



Second Meeting of the CPM Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance

**01-05 October 2007
Rome, Italy**

Report

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

1. Mr Peter Kenmore, Chief, AGPP and Secretary of the IPPC, welcomed the participants to the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA). In doing so, he noted that it was an important time for the future direction of the IPPC given the outcome of the recent Independent Evaluation of the Workings of the IPPC and its Institutional Arrangements. He recognised the important need for the meeting to discuss how to implement/incorporate the recommendations of the Evaluation for presentation at CPM-3, as well as the need to formulate additional comments to those already given by the extraordinary meeting of the SPTA (ESPTA) held in July.

2. The Secretary noted that the agenda was particularly full and as well as the need to thoroughly discuss the Evaluation Report recommendations, the SPTA had also been given the task by the CPM of analysing and discussing the outcomes of the Focus Group on the Standard Setting Process. As there was also the regular business to discuss, the SPTA would need additional sessions.

3. Ms Reinouw Bast-Tjeerde, CPM Vice-Chair, was elected Chair.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

4. The agenda was adopted. It was agreed that due to the full programme, two or three additional evening sessions would be held.

3. REPORT OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

5. A brief discussion was held relating to a non-contracting party representing a region on one of the CPM subsidiary bodies. As the country had since become a contracting party and it was highly unlikely that the situation would ever be repeated, the issue was considered academic and resolved.

4. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF THE WORKINGS OF THE IPPC AND ITS INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

4.1 General comments on the IPPC Evaluation report

6. The Chair reminded the SPTA that evaluation of the IPPC requested by ICPM 7 was to provide:

- i) Input on future policy, strategy and management and
- ii) Analysis of the current management of IPPC

4.2 Discussion on the recommendations made by the Extraordinary SPTA to the FAO Programme Committee at its 98th Session in September 2007-09-27

7. Mr. Ralf Lopian, CPM Vice-Chair represented the CPM at the 98th Session of the FAO Programme Committee and gave a brief summary of the discussion of the IPPC Evaluation Report (the Programme Committee also took into account the response by the CPM (via the ESPTA meeting) and the FAO Management response). Areas of interest to the SPTA included:

- **Staffing of the IPPC Secretariat** – The Programme Committee agreed with the ESPTA recommendation that there should be a full time Secretary (D1 position) plus a Coordinator
- **Translation of documents** - The Programme Committee was interested in the possibility of outsourcing translation of documents as it would provide considerable savings (approximately one third the FAO cost), but was mindful of the FAO rules regarding outsourcing. The Director of the Translation Service explained that according to FAO rules, Article 14 bodies' work should be translated in house in order to maintain consistency, and that ISPMs be translated in house to maintain technical consistency (it was noted by others that one of the benefits of outside translation was to get technical accuracy and consistency!). The Programme Committee recommended that the issue of translation outsourcing, including the FAO rules be investigated.
- **Reduction of the size of the Standards Committee** - The Programme Committee considered this to be an internal matter of the CPM, but thought there may be some benefit in reducing the number of participants (the IPPC Evaluation Report recommended reducing from 25 down to 14).
- **Financial requirements** - The Programme Committee noted that the Secretariat required additional financial resources and that the staff increase recommended by the Evaluation Report should be realized especially with funding additional professional officers. However whether the additional resources should come from FAO regular funds or from members was left unanswered.
- **Technical assistance** - The Programme Committee agreed with many recommendations of the Evaluation Report but also accepted the need for good coordination between the IPPC (CPM), the Secretariat and the divisions of FAO that worked with technical assistance (leadership may not be in IPPC, but coordination was important).
- **Review of the status of plant protection in the world** - The Program Committee liked the idea of preparing a "Status of the world's plant protection" report but agreed with FAO Management that it was too big a project for the IPPC and recommended that a less costly product be produced.

It was noted that the Programme Committee had appreciated having a member of the IPPC governing body present (CPM) at the meeting.

8. The Secretary informed the SPTA that the FAO itself was currently undergoing an independent external evaluation (IEE), the draft report of which was available on the FAO website. Points of interest (IEE report) to the SPTA included:

- The FAO management, culture and governance must change (be recreated) in order to be effective in the 21st century.
- There had been a steady decline in funding over the past 10 years (funds were now 28% less than a decade ago - more so in the past few years due to declining value of the US dollar), so despite the IPPC having received some additional funds, the increases had been counteracted by the poor exchange rate.
- If the regular programme budget continued to shrink, FAO would be unable to complete the tasks that the member countries required. The IEE addressed both the need for management to change, as well as for the members to better clarify their goals for FAO.

Essentially there was no disagreement between the recommendations of the FAO independent external evaluation and the IPPC evaluation. From a technical perspective, the work of plant protection was considered of importance.

9. The Secretary emphasised that IPPC funding must also be from other sources, not just FAO. There was a large shortfall in the funds required by the IPPC that would not be covered by the FAO Regular Programme. The CPM had to become a major player in a technical assistance strategy and a funding strategy would have to be developed to cover the increasing workload on a multi-year basis (year by year was not practical).

10. A range of issues requiring resolution was noted by the SPTA. These included:
- the need to develop strategies to address the recommendation that the CPM take on the role of coordinating technical assistance;
 - the implications of the Programme Committee recommending a full time Secretary;
 - Secretariat staffing;
 - financial support; and
 - translation (timeline for FAO finalizing (the possibility of) outsourcing).

11. The Secretary agreed that the CPM develop strategies for technical assistance. The appointment of a full-time Secretary would depend on funds being available. He noted that the FAO Conference would probably discuss the budget and the IEE separately, so a zero nominal growth budget (decline in real terms) was likely. Also there was the prediction of an extra-session of the FAO Conference in 2008 to address the IEE, which could result in a revision of the budget (possibility that the IPPC budget may change). The Programme Committee's support for a full time IPPC Secretary meant that there was not so much an administrative obstacle but rather a financial one. It could still happen before CPM-4 and the Bureau/SPTA should develop the process on how to be involved in the selection of a full time Secretary for the CPM's consideration.

12. It was suggested that the IPPC funding strategy be discussed by the FAO governing bodies, not just within IPPC as it was the FAO governing bodies who were the decision makers. The Secretary noted that the IEE recommended that FAO's budget in the future include all extra-budgetary (trust funds) contributions, not just regular programme. CPM-2 had encouraged a more project-oriented planning of the activities to be carried out under the trust fund.

13. The SPTA discussed each of the recommendations (including those that had been previously discussed by the ESPTA) and for those with which they agreed, gave future time-frames for implementation. **Appendix 1** lists the responses of the SPTA to the Independent Evaluation, giving comments on the Evaluation recommendations and recommendations to CPM-3.

Additional comments on each of the recommendations are as follows:

Standards and standard-setting process

Quality and usefulness of standards

14. *Recommendation 1.1 As the existing concept standards cover already many fundamental international plant quarantine and inspection functions, there should be a greater balance in the selection of standards in favour of specific standards;*

Agreement. Already in place (fast track)

15. *Recommendation 1.2 Industry stakeholders should be consulted and their knowledge and experience used at an early stage of the standard-setting process, particularly for specific standards on the basis of the Codex model (as explained in paragraph 56), and the necessary safeguards should be set up;*

Partial agreement. The SPTA felt that consultation depended on member states. There was some discussion as to how industry stakeholders should participate in the IPPC standard setting process. It was agreed that NPPOs should consult a range of stakeholders in their countries, not just industry (other affected and interested parties would include research and teaching organisations, environmental groups, exporters, transporters, etc). It was not the responsibility of Secretariat to solicit comments from industry.

16. *Recommendation 1.3. Greater efforts should be put into prioritization of standards, using existing criteria and weighting their importance as well as taking into account available resources;*

Agreement. Recommendations from the Focus Group on the standard setting process addressed this issue.

17. *Recommendation 1.4 Priorities should also be based on maintaining an average number of three to four standards per year at least in the next three to five years (an increased number of standards may be envisaged where greater efficiency is gained in the process). The process through which priorities are established should be made clear to Contracting Parties;*

Disagreement. The number of standards produced each year depended on their nature. The intention as stated in the Business Plan was to achieve five standards per year.

18. *Recommendation 1.5. Opportunities should be sought to make greater use of existing standards, particularly those developed by RPPOs;*

Agreement. The recent Technical Consultation among RPPOs (TC-RPPOs) held in Ottawa, September 2007, reported that the use of regional standards was already practiced. The SPTA discussed the use of a possible inventory of IPPC-related existing standards, which could be adopted/utilised for the CPM to examine and evaluate. However there was concern that that would create a parallel system of prioritization of new topics; currently contracting parties could send existing standards in as new topics through the normal call procedure. The SPTA agreed that standard development should be based on need and that the contracting parties were best suited to propose standards. It was noted that some contracting parties may not be aware of existing standards, so an inventory could be useful. Preparation of an inventory of existing standards (industry, RPPOs, etc) was not included as an action item.

Environmental and biodiversity concerns

19. Recommendations 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8 were considered together during the discussion.

Recommendation 1.6. A Technical Panel on Biodiversity should be established to review standards from the point of view of environmental impacts, biodiversity threats, and invasive species pathways that could be given accelerated priority and that could be included in the CPM work programme;

Disagreement.

Recommendation 1.7 Some standards should have a primary theme directed at biodiversity issues;

Disagreement

Recommendation 1.8 The Expert Working Groups, Technical Panels and Standards Committee should incorporate bio-diversity and environmental considerations into their work so that all standards address these concerns, not just the standards coming from the Technical Panel on Biodiversity. All standards should have a statement regarding their biodiversity impact;

Agreement. One of the attendees noted that the legal counsel in their country believed that Recommendation 1.6 (biodiversity) was outside the scope of the IPPC, albeit there was no problem with including environmental concerns in ISPMs. The SPTA strengthened the ESPTA comments to emphasise that the CPM agreed that the scope of the Convention extended beyond just cultivated plants. For further emphasis it was agreed to include in the comments examples of standards where environmental concerns had been systematically taken into account, e.g. ISPMs 5 (supplement 2) and 11. The SPTA felt that there was a need to promote among contracting parties the responsibility to implement the standards and objectives of the IPPC, which included reference to environmental matters and recommended such an action accordingly. It was also agreed that there should be a statement regarding biodiversity considerations in all ISPMs (as appropriate).

20. *Recommendation 1.9. An Environmental Liaison Officer position should be created in the IPPC Secretariat with responsibility for environmental content in standards, information and training, and for leading the Technical Panel; and she/he could also carry out liaison functions with other international organizations for the Secretariat such as the Convention on Biodiversity;*

Partial agreement. The SPTA considered that the need was for a general liaison/information officer, recognising that the Secretary and Coordinator would also assume various liaison roles.

Implementation of standards

21. Recommendations 1.10 and 1.11 were considered together during the discussion.

Recommendation 1.10. A procedure for monitoring implementation and impact of standards should be developed by the CPM, and used to inform both revisions of standards and the priorities and processes for developing new standards;

Agreement

Recommendation 1.11: Each standard should have an implementation statement indicating the expected timeframe for implementation, an estimate of the potential impacts and costs and benefits of implementation, and a plan on how implementation could be achieved and monitored;

Disagreement. The SPTA was informed that the OEWG on Possible Compliance Mechanisms had developed recommendations for the CPM with regard to standards implementation (refer section 12.2). It was suggested that the RPPOs could be involved with monitoring implementation.

22. *Recommendation 1.12. Regional workshops reviewing draft ISPMs should continue and new regional workshops promoting implementation should be initiated, with the assistance of RPPOs;*

Agreement (first part of recommendation) and partial agreement (second part of recommendation)

The meeting suggested that the technical assistance and capacity building strategy be expanded to include regional workshops on specific standards if countries indicated there were problems with implementation.

Maintenance of the current level of standard setting

23. *Recommendation 1.13 The CPM should ensure that there is both sufficient direct funding either from the FAO Regular Programme or extra-budgetary sources, to recruit expertise in standard setting to facilitate the work of stewards and to be able to recruit the necessary expertise not provided on a voluntary basis and when needed;*

Agreement. The SPTA discussed the need for sustainability of core operations and an associated funding strategy. It was recognised that each country could have a have a different way of contributing (including via industry). Sponsorship of workshops, standards committee meetings etc (cf. Codex Alimentarius member countries supporting a particular committee for a number of years) and the need to promote such was also discussed. The SPTA recommended that the CPM develop, implement and promote a multi-year funding strategy.

Participation of Contracting Parties

24. *Recommendation 1.14 Sufficient financial and technical support should be directed at active participation of experts from developing countries in the SC, and EWGs and TPs (this will mean the active search and financial support of experts from developing countries).*

Agreement. The SPTA agreed that the recommendation should be part of the multi-year funding strategy.

Transparency of the standard-setting process

25. *Recommendation 1.15 Minutes of standard-setting committees (EWGs, TPs, SC) should provide sufficient detail on the nature and depth of the debates on key issues related to draft standards, and be available prior to member consultations;*

Agreement. The SPTA recommended that the Secretariat remind committees of the need for detail in their reports. The Focus Group on Standard Setting Procedures also dealt with the issue.

26. *Recommendation 1.16. Greater time should be allocated between the end of member consultation on draft ISPMs and the SC meeting and the posting of SC approved draft ISPMs and the meeting of the CPM to allow time for feedback on comments and to achieve greater consensus prior to the CPM;*

Agreement. The SPTA recommended that the Standards Committee (SC) decide on the appropriate time to present the draft to the CPM

27. *Recommendation 1.17. A three-year standard-setting cycle would be more appropriate to ensure adequate time for standards specification, drafting and consultation;*

Partial agreement. The SPTA recommended that the SC decide on the appropriate time to present the draft to the CPM.

28. *Recommendation 1.18 The number of permanent professional staff in the Secretariat involved in supporting the standard-setting process should be increased from 1.5 person years to 4 person years plus part of the time from the Senior Environment Liaison Officer (mentioned above); (This did not include temporary staff and contractual arrangements);*

Partial agreement. The SPTA believed that the number of permanent professional staff in the Secretariat for the standard setting process should be increased from 1.5 person years to 6 person years as rationalized in the CPM Business Plan. This assumed that less work would be done on a voluntary basis, which was contrary to the assumption in the evaluation report.

29. *Recommendation 1.19 The Secretariat should be able to have a greater role all along the standard-setting process in support of the EWGs, TPs, the SC and the CPM with a view to increasing transparency, quality of the work and facilitating participation of all Contracting Parties;*

Agreement. The SPTA recommended that Secretariat's capacity be strengthened as per the business plan

Information exchange

Assistance to Contracting Parties

30. *Recommendation 2.1. The IPPC Secretariat should continue to assist countries to better understand their information reporting obligations and to provide training on how to use the IPP to meet those obligations;*

Agreement

31. *Recommendation 2.2. Once the Secretariat finishes giving the basic workshop to Contracting Parties in all the regions, future training support should involve the development and provision of short refresher courses to reinforce the training and ensure capacity;*

Agreement. The SPTA felt that opportunities should be explored to combine training workshops with refresher workshops.

Evaluation of obligation status

32. Recommendations 2.3 and 2.4 were considered together during the discussion.

Recommendation 2.3. The IPPC Secretariat should consider developing a basic form, available on the IPP, for countries to use to auto-evaluate their reporting obligation status, as well as the accuracy of the data provided. Countries could be encouraged to auto-evaluate their status on a regular basis (e.g. yearly);

Agreement

Recommendation 2.4. In view of the arrival of new editors and the need for refresher information by existing ones, the IPPC Secretariat should continue the development of appropriate capacity-building tools;

Agreement. The SPTA considered that 2.3 would be an outcome of the proposals by OEWG on a Possible Compliance Mechanism. With regard to 2.4, the SPTA recommended that the Secretariat develop the appropriate capacity-building tools and IPP manual.

Increased availability of information

33. *Recommendation 2.5. The IPPC Secretariat should establish formal linkages with other information exchange mechanisms and their databases in particular with RPPOs and the International Portal on Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health, through Memoranda of Understanding or other appropriate mechanisms to improve the availability of information and to increase the usefulness of the IPP;*

Agreement. The SPTA shared the comments contained in the FAO Management response, i.e., Consider the need for a formal working group within the Organization, to make best use of resources in the International Portal on Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health (IPFSAPH) and synergies with similar information exchange programmes where possible (e.g. Codex Alimentarius).

34. *Recommendation 2.6. Information provided through RPPOs should be recognized as a legal reporting route for the IPPC, providing that IPPC can harvest the information. This would imply that a standard format for data exchange be defined in the Memorandum of Understanding to permit periodic harvesting of data from these official sources.;*

Partial agreement. The SPTA discussed whether the RPPOs could report for the IPPC in a legal sense and believed that RPPOs should be recognized as an “official” reporting route rather than “legal” due to legal ambiguities in relationship between the IPPC and the RPPOs (Secretariat to confirm with FAO Legal). The SPTA felt that the topic needed to be discussed at CPM-3 and the implementation could then be discussed at the next Technical Consultation among RPPOs (2008) to be held in Rome.

35. *Recommendation 2.7. Further, the IPPC Secretariat should establish a mechanism for Contracting Parties to officially declare to the IPPC which reporting channel they are using to meet their reporting obligations;*

Disagreement. The SPTA noted that a reporting mechanism already existed through the IPP. It was noted that there was a range of reporting obligations, and a contracting party was able to use more than one reporting channel. The Secretariat noted that it would be helpful to know where to look for a contracting party’s reporting information. Legally, the Convention was between contracting parties, so further legal analysis may be required to address whether reporting through RPPOs was sufficient (see recommendation 2.6).

Compliance with mandatory information exchange obligations

36. *Recommendation 2.8. Compliance with mandatory information exchange obligations should be given much greater emphasis by the CPM and the Secretariat*

Agreement. The SPTA noted that compliance was a responsibility of the contracting parties and that commitment must be made by the contracting parties. Recommendations of the OEWG on a Possible Compliance Mechanism also dealt with the issue.

