**Resource Mobilization for the IPPC**

1. Given the general shortages of resources to deliver the CPM work programme in a sustainable manner, new and consistent extra-budgetary resource mobilization are essential for the implementation of all the components of the CPM work programme and the sustainability of the IPPC Secretariat.
2. The attached paper on “Resource Mobilization for the IPPC” was authored by Mr. Craig Fedchock (USA) and Mr. Ralf Lopian (Finland). The Secretariat wishes to thank them sincerely for their efforts in producing this proposal.
3. The Secretariat has only made formatting changes to the document and the recommendations are those of the authors and do not reflect those of the Secretariat or FAO. FAO Legal Office and the Secretariat will provide input as part of the SPTA review process.
4. Mechanisms for reporting and monitoring will need to be developed that ensure a single format and process for reporting to CPM and FAO, within the framework of the FAO Work Plan and IPPC Strategic Framework.
5. Appendix 1 of the attached paper provides a suggested operational plan for the proposed resource mobilization strategy. If agreed by the SPTA this will need to be developed into the various FAO formats.
6. After the SPTA discussions on this subject, the current format of the paper will need to be:
* Aligned to reflect the headings (cross-referencing) of the IPPC Strategic Framework;
* Formatted to reflect the FAO format being adopted for all IPPC Strategic Plans; and
* Cross-referenced with the IPPC Communications, Capacity Development and Standard Setting Strategic Plans.
1. The SPTA is invited to:
* Study the proposal on resource mobilization;
* Make suggestions for improvements in this strategy for presentation to the CPM; and
* Make suggestions on the operational plan and its implementation.

 **Resource Mobilization for the IPPC**

*by C. Fedchock & R. Lopian*

*This draft resource mobilization strategy for the IPPC represents the views and opinions of the authors only.*

1. **Objective**

To ensure sustainable and sufficient funding for the IPPC in order to reach the Commission’s/IPPC’s strategic objectives.

1. **Purpose**
	1. To make certain that adequate resources are made available to and used by the IPPC via transparent, efficient and effective means for the purpose of :
		1. protecting sustainable agriculture and enhance global food security through the prevention of pest spread;
		2. protecting the environment, forests and biodiversity from plant pests;
		3. creating economic and trade development opportunities through the promotion of harmonized international standards for plant health; and
		4. developing phytosanitary capacity for members to accomplish the first three objectives,
	2. To provide guidance to the IPPC Secretariat on how to solicit extra-budgetary resources from donors and on the application of donor friendly financial reporting and management practises,
	3. To outline the responsibilities of the CPM in the resource mobilization process and to provide advice to the CPM as to which instruments should be developed to enable sustainable resource mobilization, and,
	4. To create awareness of the resource needs of the IPPC among contracting parties and donors.
2. **Goals**
3. **Creating an adequate administrative financial framework.**

Successful mobilization of resources is ensured through the creation of an adequate administrative framework. This framework must include effective management and leadership which will ensure the accountability and transparency of the IPPC and its budgetary processes. Making the case for additional resources is additionally strengthened by demonstrating that the IPPC has financial systems in place that will safeguard the resources raised, including adequate financial controls that demonstrate good management and builds trust. If donors know that their support is being put to good use, this will support sustainability as well as good accounting practices internally within the organization. Means for establishing an adequate administrative framework are outlined below.

The IPPC Secretariat and the CPM recognize that the establishment of financial governance tools is essential to create appropriate financial management, control and transparency structures and provisions which in turn reinforce donor confidence and stimulate resource contributions to IPPC activities.

**Recommendations:**

***A1 Establishment of a Financial Committee***

The CPM establishes a financial committee. The financial committee should consist of a few (3-4) dedicated persons, elected by the CPM, which would assist the CPM Bureau, IPPC Secretariat and the CPM in financial planning, solicitation of resources (champions), and monitoring and reporting of finances. The financial committee may meet in association with the CPM Bureau meetings in March/April and October. Detailed rules of procedures and terms of reference for this financial committee should be adopted to demonstrate to donors those responsibilities in a transparent manner. The financial committee may also be responsible for drawing up standard operating procedures for the preparation of IPPC budgets and budgets for projects.

