggested the IPPC Observatory, One Health and an update on sea containers as possible topics for side sessions at CPM-17 (2023). The bureau considered these alongside the topics they had suggested before the SPG meeting, also recalling their decision before the SPG to include a science session on the use of biotechnology in plant protection on the Thursday of the CPM agenda (agenda item 9.3).

[147] The bureau recognized that, because the plenary sessions would be shorter as a result of interpretation constraints, there may be insufficient time in the schedule for a science session.

[148] The bureau:

- (1) *agreed* that there should be two side sessions at CPM-17 (2023) –an orientation session for NPPO delegations (including an introduction to IPPC guides and training materials) and an update on activities related to sea containers; and
- (2) *retracted* their previous decision to hold a science session on the Thursday of CPM-17 (2023).

16. CPM Bureau meeting schedule for 2023

[149] The bureau considered the schedule of bureau meetings for 2023, including a proposal from the secretariat that two of the meetings (March and October) be held in person and two (June and December) be held in virtual mode, as COVID restrictions may prevent some bureau members from attending meetings in person. The bureau recalled that the June bureau meeting would normally last five days, which would be too long for a virtual meeting, and the content of it would benefit from the meeting being in person.

[150] The bureau:

- (1) *agreed* that bureau meetings in 2023 would be held in March, June and October (all face-to-face) and in December (in virtual mode), but with the possibility of the June meeting being held virtually, depending on the COVID situation.

17. Any other business, part 2 (26 October)

17.1 CPM-16 (2022) decisions that have financial implications

[151] **IPPC Observatory.** The secretariat recalled that CPM-16 (2022) had requested that the Finance Committee, with support from the secretariat, consider allocating USD 185 000 per year from the secretariat's regular programme as baseline funding to cover the fixed costs of the IPPC Observatory. The bureau considered but declined this request.

[152] **Pest outbreak and alert systems.** The secretariat recalled that CPM-16 (2022) had requested that the Finance Committee consider how to allocate an appropriate level of resources to continue the work on POARS during 2022 (which presumably meant 2023).

[153] The bureau recognized the synergies between the work on POARS and the global phytosanitary programme currently being considered by the secretariat, noting that POARS may form the structure through which the new phytosanitary programme is delivered.

[154] The bureau:

- (1) *agreed* that the fixed costs of the IPPC Observatory, not just the costs of studies and surveys, should be mobilized from extra-budgetary sources; and
- (2) *agreed* that a contract position (i.e. one drawn from extra-budgetary resources) should be created to support the work of the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Steering Group and the development of plans for a global phytosanitary programme.

18. Next meeting

[155] The next meeting is scheduled for 15 December 2022 in virtual mode.

19. Close of the meeting

[156] The CPM chairperson and the IPPC Secretary thanked all participants for their contributions and support. The CPM chairperson closed the meeting.

APPENDIX 01 – Provisional Agenda

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1.	Opening of the Meeting	--	Lucien K. KOUAMÉ <i>CPM Chairperson</i> Osama EL LISSY <i>IPPC Secretary</i>
2.	Meeting Arrangements	-	DENG
2.1	Adoption of the Agenda	01_Bureau_2022_Oct	KOUAMÉ
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1.	Document list	02_Bureau_2022_Oct	DENG
3.2.	Participant list	03_Bureau_2022_Oct	DENG
3.3.	Local Information	Link to the Local Information	
4.	Follow up Actions from Bureau meeting June 2022	Link to the June 2022 Report	KOUAMÉ
5.	Preparation for SPG of October 2022	Link to SPG agenda	GREIFER
6.	Updates from CPM Focus Groups		
6.1	Implementation of the Strategic Framework 2020 – 2030 Development Agenda Items.	Link to SPG paper	THOMSON / GILMORE
6.2	Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues action plan	Link to SPG paper	BISHOP / MANGILI
6.3	Communications strategy	Link to SPG paper	WANG / FRIO
6.4	ePhyto Sustainable Funding	Link to SPG paper	THOMSON / FEDCHOCK
6.5	Safe Provision of Food and other Humanitarian Aid	Link to SPG paper	KOUAME / MOREIRA
6.6	Sea Containers	07_Bureau_2022_Oct	WOLFF/ SHAMILOV
6.7	Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems Steering Group - Nomination of members	08_Bureau_2022_Oct_Rev Link to SPG paper	BRUNEL
7.	Discussion on Dispute Settlement future oversight function	Link to SPG paper	BISHOP/ KOUNBA
8.	Development of observer policy	Link to SPG paper	GREIFER/ BISHOP
9.	Preparation for CPM-17 (2023)		
9.1	Agenda (restructuring proposal)	Link to SPG paper	DENG/ CASSIN
9.2	Identification of Keynote Speaker	-	BUREAU MEMBERS
9.3	Side sessions proposals and preparations	-	BUREAU MEMBERS
10.	Updates from CPM Subsidiary Bodies		
10.1	Update from the Standards Committee (SC)	05_Bureau_2022_Oct	NERSISYAN
10.2	Update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)	-	BRUNEL
11.	Finance, Budgetary and Work Plan		
11.1	Discussion on work plan and budget of the IPPC Secretariat 2023	-	BENOVIC