37. *Recommendation 2.9. A monitoring and compliance system for meeting mandatory IPPC reporting obligations should be developed and implemented. (A first step in that direction would be to publish country information reporting every year at the CPM.) This system should specifically track Contracting Party compliance with all reporting obligations;*

Agreement. The SPTA noted that the OEWG on a Possible Compliance Mechanism used the term “implementation monitoring”. The SPTA felt that monitoring was a responsibility of the CPM.

Professional support

38. Recommendations 2.10 and 2.11 were considered together during the discussion

Recommendation 2.10. The Secretariat should hire a Webmaster for information exchange and a Programmer to maintain the IPP and to improve its tools and features;

Agreement

Recommendation 2.11. Funding should be made available for hiring external Information Technology professional assistance to assist with the maintenance of the IPP and to support its further development;

Agreement: The SPTA noted that staffing issues would be addressed in section 6.9, the structure of the Secretariat; and that a webmaster had already been hired.

Technical Assistance

Coordination of Global Support

39. *Recommendation 3.1 FAO, and not the IPPC Secretariat, is best placed to coordinate global support for strengthening national phytosanitary capacity; and*

Disagreement. Contrary to the recommendation in the report, the SPTA felt that the IPPC Secretariat was best placed to coordinate phytosanitary capacity building and recommended the development of a phytosanitary capacity building strategy which would address implementation, funding, and linkages to FAO resources. The strategy, as developed, would specify reporting channels.

40. *Recommendation 3.2 An International Consultative Group on Technical Assistance and Capacity-Building on Phytosanitary Matters should be set up and coordinated by the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division.*

The group:

- a) would be open to all donors and recipient countries in the field of phytosanitary capacity;*
- b) objectives would be to define priority needs, facilitate resource mobilization, and ensure coordination;*
- c) it should establish effective linkages with the CPM;*

Disagreement. In addition to comments made for recommendation 3.1, the SPTA felt such a committee would add an unnecessary oversight.

Organization of Technical Capacity

41. *Recommendation 3.3: FAO, through the Plant Production and Protection Division, should organize the necessary technical capacity outside the IPPC Secretariat as part of its regular programme with a view to providing technical assistance in support of phytosanitary capacity development. FAO should do so taking into account its resources and in partnership with other main actors;*

Disagreement

42. *Recommendation 3.4 FAO should report to the CPM on its phytosanitary technical assistance;*

Agreement. The SPTA noted that there should be transparency in communication and link between the IPPC and FAO. There was some discussion as to whether FAO would continue to have independent capacity building activities which should be reported to the CPM, or if the FAO activities would be incorporated into the IPPC capacity building strategy. It was agreed that the envisaged phytosanitary capacity building strategy would specify the reporting requirements.

IPPC Technical Assistance

43. *Recommendation 3.5 Technical assistance carried out directly under the IPPC should be limited to its core business, i.e. closely linked to a better understanding of standards and monitoring of the impact of these standards, the development and use of the IPP as a tool for information exchange among Contracting Parties, and support to developing country attendance at technical and governance meetings;*

Partial agreement. The SPTA noted that the activities suggested by the Evaluation Report would be a subset of a much wider range covered by the envisaged phytosanitary capacity building strategy.

Dispute Settlement

44. *Recommendation 4.1. Continued effective support should be given to maintain the newly established Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement and to promote awareness of the IPPC's dispute settlement procedures;*

Agreement. The question was raised as to why contracting parties were not using the established dispute settlement procedures. The Secretariat explained that the good offices of the IPPC Secretariat had been used and potential disputes had been resolved before formal dispute settlement procedures were necessary. It was agreed that a report of the use of any element of the SBDS system be presented to the CPM. There was a reporting obligation with formal SBDS issues.

45. *Recommendation 4.2. The CPM should encourage Contracting Parties, when appropriate, to make use of this process;*

Agreement. The Secretariat noted that if there were too many disputes the Secretariat would not have the resources to address them.

Governance

CPM Programme of Work

46. *Recommendation 5.1. The CPM should review and formally adopt the annual programme of work and related budget;*

Agreement. Recommendation 5.1 was considered with 7.2 and 7.3.

There was still a possible legal constraint (IPPC is established under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution), However the SPTA considered that resources allocated from FAO to the IPPC should be used in the way that CPM believed appropriate.

CPM's Cost

47. *Recommendation 5.2 In order to reduce the CPM's cost, it is recommended that translation costs should be reduced by outsourcing these activities;*

Agreement. However, translation must be consistent with the expectations of the IPPC and within the FAO requirements. The SPTA strongly supported that the FAO Member representatives should be aware that the SPTA agreed with the Programme Committee's inquiry into relaxation of translation policies. It was suggested that the chair of the CPM write a letter pointing out the recommendations of the Programme Committee and that it would be helpful if the heads of NPPOs could contact FAO representatives to support the Programme Committee recommendations, in particular the D1 Secretary, the investigation of translation options, and increased regular programme funding.

Information

48. *Recommendation 5.3 Acknowledging that one of the CPM's key functions should remain the review of phytosanitary issues at the global level, but noting that the Secretariat does not have the capacity to carry out such a review on a regular basis. FAO (and not the IPPC Secretariat) should integrate into its core work programme a review of the phytosanitary status of the world as part of the technical services provided by the Plant Production and Protection Division to the IPPC and to the FAO membership as a whole;*

Disagreement. The "review of the state of plant protection in the world" is a function of the CPM and the SPTA believed that a review of phytosanitary issues at a global level was best carried out under the IPPC as existing reporting channels such as the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) were already functional. Increased efficiency and use of the IPP coupled with accurate reporting may contribute considerably to such a review. The implementation review mechanism proposed by the OEWG on a Possible Compliance Mechanism would provide the basis for such a review.

Structures and Transparency

49. *Recommendation 5.4 To combine the functions of the Bureau and the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance into the newly enlarged Bureau;*

Agreement. The extended Bureau would still have one annual open meeting which would work in the same way as the current SPTA.

50. *Recommendation 5.5 Greater transparency be ensured through various measures including quick availability of minutes of meetings and audio-recordings on the Internet as well as possibility to co-opt or invite experts;*

Partial agreement. The SPTA agreed that transparency was an ongoing issue and should be addressed by the CPM and its bodies, wherever practical and possible. It was noted that the Focus Group on Standard Setting Procedures had made recommendations regarding transparency in standard setting. As far as the use of audio recordings on the internet was concerned, the SPTA felt that for the present the use of audio recordings should not be implemented and that the associated cost would need to be considered against the demand.

Effective management of the work to be undertaken by the Standards Committee

51. *Recommendation 5.6. The total membership of the Committee should be reduced to 14: two from each FAO Region;*

Disagreement. While there was some concern over the efficiency and cost of the SC, the SPTA recognised that the CPM had put considerable energy into reaching consensus on the size of the SC and felt it would be inappropriate to re-open the matter.

52. *Recommendation 5.7. RPPOs should be involved in the identification of appropriate candidates*

Partial agreement. The SPTA felt that it was up to the individual regions to decide how best to identify candidates.

Staffing

53. *Recommendation 5.8 The Secretariat should ensure that proposed members meet the requirements as described in the Standards Committee's rules of procedure (subsequently, candidates should be endorsed by the Bureau against agreed criteria before being submitted to the CPM for confirmation);*

Partial agreement. The SPTA believed that it was the FAO Regions' responsibility to ensure that the candidates met the agreed criteria. The Secretariat would ensure that the Regions were aware of the criteria

Secretariat

54. *Recommendation 6.1 The Secretary post should not be associated with other FAO functions and should be a full-time D1 (Manager);*

Agreement. The Secretary would focus time and effort on leadership and management of the IPPC and its Secretariat.

55. *Recommendation 6.2 There should be open competition for the post of Secretary;*

Agreement. It would be useful for the Bureau to have a draft job description ready for consideration by the CPM-3.

56. *Recommendation 6.3 The Coordinator post should then be abolished;*

Disagreement. The SPTA believed that after appointing the full time Secretary, the Coordinator position must be maintained for at least a certain period in order to maintain and improve an efficient functioning of the Secretariat. Once a full time secretary was appointed, the workload and CPM's expectations of the Secretariat should be reviewed to determine the appropriate structure, size and scope of the Secretariat.

The FAO Management Response noted that:

Based on the experience of the Secretaries of other Conventions and Treaties where the Secretariat is provided by FAO, Management considers that the Secretary's Terms of Reference would focus on leadership, policy linkages, relations between the IPPC, FAO and other international public and private Organizations, and strategic planning. Most of the functions of the Coordinator in managing the current work distribution, improving communication among Secretariat teams, and monitoring and increasing the efficiency of the Secretariat will remain after the appointment of a full-time Secretary. Additionally, technical and operational coordination with other relevant Organizations and Secretariats within approved policies and strategies will increase.

The ESPTA recommended maintaining the Coordinator's position for a fixed term and then evaluating the overall performance of the Secretariat.

57. *Recommendation 6.4 The seniority of the posts dealing with the IPPC's two core functions (i.e. standard-setting and information exchange) should be upgraded to P5, supervising other professionals;*

The SPTA believed that the determination of pay grade should be done by the IPPC Secretary and FAO and that staff should be remunerated in accordance with their responsibilities as per Recommendation 6.9

Technical Assistance

In view of the proposed changes regarding the role of the Secretariat on technical assistance:

58. *Recommendation 6.5. Regional Plant Protection Officers should perform specific tasks against reimbursement from the IPPC budget. Activities funded from this source should be concerned with the primary role of the IPPC (e.g. standard-setting, information exchange and dispute settlement);*

Agreement. It was recognised that the programme for the FAO Regional Plant Protection Officers would need to be negotiated (in line with the draft operational plan) in anticipation of approval by the CPM meeting in March. Work undertaken by the Officers should be correlated with the funding supplied from the IPPC contribution.

59. *Recommendation 6.6. The activities carried out by the Regional Officers should be reported annually in the CPM as part of the activity and financial report of the Secretariat to the CPM;*

Agreement. This practice was initiated as part of the Secretariat report to CPM-2 (2007).

Selection of staff

60. *Recommendation 6.7 In line with the provisions of Article XIV of the FAO Constitution, the Bureau and the representatives of the Director-General (e.g. from the Plant Production and Protection Division) will recommend a candidate for Secretary to the Director-General following a transparent and competitive selection process.*

Agreement. Liaison with FAO would be required to ascertain the most practical way of involving the CPM/Bureau. (Note: the response made by the ESPTA to 6.7 was based on an earlier version of the Evaluation Report, which was later modified by the Evaluation Team)

61. *Recommendation 6.8 A similar procedure will be followed for the selection of the professional staff of the IPPC Secretariat. Such staff would not be eligible for consideration as internal candidates for posts elsewhere in FAO.*

Agreement. Under the FAO rules, staff *would* be eligible for consideration as internal candidates for posts elsewhere in FAO. The SPTA noted the FAO management response, i.e. *Professional appointments will be considered by the Professional Staff Selection Committee (PSSC) before a short list is presented. For identification of the most qualified candidates for the short list, the positions will be widely advertised and nominations will be sought from relevant institutions and organizations, including the CPM. Once appointed, under FAO Staff rules, any staff member must be eligible for consideration as an internal candidate for posts elsewhere in FAO.*

Any vacancy announcements could be sent to the Bureau for distribution and the Bureau (CPM) could be involved in developing the job description. For a P4 position, typically 400 people would apply, which would ultimately end up with a final shortlist of say 12 people to interview, following which a final short list of four to five would be prepared for consideration by the Professional Staff Selection Committee.

(Note: the response made by the ESPTA to 6.8: was based on an earlier version of the Evaluation Report, which was later modified by the Evaluation Team)

5.1 Structure and number of Professional Secretariat Staff

62. *Recommendation 6.9 Based on the analysis in the previous chapters, changes proposed regarding the structure and the number of professional staffing of the Secretariat are as follows:*

- D-1 IPPC Secretary (Manager)
- 1 P-5 Senior Environmental Liaison Officer and Coordination with other international organizations
- 1 P-5 IPPC Senior Standards Officer
- 3 P-4 Standards Officers
- 1 P-5 IPPC Senior Information Exchange Officer
- 1 P-4 Information Officer
- 1 P-3 Programmer
- 1 P-2 Webmaster;

Partial agreement. The SPTA noted that the Evaluation did not reflect the capacity building staff needs, as it had recommended that that area be moved outside the Secretariat (Rec 3.1). The SPTA believed that the CPM Business Plan (2007-2011), which also included the general staff, more accurately reflected the staffing needs of the Secretariat. However it was recognised that the Business Plan may need to be revised to incorporate the envisaged strategic plan for technical assistance (assuming CPM agreement).

IPPC's Financial Resources

63. *Recommendation 7.1. FAO should preferably ensure systematic annual core funding of the Secretariat's core activities on a basis agreed upon by the CPM's expanded Bureau and FAO;*

Agreement. However it recommended that the terms "preferably" and "expanded bureau" be deleted so that the recommendation would read: *FAO should ensure systematic annual core funding of the Secretariat's core activities on a basis agreed upon by the CPM and FAO.* The basis for the CPM's consideration of core activities was the 7 strategic 5-year goals presented in the CPM Business Plan and aimed at implementing the provisions of the IPPC. The SPTA considered that the successful implementation of the goals would require sufficient resources both from FAO and external sources. This would also be in accordance with the opening speech of the Director-General at CPM-2.

The SPTA also discussed funding problems experienced by some of the RPPOs. The meeting agreed that the subject of the development of RPPOs should be included in the envisaged capacity building strategy.

64. Recommendations 7.2 and 7.3 were considered together with recommendation

Recommendation 7.2. The annual budget and programme should be defined by the expanded bureau.

Partial agreement

Recommendation 7.3. The Secretariat should be fully accountable to the expanded Bureau and should provide detailed and clear financial reports;

Partial agreement

The Bureau would develop and propose an annual work programme with an associated budget in consultation with the Secretariat. The Secretariat would only be fully accountable to the Bureau and the CPM with respect to the *work programme and associated budget* and provide detailed and clear financial reports. The FAO management response describes the financial responsibility (limited) of the Bureau, i.e.,

.... In such a situation the Bureau can only have an advisory function unless the CPM decides otherwise. Furthermore, this can only be seen in the context of the CPM as an Article XIV body of the IPPC, which does not include financial responsibility for FAO's Regular Programme funds. ...

65. *Recommendation 7.4. The Secretariat should have a more solid resource mobilization strategy, stressing the preference for multi-donor trust funding over bilateral funding;*

Agreement. The IWG-SPTA gave the Recommendation considerable importance and agreed that the Secretariat should have a more solid resource mobilisation strategy, stressing the preference for multi-donor trust funding over bilateral funding (albeit any form of extra-budgetary contribution at any time would be considered).

66. *Recommendation 7.5. Donor Contracting Parties should make an effort to tie their contributions to the IPPC's annual planning cycle;*

Partial agreement. The SPTA considered this recommendation as a subset of Recommendation 7.4

67. *Recommendation 7.6. More innovative approaches of funding such as cost-recovery schemes will have to be systematically and carefully considered in the future;*

Partial agreement. The SPTA emphasised that alternative funding mechanisms, including cost recovery schemes had been investigated over the past five years and were considered not to be practical at present. However, other innovative approaches would be considered as part of the development of a resource mobilization strategy being developed under Recommendation 7.4.

Regional Plant Protection Organizations (Suggestions)

68. The SPTA also considered the suggestions made by the Evaluation Team regarding the RPPOs (Paragraphs 189 and 190), in the areas of: Information Exchange, Standards and comments relating to the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission, the Caribbean Plant Protection Commission and the establishment of the Near East Plant Protection Organisation. The comments from the 19th Technical Consultation among regional Plant Protection Organisations (Ottawa 1007) were considered and there was agreement and support for these.

4.3 TC-RPPO Comments on the IPPC Evaluation

69. The Nineteenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organisations (TC-RPPOs) took the opportunity to consider the recommendations of the IPPC Evaluation Report that were relevant to RPPOs. Comments on relevant recommendations were as follows (Note: Comments have all been noted within Appendix 1 under the pertinent recommendations):

70. *Recommendation 1.5. Opportunities should be sought to make greater use of existing standards, particularly those developed by RPPOs;*

The TC-RPPOs agreed with the recommendation, which was already being implemented.

71. *Recommendation 1.12. Regional workshops reviewing draft ISPMs should continue and new regional workshops promoting implementation should be initiated, with the assistance of RPPOs;*

The TC-RPPOs agreed with the recommendation including assistance from RPPOs. The TC-RPPOs felt that a coordinated strategy would be necessary between the IPPC and RPPOs in order to accomplish the new regional workshops on implementation. The TC-RPPOs also noted that Goal 1 of the CPM Business Plan included RPPOs giving assistance to members for the implementation of standards.

72. *Recommendation 2.5. The IPPC Secretariat should establish formal linkages with other information exchange mechanisms and their databases in particular with RPPOs and the International Portal on Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health, through Memoranda of Understanding or other appropriate mechanisms to improve the availability of information and to increase the usefulness of the IPP;*

The TC-RPPOs agreed in principle with the recommendation, based on availability of the information.

73. *Recommendation 2.6. Information provided through RPPOs should be recognized as a legal reporting route for the IPPC, providing that IPPC can harvest the information. This would imply that a standard format for data exchange be defined in the Memorandum of Understanding to permit periodic harvesting of data from these official sources.;*

The TC-RPPOs agreed with recognizing the RPPOs as an official reporting route and using a standard format for this purpose. It believed that the word “legal” in the recommendation was not appropriate and should be replaced with the word “official”. RPPOs cautioned however against creating additional obligations for them.

74. *Recommendation 5.7. RPPOs should be involved in the identification of appropriate candidates*

The TC-RPPOs agreed with the recommendation.

75. *Para 189. The evaluation team identified a number of areas where RPPOs could have a greater role in the implementation of the Convention, which are:*

a) *Information Exchange:*

The development of MOU for the establishment of systematic links with databases of RPPOs as discussed in the section above on Information Exchange; EPPO, NAPPO and COSAVE have particularly well-developed databases.

The TC-RPPOs agreed with the suggestion.