References for a financial committee may be included in a future revision of the IPPC.

***A2 Improving budget transparency and clarity***

The CPM reinforces budget transparency and clarity by adopting guidelines for the preparation of budgets (regular, project or trust fund based) and their reporting. The CPM recognizes that budget transparency and clarity are essential tools to safeguard the resources raised, to demonstrate good financial management and to build trust with donors.

1. **Developing communication and information strategies**

Presenting a clear, consistent message about the IPPC is a key component in the resource mobilization effort. The way in which information about the IPPC is communicated to potential donors and others is very important as it can hold the key to the willingness of donors to participate in IPPC activities. A coherent and well-thought communications plan will serve to build excitement about the work of the IPPC and in turn will provide recognition of the role the IPPC plays in standard setting and development activities. The selling of the IPPC idea is critical to gaining access to the resources needed to accomplish the mission of the organization.

**Recommendation:**

***B1 Development of an IPPC communications strategy***

The CPM establishes, with the cooperation of contracting parties, an outreach or communications strategy in which, among others, the IPPC establishes itself as a “brand”. The CPM also establishes a specific information policy to facilitate Secretariat and Bureau messaging to news media, potential donors, and other resources. This strategy would be developed through the utilization of in-kind resources provided by a small number (3-4) of interested contracting members who would develop a strategy which would include all the available social networking tools (Facebook, Twitter, etc.) in order to reach the broadest possible audience. The strategy would also include specific outreach to environmental and forestry organizations. This group would work on an informal, ad hoc basis in coordination with appropriate Secretariat staff. Consistent and coherent talking points will be developed to ensure consistency of the IPPC “message” when engaging outside contacts.

1. **Intensification of the In-kind Contribution System**

As a result of technological developments worldwide, it is significantly easier to gain access to highly skilled human resources without ever needing to recruit, hire and relocate them to a specific location. Recent contributions from in-kind experts has provided key assistance.

**Recommendations:**

***C1 Strengthening the use of in-kind expertise***

The CPM strongly encourages national plant protection organizations, regional plant protection organizations and other types of groups to assist the IPPC by contributing experts to work for the Secretariat over a period of time (e.g. one or more years) as scientists or consultants to address issues of importance for which scarce Secretariat resources are unavailable. The process for making such arrangements should be codified for the purpose of providing clarity to outside observers that any such contributions are intended to provide expert assistance only to the work of the IPPC with no expectation of inappropriate influence on the outcome of those efforts. Standardized contract formats are developed and made available by the Secretariat for use by interested contributors. Experts may work on standards, technical assistance, information exchange or other issues as appropriate. Such experts may work in the Secretariat itself, or at their home location.

***C2 Revising the Associate Professional Officer Programme***

The CPM increasingly solicits contracting parties for providing human in-kind contributions in the form of Associate Professional Officers who would serve as Secretariat staff for 3-6 years. The longer time frame would help to ensure sustainable staff resources to the Secretariat.

***C3 Increasing the use of ad hoc working groups***

The CPM increases the use of *ad hoc* working groups to address issues of importance for which scarce Secretariat resources are unavailable.

1. **Institutionalizing the sponsorship of meetings**

The system of *ad hoc* sponsored standard setting activities has contributed to the success of a sustainable standard setting of the IPPC and has alleviated serious reductions in standard setting due to financial limitations of the IPPC. Taking as an example practises in *Codex Alimentarius* it is recommended that a formal and sustainable system for sponsorship of standard setting meetings is established including the provision of human resources for technical oversight of the activities.

**Recommendations:**

***D1 Institutionalizing a formal system for the sustainable sponsorship of meetings***

The CPM institutionalizes the sponsorship of meetings by formalizing rules and procedures for such a system. It is envisaged that individual contracting parties “pledge” their sponsorship of a particular activity for a longer period (e.g. 5 years) which makes it possible for the IPPC Secretariat and the CPM to plan standard setting activities in a much more sustainable way.

