



***REPORT***

Rome, Italy  
4-7 August 2014

# **Open Ended Working Group on Implementation August, 2014**



**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation**

## CONTENTS

1. Opening and introduction .....	3
2. Election of the Chair and rapporteur .....	3
3. Adoption of the agenda.....	3
4. The general understanding of implementation (ToR 4.1).....	3
4.1 The challenges of implementation .....	4
4.2 The scope of implementation: Elements of an ideal implementation programme (ToR 4.1) .....	4
4.3 The roles of IPPC structures and stakeholders in implementation (ToR4.1) .....	4
4.4 The determination of priorities (ToR 4.2) .....	5
5. Organization of a global implementation programme (ToR 4.4) .....	6
5.1 The process of developing and managing an implementation programme (ToR 4.5) .....	6
5.2 Approval, coordination, monitoring and reporting mechanisms (ToR 4.6) .....	6
6. The financial support of the programme including realigning resources from other areas of the IPPC's work.....	6
7. Development of a pilot work plan to implement ISPM 6:1997. (ToR 4.8) .....	7
8. Recommendations of the Open Ended Working Group .....	7
9. Closing.....	8

## APPENDIXES

Appendix A - Terms of Reference for an Open-Ended Working Group on Implementation (agreed at CPM-9, 2014) .....	9
Appendix B - Agenda – OEWG on Implementation.....	10
Appendix C - Participants list .....	11
Appendix D - Elements that comprise an ideal implementation programme.....	17
Appendix E - Other key priorities for future implementation programmes .....	18
Appendix F - Elements of a Strategic work plan for Implementation of a specific topic .....	19
Appendix G - Proposed steps for development, approval and management of a strategic work plan development.....	20
Appendix H - Draft Strategic Work Plan for pilot programme on surveillance for further development.....	22

## **1. Opening and introduction**

- [1] The meeting was opened by Mr. Yukio Yokoi, Secretary of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). He welcomed participants and introduced Mrs. Kyu-Ock Yim, Chair of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), who also welcomed the participants. She noted that despite the work carried out by the CPM and IPPC Secretariat over the years and the number of standards developed, contracting parties still have numerous important implementation challenges that make it difficult to fulfill the IPPC's goals. She emphasized that the meeting was to provide guidance to the Secretariat for the establishment of implementation programmes and the development of strategic work plans by contracting parties whose responsibility it is to undertake implementation of the Convention. Mrs. Yim highlighted the opportunity to work towards concrete results at both the national and global level.
- [2] Mr. Peter Thomson (Vice Chair of the Bureau) introduced the subject of implementation starting with an overview of the Terms of Reference for this working group as approved at CPM-09 (**APPENDIX A**). Mr. Thomson discussed the context of implementation in particular referencing Article XI 2 of the Convention which describes the promotion of full implementation as a key role of the CPM. He provided background to recent efforts to develop a stronger focus on implementation and introduced the background documents produced on the topic from CPM 8 (CPM 2013/INF/13), SPG 2013 (SPG 2013/07) and CPM 9 (CPM 2014/20 Rev.1). The last-mentioned culminated in the CPM request (CPM 2104/CRP/09) to the Secretariat to work with an Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) and the Bureau to establish the required mechanisms for a pilot programme on implementation. Mr. Thomson concluded by noting that the tasks of the OEWG concern strengthening implementation by identifying globally applicable activities, having the contracting parties and Secretariat work together effectively, and having more contracting parties meet their obligations under the IPPC. He emphasized that the OEWG would not set up another work area or set up more individual projects and, also, not solve particular country problems, but rather to find a new way of working towards concrete results and toward achieving the IPPC's global objective. He noted that the process would not be easy or quick, would need commitment from contracting parties, and would not be accomplished without additional resources.
- [3] The meeting was attended by 15 representatives from contracting parties, staff of the IPPC Secretariat and 1 observer (Appendix C).

## **2. Election of the Chair and rapporteur**

- [4] Mr. Peter Thomson (Bureau) was elected as Chair and Mr. John Hedley (New Zealand) for rapporteur.

## **3. Adoption of the agenda**

- [5] The agenda adopted is presented in Appendix B.

## **4. The general understanding of implementation (ToR 4.1)**

- [6] The group considered a general understanding of implementation by discussing a range of factors:
- the challenge of implementation
  - the scope of implementation
  - the roles of IPPC structures and of stakeholders
  - the determination of priorities.

## 4.1 The challenges of implementation

- [7] Prior to the meeting, the Secretariat had asked participants to reflect on several issues concerning implementation before the meeting and to complete a meeting preparation form<sup>1</sup>. At the meeting, the participants including the Secretariat Staff were invited to express their understanding of what “implementation” meant to them and the general challenges faced. Based on the active feedback of participants, common opinions included:

In preparing implementation programmes, contracting parties should remain cognizant of the main goal of the IPPC is to prevent pest spread and introduction and to facilitate trade

- Implementation involves the building of the capacity of NPPOs and other stakeholders.
- The low profile of the IPPC and related issues is of great concern.
- Contracting parties need to be well resourced to undertake implementation.
- There is a need for a common vision for the implementation of standards .
- A strategic plan are needed at national and IPPC levels that are aligned to each other.
- Contracting parties attribute more importance to certain standards than others for implementation. In some cases this is based on national context but in other cases it is based on the need for facilitation of trade.
- RPPOs should play an important role in implementation.
- There is a need to be realistic with implementation and to take small steps rather than try to take giant leaps.

