

# **PREPARATORY TECHNICAL MEETING FOR CPM 8**

## **Report**

**ENTEBBE; 11-13 MARCH 2013**

## 1. Introduction

The Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (AU-IAPSC) and the African Union Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU/IBAR) organized jointly a technical meeting for the preparation of the 8<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission for Phytosanitary Measures (CPM8) due in Rome 8-12 April 2013.

Part of the funds was provided by the consolidation phase of the project Participation of African Nations in Sanitary and Phytosanitary standards-Setting Organizations (PAN-SPSO). With regard to phytosanitary, the project funded by the European Commission (EC) is specifically aimed at improving the participation of African countries in the activities of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

The other part of the funds for the activity was provided by the program budget of IAPSC in its component relating to SPS enforcement.

The preparatory meeting was held in Entebbe on 11-13 March 2013 and aimed at achieving common positions for the CPM, the governing body of the IPPC and responsible for the development and adoption of the International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) through consultations of the IPPC contracting parties.

Once adopted by CPM, the ISPMs are recognized as the basis for phytosanitary measures applied by Members of the World Trade Organization under the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement).

CPM is therefore a critical step in phytosanitary standards setting process and building common positions for CPM is therefore crucial for Africa Region.

## 2. Objectives of the preparatory meeting to CPM 8

The Overall objective was to assist countries in the preparation of African positions on the various items on the agenda of CPM8. This was achieved through:

- ✓ Reviewing the draft Agenda for the 8<sup>th</sup> CPM Session and adopting a strategy and common positions on pertinent Agenda items (Annex 1)
- ✓ Analyzing and commenting on the final drafts ISPMs submitted for adoption;
- ✓ Providing the opportunity to benefit from explanations regarding the background and content of documents on the CPM8 agenda;
- ✓ Planning for the coordination of countries' participation during the session of CPM ;

Details on the discussions are provided by the Annex 2 and the comments to be presented during the plenary are in annex 3. The latter will be circulated to all NPPOs for use by their delegates at CPM8.

It was agreed that common positions adopted and roles during CPM8 are distributed by IAPSC during the pre-CPM meeting of Sunday 7<sup>th</sup> April 2013 and whenever necessary during the plenary.

### **3. Participants to the meeting**

Due to funds limitations, the following countries were selected on the criteria of attendance of previous CPM meetings and balance among RECs: Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Gabon, Cameroon, South Africa, Malawi, Kenya, Uganda, Madagascar, Niger, Sierra Leone, Ghana, Senegal, Mozambique, Cote d'Ivoire, Tunisia, Burkina Faso, Swaziland, Tanzania, Seychelles, Nigeria, Guinea Bissau, Egypt and Algeria. The meeting was facilitated by IAPSC.

### **4. Opening ceremony and election of the Bureau**

The opening session was marked by 2 speeches: remarks Prof. Bahama Jean-Baptiste, PANSPSO Focal point at IAPSC and Facilitator of the Meeting and the opening speech by Komayombi J. Bulegeya, the Commissioner for Crop Protection, Uganda. They all put emphasis on the importance of achieving common positions in CPM meetings as the ultimate step for standards adoption and standard setting work plan. They also urged countries to comment on standards and to participate to various steps of the standards setting process.

The meeting was chaired by Uganda while Seychelles and Gabon were reporters.

### **5. Review and adoption of the agenda**

The proposed agenda was an extract from the provisional agenda of CPM8.

For this meeting, more emphasis was put on items relating to standards and capacity development for implementation of ISPMs. Thus, the adopted agenda (Annex 1) comprises various items including:

- Governance of CPM
- International standard setting and implementation programme
- Phytosanitary capacity Development
- IPPC Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)

### **6. Governance of CPM**

Documents relating to Nomination, Selection and Rotation of the CPM Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson, rules of procedure for the Strategic Planning Group were analyzed.

Concerning the rules for CPM, it was mentioned that previously there were no rules for rotation and the suggested procedure try to mix up so as to ensure a good representation from different regions. 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.**

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.

**There are no clues to why that group should be institutionalized and there was concern about the regional balance of this composition. Keeping its functioning as the SPTA is the best option.**

## **7. International standards setting**

### **7.1. Adoption of International standards**

The two draft standards to be submitted to CMP8 for adoption were discussed:

- draft Annex 4 (Pest Risk analysis for plants as Quarantine pests) to ISPM 11:2004 and consequential changes to the core text of ISPM 11. 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 be 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.** Having made these comments participants agreed to support the adoption of the Draft Annex 4 to ISPM 11 during the 8<sup>th</sup> CPM Session.
- **the revision of Annex 1** (Approved treatment Associated with wood packaging materials) to ISPM 15:2009 and consequential revision of Annex 2 (the mark and its application) to ISPM 15:2009. During the discussion some members shared their experience of heat treatment for better understanding and shared its practicability, further highlighting that no issues regarding non compliance has been so far encountered. Participants observed that this standard is very technical and requires a certain level of experience in the field of work. 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.

### **7.2. Other items relating to standards setting**

Beside the 2 draft ISPMs, other items relating to standards setting process were discussed. These include:

- **Ink amendments** to correct inconsistencies in the use of terms in adopted standards: during the discussion participants raised the concern about the risk of change of the meaning of the text when reviewing a particular standard.
- **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.
- **List of Topics for IPPC Standards:** Chart of Work on Topics for IPPC Standards in 2012.

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.

Concerning topics submission, it was recommended that countries and IAPSC establish a strong linkage for effective communication and coordination to push topics of interest for Africa.

There should be a focal point at IAPSC to collect topics in order to prioritize them before they are sent to CPM. Especially for this year 2013, countries are requested to identify some topics to be submitted in May.

Participants also noted that out of the 122 topics there has not been an African steward so far. Emphasis was then laid on the need to have a data base of experts in Africa compiled and maintained by AU-IAPSC, from which experts can be sourced for Phytosanitary Standards Setting.