***D2 Introducing “Technical Secretaries” as a new format of human in-kind contribution***

In association with a formal system for the sponsorship of meetings a new format of human in-kind contributions is introduced – that of a “Technical Secretary”. “Technical Secretaries” would provide technical oversight over the activities of panels or other groups and be committed by the contracting party sponsoring the meeting. Specific rules for such technical secretaries are to be drawn-up by the CPM

1. **Capacity Development**

The creation of partnerships with specific donors has significant potential beyond simply passing funds forward to the IPPC. It is also a critical means by which the work of the IPPC can be expanded without soliciting or expending limited resources. The following are proposals for maximizing the use of partnerships in a non-traditional way.

**Recommendations:**

***E1 Promoting further the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE):***

The CPM endorses the Secretariat’s efforts to broaden the application and acceptance of the PCE tool beyond current practice. For example, the World Bank is moving towards using the PCE tool as a first step in projects for which there is a plant health component. The first benefit is raising awareness of the PCE tool itself within the Bank, and the second benefit is that there is the resulting development of a funding source as the IPPC receives funds for the administering the PCE. The CPM also advocates for a similar approach with other donor organizations. Using the PCE as a review mechanism for longer time frame capacity development projects as a means to ensure that efforts remain on track should be endorsed by the CPM.

***E2 Development of an international phytosanitary “Roster of Experts”***

The CPM establishes a process for the development of a roster of IPPC-recognized/credentialed capacity building experts. This roster will provide an essential resource for developing countries seeking highly qualified and experienced professionals capable of delivering needed education and training which can further their national phytosanitary capacity development. The possibility of a fee-based credentialing system for persons who are interested in being on the roster should be explored for legal sufficiency as an additional resource opportunity.

***E3 Foundation of a dedicated volunteer programme***

The CPM endorses and encourages efforts which are based on the solicitation of volunteer human resources. Such a programme could be designed for the development of scientific and administrative proposals (drafting concept, discussion and standard papers), but should also be extended, in association with the roster of experts, to practical implementation work in phytosanitary capacity development projects. Parameters for participation should be clearly articulated and available for review by contracting parties. Examples of this type of activity already abound (e.g. the authors of this paper, as well as the authors of the IPPC Strategy document). Potential participants would be experts from NPPOs, academia and depending on the activity, students. The advantages could be seen in having a potentially huge human resource pool and an increased IPPC recognition.

1. **Strengthening Institutional Financial Instruments and Practises**

The financial instruments currently available to the IPPC are very limited and are basically in the form of the regular FAO budget contribution and the very limited extra-budgetary contributions through trust funds. While these traditional funding instruments are undoubtedly of importance, the development of new financial instruments to fund IPPC activities is crucial for the successful progress of the IPPC. Financial instruments and practises may be considered to entail income generating schemes, new international agreements or systems to allow expenditure efficiency within the IPPC Secretariat. The CPM recommends:

**Recommendations:**

***F1 Seeking an increased operational autonomy from FAO***

An analysis of FAO and the IPPC and possible financial benefits from greater autonomy will be conducted expeditiously. Should this study reveal potential financial benefits for the IPPC, greater autonomy should be sought and executed. The issue of having a greater autonomy for the IPPC from FAO had been raised at CPM-6. Greater autonomy does not include leaving FAO altogether, but means that the IPPC could have its own budget and could operate to a certain degree on its own rules without having to follow the overly complex FAO system. The expectations from a greater autonomy are that the IPPC would be able to work much more efficiently.

***F2 Creating an additional funding instrument through royalties on Phytosanitary Certificates***

The CPM investigates the practical arrangements for the establishment of a system to collect royalties for phytosanitary certificates and if reasonable establishes it. Sustainable funding of the IPPC can only be achieved if additional, supplementary funding mechanisms are unlocked for the IPPC. In addition, additional funding mechanisms should as much as possible rely on the widest possible donor or contributor base – all contracting parties. In this context, the establishment of a system which allows for individual IPPC registration numbers for phytosanitary certificates (PC) may be considered. In such a system each NPPO could order specific identification numbers for their PCs from the IPPC. The IPPC may collect a tiny royalty per PC (appr. 0.10 – 0.20 US$) which could be used to finance the IPPC. Such a system may incorporate a valuable service (such as fraud prevention) to contracting parties, and may also be a sustainable source of income to the IPPC.