## 4.2 The scope of implementation: Elements of an ideal implementation programme (ToR 4.1)

- [8] The group agreed that the scope of implementation should be to work towards achievement of the purpose of the IPPC, and should include both the Convention and its ISPMs. In the discussion of the scope it was recognized that not all countries can implement all the ISPMs nor would they select the same ISPMs as priorities for implementation. Some members of the group suggested to reduce the production of standards and to focus on the implementation of existing ones.
- [9] It was suggested that each implementation programme should be able to be linked to an obligation, responsibility, or right in the convention and with the general purpose of the Convention. The key role of a well-resourced NPPO in implementation was recognised. There was some discussion concerning the lack of support to NPPOs by governments due to lack of awareness of the IPPC. This could be an impediment to implementation and as it is a fundamental issue it needs to be addressed. It was also discussed that implementation should link to higher-level national, regional and global policy priorities in order to demonstrate how the IPPC implementation contributes to priority areas and that contracting parties be able to demonstrate this link to policy makers and funders.
- [10] The OEWG conducted an exercise to identify principal elements that would constitute an IPPC implementation programme. The group agreed that it should contain strategic and operational management components as well as scope for projects and activities. The group also identified desired characteristics that an implementation programme should reflect. A draft table outlining these attributes was prepared to contribute to the Secretariat’s further work on developing a proposal for an implementation programme (Appendix D)

## 4.3 The roles of IPPC structures and stakeholders in implementation (ToR4.1)

- [11] Mr. Fedchock, Coordinator of the IPPC Secretariat, provided an overview of the various IPPC structures, listed in Annex 1 of the Meeting Preparation form, which could play a role in any

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/publications/oewg-implementation-meeting-preparation-form>

implementation programme. This provided background for the other discussions on the development of an implementation programme.

#### 4.4 The determination of priorities (ToR 4.2)

[12] The OEWG agreed that there could be multiple ways to arrive at a decision on priority topics. The selection of priorities that have strategic global impact would require contracting party input taking into consideration regional priorities. There was the suggestion that the Secretariat could perform some analysis beforehand to inform contracting parties of global issues and provide some contextual information to aid contracting parties to set their priorities. The OEWG suggested that the PCE or other analytical and consultative processes could contribute to the development of country priorities for implementation. Another suggestion was that the IRSS could be a vehicle to identify country and regional priorities. There was consensus that the priorities should undergo some form of analysis before being presented to CPM for decision. It was also recommended that only a very few priorities should be presented to CPM at any one time.

[13] The OEWG considered that it may be necessary for the IPPC Secretariat to establish some criteria to be able to select priorities for CPM consideration. They suggested the priority programmes may be guided by the following:

- (1) They should be broadly applicable (relevant to greatest number of contracting parties)
- (2) feasible (able to be implemented by contracting parties),
- (3) not similar to any that are taking place elsewhere (don't duplicate),
- (4) applicable to the concrete situation – not to collateral issues,
- (5) relevant for trade facilitation
- (6) affordable - based on an estimate of costs
- (7) an implementation keystone
- (8) of broad global benefit
- (9) cost-effective
- (10) meets the aims of the convention.

[14] The OEWG identified possible difficulties in the selection of priorities. These included:

- not knowing the *real* situation of contracting party compliance with the convention,
- obtaining agreement nationally and within regions
- reaching consensus in general at CPM,
- conflict between political and technical interests, and
- difficulty in comparing topics requiring different actions.

[15] While CPM 9 agreed to focus on surveillance as a priority area for the pilot programme, the OEWG identified other potential key areas of priority for implementation (Appendix E). The list reflects the potential diversity of responses that could be communicated if there were broader consultation.

[16] Finally, the group concluded that the prioritization process should be an analytical process led by the Secretariat, with active input from contracting parties and RPPOs. The Secretariat would also draw on additional expertise as needed. It was noted that this may be a resource-intensive process, but would provide a solid technical foundation for future work. It was envisaged that through this process only 1-2 priorities would be proposed to the CPM at a time. The group believed the early country-level input would achieve a high-quality proposal that would facilitate rapid decision-making at CPM.

## **5. Organization of a global implementation programme (ToR 4.4)**

- [17] The OEWG developed a draft outline for such a programme which would be further developed by the Secretariat for submission to CPM-10 (Appendix F).

### **5.1 The process of developing and managing an implementation programme (ToR 4.5)**

- [18] The OEWG considered how such a programme would be developed, approved and managed. The group prepared an outline process as shown in Appendix G (to be further developed by the Secretariat with expert input as needed for submission to CPM-10). The OEWG emphasized that a priority programme should be agreed by CPM after which programme development and management should be delegated to the Secretariat, the Bureau and selected experts as needed.

