



INTER-AFRICAN PHYTOSANITARY COUNCIL CONSEIL PHYTOSANITAIRE INTERAFRICAIN
Yaoundé, CAMEROUN P. O. Box 4170 Téléphone 2221 19 69 Fax : 2 221 19 67 E-mail : au-cpi@au-appo.org

African participation to CPM8: 08-12 April, 2013

Draft Report

Prof. Jean Baptiste BAHAMA, Senior Scientific Officer, AU- IAPSC

May 2013

1. Introduction

African participation to CPM has been very low so far. The PAN-SPSO project was established with a goal of contributing to the reduction of poverty and enhancing food security in Africa through greater access for agricultural products from African countries to international markets. The specific objective of the project is to improve the efficiency of the participation of African countries in the activities of the *Codex Alimentarius* Commission, OIE, and IPPC during the formulation of international standards on food safety, animal and plant health through the services of the African Union Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU/IBAR) (project Regional Authorizing Officer (RAO)) and the Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (AU-IAPSC) working with the RECs. PANSPSO is now in its 2nd phase and progress have been made with regard to participation to phytosanitary standards setting through organization of technical meetings to discuss draft standards and preparatory meeting for the Commission for Phytosanitary Measures sessions. **The latter is the governing body of the IPPC and is responsible for the development and adoption of the ISPMs through wider consultations of the IPPC contracting parties. The CPM convenes annually meetings to discuss among other issues matters of global phytosanitary importance as well as adoption of ISPMs.** This report relates to the 8th session of CPM held in Rome from 8th to 12th April 2013.

2. Strategy for participation

Although some improvement had been achieved, the participation of Africa at CPM was still low. There was a need to adopt a strategy for building and defending common positions. For the 8th session, 2 meetings were held, one in Libreville-Gabon for ECCAS countries through the FAO capacity building project and another in Entebbe-Uganda for selected countries with support of PANSPSO and IAPSC program budget. The strategy was to deeply analyze the topics on the CPM agenda, understand the background of each document and identify those with a particular interest for Africa. For each topic of interest, prepare a comment and assign to it a country responsible for presentation at plenary and supporting countries. In case there would be lengthy discussions on the topic during the plenary, other countries were requested to raise their flag and support. In case no comment was made and during discussion some points need to be raised, a country could do it and it was agreed that for every African intervention, other African delegates were to support, never oppose.

The other important element of the strategy was the participation to evening sessions, ad hoc commissions and side events. Every morning, IAPSC organized a meeting for reporting from evening sessions, evaluation of the previous day and assignment of roles for the day. Details on the positions and the outcomes are provided below.

3. Common positions from preparatory meetings (Entebbe&Libreville), role distribution and CPM decision

Position	Responsible and supporters	CPM decision
<p>1. Possible criteria to determine if a formal objection is technically justified 8.1.7(CPM 2013/04)</p> <p>Participants strongly urge that the region should first formulate changes in the Agenda. Participants felt concerned about a group composed of CPM Bureau Chair, SC Chair and Secretariat with the power of lifting a technically justified formal objection and pushing the concerned ISPM up to adoption and publication. Is that group a new organ? If not some change should be made to avoid violation of the normal process.</p>	<p>Responsible: Gabon Supporters: Congo, Chad</p>	<p>The change in the agenda was accepted and the 3 countries were requested to make a proposal of the figure. The group was then removed from the chart</p>
<p>2. Guidelines for Nomination, Selection and Rotation of the CPM Chairperson and Vice Chairperson: 7.1.2 (CMP 2013/22):</p> <p>Though participants agreed on rotation based on regions, it was felt that without any documented clarification, they could not understand the decision as to why the Vice-Chairperson could not achieve automatic succession for position of Chair. It was thus recommended that since rotations are based on regions, the Vice-Chairperson should automatically succeed for Chairperson except under special circumstances.</p> <p>Paragraph 3 Annexe 1. Clarify that candidates should belong to NPPO and <u>if possible</u> should have served as a member of the Bureau for one term.</p>	<p>Responsible : Uganda Supporters : Angola, Burundi</p>	<p>The clarification on paragraphe 3 annex 1 was accepted and the article on rotation reviewed according to the African proposal to remove the confusing terms</p>
<p>3. Draft Rules of Procedure for the Strategic Planning Group (SPG):7.4 (CPM 2013/16):</p> <p>With regards to draft Rules of Procedure for the Strategic Planning Group (SPG), it was observed that although the Strategic Planning Group has been an adopted group, its mandate is not clear and its terms of reference overlap with those of existing organs. There was a request that Africa region seek for what have triggered to the formation of such group.</p> <p>There are no clues to why that group should be institutionalized and there was concern about the regional balance of this composition. Keeping its</p>	<p>Responsible: Kenya Supporters: RDC, Angola</p>	<p>It was accepted that clearer mandate will be given to avoid overlapping</p>