Such a system may also be taken into consideration when revising the IPPC.

***F3 Establishing an international phytosanitary emergency fund through a supplementary agreement***

The CPM considers the establishment of an “International Phytosanitary Emergency Fund” (IPEF). Such a fund could be established through a supplementary agreement and primarily be focused on the eradication or containment of pest incursions into countries. Potentially very attractive to donors, especially NGOs, such a fund would contribute prominently to protecting sustainable agriculture and enhance global food security through the prevention of pest spread. Within this context the IPPC would contribute in a very substantial way to the millennium goals of the UN, notably hunger alleviation. The founding charter would have to be drawn-up at an intergovernmental meeting. Rules and procedures for the IPEF would have to be developed and could be modeled after the STDF of WTO.

 **G. Technical Improvements, Donor Relations and Incentive Programs**

New technologies are facilitating the transmission of information in ways unforeseen less than ten years ago. As a result, new interest groups are promulgating, and the exchange of information globally is taking place at a frenetic pace. The IPPC should capitalize on these developments and provide an opportunity for growth in global interest in plant health issues. Beyond making use of technological innovations such as videoconferencing, cloud computing, etc., the IPPC should seek to broaden its interaction with interest groups and non-government organizations with which it had never before interacted.

**Recommendations:**

***G1  Establish a policy for the use of best available technologies and other non-traditional approaches for conducting IPPC business.***

A very good example already exists of the type of effort envisioned here. The on-line comment system for proposed ISPMs represents a “best practice” for enhanced commentary for the standard setting process. Working to institutionalize and make mandatory the use of this system, and others when appropriate (such as on-line video conferencing through Skype and Go-to-meeting to hold discussions/ad hoc meetings, etc.) will serve to lower costs which had previously gone to providing evening sessions on the margins of the annual CPM meetings. Additional benefits will be realized by holding key meetings outside of Rome when possible in areas where financial charges for meeting arrangements are significantly lower.

***G2  Establish a formalized program for donor relations.***

While much of the work necessary to put such a program in place will be dependent upon the establishment of a transparent financial reporting system within the IPPC Secretariat, there are nevertheless additional measures to develop that will ensure sustained support for IPPC activities. These should include a coherent IPPC message, to be used by any contracting party as well as the Secretariat, which can succinctly explain why the donor should provide resources, how those resources will be used, how the results will make a difference, and how the donor can be recognized for their support (see G3 below). Beyond this, the CPM should canvass contracting parties to ensure that all possible donor organizations have been considered as potential donor partners. Particular emphasis should be given to developing relationships with non-governmental organizations and industry associations (such as forestry groups), which have interests aligned with those of the IPPC.

***G3 Establish an incentive program for donors***

Small efforts can often make a big difference in gaining support, financial or other, for the efforts of an organization. An important psychological consideration is to “bind” donors, contributors, volunteers etc. to the IPPC. If such players are “connected” to the IPPC, they will most likely support it with resources for a longer period and a more sustainable manner. The establishment of an “Incentive” programme would aim at this target group by providing recognition for their support and specifically providing a personalised goal for their support. Such recognition would take place during the annual CPM meeting in Rome and could be as simple as a broadcast acknowledgement from the Secretary of key contributions to as complex as the institution of a formal award.

1. **Revising the IPPC**

Usually, financial instruments and decision-making provisions belong to the core provisions of founding charters or conventions of international organizations. The founding fathers and mothers of such international agreements want to ensure that financial rights and responsibilities are clearly attributed and that the financial contributions are predictable. The IPPC does not have any financial instruments and provisions included, since the original IPPC (1951; revision 1979) was from an organizational point of view a convention without a decision making body. The revision of the IPPC in 1997 did establish a physical structure for the IPPC in the form of a larger Secretariat and a governing body, but did not include financial instruments. This was mainly avoided because it was understood that the inclusion of financial instruments into the IPPC would impose additional obligations to contracting parties, which would in turn require the ratification of the new IPPC by all contracting parties instead of a mere acceptance.