76. b) *Standards:*

i) *RPPOs could play a greater role regarding the development and implementation of ISPMs, including the organization and conduct of regional workshops to review draft ISPMs;*

The TC-RPPOs agreed with the suggestion and felt that it could be further extended to include cooperation (e.g. sharing of information, personnel) between the RPPOs

77. ii) *RPPOs could plan the regional implementation of adopted ISPMs in cooperation with the FAO Plant Protection Officers. This could also involve the coordination of technical assistance requirements for Contracting Parties to meet their obligations as well as the provision of technical assistance support to facilitate the implementation of ISPMs.*

The TC-RPPOs agreed with the suggestion that in regions that had FAO Plant Protection Officers, a work plan should be developed for cooperation in the implementation of ISPMs. However, coordination of technical assistance may be a new role for RPPOs and additional resources would be required and the capacity to coordinate would vary from region to region. There may be opportunities for collaboration among RPPOs in that activity.

4.4 Recommendations to CPM-3

78. Appendix 1 lists the recommendations from the SPTA to CPM-3. The recommendations identify the action, timing and the unit responsible for implementation. The SPTA discussed the mechanism whereby the recommendations should be presented to CPM-3, recognising that it would not be possible to go through each of the Evaluation Report’s 60 recommendations individually. It was suggested that the Bureau and Secretariat “cluster” the recommendations and present as such.

4.5 Budget implications of the SPTA recommendations to CPM-3

79. The budget implications of the SPTA recommendations to CPM-3 were not discussed due to lack of time and financial information.

5. Focus Group on the review of IPPC standard setting procedures

5.1 General consideration of the report of the Focus Group

80. The highlights of the report of the Focus Group (FG) were outlined by the Chair of the SPTA. CPM-2 (2007) had decided to convene a FG to review several standard setting procedures, in particular Annex I to the Rules of Procedure of the CPM, which outlined the standard setting procedure, the procedure and criteria for identifying topics for the standard setting work programme, the terms of reference and rules of procedure for technical panels (TPs) and the general topic of transparency. The Chair indicated that transparency had been considered throughout the discussions of the FG and appropriate modifications made to the procedure documents discussed by the FG and that no separate paper had been prepared on transparency. The FG had discussed and modified the procedures and made a number of other recommendations, which were detailed in its report. The recommendations relevant to the SPTA were discussed by the SPTA and all recommendations would be integrated into relevant CPM papers.

5.2 Procedure and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme

81. The SPTA noted that the FG had defined a hierarchy of terms, namely:

- technical area,
- topic, and
- subject.

The SPTA noted that these terms had been used in the revision of the procedure and felt the CPM should be invited to note the terms and their related hierarchy.

82. The SPTA discussed the document as modified by the FG. In the draft procedure, a footnote indicated that for annexes worked on by technical panels, the procedure and criteria outlined in the document need not be used. One member was concerned that if the CPM was not adopting these subjects (i.e. if this remained under the sole supervision of the SC), member countries would not be informed of the specific subjects the TPs were working on until late in the process. There was a risk that TPs would spend time developing annexes which were not considered high priority by the CPM. The Secretariat indicated that such adoption would be difficult for the work of some TPs, such as the TP on Phytosanitary Treatments, as it would have to wait for CPM approval before working on submissions from countries, which would considerably delay their work. The group discussed the matter at length and determined that the role of the TPs was to provide drafts and technical advice under the guidance of the SC. While the member still considered the role of the CPM to be important in defining the work of the TP, the group reached consensus for the work of the TPs to remain under the guidance of the SC. The SPTA felt that the CPM should continue to adopt topics for the TP work programmes, but that the subjects under each topic should be left to the experts in the TPs to decide, with ongoing guidance from the SC.

83. The SPTA discussed the role of the SPTA, SC and CPM in setting topics for the work programme. It was clarified that the SPTA set strategic priorities for the work programme. The SC considered the strategic priorities and reviewed the specific submissions for topics and made a proposal to the CPM for adjustments to the standard setting work programme including additions, deletions and/or changes of priority of topics. The CPM would then discuss the work programme based on the proposal of the SC and discussion by CPM members, and the resultant work programme would be adopted by the CPM. Given that, the SPTA agreed that the SPTA and SC would use the *Procedure and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme* and that the CPM would take them into account.

84. The criteria outlined in the procedure were discussed. It was agreed that the core criteria should be met for each topic before it would be considered for inclusion in the work programme. The “other criteria” were renamed “supporting criteria” and should also be considered when assessing which new topics should be included in the work programme. One member indicated that the criterion “estimated reductions in cost of pest control or quarantine activities” would be difficult to apply because often the implementation of standards initially increased costs. It was changed to read “potential benefits of pest control or quarantine activities”.

85. Modified procedure would be presented to the SC in November 2007 and then to the CPM for adoption. The CPM would be invited to note the hierarchy of terms proposed by the Focus Group

5.3 IPPC standard setting procedure (Annex 1 of the Rules of Procedure of the CPM)

86. The SPTA discussed the standard setting procedure, and made some modifications. In particular, the following points were discussed.

General points

87. One member of the SPTA commented on the reference to the IPPC Procedural Manual in the introduction to the document, indicating that the SPTA or CPM should review it periodically and that it should be made more user-friendly. The rest of the SPTA agreed that it was an important and useful document but that it was a compilation of decisions. The revised standard setting procedure should take account of the appropriate decisions compiled in the Procedural Manual.

88. The SPTA discussed the use of e-mail by the SC for approval of documents, such as specifications or drafts for consultation through the fast-track process.

89. The SPTA agreed that when the SC reviewed its TORs and ROPs (as indicated in the FG report, only after adoption of the IPPC standard setting procedure), it should also clarify and expand on the use of e-mail for approval of specifications and other documents.

90. The SPTA discussed the case where the SC-7 met on its own to review draft ISPMs in preparation for member consultation. For transparency purposes, the SPTA agreed that all documents for the SC-7 should be available to the whole SC and that the full SC had the right and would be encouraged to provide comments to SC-7 for their consideration. A full report of the SC-7 meeting and discussions should be produced, as was done for the SC.

91. The SC should also address this when reviewing its TOR and ROP.

92. At the end of Step 6, the SPTA discussed the sentence indicating that SC members should report back to countries in their region. The SPTA agreed that that it would be difficult for SC members to do so as the SC often did not go through individual member comments and that more detailed SC reports, as agreed previously, would help to give countries the information needed.

93. The issue of observers at the SC-7 was discussed. Some members felt that the SC rules on observers would apply while others felt that observers should not be allowed. The Secretariat indicated that they had been using the rules of EWGs, which stated that no observers were allowed. In addition, since the IPPC Secretariat was unable to fund observers, opening the SC-7 to observers would mean that only countries with resources would be likely to attend, thereby possibly biasing meetings. The presence of observers could also make a meeting, intended to be small, much larger.

94. The SPTA noted however, that the presence of stewards of draft ISPMs to be discussed by the SC-7 was very useful and that stewards should be invited to attend the SC-7. For other issues relating to observers, the SC should decide on the rules for observers at the SC-7.

Fast-track process

95. The SPTA extensively discussed the fast-track process taking into account recent developments with the first draft diagnostic protocol submitted under the process.

96. The SPTA discussed the name “fast-track process” and agreed that it was inappropriate, and changed it to “special process”. Many contracting parties may be surprised to learn that the fast-track was not fast, just different, and that that should be clearly explained.

97. Regarding the timing of the fast-track process, as currently member consultation could happen at any time of the year, it was suggested that there could be one or several fixed times for member consultation during the year, as countries needed to put resources into the consultation process and also arrange to consult with industry, stakeholders, etc. The Secretariat indicated that arranging a fixed time frame could be difficult as several factors come into play, including translators’ schedules, meeting dates for Technical Panels, general work load on the Secretariat, etc.

98. The SPTA decided that the Secretariat and the SC should examine the possibility of having some predictability as to when the consultation period would occur for the fast-track process (if not fixed dates).

99. The SPTA discussed a document that had been prepared by the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) at their meeting in September 2007. The document was prepared as a result of the Panel’s work on the comments received on the diagnostic protocol for *Thrips palmi*, which had been sent for member consultation through the fast-track process. The document outlined the difficulties linked to the comments v. formal objections received during member consultation. The process did not provide for the revision of the document based on comments and the TPDP faced a dilemma as some of the comments received were very good and enhanced the protocol. Additionally, according to the process, if a fast-track draft was changed, it would go to the CPM for discussion. However, the CPM would not be the appropriate forum for such a technical discussion as the appropriate experts would not likely be present. The TPDP wanted more guidance on what a formal objection was and how it should be resolved. It was noted that in effect there was no provision for comments in the process and only formal objections could be provided. It was thought that if there was no way to incorporate comments, countries would submit formal objections and block the adoption of such annexes and appendices. The SPTA therefore agreed that it was worthwhile to create a category of comments other than formal objections. The Secretariat could still try and resolve formal objections but other comments could be examined by the relevant TP and the SC, possibly by e-mail. The SPTA modified steps 5 and 6 of Stage 3 (member consultation) of the fast-track process to incorporate the ideas.

100. It was suggested that it would be more appropriate to ask for formal objections after the consultation period and after comments had been incorporated. In that way, countries could decide if their comments had been properly integrated. If no formal objections were received, the draft would be submitted to the CPM for adoption without discussion, and conversely, if a formal objection was received, the draft would be returned to the SC, which would consider the objection and decide, in consultation with the relevant TP, if the standard could be resubmitted to the CPM or sent back for further drafting. The text of Step 7 was modified to reflect that.

101. The SPTA discussed the period necessary for countries to make formal objections before the CPM met. It was decided to leave the deadline at 14 days prior to the CPM, as it was for the regular process standards and to consider a review of that timeframe after more experience was gained with the special process.

102. The SPTA noted that it should be emphasized that the special process was only for highly technical standards.

Status of the procedure and recommendations for the CPM

103. The SPTA agreed that the CPM paper, which would contain the procedure, would also invite the CPM to note the 11 main points for delivering standards that the FG had identified (paragraph 14 of the FG Report).

104. The SPTA considered a proposal made at CPM-2, to not have the standard setting procedure as an Annex to the ROPs of the CPM. It was agreed that it would be easier to maintain a consolidated process for standard setting if it was not an annex to the ROP of the CPM (easier to modify, less formality, easier to ensure consistency between general and associated procedures as they were developed or modified, more flexibility). However, the SPTA recommended that the document be presented to CPM-3 in 2008 as an Annex to the ROP of the CPM and at the same time to propose to the CPM to develop a consolidation of all standard setting procedures and to present this consolidation to the CPM at a future date for adoption as a separate document. That would require a change at that time to Rule X of the ROPs of the CPM in order to remove the reference to an annex.

105. The procedure would be presented to the SC and then to CPM for adoption. Several points as noted above would need to be in the introduction to the CPM paper (including status of the document, explanation on fast-track and regular process, etc.).

5.4 Terms of reference and rules of procedure for technical panels

106. The SPTA discussed whether the subjects under topics considered by the TPs (e.g. specific diagnostic protocols or treatments) should be adopted by the CPM. The discussion was reported under 5.2.

107. The SPTA reviewed the TORs and ROPs, and discussed in particular the following points.

Disestablishment of technical panels

108. According to the proposed TORs and ROPs for technical panels, the SC may recommend the disestablishment of a TP but it was felt that only the CPM may take that action. The ROPs of the SC should be modified to reflect the change.

109. The SPTA agreed that, when the SC reviewed its TORs and ROPs (as indicated in the FG report, only after adoption of the TORs and ROPs for TPs), it should also address disestablishment of TPs.

Nomination of TP members

110. The TORs and ROPs *allowed* the Secretariat to make nominations, which may present a conflict of interest as the Secretariat also summarized the candidates' qualifications and recommended the selection of individual candidates. It had been suggested that each candidate's CV be posted publicly on the IPP but it was noted that the FG had not recommended that due to the potential negative impact on candidates who were not selected. The SPTA concluded that the Secretariat should be allowed to submit nominations but only in exceptional cases, such as in relation with other international organizations.

Period of membership

111. Currently TP members serve indefinite terms but the FG had recommended that the SC review membership every five years. One member proposed to shorten the period of membership to three years as that would more closely match the length of time between developing a draft into a standard. After discussing the need to balance continuity of membership in TPs with regular review of membership, the SPTA agreed to make the period of membership five years, realizing that the SC should review and adjust as appropriate the membership of TPs on a regular basis (more frequently than once every five years).

Role of stewards in TPs

112. The text was modified to clarify that the steward of a TP was a member of that panel and that stewards of TPs should where possible, be selected from among SC members. Stewards assigned by the SC to work on a specific topic referred to the TP but which were not members of that TP may also participate in the relevant TP meeting, but would not be considered members of the TP.

Participation of non-members

113. TP meetings do not allow observers. However, when specific expertise may be required, the participation of an outside expert may strengthen the TP's work. The SPTA discussed whether a procedure should be established to guide the selection of invited experts. One member noted that with their current workload, TPs operated almost like subsidiary bodies and that the selection of invited experts might need some oversight. The Secretariat clarified that in many situations, members of TPs had strong networks in the subject area and knew which expert would be most suitable to contribute to the meeting. Additionally, there was not always sufficient time to make a call for experts to NPPOs, as that process could take several months. The SPTA agreed that the TP members may, through prior agreement and without objection from the SC, select and invite experts to participate in all, or part of a specific meeting on an *ad hoc* basis. In addition, one representative of the host country and/or organization may assist the IPPC Secretariat in the organization of the meeting and participate in discussions. Decisions, however, should be made by TP members only.

5.5 Review of items in paragraphs 112-117 of the Focus Group report

5.5.1 Extended time schedule

114. The SPTA reviewed the diagram annexed to the FG report, which outlined how the standard setting time schedule would shift in order to allow more time for stewards and the SC to consider and incorporate the member comments. The development time of a standard would be lengthened by at least one year, which should address SC members' concern that time pressures had a negative impact on the quality of standards. However, one member noted that with the extended time frame, countries would have to wait a long time between the submission of their comments and the availability of the revised draft.

115. The SPTA clarified that currently the SC may choose when a standard should be presented to the CPM, thus the recommendation to extend the time schedule was not a change in policy. Rather, the SPTA was providing encouragement for the SC to take more time for consideration of comments, if required, in order to release high quality drafts. This additional time to respond to comments could become the routine practice of the SC but the option of following the current, more expedited procedure would remain if a standard was urgent or few comments were received.

116. After discussing the benefits of additional time for stewards and the SC to consider draft ISPMs and review member comments, the SPTA:

- *supported* the SC extending the time schedule, when needed, of the standard setting process in order to allow additional time for the consideration of member comments
- *noted* the importance of flexibility in the standard setting timeline
- *noted* that the CPM should be informed that drafts submitted for member consultation may be presented for adoption at the CPM two years after the consultation period, and
- *invited* the chair of the SC to note the extended time schedule in the SC report.

5.5.2 Annual open-ended workshop to review draft ISPMs prior to each CPM

117. The proposal to discuss draft ISPMs at an open ended working group prior to the CPM was made to ensure that the draft ISPMs were of high quality and that major discussion points had been addressed before they were presented to the CPM. The FG had invited the SPTA to consider the issue, some members of the FG suggesting that funds allocated for regional workshops for the review of draft ISPMs could instead be applied towards this open-ended workshop.

118. The SPTA noted that such annual open-ended workshops would have major resource implications. In addition, the changes which were now proposed to the standard setting process, with improved transparency, improved reporting, and increased flexibility in the standard setting schedule, would already improve the drafts before they reached the CPM. In addition, it was the SC responsibility to present high quality drafts to CPM, and it could return drafts to the steward or EWG for further development as necessary.

119. The SPTA did not support calling an annual open-ended working group to discuss draft ISPMs prior to CPM.

5.5.3 Funding policy for the standard setting process

120. The FG had invited the SPTA to consider the current funding policy for standard setting to determine a consistent and defined policy. The Secretariat explained the current funding policy, which was that the organization that employed a meeting participant was responsible for funding the participant. However, when participants failed to secure such funding, they may request financial assistance from the IPPC Secretariat. Priority for funding (assuming funds were available) was determined using data from the World Bank (Gross National Income per capita (GNI) in combination with the ranking of the overall size of a nation's economy/GNI). Participants from low and lower-middle income countries might be eligible for both daily subsistence allowance (DSA) and airfare, while participants from upper-middle income countries might only receive airfare. The eligibilities would change depending on the overall size of a country's GNI. The Secretariat clarified that the guidelines required some flexibility, as in some cases participation of an individual to a meeting may be of key importance. It was noted that in the case of the current meeting of the SPTA, one participant was unable to attend as his NPPO would not fund the DSA portion in the cost-sharing scheme.

121. The SPTA noted the policy of cost sharing between employers and the Secretariat, with the understanding that the Secretariat may adjust the policy in exceptional cases.

5.5.4 Posting of documents on the IPP

122. The SPTA noted that the FG had made recommendations on transparency in its report (see paragraphs 93-102 of the focus group report). In addition, the FG had invited the SPTA to consider whether to improve transparency should there be a list of SC documents for posting on the IPP (positive list) or whether all documents should be posted unless they were considered confidential or working documents by the SC (negative list). The FG had agreed that in either case the list of documents for SC meetings should be posted.

123. Several members expressed support for a clear policy of maximum necessary transparency in which all SC documents would be posted with the exception of when an author chose not to share his/her material. It was noted that that may not always be appropriate for the SC for which, due to the collegial nature of the committee, informal documents were produced quickly for discussion at the meeting. Additional concerns were raised regarding version control of documents if they were released both before a meeting in which they would be reviewed and again afterwards with more updated information.

124. It was noted that the compilation of member comments and the summaries of responses to comments in the SC report should address countries' concerns that they received feedback on how their comments were incorporated into draft ISPMs. The SPTA agreed with the FG in that all documents approved by SC during its meetings be made available to contracting parties. Final reports prepared by TPs and EWGs for consideration by the SC would be made available to contracting parties. Draft specifications to be discussed by the SC would be made available.

125. The SPTA suggested that the decision regarding which other documents would be made publicly available would be made on a meeting-by-meeting basis. The list of documents, however, would always be available and should indicate which documents were available only for SC members.