- **Language Review Group:** participants were informed that there is an appeal on the IPP for participation to language review group but there have few responses if any from the Africa Region. It was recommended that as a continent we need to identify language specialists to participate in the language group.
- **Status of ISPM 15 Implementation:** at CPM-7 (2012) the Secretariat presented a report on the status of registration and renewal of registration of the ISPM 15 symbol.

The Secretariat advised contracting parties of the due dates for the renewal of the registration under the systems currently used to register the symbol and that they should take this into account for their appropriate action. After long discussions on the issue, participants were encouraged that they should look at ways for protecting the symbols. They expressed concerns about how the standard is practically done and translated.

Participants were encouraged to interact and share knowledge and experience regarding the status of implementing ISPM No.15 in the region.

- **E-Phyto Updates:** participants were informed that some countries have participated in the various consultations on the subject and that they can share their experiences and relevant information to others. They requested Kenya to share its experience of E-Certification as this would help develop capacity in the region. The NPPO of Kenya assured members of the possibility to apply E- Certification and is willing to share expertise but clearly pointed out that there is a need for IT Capacity.

- **Regional workshops on Draft ISPMs:** it was observed that contracting parties that have submitted comments in 2012 is low: for Africa, only 13 countries out of 35 which attended the workshop. As requested by the IPPC Secretariat, contact points would include at least one general comment on each specific standard to inform that there was no intention to submit any comment. This would allow the Secretariat to differentiate between a lack of comments due to the absence of concerns on technical issues and a lack of willingness to participate in the process.

In case contact points encounter difficulties with the Online Comment System, they were advised to use other means of sending their comments in order to exercise their rights.

With regards to funding the workshops, it was proposed that the region should continue exploring the possibility for donors but also countries are encouraged to contribute.

- **Possible criteria to determine if a formal objection is technically justified:** the paragraph 5 document CPM 2013/03 (item 8.1.2 on the agenda: adoption of international standards) refers to the figures in CPM 2013/04 (item 8.1.7). For better understanding and consistency, item 8.1.7 should be discussed before 8.1.2.

**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.

## **8. Establishment of the Capacity Development Committee (CDC)**

Participants would like to have a strong proposition of how to handle the opening invitation for technical expert. **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.**

**Participants expressed the desire to vet nominees who will represent the Africa region on such committees.**

NPPOs were encouraged to make good use of the IAPSC and if they have the capacity to represent the region they should make their request through IAPSC which will then send the nomination to IPPC secretariat.

It is understood that the person being **nominated should belong to a National Plant Protection Organization and should be known by the region.**

## 9. Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)–2012 Report:13.1(CPM 2013/20)

Participants noted the information document emphasis on the survey that was done on 4 standards with table that summarize the result.

They also took note of proposed CPM recommendations based on implementation review and support systems studies. Concerns were raised about the internet commerce: sale of plants and plant products through the internet (e-commerce) has increased significantly in the years since the IPPC and most ISPMs were adopted. This allows the movement of regulated articles to enter a country without the required phytosanitary certification or other phytosanitary measures being put in place. In order for the global plant protection framework to keep pace with this emerging trend, NPPOs, RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat should collaborate with other stakeholders to monitor these trends and incorporate internet sales into the phytosanitary regulatory framework on the basis of risk analysis. **The following recommendations were suggested by participants to Entebbe meeting:**

- NPPOs to have strong linkages and dialogue partnership with the courier services ;
- need to create more awareness about the danger posed by Internet Trade of Plants
- Internet Trade of Plants need to be regulated for phytosanitary purposes and **guidelines should be developed on how to regulate the subject matter of concern;**
- Development of **a manual which can guide inspectors of what to look for during the activity.**

Part of the solution should be to develop capacity at National and Regional levels to detect these materials.

## 10. Recommendations

**NPPOs represented at Entebbe agreed on the following:**

- A synthesis of the comments/positions be done by IAPSC and circulated to all NPPOs;
- Comments/positions to be distributed to NPPOs for their presentation at the plenary. After presentation other NPPOs should take the floor to support.
- Coordinated participation to side events, evening sessions and various ad-hoc sub-commissions ;

**Annex 2. REPORT ON THE DISCUSSIONS OF THE CPM8 PREPARATORY MEETING HELD IN ENTEBBE, UGANDA**

**FROM 11<sup>TH</sup>-13<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2013 AT CENTRAL INN HOTEL**

	<b>DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM</b>	<b>AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS</b>	<b>PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS</b>	<b>GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS</b>
<b>1</b>	Guidelines for Nomination, Selection and Rotation of the CPM Chairperson and Vice Chairperson: 7.1.2 (CMP 2013/22)	The CPM is invited to: 1) <i>endorse</i> the guidelines for the Nomination, Selection and Rotation of the CPM Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson (attached as Annex 1) as proposed by the SPG		<p>☞ Members recommended that the rules of procedures should be written</p> <p>☞ Members agreed on rotation based on regions</p> <p>☞ Members recommended that since rotations are based on regions then the Vice Chairperson should automatically succeed for Chairperson except under special circumstances</p> <p>Also it was proposed that <i>Annex 1</i> need further clarity for better understanding</p>	<p><b>Rotation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was mentioned that previously there were no rules for rotation and <i>Annex 1</i> try to mix up so that there will be a good representative from different regions.</li> </ul> <p><b>The Gap</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Without any documented clarification, members could not understand the decision as to why the Vice Chairperson could not achieve automatic succession for position of Chair</li> <li>It was pointed out that the proposition on drafting rules of procedures for the nomination, selection and rotation of the CPM Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson is silent and request is to have it written and documented to be used as justification.</li> </ul> <p>(This carries the same meaning as the one above in (a))</p> <p>It was also noted that this process look like a</p>



	DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED	RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM	AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS	PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS	GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS
					<p>bit complicated and it will be not an easy sequence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the discussion it was clearly explained that this document is going to be tabled at CPM 8 and once it adopted it will be binding</li> </ul>
2	Draft Rules of Procedure for the Strategic Planning Group (SPG):7.4 (CPM 2013/16)	<p>CPM is invited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <i>Consider</i> the draft Rules of Procedures for the Strategic Planning Group (SPG)</li> <li>2) <i>approve</i> the draft with the amendments as needed; and,</li> <li>3) <i>agree</i> to revoke the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedures for the CPM Informal Working Group of Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) adopted in CPM-2 (2007).</li> </ol>	Members considered, approved and agree to the proposal of this document	☞ Members has consider, approve and agree to the proposal of this document and no further proposition was made . No further proposal was made as members considered, approved and agreed to the provisions of the document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was observed that although the Strategic Planning Group has been an adopted group, none of these subsidiary groups have a clear mandate</li> <li>• Members were informed that the SPTA actually consist the Bureau but it open to all member states that can fund their own participation. However there was concern that many contracting parties are unable to participate due to lack of funds.</li> <li>• Members raised concern about ensuring regional balance due to the fact that only countries with the capacity to fund would participate.</li> <li>• There was a request that the region will find out exactly what have trigger to the formation of such group as they do not have clear idea why the composition is becoming more confusing and difficult.</li> <li>• Members have no clues why that group should be institutionalized and there was concern about the</li> </ul>

	<b>DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM</b>	<b>AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS</b>	<b>PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS</b>	<b>GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS</b>
					<p>regional balance of this composition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members request to have a good representative of developing countries on this working group to influence the agenda of the committee, ensuring balance and adequate participation.</li> <li>• Concern was raised about the obligation of IPPC secretariat in terms of supporting these subsidiary body of which members are exploring the possibility to support the participation of developing countries.</li> <li>• Members wondered why this subsidiary body is different from other subsidiary bodies in terms of participation and the reason given is that it supports the bureau and maximizes synergies.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>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)</b>	Adopt the draft Annex 4 (Pest Risk analysis for plants as Quarantine pests) to ISPM 11:2004 and consequential changes to the core text to ISPM 11	Members agree with the proposal made to the Draft Annex 4 (Pest Risk Analysis for Plants as Quarantine Pests) to ISPM 11:2004, the consequential changes in the core text of ISPM 11:2004 (2005-001).	☞ Members agreed to the amendment made to this standard and no formal objection has been made (by members present) prior to consideration for adoption of this standard at the CPM	<p><b><u>Anomaly in French translated Version</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members from French speaking countries expressed difficulties with the translated version of this document and recommend that translation be done to reflect as close as possible the content of the original document in English.</li> </ul> <p>Members were keenly concerned about the issue of invasive species raised in the document. They considered it a matter that required particular attention</p>

	<b>DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM</b>	<b>AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS</b>	<b>PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS</b>	<b>GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS</b>
					<p><b><u>Support to draft Annex 4 for Adoption at CPM</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members agreed to support the adoption of the Draft Annex 4 to ISPM 11 during the 8<sup>th</sup> CPM Session.</li> </ul>
4	CPM 2013/03-2: Draft Revision of Annex 1 (Approved treatments associated with wood packaging materials)	The CPM is invited to Adopt the revision of Annex 1 (Approved treatment Associated with wood packaging materials) to ISPM 15:2009 and consequential revision of Annex 2 ( the mark and its application) to ISPM 15: 2009 consider and approve the additional amendments made to the specific standard for adoption	Members agree with the amendments made to this standard without any formal objection raised on the core text, Annexes 1 and 2	<p>Members agreed to support the adoption of the revision to Annex 1 (Approved treatments associated with wood packaging materials to ISPM 15:2009 at the CPM, however, members felt that they need the capacity and ability to meet the requirements.</p> <p>Discussion among members indicates that the requirement of this standard is working.</p> <p>Members express that we can approve the standard but there's the need to seek for technical capacity</p>	<p><b><u>observations</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the discussion some members shared their experience of heat treatment for better understanding and shared its practicability, further highlighting that no issues regarding non compliance has been so far encountered.</li> <li>Members observed that this standard is very technical and requires certain level of experience in the field of work.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul> <p>Some countries provided a general observation by sharing their experiences with regards to use of these treatments and recommend wider application as a means of assessing the effectiveness of the Standard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members were re-assured that</li> </ul>

	<b>DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM</b>	<b>AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS</b>	<b>PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS</b>	<b>GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS</b>
					<p>before a standard is drafted the Technical Panel of the IPPC Secretariat would have analyzed all the scientific and research data pertaining to a proposed standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members were advised that if they have any scientific data regarding the treatments of this standard they can submit to technical panel for discussion and consideration.</li> </ul>
5	CPM 2013/19 Rev.1 Proposed ink amendments to correct inconsistencies in the use of terms in adopted standards:8.1.3	The CPM is invited to note review and minor modifications from the review of ISPMs (Attachment 1, Table A-H)		Members agree that those amendments can go through but should not affect/consultate the adopted Standards (ISPMs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the discussion members were informed that they should be very careful not to change the meaning of the text when reviewing a particular standard</li> </ul>
6	List of Topics for IPPC Standards: International movement of Grain (2008-007):8.1.4 (CPM 2013/06	The CPM is invited to Consider the three options on how to move forward with the topic: International movement of grain (2008-007) Decide which option and/or other action should be taken to progress this topic		Members strongly urge that there is need to have a fully fledged standard and proposed Option 1 given the importance attached to the continued and increasing movement of grain in the region and internationally.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members strongly voice out the importance of having a standard for the movement of grain to enable the regulation of phytosanitary concerns associated with grain but unfortunately they observed that there is no funding for the development of such standard.</li> <li>It was pointed out that at the IPPC Secretariat there is mechanism in place for funding the development of standard but the demand is high and funding is limited.</li> <li></li> <li>Members were informed that there's already a dilemma on that</li> </ul>

	DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED	RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM	AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS	PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS	GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS
					<p>subject and for that reason <i>three options</i> are tabled for CPM consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was noted that no one really understands the basis of having <i>3 options</i> to be considered for a common position</li> </ul>
7	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>The CPM is invited to:</p> <p>1) <i>note</i> the assignment of strategic objectives to topics as presented in the List of Topics for IPPC standards  <a href="https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=20776">https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=20776</a></p> <p>2) <i>adopt</i> the List of Topics for IPPC Standards as presented on the IPP  <a href="https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=20776">https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=20776</a></p> <p>3) <i>adopt</i> the change in priority for the following topics: <i>Review of ISPM (2006-012) priority 4 and use of permits as import authorization (annex to ISPM 20:2004 Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006) priority 3.</i></p> <p>4) <i>request</i> the Secretariat to update the List of Topics for IPPC Standards accordingly, and post the updated version on the IPP.</p>		<p>Members propose that there is need to take a position regarding the powers taken by the Standard Committee (SC).</p> <p>Members request to have a focal point at IAPSC to sent topics to RPPO in order to have a common position of topics before sending to CPM.</p> <p>It was noted that if at the region of Africa have other topics to add or submit they can do so and may be later give the necessary information and it rational for consideration</p> <p>Members was requested to identify some topics to be submit in May this year</p> <p>Members are concern about where are the powers coming from for SC to change the priority of topics</p> <p>It was strongly recommended that members and IAPSC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members were informed that Standard Committee (SC) do re-prioritizes topics before submitting to CPM for adoption but it is up to us to object, members were urged to participate fully in the night session during the CPM to be able to voice out our views.</li> <li>Members are wondering whether SC has the authority to change topics and/or re-prioritize topics.</li> <li>Members noted the existence of 4 African members on the Standards Committee, however there are still concerns about the strategies to prioritize topics.</li> <li>Members were informed that Contracting Parties can propose to the Standard Committee topics to be prioritized, but the respective country need to justify why the need for prioritization of a topic(s).</li> <li>Members were encouraged to look at the TOR of the SC to see what</li> </ul>

	DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED	RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM	AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS	PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS	GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS
				<p>should establish a strong linkages for effective communication and coordination to empower the SC from the region to participate effectively</p> <p>Members request to have good coordination from IAPSC to push topics for our interest.</p>	<p>they can or cannot do.</p> <p>There was request about the participation of African representative on such meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members were concerned that in the Africa region we are not making our representatives to participate effectively at the SC</li> <li>Members also noted that out of the 122 topics there has not been an African steward so far. Emphasis was then laid on the need to have a data base of experts in Africa compiled and maintained by AU-IAPSC, from which experts can be sourced for Phytosanitary Standards Setting</li> </ul>
8	Language Review Group 8.1.5 (CPM 2013/07)	<p>The CPM is invited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>note</i> that ISPMs have been reviewed by the Chinese, French and Spanish LRGs and FAO translation services</li> <li><i>note</i> that Russian speaking members need to choose a replacement for the Coordinator of the Russian LRG</li> <li><i>urge</i> its members who participate in LRGs to ensure that the deadlines for the CPM adopted LRG process are followed and due dates respected</li> <li><i>request</i> the Secretariat to accept all changes as indicated in track changes in the Attachments 1 to 17</li> </ol>	In principle members agree but they have the following	<p>Members propose that there is merit to strongly look at the CV and individual to perform specific responsibilities and ability to deliver based on personnel merit.</p> <p>Members emphasised the need to have ways of determining competencies and modalities for motivation.</p> <p>In Africa we need to have a harmonizing process that members communicate and coordinate to all “Calls” for experts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members were informed that there is an appeal on the IPP for participation but the Africa Region has not responded and/or shown any interest therefore it is up to us to represent our group in areas of expertise.</li> <li>Members were informed that every committee have rules and procedures therefore we can adopt the same principles at the region</li> <li>Members recommend that as a continent we need to identify language specialist to participate in the language group.</li> </ul>

	<b>DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM</b>	<b>AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS</b>	<b>PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS</b>	<b>GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS</b>
		and replace the Chinese, French and Spanish ISPMs adopted at CPM-7 (2012) with these modified versions		<p>Members propose that CVs should also be motivated from NPPO and/or their respective organization.</p> <p>Members were encouraged to empower IAPSC to scrutinize the CV's and agree to perform the task.</p> <p>Proposed way forward involve need to have the following:  1) Criteria  2) Support  3) Motivation  4) Commitment</p>	It was noted that we should use the criteria for nomination of candidate but there's a need to look at other additional issues that are required.
9	Proposed changes for the rules of procedure for the Standards Committee 8.1.6 (CPM 2013/08)	The CPM is invited to: 1) <i>adopt</i> the revised Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee, as presented in Attachment 1 to this paper	Members pledged support to adopt the revised Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee during the CPM, as presented in <i>Attachment 1</i> of this paper	As an observation members felt that since the level of observers is limited and it is the chairperson to nominate candidates, then there is need to spell out the criteria for observers and their specific roles can be dealt with effectively.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was clearly indicated that logistically we are limited in terms of number of observers, and observers can talk more than members and the meeting may take longer than it has been scheduled</li> <li>• Also it was noted that it is the IPPC Secretariat that make the logistics arrangement but with limited resources.</li> <li>• Members were informed that invitation will depend on the capacity of the room and themes to be discussed.</li> <li>• Members expressed their satisfaction with the current changes compared to what was</li> </ul>

	DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED	RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM	AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS	PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS	GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS
					<p>previously done.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members were informed that for restricted document we should leave it to Contracting Parties to decide.</li> </ul>
10	Possible criteria to determine if a formal objection is technically justified 8.1.7(CPM 2013/04)	<p>The CPM is invited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>approve</i> the Criteria to help determine if a formal objection is technically justified as presented in Attachment 1 to this paper.</li> <li><i>approve</i> the Processes for determining if a formal objection is technically justified for draft ISPMs, phytosanitary treatments and diagnostic protocols, as presented in Attachment 1: Figures 1, 2 and 3.</li> <li><i>encourage</i> members to submit formal objections well in advance of 14 days prior to CPM to allow a sufficient amount of time for formal objections to be reviewed.</li> </ol>		<p>Members agreed that at the CPM 8 they will recommend to the IPPC Secretariat for clear explanation of the procedure for subjecting a formal objection on a standard for better understanding and to decide on a uniform point of view.</p> <p>Members propose that the step for <i>Figure 1</i> should be changed because it violates the normal process and should be modified to include feedback within the time given.</p> <p>Members strongly urge that the region should first formulate changes in the Agenda.</p> <p>There was a strong request that members should re-look</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was concern raised that there might be certain group which is not known making decision in this process.</li> </ul> <p>Members felt that there are errors in the drawing and wording used in the structure particularly <i>Figure 1</i>.</p> <p>Members were informed that the justification as to whether a formal objection is technically justified is the responsibility of the Standards Committee, <b>members however wanted to know the role of the CPM in the formal objection??</b></p> <p>Members were concerned about the general lack of a feedback mechanism to Contracting Parties until the CPM. It come-up clearly that the feedback mechanism is not effective</p> <p>It was observed that sometime the changes in priority are not communicated to the wider stakeholders.</p>



	DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED	RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM	AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS	PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS	GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS
				<p>at the topics arrangement for CPM 8 to propose some amendment in the arrangement of the agenda to have a consistent flow in the discussion.</p> <p>The discussion of our region meeting were are base on the propose CPM 8 has overlap</p>	
11	<p>Issues relating to the IPPC standard Setting Process 8.1.8 (CPM 2013/09)</p>	<p>The CPM is invited to:</p> <p>1) <i>note</i> the current status of the implementation of the standard setting process adopted at CPM-7 (2012)</p> <p>2) <i>comment</i> on the usefulness of the new substantial concerns commenting period (SCCP)</p> <p>3) <i>provide</i> suggestions to facilitate the implementation of the new standard setting process</p> <p>The CPM is invited to:</p> <p>1) <i>note</i> the SC discussion and agree with their conclusions in 1,2 and 3 above</p> <p>The CPM is invited to:</p> <p>1) <i>note</i> that the SC has added a new task (see above wording for the task) to each specification relating to the identification of potential implementation issues of the standard, accompanied by the corresponding information</p>	<p>No common position was taken on the recommendation made from CPMh however the following proposals were made☞</p>	<p>☞ There was a request to focus on matters of specialist and table it for discussion.</p> <p>☞ We need to have our own capacity building and depending on the capacity and expertise the process of standard development will be eminent.</p> <p>☞ There was a strong request to have a pool of expert at the region for consultation.</p> <p>☞ Members think that at this stage we don't think we can have another technical input.</p> <p>☞ Members are encouraged to collaborate with private standard taking into consideration marketing and trade concern.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members noted the concern about Portuguese language translation</li> <li>• Members were informed that standard are adopted by consensus but not voting meaning all Contracting Parties take a decision on the Standard as emphasis is laid on transparency of the process</li> <li>• The need to identify specialist in the region for review of proposed standard(s) and make timely response was highlighted</li> <li>• Members noted that the procedures adopted by the IPPC are consistent with other standards bodies.</li> </ul> <p>There was question raise about our mobilization capacity to come at the level of providing expertise.</p> <p>Members agree that we cannot get rid of private standards as they are marketing</p>

	<b>DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM</b>	<b>AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS</b>	<b>PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS</b>	<b>GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS</b>
		<p>2) <i>ask</i> the SC to review and submit information on the issue of implementation to the Secretariat for further consideration</p> <p>The CPM is invited to:</p> <p>1) <i>encourage</i> members or groups of members using the same non-FAO language to enter into a copublishing agreement with FAO when planning to translate or publish standards</p> <p>2) <i>thank</i> the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization for their past translations of ISPMs into Russian, produced and distributed under a copublishing agreement with the IPPC Secretariat</p>			standards.
12	Status of ISPM 15 Implementation: 8.2.1 (CPM 2013/24)	<p>The CPM is invited to:</p> <p>1) <i>note</i> the developments in regard to registration of the ISPM 15 symbol;</p> <p>2) <i>encourage</i> contracting parties to actively pursue the process of national registration of the ISPM 15 symbol;</p> <p>3) <i>encourage</i> contracting parties to renew registrations that are due to expire soon;</p> <p>4) <i>suggest</i> ideas for ensuring that protection of ISPM 15 symbol is guaranteed.</p>		No proposition made due to the fact that the draft was just a report concerning the registration and protection of the symbol.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members were encouraged that they should look at ways for protecting the symbols.</li> <li>Members noted that the standard is there but there was concern about how it is practically done and translated.</li> <li>Members were encouraged to interact and share knowledge and experience regarding the status of implementing ISPM No.15 in the region.</li> </ul>
13	E-Phyto Updates:8.2.2 (CPM 2013/INF/02 Rev1)			It was stated that management issues are well informed and there is not much that can be	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members were informed that some countries have participated in these consultations and that they can</li> </ul>

	DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED	RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM	AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS	PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS	GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS
				commented on.	<p>share their experiences and relevant information to other members.</p> <p>Members requested Kenya to share its experience of E-Certification as this would help develop capacity in the region. The NPPO Kenya assured members of the possibility to apply E-Certification and is willing to share expertise but clearly pointed out that there is a need for IT Capacity.</p>
14	Regional workshops on Draft ISPMs: 10.1(CPM 2013/02)	<p>The CPM is invited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <i>encourage</i> contracting parties to contribute funding and participate in the workshops in their regions.</li> <li>2) <i>note</i> the lessons learned and the actions proposed for improvement.</li> <li>3) <i>note</i> these workshops will now be called Regional Workshops to discuss IPPC related issues.</li> <li>4) <i>encourage</i> the regional workshop organizers to follow the Guidelines for the organizational arrangements for Regional Workshops to discuss IPPC related issues</li> </ol>		<p>☞ Members were advised to use other means of sending their comments in order to exercise their rights if encountering difficulties with the online- system.</p> <p>☞ It was proposed that the region should continue exploring the possibility for donors and/or source out funding to run workshops at regional level.</p> <p>☞ Members are encouraged to do in kind contribution.</p> <p>It was also suggested that we can consider proportion funding to run workshops at regional level.</p> <p>Member strongly request that they should submit comments online and by other means available to take care of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was strongly stated that even the online system is functional but it is not mandatory therefore members can still sent comments by means available.</li> <li>• Members express that the online system was a bit challenging for first time users and thereisneed for fast internet connection.</li> </ul> <p>Members were informed that there's capacity building that can be obtained from the IPPC Secretariat for on line comments (This is not clear!!!!).</p> <p>Members requested that comment submission by Contracting Parties should also copy to other members within the region.</p> <p>Members were informed that South Africa will inform IPPC Secretariat at CPM 8 about the rejection of comments that was clearly explained during the discussion.</p>

	DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED	RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM	AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS	PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS	GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS
15	Establishment of the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) 10.2(CPM 2013/13)	The CPM is invited to: 1) <i>note</i> the establishment of the CDC; 2) <i>note</i> the current membership and potential alternates for the Capacity Development Committee as shown in Annexes A and B; and 3) <i>encourage</i> regions that have not submitted nominations for alternate members of the Capacity Development Committee to do so as soon as possible		<p>inefficiency restriction.</p> <p>☞Members would like to have a strong proposition of how we handle the opening invitation for technical expert.</p> <p>☞Members expressed the desire to vet nominees who will represent the Africa region on such meetings</p> <p>☞Members proposed that we need to have clarity for call of expert and someone to represent the region.</p> <p>☞Furthermore we need to put a structure in place on how to come up with nomination and submit to IPPC Secretariat.</p> <p>☞Members were encouraged to make good use of the IAPSC and if they have the capacity to represent the region they should make their request through IAPSC which will then sent the nomination to IPPC secretariat .</p> <p>☞Members urge that there is need to activitywhich should be coordinated at the regional level and the mandate was given to IAPSC. Also the region should look at all the committee's and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members were informed that the region has not yet sent names of alternative candidates to be selected for the Capacity Development Committee (CDC).</li> <li>• Members were also informed by the Nigerian NPPO that their colleague (from Nigeria) on the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) is representing Regional position of Africa and not as an individual country.</li> <li>• Members learnt that the African representative have already established a strong linkage between the CDC members.</li> <li>• It was pointed out that presently the committee is being treated as a technical committee.</li> <li>• Members were informed that the open invitation is for technical expertise and IPPC Secretariat does the selection and regional bodies do not have much say about it.</li> <li>• Members agreed that there is need to have a clear objective and the person being nominated should belong to a National Plant Protection Organization and should be known by the region.</li> </ul>

	<b>DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM</b>	<b>AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS</b>	<b>PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS</b>	<b>GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS</b>
				request for nomination from members and/or Contracting Parties within the Region.  ☞ Members are recommended that in the future if there's the need to nominate a representative from the region then members are encouraged to go through the normal process and/or procedures at the regional level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members were told that there are roles of procedures to nominate a candidate through Contact Point. The role is clearly defined and all the best fit will be given the responsibility.</li> </ul>
16	Chart of IPPC Capacity Development Project Active in 2012 (CPM 2013/INF/05)				It was information welcome by all members
17	Outline of Capacity Development Work of the IPPC:10.3 (CPM 2013/21)	The CPM is invited to: 1)note the Outline of Capacity Development Work of the IPPC; 2)encourage NPPOs and RPPOs to undertake a similar study of the global work plan contained within the National Phytosanitary Capacity Building Strategy to develop plans for activities under their area of responsibility and report back to the Secretariat		Members were encouraged to read the detail and take the advantage of the activities that are going to be implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members take note of the outline areas for capacity development.</li> <li>Members are encouraged to look at the document carefully and see what going to be done but apparently the Capacity Development Project activities will solicit a lot of funding.</li> </ul> <p>There was a strong request to look at the table and see where we can fit in as members and directly linked up.</p>
18	IPPC Communication Strategy 11.1(CPM 2013/11)	The CPM is requested to: 1) <i>consider</i> and, if agreed, adopt the IPPC Communications Strategy as presented in Attachment 1	Members noted and consider the document on Communication Strategy that is going to be implemented		Members noted that there are advantages have been highlighted in terms of goals and objectives of the document.
19	IPPC Communication Work Plan :11.2(CPM 2013/14)	The SPG is invited to: 1) <i>provide</i> guidance on this format and content of the envisaged IPPC Communication work-plan for			

	DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED	RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM	AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS	PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS	GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS
		2013-2015; 2) <i>provide</i> specific guidance on which non-Secretariat activities need to be monitored and communicated			
20	Information Exchange : Secretariat Update 11.3 (CPM 2013/15)	The CPM is invited to: 1) <i>provide</i> guidance as necessary; and 2) <i>endorse</i> the revision of the IPPC Information Exchange work program	Members recognized the work that have be done by the IPC Secretariat which has come at the right time and we emphasized the need to use the reporting mechanism in our national plan to fulfill our obligation specify by the convention	<p>☞ Members express that we should find ways and means to improve visibility and publicity</p> <p>☞ Members were encouraged to come up with a National Strategic Plan on how they going to effectively update information on the IPP portal.</p> <p>☞ Members suggested the need to utilize country survey to update the portal.</p> <p>☞ Members request for the formulation of a consultative group to improve information exchange.</p> <p>☞ Members proposed formal training for IPP editors for information exchange</p> <p>☞ There is a strong request for advocacy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members were informed that this is an obligation as per the convention</li> <li>• Members were told that they should streamline the way information disseminates because we agree to abide by the rules and procedures on the convention.</li> <li>• Members clearly pointed out that we need to analyze the constraints and gaps to see how best we can address them.</li> <li>• There was request for IPPC Secretariat to look in the possibility of assisting in building the capacity.</li> <li>• Some Members strongly voice out about capacity at National Level to meet the requirement.</li> <li>• There was concern about bureaucracy and the need to empower editors to do the job effectively.</li> </ul>
21	Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)–2012 Report:13.1(CPM 2013/20)	The CPM is invited to: 1) <i>note</i> the recent developments of the IRSS programme; 2) <i>encourage</i> contracting parties to participate in the IRSS activities and	Members note the work done by the IRSS and it is quite revealing  Members note the rest of the		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members were encourage to read the document in detail to make intervention</li> </ul>

	DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED	RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM	AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS	PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS	GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS
		in particular the surveys in a timely manner; 3) <i>encourage</i> contracting parties to use the help desk and provide the IPPC Secretariat with feedback for its improvement; 4) <i>provide</i> further resources to ensure that the IRSS can benefit all contracting parties in FAO languages; 5) <i>encourage</i> contracting parties to provide further funding to ensure a second cycle of the IRSS (2014-2017)	recommendation (2,3,4,5) made from CPM		
22	Implementation Review and Support System Surveys: Overview of Work and Next Steps 13.1 (CPM 2013/INF/04)		Members note the information document emphasis on the survey that was done on 4 standards with table that summarize the result		Members are requested to read carefully the information provided which can encourage us to take part in the process
23	Proposed CPM recommendations based on implementation review and support systems studies 13.2(CPM 2013/17 Rev1)	The CPM is invited to: 1) <i>consider</i> and if appropriate adopt the proposed CPM recommendation on aquatic plants as presented in Annex A; and 2) <i>consider</i> and if appropriate adopt the proposed CPM recommendation on internet trade as presented in Annex B		☞ Members propose to have strong linkages and dialogue partnership with the courier services  ☞ Members agree that we need to create more awareness about the danger posed by Internet Trade of Plants  ☞ Members clearly indicate that Internet Trade of Plants need to be regulated for phytosanitary purposes and we need guidelines on how to regulate the subject matter of concern. Members urge for the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members were informed that there are many plants and plant products that are being traded on line and we need to be vigilant on this matter that need to be regulated.</li> <li>Members were told that awareness in very critical when taking into consideration concerns regarding Internet Trade of Plants</li> <li>Members were encouraged to put a lot of emphasis on sanitization program regarding this matter.</li> </ul>

	<b>DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION FROM CPM</b>	<b>AGREEMENT BY MEMBERS</b>	<b>PROPOSITION FROM MEMBERS</b>	<b>GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS</b>
				<p>development of guidelines to regulate Internet Trade of Plants</p> <p>Members also request for the development of a manual which can guide inspectors of what to look for during the activity.</p> <p>Part of the solution should be to develop capacity National and Regional level to detect these materials such as scanning etc</p>	



# Document 5c

## Annex 3: Common positions from the preparatory meeting Entebbe-Uganda

11-13 March, 2013

1. **Guidelines for Nomination, Selection and Rotation of the CPM Chairperson and Vice Chairperson: 7.1.2 (CMP 2013/22):**

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.**

2. **Draft Rules of Procedure for the Strategic Planning Group (SPG):7.4 (CPM 2013/16):**

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. **There are no clues to why that group should be institutionalized and there was concern about the regional balance of this composition. Keeping its functioning as the SPTA is the best option.**

3. **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)**

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 be 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.

4. **CPM 2013/03-2: Draft Revision of Annex 1 (Approved treatments associated with wood packaging materials)**

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.

5. **CPM 2013/19 Rev.1 Proposed ink amendments to correct inconsistencies in the use of terms in adopted standards:8.1.3:**

Participants raised the concern about the risk of change of the meaning of the text when reviewing a particular standard

6. **List of Topics for IPPC Standards: International movement of Grain (2008-007):8.1.4 (CPM 2013/06**

**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.

7. **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):**

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.

8. **Proposed changes for the rules of procedure for the Standards Committee 8.1.6 (CPM 2013/08):**

As an observation participants felt that since the level of observers is limited and it is the chairperson to nominate candidates, then there is need to spell out the criteria for observers and their specific roles can be dealt with effectively.

9. **Possible criteria to determine if a formal objection is technically justified 8.1.7(CPM 2013/04):**

**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.

10. **Establishment of the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) 10.2(CPM 2013/13):**

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.

11. **Proposed CPM recommendations based on implementation review and support systems studies 13.2(CPM 2013/17 Rev1):**

Internet Trade of Plants need 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.

## Common positions from the CPM8 preparatory meetings (Entebbe&Libreville)

### 12. Possible criteria to determine if a formal objection is technically justified 8.1.7(CPM 2013/04):

**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.

Responsible: Gabon

Supporters: Congo, Chad

### 13. Guidelines for Nomination, Selection and Rotation of the CPM Chairperson and Vice Chairperson: 7.1.2 (CMP 2013/22):

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.**

Paragraph 3 Annexe 1. Clarify that candidates should belong to NPPO and if possible should have served as a member of the Bureau for one term.

- Responsible : Uganda
- Supporters : Angola, Burundi

**14. Draft Rules of Procedure for the Strategic Planning Group (SPG):7.4 (CPM 2013/16):**

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.

**There are no clues to why that group should be institutionalized and there was concern about the regional balance of this composition. Keeping its functioning as the SPTA would be the best option.**

- Responsible: Kenya
- Supporters: RDC, Angola

**15. 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)**

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 be 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.**

- Responsible: Burkina Faso
- Supporters: DRC, Tunisia

**16. CPM 2013/03-2: Draft Revision of Annex 1 (Approved treatments associated with wood packaging materials)**

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.

What is meant by dielectric treatment is confusing: The Technical Group for the Glossary would provide a definition of the term dielectric treatment.

Responsible: South Africa

Supporters: Gabon, Senegal

**17. CPM 2013/19 Rev.1 Proposed ink amendments to correct inconsistencies in the use of terms in adopted standards:8.1.3:**

Participants raised the concern about the risk of change of the meaning of the text when reviewing a particular standard.

Responsible: Madagascar

Supporters: Mali, Comoros

**18. List of Topics for IPPC Standards: International movement of Grain (2008-007):8.1.4 (CPM 2013/06**

**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.

Responsible: Kenya

Supporters: Nigeria, Madagascar

**19. 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):**

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.

Responsible: South Africa

Supporters: Guinée Equatoriale, Niger

**20. Proposed changes for the rules of procedure for the Standards Committee 8.1.6 (CPM 2013/08):**

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.

Responsible: Ghana

Supporters: Guinée, Ethiopia

**21. Establishment of the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) 10.2(CPM 2013/13):**

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.