Almost fifteen years after the last revision of the IPPC considerations for new adjustments of the IPPC are discussed and a new revision of the IPPC may well be undertaken by the end of the decade. The IPPC is a dynamic organization and this dynamism should be maintained and reflected in the text of the Convention. In the context of a new revision of the IPPC it would be strongly advisable to provide clarity concerning budgetary and financial matters of the IPPC including the identification of sources for financial contributions and full operational and financial decision-making powers for the CPM. The following chapters provide suggestions in how far financial instruments, rules and resource mobilization components could be discussed in an eventual revision of the IPPC.

1. ***Assessed Contributions***

The effectiveness of an international organization is enhanced when management is held accountable and its activities are transparent. Assessed contributions from contracting parties will play a vital role as they would not only provide a sustained and consistent source of reliable funding for the IPPC, but they would also help to ensure the accountability and transparency of the IPPC budget. In addition, having a consistent source of funding which is managed transparently is a tool to assure potential donors that the IPPC can be trusted to utilize new resources efficiently and effectively. While a decision was made by the CPM that assessed contributions should not be further investigated unless within the context of a revision of the IPPC, if the IPPC is to be revised, a financial component which includes assessed contributions should be included.

1. ***Joint FAO/UNEP/CBD convention***

In the context of the discussion on a revision of the Convention, one major question is whether the IPPC should be solely placed within the FAO framework. Over many years the IPPC has taken up responsibilities in the field of preserving biodiversity and addressing invasive alien species. This has been done in cooperation with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). It is also very clear that the environmental aspects of plant health will continue to increase over the coming years, also in relation to climate change. In this context, legitimate consideration should be given to the possibility of the IPPC conducting its affairs under both the FAO and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)/CBD umbrellas. Both are United Nations organizations and the likelihood of legislative problems to establish such a framework is minimal. The IPPC could consider functioning like the Rotterdam Convention, a joint undertaking of FAO and WHO, and this discussion should take place within the context of the revision of the IPPC. An additional potential benefit is the possibility of additional budget allocations through the UNEP/CBD framework.

1. ***Transboundary Pests***

A key topic for discussion within the context of the IPPC revision must be the clarification of the IPPC responsibility with regard to transboundary pests. The movement of plant pests, animal diseases and invasive alien aquatic organisms across physical and political boundaries threatens food security and creates a global public concern across all countries and all regions. Transboundary plant pests refer to quarantine pests. These include pests of potential economic importance to the area endangered, even if they are not yet present, pests that are present but not widely distributed and officially controlled, and migratory pests. Within the FAO Plant Protection Unit this topic is dealt with especially in relation to locust control and the financial contributions to that matter are considerable. In order to avoid any possible overlap of activities and to benefit from human resources in this field it may be advantageous to the IPPC to cover this topic. It could also result in a much wider recognition of the IPPC especially in relation to the alleviation of hunger.

1. ***Inclusion of financial provisions into the IPPC***

A future revision of the IPPC should deal with the inclusion of financial governance tools into the convention itself. The convention should express how much financial resources are provided to the IPPC and where they are coming from. A revised IPPC should also contain provisions which attribute the right to the CPM to decide on its budget. With the privilege to decide on a budget comes the obligation to ensure that the resources are available and the responsibility to ensure that they are used correctly and conscientiously. It is therefore strongly suggested that a future revised IPPC contains financial and budgetary provisions.

1. **Implementation**

Implementation of the resource mobilization strategy will take place over a period beginning in 2012 through 2021. For detailed information regarding specific implementation activities and responsibilities, please see Appendix 1.

1. **Monitoring**

Monitoring of the resource mobilization strategy is a critical component of implementation and should be an essential function of the collective participants engaged in the activity. While the monitoring process is an ongoing activity which should engage all participants involved in carrying out the strategy, the Secretariat should present a succinct annual update to the SPTA and the CPM that will serve to provide feedback on the extent to which the resource mobilization strategy activities are achieving their goals.

1. **Review**

A formal review of the resource mobilization strategy should be carried out within two years of initiation, with subsequent reviews taking place every two years thereafter. The review should take into consideration the results of the monitoring exercise with a view to identifying potential problems at an early stage and proposing possible solutions, making adjustments to the strategy as appropriate and evaluating the extent to which the strategy is able to achieve its overall objectives.