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
11.2	Discussion on future mode of operating - Lessons learned from virtual meetings	-	THOMSON / ALL
12.	Updates from IPPC Secretariat		
12.1	Update from the IPPC Regional Workshops	06_Bureau_2022_Oct	GILMORE
12.2	IPPC Partnership Strategy	Link to SPG paper	DENG/ FEDCHOCK
12.3	Update on IYPH legacies	04_Bureau_2022_Oct	DENG/ CASSIN
13.	Any Other Business	--	KOUAMÉ
14.	Next Meeting	Post SPG (27 October 2022)	KOUAMÉ
15.	Closing of the Meeting	--	KOUAMÉ

APPENDIX 02 - Documents List

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
01_Bureau_2022_Oct	2.1	Agenda	30-09-2022 07-10-2022 11-10-2022
02_Bureau_2022_Oct	3.1	Documents List	07-10-2022 11-10-2022
03_Bureau_2022_Oct	3.2	Participants List	07-10-2022
04_Bureau_2022_Oct	12.3	Update on IYPH legacies	07-10-2022
05_Bureau_2022_Oct	10.1	Update from the Standards Committee (SC)	07-10-2022
06_Bureau_2022_Oct	12.1	Update from the IPPC Regional Workshops	07-10-2022
07_Bureau_2022_Oct	6.6	Update on CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers	07-10-2022
08_Bureau_2022_Oct_Rev	6.7	Nominations for Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems Steering Group	07-10-2022 10-10-2022

APPENDICE 03 – Participants List

Attending	Participant role / Region	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
✓	Africa <i>Chairperson</i>	Mr Lucien KOUAME KONAN Inspecteur Direction de la Protection des Végétaux, du Contrôle et de la Qualité Ministère de l'Agriculture B.P. V7 Abidjan, COTE D'IVOIR	l_kouame@yahoo.fr
✓	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 CHINA	wangfuxiang@agri.gov.cn
✓	Europe	Mr Sam BISHOP Head of International Plant Health Policy Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs York UK	sam.bishop@defra.gsi.gov.uk
	Latin America and Caribbean	Mr Francisco Javier TRUJILLO ARRIAGA DIRECTOR EN JEFE Servicio Nacional de Sanidad, Inocuidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria (SENASICA) Secretaría de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural (SADER) Insurgentes Sur 489, Mezzanine Col. Hipódromo, 06100 Cuauhtémoc, CDMX MEXICO	trujillo@senasica.gob.mx ;
✓	Near East	Mr Ahmed Kamal EL-ATTAR Head of Central Administration of Plant Quarantine Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation Giza EGYPT	ippc@capq.gov.eg ; ahmadkamal-arc@hotmail.com ;
✓	North America (Vice Chairperson)	Mr John GREIFER Assistant Deputy Administrator Plant Protection and Quarantine APHIS, USDA 1400 Independence Av. SW Washington, DC 20250 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	john.k.greifer@usda.gov

Attending	Participant role / Region	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
✓	Southwest Pacific	Mr Peter THOMSON Director Plants & Pathways Biosecurity New Zealand - Tiakitanga Pūtaiao Aotearoa Ministry for Primary Industries - Manatū Ahu Matua TSB House 147 Lambton Quay PO Box 2526 Wellington 6140 NEW ZEALAND	Peter.Thomson@mpi.govt.nz

Secretariat / Others

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone, nationality	Email address
✓	Latin America and Caribbean	Mr Diego QUIROGA Director Nacional de Protección Vegetal SENASA ARGENTINA	dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar
✓	North America / Sea containers	Mr Greg WOLFF Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive, OTTAWA, ON. K1A 0Y9 CANADA	greg.wolff@canada.ca
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Osama EL-LISSY	Osama.Ellissy@fao.org ;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Avetik NERSISYAN	Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Arop DENG	Arop.Deng@fao.org ;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Marko BENOVIC	Marko.Benovic@fao.org ;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Craig FEDCHOCK	Craig.Fedchock@fao.org ;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Adriana MOREIRA	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Sarah BRUNEL	Sarah.Brunel@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Aoife CASSIN	Aoife.Cassin@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat / Report writer	Ms Karen ROUEN	karen@karenrouen.com
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Erika MANGILI	Erika.MangiliAndre@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Descartes KOUMBA	Descartes.Koumba@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr John GILMORE	John.Gilmore@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Artur SHAMILOV	Artur.Shamilov@fao.org

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone, nationality	Email address
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Zdravka DIMITROVA	Zdravka.Dimitrova@fao.org