6. Goal 1 - A robust international standard setting and implementation programme

6.1 General update on 2007 activities

126. The Secretariat reported on the standard setting activities in 2007. It was noted that the funding policy had changed and a good response had been received with more participants funding in-whole or in-part their own travel costs to attend meetings. The first diagnostic protocol had been sent for member consultation through the fast-track process and had attracted a large number of comments. As a result, the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols had discussed some general issues raised in comments in order to solve them for future protocols.

6.2 Cancellations in 2007

127. Due to limited resources, the meeting of the Technical Panel on Fruit Flies, scheduled in August, had to be cancelled. The International Atomic Energy Agency later proposed to organize and fund the meeting, which would be held in December 2007.

6.3 Proposed work programme for 2008

128. The Secretariat noted that the following standard setting meetings were planned for 2008: two expert working groups (revision of ISPMs No. 7 and 12; Pre-clearance for regulated articles); annual meetings of each of the five Technical Panels; one extra meeting of the Technical Panel for the Glossary in relation to the review of ISPMs for consistency; two meetings of the SC; one meeting of the SC-7. The proposed work programme would be further discussed in relation with the operational plan and prioritization of activities depending on resources (see section 10.5 Prioritization of activities for 2008 (based on budget))

129. Regarding standards which would be sent for member consultation in 2008, it was anticipated that 5-6 drafts would be sent through the regular process. More drafts would be ready for consideration by the SC in May 2008, but the SC would not be able to review them all in one week. In addition, some diagnostic protocols may also be ready to be sent out for member consultation under the fast-track process. Fourteen Phytosanitary Treatments would be ready later in 2007 for member consultation under the fast track process.

6.4 Identification of strategic priorities for the work programme based on submissions for topics

130. The Secretariat presented a document on topics received from members in response to the call for topics for ISPMs. The Secretariat emphasized the need to add topics to the work programme to ensure sustainability of the standard setting programme given the long cycle of standard development. It also suggested that the SPTA consider developing standards that could be implemented by other organizations and whether the review of existing standards or development of new ones should be given priority. Finally, it was noted that topics which were already on the work programme had priority and for those topics where a draft ISPM existed, resources should be channelled, where possible, into completing the draft before work began on a new topic.

131. The SPTA also noted that for the strategic areas identified, it would be up to the SC to identify how the proposed topics interacted with existing standards or topics already on the work programme in order to avoid duplication. The SPTA also recommended that the SC consider the framework for standards.

132. Regarding the criteria to be used for defining priorities, the SPTA noted that revised criteria had been proposed by the FG as part of the draft *Procedure and criteria for identifying topics and priorities*, but that these had not been adopted yet and the SPTA would therefore work with the criteria adopted in 2002.

133. Reorganization of ISPMs by subjects had been proposed in several submissions. It was noted that COSAVE had a numbering system for standards based on broad categories, which could be applied to ISPMs. The SPTA found the idea of reorganizing ISPMs appealing, especially as it would also identify gaps in the series of standards and possibly remove duplication. However, it would be a huge undertaking. Any reorganization would have to start with the preparation of a structural plan for ISPMs. It would not simply be a matter of grouping and renumbering standards better, nor of editing them, but would imply rewriting and re-arranging text. Such reorganization would be feasible only if additional resources were available. The SPTA decided not to add the task to the strategic priorities. (May do so at a later date.)

134. The SPTA identified strategic priorities (see following decision below – Para. 135), and the following points, which would need to be considered by the SC:

- i) General framework of standard setting - identify the gaps which should be filled.
It was especially important that guidance be developed that related to where major quarantine activities were taking place, i.e. entry points, compliance at ports, and which were the main global pathways for the spread of pests.
- ii) Topics on conveyances - The SC would have to consider how best to divide or group them, i.e. whether sea and air transport should be considered together, whether containers could be a separate topic for both, and the fact that guidance for industry was needed.
- iii) Air transport - It should be noted that the International Civil Aviation Organization with input from CBD and the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP) was developing draft *Guidelines for preventing the transport and introduction of invasive alien species by air*
- iv) Topics related to maritime vessels - are of special importance to island nations of the Caribbean and the Pacific regions.
- v) Introduction of pests with international garbage – A topic proposed by two countries. Was a big issue for developing countries worldwide.
- vi) Certification of origin of plant material - was a global problem, especially for grain, seeds and cut flowers. Consignments had multiple origins, and information on origin was not always provided.
- vii) Topics on plants for planting - it was noted that consideration would be needed as to how these specific topics interacted with the draft ISPM on pest risk management for plants for planting or the specification for plant breeding material ISPM.
- viii) Grain - there may be a relationship with the topic on stored products
- ix) Accreditation - Could present the advantages for NPPOs of accrediting other organizations to help meet their IPPC mandate.

135 The SPTA agreed on the following strategic priorities for consideration by the SC (specific topics):

1. Pathways for the spread of pests (conveyances, plants for planting, grain, cut flowers, international garbage)
2. Certification systems (including accreditation/authorization) with a view of filling some of the gaps in the framework for standards.

6.5 Training material and plan for the implementation of standards

136 The Chair introduced a paper that provided background on how training material on pest risk analysis (PRA) had been developed by an informal ad hoc international PRA steering committee composed of interested experts. The PRA Steering Committee had originally developed training materials for the International Plant Health Risk Analysis Workshop held in Niagara Falls Canada in 2005. That training material was refined and delivered at a PRA training course in Chennai, India in 2007, and included information for participants and instructors, presentations and group exercises. The paper raised the question of the status of the training material developed by the ad hoc group, the need to have this training material used as much as possible in countries, and if other standards should have similar

material developed. The idea of establishing a formal steering committee to develop training material was suggested, either a general committee on training, or several committees focussing on specific topics.

137. The SPTA agreed that more training material would be very useful, especially if developed in conjunction with capacity building. The SPTA was not supportive of formalizing the group who had developed the PRA materials, or other such groups, as it would mean that nominations, approvals, etc. would be required. It was suggested that one of the reasons that the PRA steering committee may have functioned so well was because it was an informal group of interested and motivated experts.

138. The SPTA noted that development of such training material should be integrated into the envisaged capacity building strategy and that a plan should be developed, identifying areas where training was most needed.

139. The Secretariat raised the issue of funding, i.e. if funding from the IPPC could be available for that steering committee or other groups that developed similar material. The SPTA noted that IPPC funding may be available depending on circumstances and resources but also that outside sources of funding should be considered (e.g. through the WTO SPS Committee by developing such material in the framework of SPS training material). In addition when integrating such activities into the capacity building plan, funding should be provided to cover the need for consultants to develop material or to ensure involvement of experts from developing countries in such steering committee.

140. The SPTA agreed that there should be a report to the CPM on the development and further use of the PRA training material.

6.6 Future of regional workshop for the review of draft ISPMs

141. The Secretariat introduced a paper on the organization of regional workshops on draft ISPMs, and requested guidance on several issues. Seven regional workshops had been held each year since 2003, with a total of 151 individuals participating in 7 regional workshops reviewing draft ISPMs in 2007. The Secretariat had involved the FAO regional plant protection officers in the meetings over the past few years as part of their greater involvement in IPPC activities. The workshops were seen by many as very important activities but because external funding was never confirmed in advance, appropriate time frames for planning had never been possible.

142. It was noted that former-USSR countries of Central Asia did not fit in the current workshops for Asia or Near East and would benefit from a separate workshop conducted in Russian. Some of the 8 countries concerned were EPPO members, and the Secretariat was discussing with EPPO how the IPPC workshop could be combined with an EPPO meeting, with the possibility to involve other former USSR countries, which may be interested in a workshop conducted in Russian. The SPTA was supportive of the idea and agreed that it should be pursued.

143. With regard to participants, the SPTA noted that the type of knowledge and expertise participants should have could be emphasized in the invitation letter. Although encouraging continued participation of the same delegates from year to year may have some advantages it should be recognized that the workshops could also be used to provide exposure to more experts hence improving the workshops' capacity-building use. The SPTA did not think that continued participation should be taken into account when attributing funding.

144. The SPTA agreed that having SC members at the workshops was very useful. They should not necessarily be representing their own country as this would not allow them to participate fully in their role as a SC representative. The SPTA also thought it would be beneficial to have SC members attending workshops in other regions.

145. The aim of the workshops was discussed, i.e. whether their only aim was to solicit comments on draft standards, or whether they were for building capacity in relation to the standards. It was recognized that different regions had different needs, with some workshops having a large training/capacity building

portion in addition to the discussion on draft ISPMs. It was noted that some RPPOs were able to coordinate and run the workshops on their own, whereas in other regions assistance from the IPPC Secretariat may be required (either through the FAO regional plant protection officers or Secretariat staff)

146. The SPTA agreed that participants should be encouraged to provide written comments prior to the workshops so they could be distributed to other participants. Ownership of comments by participants and their respective NPPOs after the workshops should also be encouraged.

147. With regard to funding participation, the Secretariat proposed that funding be dependent on whether comments were provided by the person in advance of the meeting, and whether comments were subsequently submitted by the NPPO. The SPTA did not agree that that should be a condition for funding participation.

7. Goal 2: Information exchange systems appropriate to meet IPPC obligations

7.1 General update on 2007 activities

148. The Secretariat gave a general update on the activities undertaken in 2007. It was noted that some contracting parties had still to designate an official contact point or had not provided the Secretariat with updated information where official contact point details had changed (including e-mail addresses). However, there was an improvement in maintenance and updating of IPPC contact points by some contracting parties, which contributed substantially to improving communication with the Secretariat and between contracting parties. Of the 165 contracting parties, only 15 had unofficial contact points. To date 129 editors had been trained.

149. Maintaining navigation in the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) in Arabic, English, French and Spanish was an ongoing challenge due to resources and the need to track the many changes that took place. The translation of the IPP navigation text into Chinese should take place before the end of 2007. Most IPPC contact points had identified IPP editors to undertake the work on the IPP on their behalf. Some countries had designated several IPP editors and currently there was about a 10% change in editors each year. The next phase of IPP development would be to deal with data retrieval, facilitating Secretariat management of data, changing layout and functions as requested by the countries and the Secretariat, and measuring reporting compliance by countries.

150. A full-time “webmaster” for the IPP had been appointed through the USA APO programme and this had improved the Secretariat’s ability to maintain the IPP and ensuring that clients’ needs were addressed. Significant progress had been made with the development of an IPP user manual and the overall IPPC information exchange manual.

151. Phytosanitary information management for the CPM work programme and the Secretariat as a whole needed to be dealt with in a more integrated manner. The Informal working group on Technical Assistance met in August 2007 and discussed improvements to the current PCE and a work plan for the development of “PCE 2008” had been initiated. Revision of the PCE database would ensure:

- the PCE database was integrated into the overall IPPC information system,
- FAO would own the code to the PCE,
- it would be developed in open source software,
- data would be stored securely and centrally to allow countries to run comparisons over time to determine effectiveness of capacity building efforts, and
- available to a range of participants in a range of formats.

152. The Secretariat was currently developing automating processing in the IPP that would provide summary statistics and information on an ongoing basis. This would *inter alia*, enable the Secretariat to monitor reporting compliance by IPPC contracting parties and allow the Secretariat to monitor and evaluate IPP usage in general and specifically in the standard setting and information exchange programmes.

153. The Secretariat had been requested to expand the phytosanitary information available to contracting parties. This included organizations relevant to the CPM work programme (e.g. WTO, the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) and IFQRG) and phytosanitary information in support of IPPC implementation. However, in order to do that, clear guidance was needed as to what constituted official information and could be placed on the IPP, and what information should be placed on linked sites. Advice provided to the Secretariat so far had been conflicting.

154. The SPTA discussed the use of the unofficial information on the IPP, citing the recent posting of a vacancy within the STDF as an example. Comments from the members were mixed. However the Secretariat explained that the responsibility for placing information on the IPP would be up to the organisations themselves. The Secretariat was currently creating areas within the IPP for international organisations relevant to the IPPC and/or the CPM and it would be up to them place whatever information they considered relevant.

7.2 IPP Support Group meeting – cancelled

155. The IPP Support Group (IPP SG) did not meet in September 2007 in Indonesia as planned due to a lack of resources. The next meeting of the IPP SG was planned in September 2008.

7.3 Proposed work programme for 2008

156. It was intended that the work programme for 2008 would include: Five Workshops for the training of new IPP editors (English, French with translation, Arabic with translation, Spanish and Russian with translation), four Regional Workshops for the updating of existing IPP editors (Asia, Pacific, Africa – English and French with translation), National/sub-regional capacity building (6 work shops), develop and document procedures for the ongoing use of the IPP (development of the IPPC Information Exchange Manual in six FAO Languages, development of metadata standards, e.g. pest reporting) and an IPP Support Group meeting. (Refer to 10.5 *Prioritization of activities for 2008* for activities placed on hold).

8 Goal 3: Effective dispute settlement systems

8.1 General update on 2007 activities

157. Most members of the Subsidiary Body on Dispute settlement had met in Kuching, Malaysia, as part of the OEWG on a possible compliance mechanism (see report on agenda item 12.2). The Secretariat had received some requests for advice and these had been dealt with.

8.2 Proposed work programme for 2008

158. The planned work programme for Dispute Settlement included: Printing of an IPPC Dispute Settlement brochure and posters and the provision of Secretariat support for disputes that may arise. The SBDS would meet just prior to CPM-3 and work on the outcome of the OEWG on a Possible Compliance mechanism for the IPPC

9. Goal 4: Improved phytosanitary capacity of members

9.1 General update on 2007 activities

159. Regional Capacity building workshops on ISPMs, Pest Risk analysis, Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation and Strategic Planning were held in Asia (7 countries), East and Southern Africa (9 countries), Gulf Cooperation Council (5 countries), the Commonwealth of Independent States and Russian speaking countries (15 countries). National phytosanitary capacity building projects were undertaken in Mozambique, Syria, Oman, Kyrgyzstan, Swaziland and the Gambia. The projects provided *inter alia*, inputs to national strategic plans, increased national capacities for import regulation for protection of their natural and cultivated plant resources, enhanced export certification systems for increased market access

and establishing necessary legal frameworks for the application of phytosanitary measures domestically and to international trade.

160. One member mentioned that the APPPC intended to develop a standard on the requirements for land border crossing inspection stations and would be interested in receiving information on the model airport which was part of the Kenyan Centre of Excellence and the model border stations to be established at the Kenya/Uganda and Zambia/Tanzania borders. The SPTA was informed that the European Community Directive 98/22 spelled out the minimum requirements for border points in the EU.

9.3 Proposed work programme for 2008 (Note: 9.3 was considered prior to 9.2)

161. The proposed work programme for improved phytosanitary capacity of members included: Updating, maintaining and distributing the PCE tool (meeting of the IWG-TA, distribution of CD ROMs), use of the PCE and other inter-active learning tools for strategic planning and project development (meeting of the PCE Facilitators), regional workshops, seminars - in cooperation with/assisted by RPPOs (one regional WS on selected ISPMs, phytosanitary regulations and import regulations for Eastern Europe (Russian speaking countries), two Regional WSs for S. E. Asia (to be held as part of a Japan Project and are funded under GCP/RAS/226/JPN - year 2)), eight Regional Workshops for the review of draft ISPMs (Africa English, Africa French, Asia, Caribbean, Central Asia, Latin America, Near East and the Pacific), donor awareness of phytosanitary capacity needs (five formulated projects to be presented to donors for consideration for funding, two donor coordination meetings) and make contracting parties aware of possible donors and their criteria for assistance (preparation and distribution of donor criteria information). (Refer to 10.5 *Prioritization of activities for 2008* for activities placed on hold)

9.2 Consideration by the 19th TC-RPPOs on the recommendations provided by CABI and the comments of the IWG-PCE on the Analysis of the PCE Tool

162. At the Sixth Session of the ICPM (2004) the use of the PCE tool was noted and that as it was anticipated that the tool would be utilized by many other countries in the future, it was considered necessary to determine whether the intended benefits were being derived from its application. Accordingly, ICPM-6 endorsed a proposal to conduct an analysis of the application of the PCE. An agreement was signed with CABI Africa to develop an instrument which could be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the phytosanitary capacity evaluation process. The components of the study were outlined as:

- Critical assessment of the PCE as a needs assessment tool, with recommendations for enhancements;
- Review of the educational value of the tool in training and awareness raising;
- Assessment of the impact on strategic planning at the national level;
- Assessment of impact on other organizations internationally, including IPPC, FAO, and donor and development organizations.

163. At the Second Session of the CPM (2007), the representative of CAB International presented its report, which noted the positive impacts of the PCE tool with respect to its intended use, in particular on national strategic planning, justification for budgetary allocation, legal frameworks, training and awareness raising. Recommendations presented in the report were considered and discussed by CPM-2, taking into account the report of the Informal Working Group on PCE (IWG-PCE). The CPM agreed that the recommendations provided by CABI and the comments of the IWG-PCE should be further considered by the 19th Technical Consultation among RPPOs (TC-RPPOs) and then by the SPTA for final presentation to CPM-3.

The SPTA discussed the recommendations and comments by IWG-PCE and the 19th TC-RPPOs and prepared final comments/recommendations for CPM-3 (**Appendix 2**).

Comments on recommendations

Group 1: An overall technical assistance (TA) strategy

164 Recommendations 1 and 2 were considered together.

Recommendation 1: That a strategic plan for TA be developed that addresses the full range of issues. While various subgroups, IWG, focus groups etc may engage in developing and implementing TA, they all must be aware of and working from a single cohesive strategy with timely cross communication. A coordination role must be appropriately assigned.

Recommendation 2: That the CPM endorses a definition of national phytosanitary capacity that best fits its vision and expectations for all efforts under the IPPC

The SPTA agreed that a phytosanitary capacity building strategy was required and discussed the TC-RPPO comment on Recommendation 2 in that a concept paper on national phytosanitary capacity be prepared, recognising that phytosanitary capacity applied to all countries, not just developing countries. It was noted that the PCE tool did not define phytosanitary capacity but was based on the ability of an NPPO to comply with the IPPC and implement international standards. Flexibility was emphasised in that the concept paper should *facilitate the development* of a capacity building strategy. There was concern in that if a “final” concept paper was put forward to the CPM for adoption without a group (e.g. SPTA) having discussed and considered it, it may result in a number of ad hoc changes being made at the CPM that were not anticipated and later regretted. It was agreed that a paper for the CPM was needed but it should be introductory, leading to CPM agreement on the development of a phytosanitary capacity building strategy.