Responsible: Mozambique

Supporters: Sierra Leone, Togo

**22. Proposed CPM recommendations based on implementation review and support systems studies 13.2(CPM 2013/17 Rev1):**

Internet Trade of Plants need 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.

Responsible: Nigeria

Supporters: Kenya, Uganda

# Document 6

**PANSPSO Project (Participation of Africa Nations in Sanitary &Phytosanitary Standards Setting Organizations)**

**Terms of Reference for a Consultancy to Develop Regional Standards for the Movement of Cassava Germplasm/Planting Materials for Africa**

-----

## **I. Context and rationale**

The **Participation of Africa Nations in Sanitary & Phytosanitary Standards Setting Organizations** (PAN-SPSO) is an African Union Project funded by the European Commission and is aimed at reducing poverty through promoting greater access of African agricultural products to international markets, by improving the participation of the 54 African countries to the activities of International Standard Setting Organizations (ISSOs). The relevant ISSO bodies include the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE), the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC). The lead implementing agency is the AU-IBAR and the AU-IAPSC is a co-implementer, particularly on matters of the IPPC.

The PANSPSO activities are mainly oriented to institutional support, regional and continental harmonization, technical capacity building and data and information collecting and sharing.



To achieve this objective, PANSPSO project acts on different aspects related to the participation in standards setting, which include:

- (i) availability of information related to standards,
- (ii) coordination and harmonization of views between African countries to reach common positions,
- (iii) development of technical capacities to participate in the standards setting processes,
- (iv) provision of expertise to Member States for the development, commenting and reviewing of standards in the areas of interest to African countries
- (v) participation of the private sector in the standards setting processes and
- (vi) increasing awareness of decision makers on SPS issues.

One of the reasons limiting the participation of African countries in the SPS standards setting processes is the limited understanding by stakeholders of: (i) the institutional set-up of international organizations in charge of establishing SPS standards, (ii) the standards setting processes, and (iii) the rights, obligations and roles of the member countries in the functioning of these organizations.

This understanding needs to be enhanced as a priority, among officials representing African countries in these international organizations and also among other categories of stakeholders both in the private and public sectors, since participation in the standards setting processes should involve wide consultation at national level as well.

The PAN-SPSO project is contributing to enhance this knowledge and understanding of standards setting processes on the continent through different approaches, among which is the setting of regional phytosanitary standards aimed at facilitating the movement and trade in plant and plant products within the Africa region.

Enhancing the participation of African member states in the international standard setting process can be achieved initially through increased participation in regional standards setting process, and this should provide a foundation and also develop capacity for better participation in international standards setting. It is generally observed that some internationally adopted standards were initially conceived and adopted at regional levels.

In this respect, the AU-IAPSC in collaboration with AU-IBAR envisages a vibrant regional phytosanitary standards for Africa and is kick-starting the process with the development of a *Draft Regional Standard for the Movement of Cassava Germplasm/Planting Materials for Africa*. The AU-IAPSC/IBAR is therefore seeking the services of a Consultant to carry out this task.

### **Objectives and expected results**

The main objective of the consultancy is to support the development of a draft standard for the movement of cassava germplasm for Africa region that can be adopted to guide policy formulation and implementation, research and development to facilitate safe movement of cassava planting materials within the Africa Region.

The consultant is expected to deliver on these highlighted thematic areas-:

- Review of policies and legal framework and other related documents favourable for the movement of germplasm in general and cassava germplasm/planting materials in particular
- Provide an understanding on the global importance of cassava in general and in Africa in particular
- Highlight major constraints to cassava production in Africa with special emphasis on major cassava pests and diseases
- Provide an insight into the achievements to-date in Africa in addressing the cassava plant health constraints above
- Engage with the relevant NARS, regional/international centres of excellence in cassava research to forge the best practices possible for germplasm/planting material movement
- Propose logically, procedures and requirements for safe movement of cassava germplasm/planting materials for Africa region

- Provide technical recommendations for the production of pest free planting materials (seed, in-vitro culture and cuttings) in alignment to ISPM 36 .2012 *“Integrated measures for plants for planting”*.

## **II. Methodology**

The consultant is expected to deliver on this assignment through

- Initial briefing at AU-IAPSC (Yaoundé, Cameroun)
- Desk study
- Consultation of stakeholders in MS, RECs and at AU level (mainly through exchange of correspondences)
- Consultation with the relevant Centre for Plant Genetic Resources, Regional Centres of Excellence for Cassava, National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS) (mainly through exchange of correspondences)
- Draft report write up
- Report validation (by AU-IAPSC and stakeholders)

## **III. Deliverables**

- Submission of Draft Standard for review by IAPSC/stakeholders
- Submission of final draft standard to IAPSC

## **IV. Duration and conditions of consultancy**

The total duration of the consultancy will be 1 month

Travels and missions – the consultants will travel as follows:

- 2 missions to Cameroun, where AU-IAPSC is located, one at the beginning for initial briefing and another at the end of the consultancy period for a de-briefing
- 1 mission to a Centre of Excellence for Cassava to make an assessment on available options for the movement of cassava germplasm/planting materials

**V. Reporting and payment**

The honorarium of the consultant will be based on the rate applied by PANSPSO project for similar consultation, the payment of which shall be based on satisfactory execution of work and subject to clearance by the Project Coordinator.

Air tickets will be purchased by AU-IBAR

DSA will be paid upon approval of travel schedules

**VI. Experts' qualifications**

Education:AM.Sc. or Ph.D in Plant Breeding, Plant Health Sciences (Pathology, Entomology, Virology) or Seed Technology

Experience:

- Extensive work in cassava research or seed regulatory services
- Proven practical experience in the standards setting processes
- 10 years of professional experience in the agricultural/food sector in Africa

**AFRICAN UNION UNION AFRICAINE**

**African Union Common Repository**

**<http://archives.au.int>**

---

Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture (DREA)

Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC) Collection

---

2013

# Preparatory technical meeting for CPM 8 report Entebbe 11-13 March 2013

AU-IAPSC

AU-IAPSC

---

<http://archives.au.int/handle/123456789/1862>

*Downloaded from African Union Common Repository*