**Appendix 1**

***Implementation Plan: Timing of activities for RSM - duration 2012 - 2021***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal** | **DETAILED ACTIVITY/YEAR** | **‘12** | **‘13** | **‘14** | **‘15** | **‘16** | **‘17** | **‘18** | **‘19** | **‘20** | **‘21** | **Responsibility** |
| ***A1*** | ***Establishment of a Financial Committee*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *F.C. Establishment*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CPM |
|  | * *RoPs & ToRs*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | FC/Bureau/CPM |
|  | * *Standing Operating Procedures*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | FC/Bureau |
| ***A2*** | ***Improving Budget Transparency & Clarity*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *Establishment guidelines for budget prep.*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Bureau/Vol./SPTA/CPM |
| ***B1*** | ***Development of IPPC communication Strategy*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *Drafting the communication strategy*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec./Vol. |
| ***C1*** | ***Strengthening the use of in-kind expertise*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *Production of codified process*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec./SPTA |
|  | * *Approaching donors for in-kind expertise*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec./Vol. |
| ***C2*** | ***Revising the APO programme*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *Drafting proposal*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec. |
| ***C3*** | ***Increased work of ad hoc working groups*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *Increased utilization of ad hoc WGs*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | All |
| ***D1*** | ***Institutionalizing formal system for sponsorship of meetings*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *RoPs & ToRs*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Bureau/Vol./SPTA/CPM |
|  | * *Approaching donors and implementation*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec./Vol. |
| ***D2*** | ***Introducing the concept of Technical Secretaries*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *RoPs & ToRs*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Bureau/Vol./SPTA/CPM |
| ***E1*** | ***Promoting further the PCE*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *Raising donor awareness*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec./Vol. |
|  | * *Endorsing the review mechanism*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec./CBWG/SPTA/CPM |
| ***E2*** | ***Development of an int. “Roster of Phyto. Experts”*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *Process development*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec./CBWG |
|  | * *development of a fee system for recognition*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec./CBWG/SPTA/CPM |
| ***E3*** | ***Foundation of a dedicated volunteer programme*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *Soliciting volunteers*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec./Vol. |
|  | * *Creating official programme framework*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec./Vol./SPTA/CPM |
| ***F1*** | ***Seeking increased operational autonomy from FAO*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *Conducting a feasibility study*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec. |
|  | * *Official decision*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SPTA/CPM/FAO |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***F2*** | ***Royalties on Phytosanitary Certificates*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *Conducting a practicability study*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | FG/Vol./SC |
|  | * *Development of Rules*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec./Bureau/Vol./SPTA/CPM |
|  | * *Official decision*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CPM |
| ***F3*** | ***Establishment of IPEF*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *preparation*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Vol./ad hoc WGs |
|  | * *International negotiations*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Interested countries |
|  | * *Official decision*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Interested countries |
| ***G1*** | ***Establish a technology policy*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *use of new and best technology*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec. |
| ***G2*** | ***Establish formal programme for donor relations*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *development of guidelines*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec./Vol./CPM |
|  | * *improve donor relations*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec. |
|  | * *Establishing annual donor meetings*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec. |
| ***G3*** | ***Establish an incentive Programme*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *development of guidelines*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Bureau/SPTA/CPM |
|  | * *Implementation*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec./CPM |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IV | **Revision of IPPC** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * *Preparation*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sec./Vol./ad hoc WGs |
|  | * *International negotiations*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CPs |
|  | * *Official adoption*
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CPs |

**List of abbreviations:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***CBWG*** | Capacity Building WG |
| ***CP*** | Contracting Party |
| ***CPM*** | Commission on Phytosanitary Measures |
| ***FC*** | Financial Committee |
| ***SC***  | Standards Committee |
| ***Sec.*** | IPPC Secretariat |
| ***SPTA*** | Informal WG on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance |
| ***Vol.*** | Volunteers |
| ***WG*** | Working Group |