The SPTA agreed that an introductory paper would be prepared for CPM-3 outlining what phytosanitary capacity was and resulting from that there would be a phytosanitary capacity building strategy developed for the IPPC. John Hedley (with input from the Secretariat (Jeff Jones and Dave Nowell)) would produce a draft for the SPTA to consider (CABI may also have information that could be utilised). The Chair noted the recommendation from the Evaluation Report that technical assistance activities be moved from the IPPC and said that if the CPM wished the activities to be coordinated through the IPPC, a comprehensive strategy for implementation, coordination, etc needed to be developed.

The meeting recommended that following CPM-3, a focus group should be established to develop a draft strategy for consideration by the SPTA for presentation to CPM-4. The meeting considered that it would be useful if the paper developed by John Hedley could include suggested terms of reference for the intended focus group. The chair requested that any suggestions relating to the paper be forwarded to John as soon as possible.

Group 2 – Future development of the PCE

165. *Recommendation 3: That the PCE, (minus the information in Recommendation 7 below), be arranged into a stratified framework so that a user may follow the tool on a modular basis, going deeper into detail when more assistance is needed, with provision of links to additional information and guidance.*

The Secretariat reminded the SPTA that the improvement/revision of the tool was ongoing and that the recommendation was already being implemented.

166. *Recommendation 4: That the IWG-PCE decides whether this new PCE should be linked to the Performance, Vision, Strategy (PVS) tool developed by the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture (IICA) as far as modules/topics or should remain independent of it.*

The IWG-PCE had considered the two tools and suggested that they remain separate, recognising that both were useful. The SPTA agreed with that decision.

Group 3 - Development of other tools

167. *Recommendation 5: That the Subsidiary Body for Dispute Settlement consider the usefulness of individual ISPM implementation sheets, in the form of check lists, and how these would be developed.*

The Secretariat noted that the recommendation related to the activities being undertaken by the OEWG on a Possible Compliance Mechanism. The Secretariat was not sure whether cross linkages should be created (needed further consideration). The SPTA agreed (in principle) with the recommendation.

168. *Recommendation 6: That the IICA PVS be adopted by the IPPC for rapid assessment of national phytosanitary systems, based on expert judgement, and as a starting point for engaging different stakeholders and agreeing priorities.*

The SPTA agreed with the comments of the IWG-PCE, i.e., “In view of the comments on recommendation 4, the IWG-PCE felt that there was no need to consider formal adoption of the IICA PVS”

169. *Recommendation 7: That information commonly requested by trading partners, including the existing requirements for information sharing under the IPPC/ISPMs, be integrated into a harmonized template to be posted on the IPP with appropriate access.*

The SPTA expressed some concern with the recommendation. They supported the TC-RPPO’s need for clarification on what “... information commonly asked by trading partners ...” meant. The Secretariat informed the meeting that some contracting parties had stated that the only format related to regulations would be their official website. As such, harmonised templates would be impractical. A link had been created by the IPP. Concern was also expressed in that the recommendation could result in additional obligations beyond those already required under the Convention

170. *Recommendation 8: That simple tools, based on spreadsheets for example, be developed to address very specific evaluation objectives such as modelling risks, assessing efficiency of services, cost recovery calculations, investment decision making, etc.*

The SPTA agreed that simple tools could be useful but in order to prevent a lot of unnecessary work, the objectives of the tools would need to be clear and the costs considered.

Group 4 - Long term considerations:

171. *Recommendation 9: That a mechanism for collating information anonymously on NPPO capacity and related issues be designed and presented to the CPM for approval, taking account of confidentiality needs.*

The SPTA supported the need for collecting and collating information (while protecting anonymity) that would help the Commission direct its capacity building strategy. The OEWG on a Possible Compliance Mechanism for the IPPC had proposed a mechanism that could be used to deal with the recommendation. The OEWG proposal did not introduce any new reporting obligations and was based on a “help desk” approach which could be used to develop specific capacity building activities

172. *Recommendation 10: That the role of reviewing uses of the information generated from the PCE/PVS and other tools be assigned appropriately, so as to learn of trends, ensure the accurate transfer of information and better communicate the needs and value of plant health to other sectors.*

The SPTA agreed with the comments of the IWG-PCE, that the recommendation should be considered under the Technical Assistance strategy suggested in Recommendation 1

173. *Recommendation 11: That an initiative on the quality of phytosanitary data should be launched, as a targeted assistance to NPPOs.*

The Secretariat reported that at the recent TC-RPPOs, the representative from CABI had explained that the recommendation referred to the quality and accuracy of data from which spreadsheets would be developed (Recommendation 8), rather than the data placed on the IPP. Such data would include the costs of surveys, inspection, quarantine, staff, etc. This recommendation would be a subset of Recommendation 8 and part of the cost considerations.

174. *Recommendation 12: That all of the above systems and tools be reviewed for inclusion of environmental concerns, i.e. protection of domestic plant resources, rather than strictly trade related concerns.*

There was some discussion over the second comment made by the TC-RPPOs, which implied that work should not be done on the PCE until the review had been completed. The situation was clarified in that the PCE tool was revised/updated on an ongoing basis (e.g., to incorporate new standards) but had been reviewed by CABI as a needs assessment tool, educational value, impact on strategic planning, etc. The SPTA agreed with the comments made by the IWG-PCE, i.e. that the process of incorporating environmental and other concerns was already in place and would be reflected more prominently in the revised PCE.

10. Goal 5: Sustainable implementation of the IPPC

10.1 Update of the 2007 budget (FAO Regular Programme and Trust Funds)

175. The Secretariat presented the IPPC Secretariat “working budget” indicating the status of activities to date. It was mentioned that there had been considerable “belt-tightening” and with cancellations of some meetings and the implementation of criteria for assistance to attend meetings, things appeared to be on track. It was anticipated that the IPPC trust fund would carry over approximately \$200k. There was a possibility of a surplus in the regular programme contribution so Letters of Agreement may need to be developed.

10.2 Suggested modifications to the Business plan

176. The Secretariat had suggested a number of modifications to the business plan. These were:

i) Scope of the IPPC

It was suggested that the heading be modified to “Purpose and Scope of the IPPC”, as the IPPC only mentioned purpose.

The SPTA noted the suggestion but agreed that the heading should only read “Purpose of the IPPC”.

ii) Goal 4: Improved phytosanitary capacity of members

177 Suggested that Area 4.4, “Developing contracting parties fully participate in IPPC activities”, would be more appropriately placed under Goal 5: *Sustainable implementation of the IPPC*, as the activities related to securing funding to enable participation by developing contracting parties in all IPPC-related activities.

The SPTA agreed with the adjustment

iii) Regional Work Shops on draft ISPMs

178. The Secretariat proposed that the under Section 3.2 *Resources to support the CPM programme*, resources for RWSs on draft ISPMs be moved from 3.2.4: *Improved phytosanitary capacity of members*, to 3.2.1: *Standard setting*. The Secretariat felt that the RWSs were an integral part of the standard setting process and resource requirements for the RWSs should be attributed to standard setting and not to capacity building.

The SPTA did not agree with the modification as they felt they were an important part of capacity building

iv) Staff requirements

179. The SPTA disagreed with the Evaluation Report Recommendation 6.3 (*The Coordinator post should then be abolished*) and that after appointing the full time Secretary, the Coordinator position must be maintained for at least a certain period in order to maintain and improve an efficient functioning of the Secretariat. The meeting also considered the status of the unfilled positions (in red) in the organisational chart and modified the workshops/documentation and webmaster positions to yellow (currently being filled by the two USA APOs). The editor position was only being partially filled so was modified to half red, half yellow as was the technical panel position (contracted assistance no longer available).

180. Refer **Appendix III** for the accepted modifications by the SPTA

10.3 Draft 2008 Operational Plan plus associated budget

10.5 Prioritization of activities for 2008 (based on budget)

181. Agenda items 10.3 and 10.5 were considered together. The Secretariat reminded the meeting that CPM-2 agreed that the business plan would be supported each year by an annual operational plan, with an associated budget that would describe the activities for the forthcoming year aimed at meeting the five-year goals. The Secretariat had developed a draft CPM Operational Plan for 2008, the layout of which was consistent with the Business Plan (i.e. it included a letter from chair, table of contents, goals and vision, etc). The Operational Plan presented the summarised data and was supported by a detailed XL spreadsheet with the cost of each planned/anticipated activity. The Secretariat reminded the SPTA that although funds may be available for a meeting, staff constraints/availability may be such that the meeting may not eventuate.

182. The Operational Plan had an estimated total revenue (contributions from the FAO Regular Programme and various trust funds) of USD 3,110,500 (did not include the Japan capacity building project, which was a fixed cost) and estimated total costs of USD 4,252,500, giving a deficit of USD 1,142,000. The task for the SPTA was to prioritise the activities and remove activities accordingly until the budget balanced. The Operational Plan contained a section under each Goal that would list those areas (with associated costs) that were put on “hold” until extra funding became available. It was felt that because of the uncertainty of income (estimated by the Secretariat on the low side) and the use of the Secretariat travel assistance guidelines, that the SPTA could prioritise 10% over estimated revenue. The total sum available for non-staff activities was USD 3,110,500 minus the FAO staff cost of USD 1,562,500 giving, USD 1,548,000.

The SPTA (plus some later modification on the advice of the Secretariat) put the following activities (approx. USD 955,000) on hold:

Activities on hold

Goal 1: Standards setting

183. The May Standards Committee meeting replaced by a meeting of SC-7. (This cut was debated with concern being expressed re transparency (lack of a report, albeit one would be posted on the IPP), whether observers could be present (only invited experts and stewards are invited to relevant portions of the meeting based on EWG procedures)).

Goal 2: Information exchange

184. Workshops for the training of new IPP editors:

- Arabic with translation
- Spanish
- Russian with translation

Development of the IPPC Information Exchange Manual

Development of metadata standards, e.g. pest reporting

- One WG finalise metadata standards

IPP Support Group meeting

Administration

- On-line training/help development

Establish staff to maintain and develop the IPP

- 1 Programmer 4 months (consultant)
- 1 Information Exchange trainer/projects

Goal 3: Dispute Settlement

185. Nothing on hold

Goal 4: Improved phytosanitary capacity of members

186. Use of the PCE and other inter-active learning tools ...

- Meeting of the PCE Facilitators

RWS, seminars (in cooperation with/assisted by RPPOs)

- RWS - ISPMs, phyto regulations, etc E. Europe

Regional Workshops (8) for the review of draft ISPMs:

- Africa English
- Africa French
- Asia
- Caribbean
- Central Asia
- Latin America
- Near East
- Pacific

Goal 5: Sustainable implementation of the IPPC

187. Form strong links with appropriate research & education institutions

Goal 6: International promotion of the IPPC and cooperation with relevant organisation

188. Nothing put on hold

Goal 7: Review of the status of Plant Protection in the world

189. Nothing put on hold

190. The SPTA also had a lengthy discussion on the cost of the annual session of the CPM (approx USD 500,000). It was noted that it was a requirement under the IPPC for the Chairperson of the CPM to call an annual meeting, and also that to date the EC had contributed USD 200,000 to the cost (travel assistance). It was suggested that the SPTA/Bureau discuss with FAO Legal Office the possibility of a meeting every second year (this would also mean that the Standards Committee could meet less frequently).

10.4 Criteria for funding participants at IPPC meetings

191. Refer Section 5.5.3. *Funding policy for the standard setting process*

10.5 Prioritization of activities for 2008 (based on budget)

192. Covered with 10.3 (Draft 2008 Operational Plan plus associated budget)

10.6 Project-oriented planning for the multilateral trust fund

193. Mr Ralf Lopian, Vice-Chair of the CPM, introduced a paper on project-oriented planning for the multilateral trust fund. He outlined the basic rationale behind the project in that donors may want to target funding towards their own geopolitical and trade agendas. For that reason it was thought that it would be more beneficial and attractive to donors if they could identify certain projects under the trust fund. Such actions would entail very clear activities, objectives and a work plan that would have to be implemented, and each project would be separately budgeted. This would also enable the CPM to actually see how much money would be needed in the trust fund.

194. The paper described a three projects plus their associated budgets, i.e.

- Attendance support for IPPC meetings
- Regional Workshops on draft ISPMs
- Workshops for IPP editors

The projects comprised major activities undertaken during recent years and were generally accepted to be of high value to the IPPC-related activities and the standard setting programme in particular. The total funding required for the three projects would amount to slightly over USD 1.9 million for the year 2009.

195. The SPTA recognised that the document on the projects would need to be circulated well in advance of the CPM meeting so negotiations could begin (ideally by SPTA) and contributions be made to the trust fund in advance. The airfare calculations were based on the average cost of economy flights - with the exception of resource persons.

196. It was anticipated that contributions would be made on an annual basis, albeit if a donor wished to contribute to a multi-year project, then most certainly, that would be accommodated. This proposal was being put forward in a very open, transparent manner without any hidden costs, which should appeal to donors. In-kind contributions and inviting countries to sponsor meetings on topics of interest were discussed. Although sponsoring meetings did not fit into the multilateral trust fund scheme, a list of meetings that could be sponsored could be developed.

197. The SPTA supported the paper and agreed that it go forward to the CPM. The paper was to be adjusted to show how donors could benefit from contributing to the trust fund or a specific project. It should show the costs for paying for one RWS only. Other adjustments (FAO management costs - 6%) would also be made.

10.7 Promotion strategy for the TF- IPPC

198. Mr Gary Koivisto (Canada) informed the SPTA of his new position as Special Projects Advisor, in the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA). He would report to a Vice-President at CFIA, and in close collaboration with the Secretary of the IPPC and the CFIA, assist in the advancement of the IPPC 5-year business plan.

199. It was intended that he undertake comparative analyses to similar conventions (particularly the OIE and Codex Alimentarius) to ascertain which practices could be adopted to assist the IPPC meet the goals of its 5-year business plan, and promotion of the IPPC trust fund. Although his initial contacts for information for the comparative analysis paper would be in Canada, he would also like to visit other member countries and organizations to see what best management practices could be incorporated.

200. It was noted that the promotion of the IPPC trust fund was also associated with how the trust fund was presented. The Secretariat needed to develop some sort of promotional material that could be sent to donors. It was also felt that the trust fund could be showcased with other international organizations (e.g. Aid for Trade meeting).

10.8 Proposal for CPM “Policy Statements”

201. The Chair introduced a paper for a “Proposal for the adoption of CPM Policy Statements”. She noted that the CPM made a number of different types of decisions, which were captured in different ways and not tracked very well (additional decisions could be made that affected previous decisions) and whether the CPM should adopt “policy” statements to better track long lasting decisions.

202. General discussion by the SPTA supported the need for a mechanism to keep track of the decisions made by the CPM, particularly as they could be recognised by the WTO in a trade dispute. The legal meaning of a “policy statement” was questioned in that would it be legally binding? (Clarification would need to be sought from FAO Legal Office). The suggestion was made that rather than have “Policy Statements”, the CPM could have “Recommendations” so as not to illicit a strong negative reaction.

203. There was general agreement to a name change. It was noted that there would need to be rules to ensure consistency, relevance, clarity of what a Recommendation was, etc and that the CPM should target the “larger” decisions as it was already making decisions (note, agree, adopt etc). Most “Recommendations” should have a situation/background, enunciation, recommended actions to follow up on and very simple instructions along those lines would help make everything clearer.

204. The Chair noted that if the CPM were to give different preference decisions, there would be the need to evaluate the legal impact. Also what sort of numbering system would be used? The SPTA agreed that the Chair should continue to work on the document and prepare it for presentation to the CPM.

10.9 Discussion on best management practices of comparable Conventions

205. Covered under 10.7

11 Goal 6: International promotion of the IPPC and cooperation with relevant regional and international organizations

206. Owing to time constraints, a very brief verbal update was given by the Secretariat. There had been some activity with the Secretariat of the CBD, albeit it was reduced owing to the fact that the main contact person had left, hence the full agreed work programme had not been completed. The Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA), a subsidiary body of the Conference of the Parties of the CBD, would meet in February 2008 at FAO so it was intended to use that opportunity for the two Secretariats to meet. The IPPC Secretariat had given feedback (plus suggested modifications) to a brochure prepared by the Montreal Protocol on the pre-shipment and quarantine use of methyl bromide.

207 The IPPC Secretariat had attended all three meeting of the WTO SPS Committee in Geneva. Updates on activities of interest to WTO Members were given at each. One of the Vice-chairs (Ralf Lopian) had given a presentation on the IPPC dispute settlement system. The IPPC was also involved in WTO regional workshops.

208 The planned combined symposium with the International Seed Testing Association had to be put on indefinite hold due to lack of resources in the IPPC Secretariat and Bureau.

209 Informal contact continued to be maintained between the IPPC Secretariat and Codex Alimentarius and the World Organisation on Animal Health.

12 Goal 7: Review of the status of plant protection in the world

12.1 General update

210. No presentation given.

12.2 OEWG on a Possible Compliance mechanism for the IPPC

211 The Secretariat reported on the OEWG on a Possible Compliance Mechanism, which took place in Malaysia (September 2007). Most of the SBDS members were there as well as a fairly large contingent of members (16 countries plus FAO Legal Office; UNEP legal expert). The OEWG considered the compliance mechanisms of Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs). The IPPC did not have anything in the text of the Convention to use an enforcement system and the OEWG felt that rather it should look at compliance as a facilitation process, i.e. as an “IPPC implementation review and support system”. Section 6 of the report of the OEWG detailed the facilitation process.