Position	Responsible and supporters	CPM decision
<p>functioning as the SPTA would be the best option.</p>		
<p>4. Adoption of international standards: 8.1.2 (CPM 2013/03) CPM 2013/03-1: Draft Annex 4 (Pest Risk Analysis for Plants as Quarantine Pests)</p> <p>Participants agreed to the amendment made to this standard and no formal objection has been made prior to consideration for adoption of this standard at the CPM. However participants from French speaking countries expressed difficulties with the translated version of this document and recommend that translation is done to reflect as close as possible the content of the original document in English. Moreover, participants were keenly concerned about the issue of invasive species raised in the document. They considered it a matter that required particular attention.</p>	<p>Responsible: Burkina Faso Supporters: DRC, Tunisia</p>	<p>The request was accepted</p>
<p>5. CPM 2013/03-2: Draft Revision of Annex 1 (Approved treatments associated with wood packaging materials)</p> <p>Discussion was centered mainly to the use of methyl bromide as there is a strong request to look for alternative of which members express that so far there is no alternative for the replacement of such treatment. It is to be recalled that the Montreal Protocol restrictions do not apply to the use of MB for quarantine purposes.</p> <p>What is meant by dielectric treatment is confusing: The Technical Group for the Glossary would provide a definition of the term dielectric treatment.</p>	<p>Responsible: South Africa Supporters: Gabon, Senegal</p>	<p>It was accepted that so far there is no alternative to MB and that research are underway. It was requested to the Glossary panel to include clear definition of “dielectric treatment”</p>
<p>6. CPM 2013/19 Rev.1 Proposed ink amendments to correct inconsistencies in the use of terms in adopted standards:8.1.3:</p> <p>Participants raised the concern about the risk of change of the meaning of the text when reviewing a particular standard.</p>	<p>Responsible: Madagascar Supporters: Mali, Comoros</p>	<p>The comment was noted</p>
<p>7. List of Topics for IPPC Standards: International movement of Grain (2008-007):8.1.4 (CPM 2013/06)</p>	<p>Responsible: Kenya Supporters: Nigeria, Madagascar</p>	<p>There were two main positions: USA, Latin America position and Japan defending</p>

Position	Responsible and supporters	CPM decision
<p>International movement of Grain (2008-007): participants strongly voiced out the importance of having a standard for the movement of grain to enable the regulation of phytosanitary concerns associated with grain. The reason why three options are tabled for CPM consideration despite the demand of many contracting parties is not clear.</p>		<p>the development of a guide and the African position later supported by Europe and China requesting for a standard. An ad hoc commission “friends of the chair” was constituted and concluded that the development of an ISPM should continue.</p>
<p>8. List of Topics for IPPC Standards: 8.1.4 List of Topics for IPPC Standards: Chart of Work on Topics for IPPC Standards in 2012:8.1.4 (CPM 2013/INF/01):</p> <p>Participants proposed that there is need to take a position regarding the powers taken by the Standard Committee (SC): concerns were raised specifically about changes of priority of topics already adopted by CPM.</p>	<p>Responsible: South Africa Supporters: Guinée Equatoriale, Niger</p>	<p>The position was noted.</p>
<p>9. Proposed changes for the rules of procedure for the Standards Committee 8.1.6 (CPM 2013/08):</p> <p>As an observation participants felt that since the status of observers is restricted and it is the chairperson to nominate candidates, then there is need to spell out the criteria for observers and their specific roles.</p>	<p>Responsible: Ghana Supporters: Guinée, Ethiopia</p>	<p>The concern was about the balance among regions and countries. It was agreed that special attention will be given to the the balance.</p>
<p>10. Establishment of the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) 10.2(CPM 2013/13):</p> <p>If CDC is a technical committee, its members don’t represent FAO regions. In case regions’ representativity is needed, then the normal procedure for nomination to other organs should apply and NPPOs/RPPOs should have a say.</p>	<p>Responsible: Mozambique Supporters: Sierra Leone, Togo</p>	<p>CPM recommended that from now on selection will be done by regions</p>