212 The OEWG recommended a number of components including:

- i) Active ongoing monitoring of IPPC reporting obligations – The Secretariat could prepare an annual report of country reporting on the IPPC.
- ii) Triennial review of the implementation of obligations other than reporting obligations - Questionnaire would be developed by the Secretariat to elicit data and information from contracting parties regarding compliance to the IPPC obligations, in particular Articles IV, V, VII and VIII.
- iii) Implementation support system – The Secretariat would operate an IPPC help desk (additional staffing) that would deal with:
 - countries requesting assistance on the implementation of ISPMs
 - provision of advice relating to ISPMs
 - monitoring, identification and reporting of compliance and reporting issues; and
 - ensuring contracting parties requesting assistance were put in contact with potential funding sources.
- iv) A general report and an associated action plan on implementation - would take place on a three yearly basis.

213. The cost of implementation was insignificant, the major component being that every three years there would be the need for a group to review the questionnaire results. The most important element to consider was the time frame for implementation. The OEWG considered that as it was such an important subject and the proposal so different from a formal “compliance mechanism”, that the proposed mechanism should be presented to CPM-3, rather than CPM-4 as originally intended.

214. The SPTA was generally supportive of the proposal recognising that by using the proposed implementation review and support system the CPM would go a long way towards achieving its objective of reviewing the state of plant protection in the world. However the acting representative from Europe said that the EC had not had time to consider the report and would not have time to go into it in any depth before the CPM. The EC would prefer to keep to the current agreed timeline. The representative agreed that the document could go to CPM-3, but an in-depth discussion and acceptance of the proposal at CPM-3 would be difficult.

215. It was agreed that the report would be presented to CPM-3 with a covering request: “CPM-3 is invited to suggest how to proceed with this matter”

12.3 Suggested topics from the TC-RPPOs for a half day seminar (Thurs. afternoon) at CPM-3

216. CPM-2 was asked to consider including in its annual meeting a half- or one-day session to consider issues such as new technology or new pest threats. In turn, the CPM requested the SPTA to examine this idea at a future meeting. At their June 2007 meeting, the Bureau felt it would be very useful if the 19th TC-RPPOs could discuss cross cutting issues, i.e., new ideas/innovations that would assist with/improve the efficiency of the implementation of the IPPC, or “new” emerging potential pest problems. Ideas agreed/developed at the TC-RPPOs would be presented to the October meeting of the SPTA, with the view that two presentations be given on the Thursday afternoon of the Third Session of the CPM

217. The TC-RPPOs discussed suggestions and the following topics were suggested:

1. The impact of climate change on plant protection
2. Implementation and the practice of using PRA Standards
3. Databases of diagnostic laboratories in terms of where experts are located and their expertise
4. Implementation of Systems Approaches
5. PIPE – Pest Information Platform for Extension and Education
6. Aquatic plants

218. The SPTA agreed that the most appropriate topic would be a scientific session on the impact of climate change (including impact on pests and impact on pest risk analysis) or food security as this would line up with the proposed Ministerial meeting CPM-4 (2009). Due to the anticipated very full CPM-3 agenda it was agreed that rather than a full or half day session, there should only be one or two speakers for say half an hour each.

219. There would be a FAO Ministerial meeting in June 2008 in which the IPPC had been invited to participate. The Secretary informed the SPTA that the June 2008 meeting’s topics covered both food security and climate change. The two subjects were connected when the meeting was conceived. Ministers would be the minimum level of invited guests (Heads of State were also to be invited). The IPPC Bureau had been invited to participate in the preparations (would increase the visibility of the IPPC).

220. The SPTA agreed that there only be one key note speaker and it was proposed that the SPTA members compile a list of names, from which a possible candidates could be chosen to present a paper on climate change (and/or food security). With regard to the subject of payment, the Secretary informed the SPTA that there were other FAO trust funds that maybe could be used, especially if it could be demonstrated that there were linkages between the IPPC speakers and the preparations for the high level meeting. The need was to find someone that could speak well for an hour to an audience that had a broad technical background.

12.4 Topics for the High Level Ministerial meeting at CPM-4

221. During the opening of CPM-2 (2007), Mr Diouf, Director-General of the FAO, invited the CPM to consider holding a high level ministerial event at the end of CPM-3 in 2008 in order to examine from a longer term perspective the accomplishments and growing role of the IPPC, and to build support for political will for sustained technical and financial support. It was suggested by the CPM Vice-Chair, Ralf Lopian, during one of his presentations that possible topics could be considered by the SPTA and then presented to CPM-3 (2008) so that such a meeting could be planned for CPM-4 (2009). The CPM agreed with the Vice chair’s suggestion and the Secretariat sent a request for topics (06 September 2007) to all contracting party contact points.

222. The Chair informed the SPTA that the D-G of FAO was planning two high level ministerial meetings, six months before and after CPM-4 and questioned whether it was appropriate for the CPM to continue with planning for its ministerial meeting.

223. The SPTA considered that it would not be appropriate to hold a high level ministerial meeting associated with CPM-4. However it wished to be able to develop a profile for the IPPC at the FAO high level ministerial meeting in June 2008 and to keep the possibility of holding a follow up meeting as an effective way of increasing the IPPC's involvement in the area of climate change

12.5 Climate change and the IPPC

224. Owing to time constraints, this agenda item was not discussed

13. Other business

225. There was no other business

14. Close

226. The Chair thanked the SPTA members for their input and noted with satisfaction the immense workload that had been successfully completed.

**Response by the CPM Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance
to the Independent Evaluation
of the Workings of the International Plant Protection Convention and its Institutional Arrangements**

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
1. Standards and Standard-setting Process					
Quality and usefulness of standards					
1.1. As the existing concept standards cover already many fundamental international plant quarantine and inspection functions, there should be a greater balance in the selection of standards in favour of specific standards;	Agree	Processes are in place to improve the balance in favour of specific standards	Already in place	Continuing	SPTA, SC for additions to work programme and CPM
1.2. Industry stakeholders should be consulted and their knowledge and experience used at an early stage of the standard-setting process, particularly for specific standards on the basis of the Codex model (as explained in paragraph 56), and the necessary safeguards should be set up;	Partially agree	The consultation of industry stakeholders is a good practice of preparation within contracting parties. More industry stakeholders can be reached this way than through international stakeholder involvement.	Contracting parties to consult with stakeholders in their countries	Ongoing	Contracting parties
1.3. Greater efforts should be put into prioritization of standards, using existing criteria and weighting their importance as well as taking into account available resources;	Agree		As per recommendations from the FG on the Standard Setting Procedure	CPM-3 and ongoing	SPTA, SC, CPM

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
1.4. Priorities should also be based on maintaining an average number of three to four standards per year at least in the next three to five years (an increased number of standards may be envisaged where greater efficiency is gained in the process). The process through which priorities are established should be made clear to Contracting Parties;	Disagree	Want to maintain a target of 5 per year as per the CPM Business Plan The number of standards will depend on the nature of the standards Overlap with 1.13	Follow the CPM Business Plan	Ongoing, resource dependent	SC SPTA CPM
1.5. Opportunities should be sought to make greater use of existing standards, particularly those developed by RPPOs;	Agree	Awareness of other standards is important Potential usefulness of an inventory of other existing standards [Note: the response by the 19 th TC-RPPOs (Ottawa 2007) was: <i>Agree. This is already taking place.</i>]	As per the regular call, countries can consider other existing standards in their proposals International organizations can submit their standards through the Secretariat (optional)	Ongoing	Contracting parties, SPTA, SC
Environmental and biodiversity concerns					
1.6. A Technical Panel on Biodiversity should be established to review standards from the point of view of environmental impacts, biodiversity threats, and invasive species pathways that could be given accelerated priority and that could be included in the CPM work programme;	Disagree	1.6 to 1.8: The SPTA summarizes its concerns with respect to Recommendations 1.6 to 1.8 as follows: The SPTA stresses that the IPPC is contributing to the protection of the environment and biodiversity by preventing the introduction and spread of invasive alien species which are regulated or potentially regulated pests.	1. Keep under review issues of linkage and consistency with the environment	1. Ongoing	1. CPM
1.7 Some standards should have a primary theme directed at biodiversity issues;	Disagree				

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
1.8 The Expert Working Groups, Technical Panels and Standards Committee should incorporate biodiversity and environmental considerations into their work so that all standards address these concerns, not just the standards coming from the Technical Panel on Biodiversity. All standards should have a statement regarding their biodiversity impact;	Agree	<p>The SPTA clarifies that environmental concerns are systematically considered in the development of international standards. This has been taken into account in ISPMs, e.g. ISPM No. 5 supplement 2, ISPM No. 11, statement regarding cooperation with the CBD, consideration of environment as criteria in standard setting. The CPM has agreed that the scope of the convention extends beyond just cultivated plants.</p> <p>The SPTA believes that the role of the IPPC in relation to other conventions as well as the scope of the IPPC itself needs to be kept under review in this respect. In addition, the IPPC does not have the resources to establish a specifically designed work programme aimed at protecting the environment and/or biodiversity unless extra budgetary resources become available.</p>	<p>2. Promote among CPs the responsibility to implement stds and the objectives of the IPPC, which includes reference to phytosanitary environment matters</p> <p>3. A statement regarding biodiversity considerations in all stds as appropriate (new stds as they are developed and old standards as they are revised)</p>	<p>2. Ongoing</p> <p>3. CPM-3</p>	<p>2. CPs</p> <p>3. CPM</p>
1.9. An Environmental Liaison Officer position should be created in the IPPC Secretariat with responsibility for environmental content in standards, information and training, and for leading the Technical Panel; and she/he could also carry out liaison functions with other international organizations for the Secretariat such as the Convention on Biodiversity;	Partially agree	The SPTA partially agrees. At the current time the SPTA believes that a general liaison officer is needed for cooperation at a technical level with all other relevant international organizations.	Staffing as per the CPM Business Plan	Depending on resources and other staffing actions	Secretariat

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
Implementation of standards					
1.10. A procedure for monitoring implementation and impact of standards should be developed by the CPM, and used to inform both revisions of standards and the priorities and processes for developing new standards;	Agree	<p>1.10 and 1.11:</p> <p>The SPTA advises that although the new revised text of the IPPC has only been in force for 2 years, the first investigation into the establishment of a compliance mechanism has been undertaken. Recommendations regarding implementation of standards may follow.</p> <p>Mechanisms for supporting implementation were proposed by OEWG on Possible Compliance Mechanisms</p>	<p>Dependent on the CPM reviewing and deciding how to proceed with the proposal by the OEWG on Possible Compliance Mechanisms</p>	<p>CPM-3 or 4</p>	<p>SPTA, SC, CPM</p>
1.11 Each standard should have an implementation statement indicating the expected timeframe for implementation, an estimate of the potential impacts and costs and benefits of implementation, and a plan on how implementation could be achieved and monitored;	Disagree				
1.12. Regional workshops reviewing draft ISPMs should continue and new regional workshops promoting implementation should be initiated, with the assistance of RPPOs;	<p>Agree with the 1st part</p> <p>Partially agree with the 2nd part</p>	<p>Workshops supporting implementation -within a capacity building strategy</p> <p>[Note: the response by the 19th TC-RPPOs (Ottawa 2007) was:</p> <p><i>Agree with the recommendations including assistance from RPPOs.</i></p> <p><i>A coordinated strategy will be necessary between IPPC and RPPOs in order to accomplish the new regional WS on implementation</i></p> <p><i>The TC-RPPOs notes that Goal 1 of the CPM BP includes RPPO assistance to members for the implementation of standards]</i></p>	<p>Expand technical assistance and capacity building strategy in relation to the issue of implementation</p> <p>Combination of RWS on ISPMs with training on implementation of ISPMs proposed</p>	<p>2008</p>	<p>Secretariat, SPTA, IWG-TA CPM-3</p>

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
Maintenance of the current level of standard setting					
1.13 The CPM should ensure that there is both sufficient direct funding either from the FAO Regular Programme or extra-budgetary sources, to recruit expertise in standard setting to facilitate the work of stewards and to be able to recruit the necessary expertise not provided on a voluntary basis and when needed;	Agree	In addition, the SPTA would like to point out that the aim of the CPM is to adopt 5 ISPMs or their equivalent annually, as outlined in the CPM Business Plan. The estimated costs of 5 ISPMs per year is USD 1.5 million, of which currently approximately \$200,000 are contributed in kind by member state experts acting as stewards for individual standards.	Develop, implement and promote a multi-year funding strategy	2007/08	Secretariat, SPTA, Bureau
Participation of Contracting Parties					
1.14 Sufficient financial and technical support should be directed at active participation of experts from developing countries in the SC, and EWGs and TPs (this will mean the active search and financial support of experts from developing countries).;	Agree	The SPTA recognizes the aim of that recommendation and fully supports it.	Develop, implement and promote a multi-year funding strategy	2007/08	Secretariat, SPTA, Bureau
Transparency of the standard-setting process					
1.15 Minutes of standard-setting committees (EWGs, TPs, SC) should provide sufficient detail on the nature and depth of the debates on key issues related to draft standards, and be available prior to member consultations;	Agree	<p>Reports of these groups are intended to show the outcome of these discussions.</p> <p>Reports will be posted to the IPP as per decisions of Focus Group and SPTA. Experts should ensure that sufficient detail is recorded in the reports.</p>	<p>Secretariat:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remind committees of need for detail in their reports 2. Post the reports 	Ongoing	<p>Secretariat - responsible for posting the report</p> <p>Meeting participants - responsible for adopting reports with sufficient detail</p>

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
1.16. Greater time should be allocated between the end of member consultation on draft ISPMs and the SC meeting and the posting of SC approved draft ISPMs and the meeting of the CPM to allow time for feedback on comments and to achieve greater consensus prior to the CPM;	Agree	The SC decides on the appropriate time to present the draft to the CPM	SC decides on the appropriate time to present the draft ISPM to the CPM	2007 and ongoing	SC
1.17. A three-year standard-setting cycle would be more appropriate to ensure adequate time for standards specification, drafting and consultation;	Partially agree	See 1.16 which incorporates flexibility into the timing of the standard setting cycle	SC decides on the appropriate time to present the draft ISPM to the CPM	2007 and ongoing	SC
1.18 The number of permanent professional staff in the Secretariat involved in supporting the standard-setting process should be increased from 1.5 person years to 4 person years plus part of the time from the Senior Environment Liaison Officer (mentioned above); (This did not include temporary staff and contractual arrangements);	Partially agree	The SPTA partially agrees but believes that the number of permanent professional staff in the Secretariat for the standard setting process should be increased from 1.5 person years to 6 person years as rationalized in the CPM Business Plan. This assumes less work done on a voluntary basis , which is contrary to the assumption in the evaluation report. This is necessary because in-kind contributions by member states with experts acting as stewards may not continue and is not necessarily the most efficient way of working. The arrangement with stewards was set up as a short-term option to deal with the shortage of staff in the Secretariat.	Staffing as per the CPM Business Plan	Depending on resources and other staffing actions	Secretariat
1.19 The Secretariat should be able to have a greater role all along the standard-setting process in support of the EWGs, TPs, the SC and the CPM with a view to increasing transparency, quality of the work and facilitating participation of all Contracting Parties;	Agree	The capacity of the Secretariat should be strengthened.	Staffing, as per the CPM Business Plan	Dependent on resources	Secretariat

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
2. Information Exchange					
Assistance to Contracting Parties					
2.1. The IPPC Secretariat should continue to assist countries to better understand their information reporting obligations and to provide training on how to use the IPP to meet those obligations;	Agree		As per recommendation	Ongoing	Secretariat
2.2. Once the Secretariat finishes giving the basic workshop to Contracting Parties in all the regions, future training support should involve the development and provision of short refresher courses to reinforce the training and ensure capacity;	Agree	Opportunities should be explored to combine training workshops with refreshers workshops, consider networking amongst editors	As per recommendation	Ongoing, and as resources become available	Secretariat
Evaluation of obligation status					
2.3. The IPPC Secretariat should consider developing a basic form, available on the IPP, for countries to use to auto-evaluate their reporting obligation status, as well as the accuracy of the data provided. Countries could be encouraged to auto-evaluate their status on a regular basis (e.g. yearly);	Agree	2.3 and 2.4 Need to consider mechanisms and tools to be used	CPM to review and decide on how to proceed with the proposal by the OEWG on a Possible Compliance Mechanism	CPM-3 or 4	Secretariat, CPM, Contracting parties
2.4. In view of the arrival of new editors and the need for refresher information by existing ones, the IPPC Secretariat should continue the development of appropriate capacity-building tools;	Agree		Develop appropriate capacity-building tools and IPP manual	2008 depending on resources	Secretariat, IPP Support Group

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
Increased availability of information					
2.5. The IPPC Secretariat should establish formal linkages with other information exchange mechanisms and their databases in particular with RPPOs and the International Portal on Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health, through Memoranda of Understanding or other appropriate mechanisms to improve the availability of information and to increase the usefulness of the IPP;	Agree	<p>The SPTA shares the comments contained in the FAO Management response, i.e.,</p> <p>Consider the need for a formal working group within the Organization, to make best use of resources in the International Portal on Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health (IPFSAPH) and synergies with similar information exchange programmes where possible (e.g. Codex Alimentarius).</p> <p>[Note: the response by the 19th TC-RPPOs was: <i>The TC-RPPOs agrees in principle with this recommendation, based on availability of the information.</i>]</p>	Further develop joint work programmes and associated MoUs where required	2008	IPPC, Secretariat, FAO
2.6. Information provided through RPPOs should be recognized as a legal reporting route for the IPPC, providing that IPPC can harvest the information. This would imply that a standard format for data exchange be defined in the Memorandum of Understanding to permit periodic harvesting of data from these official sources.;	<p>Agree</p> <p>Partially agree</p>	<p>Recognize as an official reporting route rather than legal.</p> <p>Development of a MoU depends on outcome of legal interpretation, but SPTA preference is to do without MoU.</p> <p>[Note: the response by the 19th TC-RPPOs was: <i>The 19th TC-RPPOs agreed on recognizing the RPPOs as an official reporting route and using a standard format for this purpose. However, the TC believes that the word “legal” in the recommendation is not appropriate and should be replaced with the word “official”.</i>]</p>	<p>1. Consult with FAO Legal Office regarding legality</p> <p>2. Discuss at next CPM and discuss implementation at next TC of RPPOs</p> <p>3. Continue to develop standard format for Reporting</p>	<p>1. 2007</p> <p>2. 2008</p> <p>3. Ongoing</p>	<p>1. Secretariat</p> <p>2. TC and Secretariat</p> <p>3. Secretariat and RPPOs</p>

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
2.7. Further, the IPPC Secretariat should establish a mechanism for Contracting Parties to officially declare to the IPPC which reporting channel they are using to meet their reporting obligations;	Disagree	Mechanism already exists through the IPP Not all reporting obligations from a CP need to use the same reporting channel Also addressed through recommendations 2.8 and 2.9	Wait for outcome of actions under 2.6 (consultation with FAO legal)		
Compliance with mandatory information exchange obligations					
2.8. Compliance with mandatory information exchange obligations should be given much greater emphasis by the CPM and the Secretariat;	Agree	Refer to recommendations of the OEWG CPs need to commit to meeting their reporting obligations These recommendations should be considered when discussing international recognition of pest free areas	Dependent on the CPM reviewing and deciding how to proceed with the proposal by the OEWG on Possible Compliance Mechanisms	CPM-3 or -4	CPM and Secretariat
2.9. A monitoring and compliance system for meeting mandatory IPPC reporting obligations should be developed and implemented. (A first step in that direction would be to publish country information reporting every year at the CPM.) This system should specifically track Contracting Party compliance with all reporting obligations;	Agree	The OEWG on Possible Compliance Mechanisms used the term implementation monitoring. Monitoring is a responsibility of CPM	Dependent on the CPM reviewing and deciding how to proceed with proposal by OEWG on Possible Compliance Mechanisms	CPM-3 or -4	CPM and Secretariat

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
Professional support					
2.10. The Secretariat should hire a Webmaster for information exchange and a Programmer to maintain the IPP and to improve its tools and features;	Agree	2.10 and 2.11: The SPTA generally agrees, but stresses that the staff resources for information exchange of 5 persons projected in the CPM Business Plan need to be realized.	To discuss further in recommendation 6.9		
2.11. Funding should be made available for hiring external Information Technology professional assistance to assist with the maintenance of the IPP and to support its further development;	Agree	Note that webmaster has been hired “external” IT assistant is understood to refer to external to the Secretariat	To discuss further in recommendation 6.9		
3. Technical Assistance					
Coordination of Global Support					
3.1 FAO, and not the IPPC Secretariat, is best placed to coordinate global support for strengthening national phytosanitary capacity; and	Disagree	Contrary to the recommendation in the report, the SPTA feels that the IPPC secretariat is best placed to coordinate phytosanitary capacity building. To this end, the SPTA recommends the development of a phytosanitary capacity building strategy which addresses implementation, funding, and linkages to FAO resources. The strategy, as developed, will specify reporting channels. The requirements for phytosanitary capacity strengthening are best understood within the IPPC and not in the larger FAO system. The recommendation in the evaluation report would have the effect of relegating phytosanitary issues to a lower level. The CPM is made up of the world leaders of plant health and the Secretariat is staffed with some of the best expertise that can be found worldwide in phytosanitary matters.	Develop and facilitate implementation of capacity building strategy	Start in 2008	Secretariat, SPTA, Bureau, CPM

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
		It would be better if the capacity of the IPPC Secretariat was improved to address the shortcomings of the technical assistance programme identified in the evaluation report. In this regard, the link between the IPPC Secretariat and FAO-TCP programs and donors needs to be strengthened with the lead within the IPPC Secretariat, rather than outside it.			
<p>3.2 An International Consultative Group on Technical Assistance and Capacity-Building on Phytosanitary Matters should be set up and coordinated by the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division.</p> <p>The group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) would be open to all donors and recipient countries in the field of phytosanitary capacity; b) objectives would be to define priority needs, facilitate resource mobilization, and ensure coordination; c) it should establish effective linkages with the CPM; 	Disagree	Same reason as for 3.1. In addition it is felt that the recommendation in the report would add unnecessary new layers of decision making.			
Organization of Technical Capacity					
3.3 FAO, through the Plant Production and Protection Division, should organize the necessary technical capacity outside the IPPC Secretariat as part of its regular programme with a view to providing technical assistance in support of phytosanitary capacity development. FAO should do so taking into account its resources and in partnership with other main actors;	Disagree	Taking into account its resources and in partnership with other organizations, FAO should provide strong support to the IPPC for phytosanitary capacity building in developing countries.	Develop and facilitate implementation of capacity building strategy	Starting 2008	Secretariat, SPTA, Bureau, CPM

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
3.4 FAO should report to the CPM on its phytosanitary technical assistance;	Agree		As per recommendation	Ongoing	Secretariat
IPPC Technical Assistance					
3.5 Technical assistance carried out directly under the IPPC should be limited to its core business, i.e. closely linked to a better understanding of standards and monitoring of the impact of these standards, the development and use of the IPP as a tool for information exchange among Contracting Parties, and support to developing country attendance at technical and governance meetings;	Partially agree	<p>The technical capacity building strategy should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support in the development and implementation of standards • better understanding of these standards • monitoring of the impact of these standards • development and use of the IPP as tool for information exchange • support for developing countries' preparation for and participation in technical meetings. • support for developing countries' technical inputs into phytosanitary policymaking <p>In addition, the CPM Business Plan specifies the critical areas addressed under the IPPC's technical assistance programme as being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • modernization of legal frameworks • institutional strengthening • training in relation to the implementation of ISPMs • pest surveillance • pest risk analysis skills • information systems for decision making • documented procedures • laboratory facilities • strengthening of national capabilities and systems for the eradication/containment of introduced pest species • establishment of pest free areas. 	Develop and facilitate implementation of capacity building strategy	Starting 2008	Secretariat, SPTA, Bureau, CPM

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
4. Dispute Settlement					
4.1. Continued effective support should be given to maintain the newly established Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement and to promote awareness of the IPPC's dispute settlement procedures;	Agree	The role of the dispute settlement system will continue to be promoted	Report shall be provided Secretariat to liaise with SBDS Promotion continues	CPM 3 Ongoing Ongoing	Secretariat Secretariat Secretariat, SBDS, Bureau, CPM
4.2. The CPM should encourage Contracting Parties, when appropriate, to make use of this process;	Agree	Parts of the system are being used	Report use of the system to CPM	Ongoing	SBDS, Secretariat
5. Governance					
CPM Programme of Work					
5.1 The CPM should review and formally adopt the annual programme of work and related budget;	Agree	See combined response to 5.1, 7.2 and 7.3 under recommendation 7.	As per the recommendation, the CPM will review and adopt the distribution of the funds allocated by FAO, as well funds from other sources	CPM meetings	CPM Bureau plus SPTA?

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
CPM's Cost					
5.2 In order to reduce the CPM's cost, it is recommended that translation costs should be reduced by outsourcing these activities;	Agree	<p>The SPTA fully supports the recommendation, provided such translations are consistent with the expectations of the IPPC and within FAO requirements.</p> <p>The programme committee, in response to the intervention of the vice chair of the CPM, supported the ESPTA decision that the translation policy be relaxed.</p> <p>“It also noted the view of the Vice-Chair of the CPM that standards were highly technical and best translated by plant protection professionals. The Committee agreed that the FAO policy in this regard should be further reviewed with a view to its relaxation.”</p>	<p>Request an update on possibility to outsource translation for CPM- 4</p> <p>Request that CPs discuss the issue on behalf of the Bureau and raise it at FAO council and conference</p>	<p>CPM-4 (enquire in Oct-Nov 2008)</p> <p>Next FAO council and conference</p>	<p>FAO</p> <p>CPM Chair</p>
Information					
5.3 Acknowledging that one of the CPM's key functions should remain the review of phytosanitary issues at the global level, but noting that the Secretariat does not have the capacity to carry out such a review on a regular basis. FAO (and not the IPPC Secretariat) should integrate into its core work programme a review of the phytosanitary status of the world as part of the technical services provided by the Plant Production and Protection Division to the IPPC and to the FAO membership as a whole;	Disagree	It should be noted that Article XI.2a of the IPPC, states that the “review of the state of plant protection in the world” is a function of the CPM and this is correctly stated in paragraph 145 of the evaluation report. The SPTA believes that a review of phytosanitary issues at a global level is best carried out under the IPPC because existing reporting channels like the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) are already functional. The IPP could be an important medium in gathering information about the state of plant protection in the world and the increased efficiency or use of the IPP coupled with accurate reporting may contribute considerably to such a review.	Dependent on CPM reviewing and deciding how to proceed with proposal by OEWG on Possible Compliance Mechanisms	CPM-3 or 4	CPM

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
Structures and Transparency					
5.4 To combine the functions of the Bureau and the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance into the newly enlarged Bureau;	Agree	The SPTA will still have one annual open ended meeting with the extended bureau as its core group	Elections for Bureau	2008	CPM
5.5 Greater transparency be ensured through various measures including quick availability of minutes of meetings and audio-recordings on the Internet as well as possibility to co-opt or invite experts;	Agree	Agree that transparency is an ongoing issue being addressed by the CPM and its bodies wherever practical and possible The Standards Setting FG made recommendations regarding transparency in standard setting	Prepare minutes quickly and have docs available	Ongoing	Secretariat, others as appropriate
Effective management of the work to be undertaken by the Standards Committee					
5.6. The total membership of the Committee should be reduced to 14: two from each FAO Region;	Disagree	Should be no change, especially since CPM put considerable effort into reaching consensus on the size of the SC, and the decision should not be reviewed at this time			
5.7. RPPOs should be involved in the identification of appropriate candidates;	Partially agree	This is a matter for each FAO Regional Group to decide. In several regions this is already the case. [Note: the response by the 19 th TC-RPPOs <i>The TC-RPPOs agrees with this recommendation</i>]	No further action		
Staffing					
5.8 The Secretariat should ensure that proposed members meet the requirements as described in the Standards Committee's rules of procedure (subsequently, candidates should be endorsed by the Bureau against agreed criteria before being submitted to the CPM for confirmation);	Partially agree	Secretariat to make sure that FAO regions are aware of the criteria and use criteria for nomination of SC members, and show how criteria have been met	Summarize requirements for SC members from existing ROPs	Annual - prior to the CPM meeting	Secretariat

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
6. Secretariat					
6.1 The Secretary post should not be associated with other FAO functions and should be a full-time D1 (Manager);	Agree	The SPTA strongly supports the aim of the recommendation of having a full-time D1 Secretary focussing on the leadership and management of the IPPC and its Secretariat (within FAO), and strategic relations with other international bodies. Any other activities of the Secretary should be complementary to that role. The Programme Committee also agrees with the recommendation The SPTA realizes that there is a budget implication	Appoint full time secretary	As soon as possible, but depending on resources	FAO
6.2 There should be open competition for the post of Secretary;	Agree	Bureau should be involved in developing job description	Draft job description	2007	Bureau, Secretariat
6.3 The Coordinator post should then be abolished;	Disagree	The SPTA believes that after appointing the full time Secretary, the Coordinator position must be maintained for at least a certain period in order to maintain and improve an efficient functioning of the Secretariat. Once the full time secretary is appointed, the workload and the CPM's expectations of the Secretariat should be reviewed to determine the appropriate structure, size and scope of the Secretariat.			
6.4 The seniority of the posts dealing with the IPPC's two core functions (i.e. standard-setting and information exchange) should be upgraded to P5, supervising other professionals;		The SPTA believes that determination of pay grade is to be done by the IPPC Secretary and FAO and strongly recommends that staff is remunerated in accordance with their responsibilities as per 6.3 - review of structure			

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
Technical Assistance					
In view of the proposed changes regarding the role of the Secretariat on technical assistance: 6.5. Regional Plant Protection Officers should perform specific tasks against reimbursement from the IPPC budget. Activities funded from this source should be concerned with the primary role of the IPPC (e.g. standard-setting, information exchange and dispute settlement);	Agree	The time that FAO regional plant protection officers dedicate to IPPC activities should be broadly correlated with the IPPC contribution to their post. The activities of the regional plant protection officers will be determined by the CPM work programme and the technical capacity building strategy	Regional officers report through the Chief, AGPP to the IPPC Secretariat on phytosanitary activities	Immediate	FAO, IPPC Secretariat
6.6. The activities carried out by the Regional Officers should be reported annually in the CPM as part of the activity and financial report of the Secretariat to the CPM;	Agree	The regional plant protection officers should report on their IPPC activities.	Regional plant protection officers report annually	Annually	IPPC Secretariat, Regional plant protection officers
Selection of staff					
6.7 In line with the provisions of Article XIV of the FAO Constitution, the Bureau and the representatives of the Director-General (e.g. from the Plant Production and Protection Division) will recommend a candidate for Secretary to the Director-General following a transparent and competitive selection process.	Agree	The SPTA agrees with the principle of the CPM or Bureau being involved in the selection process for the post of Secretary. Therefore, it recommends that FAO should investigate how CPM representatives may be involved in this process. Programme Committee suggested the bureau be involved Note: the response made by the ESPTA to 6.7 and 6.8: was based on an earlier version of the Evaluation Report, which was later modified by the Evaluation Team	As per recommendation	Dependent on resource availability	Bureau, FAO

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
6.8 A similar procedure will be followed for the selection of the professional staff of the IPPC Secretariat. Such staff would not be eligible for consideration as internal candidates for posts elsewhere in FAO.	Agree	<p>The SPTA agrees with the principle of the CPM or Bureau being involved in the selection process for posts of professional staff, limited to the P4 and P5 level. Therefore, it recommends that FAO should investigate how CPM representatives may be involved in this process.</p> <p>Note the FAO Management Response, i.e. <i>“Professional appointments will be considered by the Professional Staff Selection Committee (PSSC) before a short list is presented. For identification of the most qualified candidates for the short list, the positions will be widely advertised and nominations will be sought from relevant institutions and organizations, including the CPM.</i></p> <p><i>Once appointed, under FAO Staff rules, any staff member must be eligible for consideration as an internal candidate for posts elsewhere in FAO.”</i></p>	No action required as this extends beyond the authority of the CPM		
Structure and number of Professional Secretariat Staff					
<p>6.9 Based on the analysis in the previous chapters, changes proposed regarding the structure and the number of professional staffing of the Secretariat are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - D-1 IPPC Secretary (Manager) - 1 P-5 Senior Environmental Liaison Officer and Coordination with other international organizations - 1 P-5 IPPC Senior Standards Officer - 3 P-4 Standards Officers - 1 P-5 IPPC Senior Information Exchange Officer - 1 P-4 Information Officer - 1 P-3 Programmer - 1 P-2 Webmaster; 	Partially agree	<p>The SPTA believes that the CPM Business Plan (2007-2011) accurately reflects the staffing needs of the Secretariat.</p> <p>The recommendation does not reflect the capacity building staff needs as it recommends that this area be moved outside of the Secretariat (Rec 3.1). Neither does it reflect the general staff, nor contracted assistance (see Recommendations (and comments), 1.8, 1.18, 2.10 and 2.11)</p> <p>Staff requirements are set out in the Business Plan. Following the IPPC Evaluation, the meeting of the</p>	Review of CPM Business Plan	2008-2009	SPTA, CPM

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
		Focus Group on the Standards Setting Procedure, the meeting of the Programme Committee and the subsequent CPM 2008, there may be a need to review the Business Plan. It is noted that the both the IPPC Evaluation and the FAO Programme Committee recommended significant Secretariat staff increases.			
7. IPPC's Financial Resources					
7.1. FAO should preferably ensure systematic annual core funding of the Secretariat's core activities on a basis agreed upon by the CPM's expanded Bureau and FAO;	Agree	<p>The SPTA agrees with the general aim of the recommendation as contained in the report but recommends that the terms "preferably" and "expanded bureau" be deleted so that the recommendation would read: <i>FAO should ensure systematic annual core funding of the Secretariat's core activities on a basis agreed upon by the CPM and FAO.</i></p> <p>The basis for the CPM's consideration of core activities are the 7 strategic 5-year goals presented in the CPM Business Plan and aimed at implementing the provisions of the IPPC. The SPTA considers that the successful implementation of these goals will require sufficient resources both from FAO and external sources. This would also be in accordance with the opening speech of the Director-General at CPM-2.</p> <p>In addition, the SPTA would like to draw attention to paragraph 170 of the Evaluation Report. Funding of staff needs to be included in the list of that paragraph</p>	FAO Council and Conference	2007 and ongoing	FAO

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
7.2. The annual budget and programme should be defined by the expanded bureau.	Partially agree	<p>5.1, 7.2 and 7.3: The procedure for developing and adopting the work programme and associated budget should be carried out as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the financial resources provided by FAO regular programme and other contributions, the Bureau, in consultation with the Secretariat will develop and propose an annual work programme with an associated budget. Based on the proposals by the Bureau, the CPM may adopt the programme. 	As for 5.1 (... the CPM will review and adopt the distribution of the funds allocated by FAO, as well funds from other sources)		
7.3. The Secretariat should be fully accountable to the expanded Bureau and should provide detailed and clear financial reports;	Partially agree	<p>With respect to the <i>work programme and associated budget</i>, the Secretariat is fully accountable to the Bureau and the CPM and should provide detailed and clear financial reports.</p> <p>Note: The FAO Management Response: <i>According to the Convention, the Secretary is responsible for implementing the policies and activities of the Commission and carrying out such other functions as may be assigned to the Secretary by this Convention and shall report thereon to the Commission. In such a situation the Bureau can only have an advisory function unless the CPM decides otherwise. Furthermore, this can only be seen in the context of the CPM as an Article XIV body of the IPPC, which does not include financial responsibility for FAO's Regular Programme funds. FAO Management accepts that the Secretariat should continue to provide the CPM, the Bureau and the SPTA with detailed financial information and to make them aware of possibilities and limitations.</i></p>	Provide detailed and clear financial report	Bureau, SPTA and CPM	Secretariat

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
7.4. The Secretariat should have a more solid resource mobilization strategy, stressing the preference for multi-donor trust funding over bilateral funding;	Agree	The SPTA attributes considerable importance to this recommendation and agrees that the Secretariat should have a more solid resource mobilisation strategy, stressing the preference for multi-donor trust funding over bilateral funding. However, the SPTA emphasises that any form of extra-budgetary contribution at any time would be considered. In addition, it should be easy to contribute extra-budgetary resources to the IPPC. The development of a more solid resource mobilization strategy should be done in cooperation between Secretariat and the Bureau.	Develop strategy	2007-08	Secretariat and Bureau
7.5. Donor Contracting Parties should make an effort to tie their contributions to the IPPC's annual planning cycle;	Partially agree	Same comment as under 7.4			
7.6 More innovative approaches of funding such as cost-recovery schemes will have to be systematically and carefully considered in the future;	Partially agree	The SPTA partially agrees and emphasises that alternative funding mechanisms, including cost recovery schemes had been investigated since 2002 by the ICPM and CPM. It was found that cost-recovery schemes are not practical at present. However, other innovative approaches will be considered as part of the development of a resource mobilization strategy being developed under 7.4.	[Consider for Ministerial meeting]		

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Recommendation to CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
<p>Para 190. The evaluation team was not in a position to conduct an evaluation of the RPPOs. However, it identified issues that need to be further explored and that should be addressed by FAO in the near future:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) and the Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC)¹ are FAO subsidiary bodies; FAO should review carefully its support to these bodies. In particular, it should define ways of ensuring greater independence and long-term sustainability; Efforts should be undertaken to finalize the establishment of the Near East Plant Protection Organization; and FAO, in collaboration with relevant regional bodies, should explore opportunities to strengthen the capacity of certain RPPOs, such as the Inter African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC), in collaboration with the African Union (AU). 	<p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p>	<p>The SPTA fully supports the suggestions made in paragraph 190 of the evaluation report.</p> <p>Note: the response by the 19th TC-RPPOs (Ottawa 2007) was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>APPPC - The TC-RPPOs believes that this is an FAO issue</i> <i>Near East – The TC-RPPOs agrees with the comment regarding the Near East</i> <i>Capacity - The TC agrees with the comment and noted that strengthening capacity should not be limited to only some RPPOs.</i> <p>The SPTA considers that all of the RPPOs should be strengthened and a strategy developed to ensure their sustainability</p> <p>Note the positive evolution of the APPPC over the past years</p>	<p>As per the recommendation</p> <p>FAO to develop a strategy to strengthen RPPOs and ensure their sustainability</p>	<p>2008 and ongoing</p>	<p>[FAO]?</p> <p>FAO</p>

¹ The CPPC is currently being disestablished and the RPPO activities will be taken over by the Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA), which will function as the RPPO for the Caribbean subregion in accordance with Article IX of the New Revised Text of the IPPC.