Position	Responsible and supporters	CPM decision
<p>11. Proposed CPM recommendations based on implementation review and support systems studies 13.2(CPM 2013/17 Rev1):</p> <p>Internet Trade of Plants needs to be regulated for phytosanitary purposes. Guidelines on how to regulate the subject matter of concern are needed. A request to the SC for the development of a manual which can guide inspectors on what to look for during the activity. Part of the solution should be to develop capacity National and Regional level to detect these materials.</p>	<p>Responsible: Nigeria</p> <p>Supporters: Kenya, Uganda</p>	<p>The request was noted</p>

4. Lessons learned and conclusions

The participation of Africa at CPM 8 has been impressive thanks to a hard work for preparation and continuous coordination during the session.

With regard to preparation, 2 meetings were organized and documents to be discussed at CPM were thoroughly analyzed. Having a clear understanding of documents helped participants to be confident and stick to their positions.

During the session, participation to evening sessions and side events was crucial: it helps understand what is at stake and better defend the position. For example, we understood from evening session on movement of grains why some countries were not interested in the development of an ISPM. We came to understand that the grain industry was acting behind the scene and that Africa as big importer of grain had to speak out.

Daily evaluation of what has been done and what remains to be done is essential to keep momentum during the whole session.

CPM8 was a good test of the strength of Africa. There is still room for improvement and now we know what the key elements to enhance participation are.

Major achievements during the Seventh Session of Commission on Phytosanitary Measures

Significant strategic decisions were made during Seventh Session of Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-7) that affect resources, processes and priority of the IPPC work programme.

CPM-7 was held in Rome from 19th to 23rd March 2012. The meeting was attended 372 participants representing 143 contracting parties, 3 non-contracting parties, 2 non-governmental organizations and 13 inter-governmental organizations.

Ms Ann Tutwiler, Deputy Director-General Knowledge, opened the meeting by expressing her gratitude towards the IPPC describing it as “the only organisation in the world that brings together countries and organisations that are linked to international plant health to discuss, debate and establish the standards by which the entire world bases its trade in plant and plant products.”

CPM-7 was unique as the IPPC are celebrating their 60th Anniversary in April 2012 – see

www.ippc.int/60years for more detail - with a half-day symposium.

The main outcomes of CPM-7 are listed below:

- A new IPPC Strategic Framework (2012-2019) <http://bit.ly/HnXnxS>.
- The IPPC Resource Mobilization Strategy was adopted to strengthen further efforts to gain external funds to support the IPPC work programme <http://bit.ly/H3B9ht>.
- Six international standards (two new standards, one revision, one new supplement, and two new diagnostic protocols) were adopted.
- Modifications to the IPPC standard setting process were agreed to increase efficiency, participation and transparency. This is the third revision in 14 years.
- Establishment of an oversight body for capacity development, the Capacity Development Committee (CDC), was agreed on, and will be subject to review in two years time.
- The results of activities in the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) – the IPPC Monitoring and Evaluation system - were reported and welcomed.
- Information exchange and communication continue to be the focal point of all IPPC activities.
- Substantial interest was shown regarding issues related to FAO Article XIV bodies, for which requests were made for further relevant information.
- ePhyto (electronic certification), based on ISPM 12, was considered a high priority by members.
- Recognized the Near East Plant Protection Organization (NEPPO) as the tenth Regional Plant Protection Organization (RPPO) under the IPPC.
- A half-day symposium for the 60th Anniversary of the IPPC introduced video messages from the Ministers of a number of countries and covered the review of achievements as well as emerging issues, such as internet trade and aquatic plants. At the end of the symposium, members adopted an IPPC Declaration.
- Side-events and poster sessions were well attended with active participation.
- The new chairperson elected for the period 2012-2013 is Mr. Stephen Ashby of the UK. The two vice-chairpersons are Mr. Mohammad Katbeh-Bader from Jordan, and also the previous chairperson, and Mr. Francisco Gutierrez from Belize.

2013

African participation to CPM8: 08-12
April, 2013 Draft Rreport Prof. Jean
Baptiste Bahama, S senior scientific
officer, AU- IAPSC May 2013

AU-IAPSC

AU-IAPSC

<http://archives.au.int/handle/123456789/1858>

Downloaded from African Union Common Repository