**Comments by the SPTA (plus those of the IWG on PCE and 19th TC-RPPOs)
on the
Recommendations from the CABI Analysis of the Application of the PCE Tool**

CABI Recommendations	Comments by the IWG on PCE	Comment by the 19 th TC-RPPOs (Ottawa 2007)	Comment by SPTA 2007
Group 1: An overall technical assistance (TA) strategy:			
<p>Recommendation 1 That a strategic plan for TA be developed that addresses the full range of issues. While various subgroups, IWG, focus groups etc may engage in developing and implementing TA, they all must be aware of and working from a single cohesive strategy with timely cross communication. A coordination role must be appropriately assigned.</p>	The IWG-PCE fully supports the recommendation.	<p>The TC agreed with Recommendation 1.</p> <p>The TC believed that (following) after recommendation 2, this should precede all other actions.</p> <p>The TC also recommended that, as part of this process, existing tools used on plant health issues be identified and collected from contracting parties or other sources, for consideration before new tools are developed (see recommendation 8)</p>	The SPTA agreed that a phytosanitary capacity strategy needed to be developed and implemented.
<p>Recommendation 2 That the CPM endorses a definition of national phytosanitary capacity that best fits its vision and expectations for all efforts under the IPPC</p>	The IWG-PCE fully supports the recommendation and proposes that it should be developed in the framework of the IWG-TA	<p>The TC partly agreed with Rec. 2.</p> <p>It felt that rather than a definition, a concept paper should be prepared and that this recommendation should be responded and agreed to before the other recommendations. The TC felt that the concept paper should be drafted by the SPTA and that as it would be a universal concept, both developed and non-developing countries should participate</p>	A concept paper to be introduced to the CPM that highlighted the need for a phytosanitary capacity strategy. Paper to be authored by J Hedley with the assistance of J Jones and D Nowell as well as information already prepared by CABI. Part of that paper would be a concept of phytosanitary capacity. Include a timeframe for actions. A new focus group is proposed.

CABI Recommendations	Comments by the IWG on PCE	Comment by the 19 th TC-RPPOs (Ottawa 2007)	Comment by SPTA 2007
		<p>in the formulation.</p> <p>The TC agreed that CABI would provide additional information to be used in the preparation of a concept document for the next SPTA.</p>	
<p>Group 2 – Future development of the PCE</p>			
<p>Recommendation 3 That the PCE, (minus the information in Recommendation 7 below), be arranged into a stratified framework so that a user may follow the tool on a modular basis, going deeper into detail when more assistance is needed, with provision of links to additional information and guidance.</p>	<p>The IWG-PCE agrees to this recommendation, and suggests modifying the structure of the PCE to include, but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouping the ISPMs into conceptual categories (modules), avoiding the need to create different PCE modules for each ISPM. This means the PCE will require to be updated by categories (conceptual ISPMs) and not necessarily for the full content of the newer ISPMs. • The PCE should be modified so as not to display further questions when the answer to the lead question precludes the need for further questions on the same area. 	<p>The TC agreed with the recommendation.</p> <p>However, the TC suggested that Recommendations 1 and 2 needed to be addressed first.</p>	<p>The SPTA noted that Recommendation 3 was already underway</p>

CABI Recommendations	Comments by the IWG on PCE	Comment by the 19th TC-RPPOs (Ottawa 2007)	Comment by SPTA 2007
<p>Recommendation 4 That the IWG-PCE decides whether this new PCE should be linked to the Performance, Vision, Strategy (PVS) tool developed by the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture (IICA) as far as modules/topics or should remain independent of it.</p>	<p>Considering the stated objectives of each tool, the IWG-PCE felt that there was no need for any formal linkage but that recognition of the PVS was adequate. The meeting felt that proposed improvements to the PCE would, in any case, make it more comprehensive and suitable for the purpose for which it is used.</p>	<p>The TC was not in a position to comment as not all RPPOs were familiar with the IICA PVS tool.</p> <p>COSAVE indicated that the plant health PVS was still influenced by the fact that the original PVS was developed for animal health. COSAVE members felt that both tools (PVS and PCE) should remain separated.</p>	<p>The SPTA agrees with the IWG - PCE: Keep the PVS & PCE separate.</p>
<p>Group 3 - Development of other tools:</p>			
<p>Recommendation 5 That the Subsidiary Body for Dispute Settlement consider the usefulness of individual ISPM implementation sheets, in the form of check lists, and how these would be developed.</p>	<p>The IWG-PCE felt that this subject fell outside the intended use of the PCE. However the IWG-PCE acknowledged the need for other, more appropriate tools to be developed for this purpose</p>	<p>The TC agreed with the comments made by the IWG.</p>	<p>SPTA agreed that the SBDS consider the usefulness of ISPM implementation sheets..</p>
<p>Recommendation 6 That the IICA PVS be adopted by the IPPC for rapid assessment of national phytosanitary systems, based on expert judgement, and as a starting point for engaging different stakeholders and agreeing priorities.</p>	<p>In view of the comments on recommendation 4, the IWG-PCE felt that there was no need to consider formal adoption of the IICA PVS</p>	<p>The TC was not in a position to evaluate Recommendation 6 (see comments on Recommendation 4)</p>	<p>SPTA agrees with IWG-PCE comments.</p>

CABI Recommendations	Comments by the IWG on PCE	Comment by the 19th TC-RPPOs (Ottawa 2007)	Comment by SPTA 2007
<p>Recommendation 7 That information commonly requested by trading partners, including the existing requirements for information sharing under the IPPC/ISPMs, be integrated into a harmonized template to be posted on the IPP with appropriate access.</p>	<p>The IWG-PCE agreed to this recommendation, noting that templates for reporting obligations were already provided for. Similar provisions could be made to harvest specific PCE information, taking into account confidentiality of specific information and the need to avoid duplication of effort</p>	<p>The TC agreed with the IWG comment that information should be placed on the portal.</p> <p>However, the TC felt that more clarification was needed as to what exactly the recommendation meant (“... information commonly asked by trading partners, ...”), in order to avoid asking member countries for unnecessary and non-relevant information.</p>	<p>The SPTA supported the TC-RPPO’s need for clarification on what “... information commonly asked by trading partners ...” meant. It was also concerned in that the recommendation could result in additional obligations beyond those already required under the convention. “Harmonized templates” for information commonly requested by trading partners was considered impractical.</p>
<p>Recommendation 8 That simple tools, based on spreadsheets for example, be developed to address very specific evaluation objectives such as modelling risks, assessing efficiency of services, cost recovery calculations, investment decision making, etc.</p>	<p>The IWG-PCE fully supported this recommendation and suggested to also include a spreadsheet dealing with the cost benefit of conformity with the international standards</p>	<p>The TC agreed that simple tools could be used for self assessment.</p> <p>It was noted that many NPPOs would not possess the expertise to develop risk models, cost recovery calculations, investment decision making, etc. Any tools would need to be adapted to developing country conditions.</p>	<p>The SPTA agreed that simple tools (e.g. spreadsheets) could be useful. However, the objectives of the tools would need to be clear and the costs of the development of the tools needs to be considered in order to prevent unnecessary work.</p>
<p>Group 4 - Long term considerations:</p>			
<p>Recommendation 9 That a mechanism for collating information anonymously on NPPO capacity and related issues be designed and presented to the CPM for approval, taking account of confidentiality needs.</p>	<p>The IWG-PCE suggests that this recommendation should be part of a TA policy recommendation (Recommendation 1) rather than a long term objective, but that there might be no need for CPM adoption.</p>	<p>The TC agreed with comments by the IWG and that there be an upfront requirement for the NPPO to provide information (in a form that could not be identified to source).</p>	<p>The SPTA supported the need for collating information such as trends and frequently encountered problems (while protecting anonymity) that would help the Commission direct its capacity building strategy. The proposals (mechanism) from the OEWG on Compliance may deal with the recommendation.</p>

CABI Recommendations	Comments by the IWG on PCE	Comment by the 19th TC-RPPOs (Ottawa 2007)	Comment by SPTA 2007
<p>Recommendation 10 That the role of reviewing uses of the information generated from the PCE/PVS and other tools be assigned appropriately, so as to learn of trends, ensure the accurate transfer of information and better communicate the needs and value of plant health to other sectors.</p>	<p>It was suggested that this recommendation should be considered under the TA strategy suggested in Recommendation 1</p>	<p>The TC agreed with the comments by IWG</p>	<p>The SPTA agreed with the comments of the IWG-PCE, that the recommendation should be considered under the Technical Assistance strategy suggested in Recommendation 1</p>
<p>Recommendation 11 That an initiative on the quality of phytosanitary data should be launched, as a targeted assistance to NPPOs. .</p>	<p>The IWG-PCE observed that quality of information put on the IPP was a responsibility of the Contracting parties. The IPPC Secretariat will be working with Contracting Parties to improve the quality of information reported under IPPC obligations</p>	<p>According to CABI, the IWG did not make a correct interpretation of the recommendation. The recommendation is more focused on improving baseline data collection (accuracy, appropriateness) within the countries and regions, in order to be able to address more adequately recommendation 8.</p>	<p>This recommendation would be a requirement for Recommendation 8. Refer Rec. 8 for comments.</p>
<p>Recommendation 12 That all of the above systems and tools be reviewed for inclusion of environmental concerns, i.e. protection of domestic plant resources, rather than strictly trade related concerns.</p>	<p>The IWG-PCE felt that the process of incorporating environmental and other concerns was already in place and will be reflected more prominently in the revised PCE.</p>	<p>The TC noted that the environment was being considered within the context of the IPPC. The second part of the comment by the IWG is an assumption and could not be supported as the decision to revise the PCE has yet to be made.</p>	<p>Agree with the IWG-PCE. The updating of the PCE is ongoing. In terms of environmental concerns, see response to the IPPC Evaluation recommendations</p>

**Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance
1-5 October 2007**

PARTICIPANTS LIST

SPTA - core group	
<p>CPM Bureau Ms Reinouw BAST-TJEERDE CPM Vice-Chairperson and Manager, International Plant Protection Issues Plant Health Division Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 CANADA Tel: (+1) 613 221 4344 Fax: (+1) 613 228 6602 E-mail: rbast@inspection.gc.ca</p>	<p>CPM Bureau Mr Chagama KEDERA CPM Chairperson and Managing Director Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) Oloolua Ridge, Karen P.O.Box 49592 00100 GPO Nairobi KENYA Tel: (+254) 020 882 308; 884 545; 882 933 Fax: (+254) 020 882 265 E-mail: director@kephis.org</p>
<p>CPM Bureau Mr Ralf LOPIAN CPM Vice-Chairperson and Senior Advisor, International Affairs Department of Food and Health Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Mariankatu 23 P.O. Box 30 00023 Government Helsinki FINLAND Tel: (+358) 9 1605 2449 Fax: (+358) 9 1605 2443 E-mail: ralf.lopian@mmm.fi</p>	<p>SOUTHWEST PACIFIC Mr Kirifi PUONO Chief Executive Officer Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries P.O. Box 1874 Apia SAMOA Tel: (+685) 22561 / 62 Fax: (+685) 24576 / 21865 E-mail: maffm@lesamoa.net</p>
<p>ASIA Mr Larry LACSON Chief, Plant Quarantine Service DA-Bureau of Plant Industry 692 San Andres Street, Malate Manila PHILIPPINES Tel: (+63) 2 523 9132 / 831 1812/4040409 Fax : (+63) 2 521 7650/4040409 E-mail: lacsonlr@yahoo.com</p>	<p>NORTH AMERICA Mr Richard DUNKLE Deputy Administrator Plant Protection and Quarantine Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service United States Department of Agriculture Room 302-E, Whitten Building 1400 Independence Avenue, SW Washington DC 20250 UNITED STATES Tel: (+1) 202 720 5601 Fax: (+1) 202 690 0472 E-mail: richard.L.dunkle@aphis.usda.gov</p>

SPTA - core group**Not able to attend:**

- Göran Kroeker (**Europe**)
- Lilory McComie
- (**Latin America & the Caribbean**)
- Charles Zarzour (**Near East**)
- Alice BAXTER (**South Africa**)

Other participants

Steve ASHBY
Deputy Head
Plant Health Strategy and Bee Health Branch
Department for Environment, Food and Rural
Affairs
1-2 Peasholme Green
York YO1 7PX
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: (+44) 1 904445048
Fax: (+44) 1 904455198
E-mail: steve.ashby@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Gary KOIVISTO
Executive Director
Plant Products Directorate
Canadian Food Inspection Agency
59 Camelot Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
CANADA
Tel: (+1) 613 2214344
Fax (+) 613 2286602
E-mail: rbast@inspection.gc.ca

Ms. Stella ONWUADUEGBO
Deputy Director,
Head, NPQS
Nigeria Plant Quarantine Service
Federal Ministry of Agriculture
Moore Plantation, P.M.B. 5672
Ibadan
NIGERIA
E-mail: npqs_ngr@yahoo.com
stelladebo51@yahoo.com

Paul EGGERT
Associate Deputy Administrator for Plant Protection
and
Quarantine
Plant Protection and Quarantine, APHIS
United States Department of Agriculture
Room 302-E, Whitten Building
1400 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington DC 20250
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel: (+1) 202 720 5601
paul.r.eggert@usda.gov

Ebbe NORDBO
Danish Plant Directorate
Skovbrynet 20
2800 Lyngby
DENMARK
Tel: (+45) 45263891
E-mail: eno@pdire.dk

Other participants	
<p>John GREIFFER Director International Services United States Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service 1400 Independence Avenue SW Washington DC 20250 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Tel: (+1) 202 720 7677 Fax: (+1) 202 690 2861 E-mail: john.k.greifer@usda.gov</p>	<p>SBDS John HEDLEY Principal Adviser International Coordination Policy Biosecurity New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry P.O. Box 2526 Wellington NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 4 474 4170 Fax: (+64) 4 474 4257 E-mail: john.hedley@maf.govt.nz</p>
<p>Diana GUILLÉN Directora Nacional de Protección Vegetal Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria Pasero Colón 367, 7 Piso Buenos Aires 1063 ARGENTINA Tel: (+54) 11 4331 6041 Ext. 1706 Fax: (+54) 11 4331 6041 Ext. 1709 E-mail: dnpv@sinavimo.gov.ar</p>	<p>Mr. David PORRITT Senior Manager Plant Biosecurity Biosecurity Australia Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry GPO Box 858 Canberra, ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Tel: (+61) 2 6272 4633 Fax: (+61) 2 6272 3307 E-mail: david.porritt@biosecurity.gov.au</p>
<p>Rob VAN LINT Director Plant Protection Service of the Netherlands Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality P.O.Box 9102, 7600 HC Wageningen NETHERLANDS Tel: (+31) 317496600 Fax: (+31) 317421701 E-mail: r.j.t.van.lint@minlnv.nl</p>	<p>Milan KOVAC Permanent representative of the Slovak Republic to FAO and WFP Embassy of the Slovak Republic Via dei Colli della Farnesina 144 00194 Rome ITALY Tel: (+39) 06 36715206 fax: (+39) 06 36715266 mobile: (+39) 3393718432 E-mail: milan_kovac@rim.mfa.sk</p>
<p>Takashi SADAKANE Assistant Director International Affairs Division Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries JAPAN Phone: (+81)3 55122291 FAX: (+81) 3 35074232 E-mail: takashi_sadakane@nm.maff.go.jp</p>	<p>Mitsuaki KINOSHITA Deputy Director Plant Protection Division Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) JAPAN Tel: (+81) 3 35025978 Fax: (+81) 3 35023386 E-mail address: kino621216@yahoo.co.jp</p>