- [19] There were several issues identified by the OEWG that need to be explored further. These were:

- contracting party buy-in and input into the programme must be balanced with the need for an efficient process that delivers a decision in a reasonable timeframe
- ways to engage contracting parties and develop ownership to show commitment
- how to ensure appropriate advisors are identified
- whether the structure/organization/roles/resources of the Secretariat are adequate to manage such a programme
- the recognition that the advisory roles of any support group to the programme need to be adaptable and fit for purpose (without pre-defined composition or length of commitment, as the needs will evolve with the programme).

### **5.2 Approval, coordination, monitoring and reporting mechanisms (ToR 4.6)**

- [20] The OEWG considered that monitoring should be coherent and avoid duplication. Considering that a programme may include a number of projects, reporting should be well organised and tailored to the requirements of the audience. It was also agreed that reporting should be bi-directional, i.e. from the programme to others (e.g. sponsors) and from Contracting Parties to the programme.

## **6. The financial support of the programme including realigning resources from other areas of the IPPC's work.**

- [21] The Secretariat provided an overview of the funding situation of the IPPC Secretariat and its staffing and clarified that there is no current allocation for funding an implementation programme. Considering that resources are limited and that most of the Human Resources of the Secretariat are temporary, the discussions focused on whether available resources in the Secretariat could be reallocated to allow for an implementation programme. Discussions considered a potential shift in work programme focus away from Standards Setting whilst recognising that the contracting parties have generally considered it as a core function of the Secretariat. The Secretariat underscored that an implementation programme should be sustainable and suggested that there should be a focused approach to resource mobilisation for new resources. The Secretariat suggested that the pilot implementation programme on surveillance could be associated with a parallel resource mobilisation / communications / advocacy effort that showcases the milestones achieved during the life of the programme. The communications programme could be tied to a future plant health year and a donors' conference. The results and outputs of the implementation programme on surveillance as well as other IPPC activities could also be used to produce the first State of Plant Protection in the World.

- [22] The OEWG explored other resource considerations that could be recommended including:

- Supplementary Agreement to support the implementation programme (assessed contributions)
- Voluntary contributions
- Holding in-person CPM every two years and exploring more cost-effective options for the alternate years

- Donors meeting - 2018
- Change CPM programme style to attract funds
- Donor targeting
- Secure project-specific funding from donors competitively
- Leveraging contracting parties capabilities
- E-Phyto service charge
- Multi-year programme support donors
- Reallocation of IPPC resources, new budget allocation model
- Contracting party resource contributions
- Training to advocate for resources
- Private sector cost recovery
- Additional fees and taxes
- Linkages to other international organizations' related activities, e.g. CGIAR.

[23] It was evident that resourcing an implementation programme could take a multiple pronged approach, considering current IPPC resource re-allocation in the short-term as well as a phased approach for resource acquisition over the life of the programme.

## **7. Development of a pilot work plan to implement ISPM 6:1997. (ToR 4.8)**

[24] The OEWG prepared a draft outline of a strategic work plan and asked the IPPC Secretariat to refine it further after the meeting.

[25] The outline contains the following sections:

- a. Situation analysis
- b. High-level Goal
- c. Objective of the pilot programme
- d. Scope of the programme
- e. Potential activities to take place within the pilot programme
- f. Indicators of success.

[26] See Appendix H.

## **8. Recommendations of the Open Ended Working Group**

1) The OEWG recommended that:

- Following the completion of the functions noted in the ToR and the preparation of a draft pilot work programme the Secretariat should be asked to develop the full strategic work plan on surveillance. Support from experts should be used as necessary. The Secretariat should also prepare a paper on implications to the IPPC for establishing an implementation programme in light of resource constraints.
- the following IPPC structures be informed of the outcome of the meeting as well and asked to consider the following specific points:
  - SPG to examine the general strategy for future implementation programmes and main changes required to ensure the programme can be implemented successfully
  - Framework for Standards Meeting – to consider and differentiate the essential standards from the less important and provide clarification as to when an ISPM is needed as compared to guidance or other forms of supporting information, considering the CPM request to place further emphasis on implementation.

- Technical Consultation among RPPOs – to raise RPPOs awareness of their role in supporting implementation and to ask them to consider consulting with their membership on how to collaborate and contribute to support an effective and sustainable programme with strong national and regional level participation.
- The Secretariat – to consider raising awareness of the programme in regional IPPC workshops and to highlight the proposed work on implementation at the upcoming WTO-SPS meeting.
- Bureau and the Finance Committee – to seek support for the programme in terms of resourcing, to ensure that the CPM can take a concrete decision on this issue and the consequences for other work areas and budgets when the topic is proposed at the next CPM and to consider the topic as a potential subject for a side session at CPM10.
- Capacity Development Committee – to consider the proposed programme and to discuss its implications on the work programme for capacity development.
- Standard Setting and NRO – to consider how these programs their programmes could contribute to a programme focused on strengthening implementation.

[27] The participants of the OEWG offered to be available for comment and feedback for the revised version of the strategic work plan produced by the Secretariat.

## 9. Closing

[28] The chair declared the meeting closed on August 7, 2014 at 15:35.

### NOTE:

*Readers of this report are reminded that the materials contained in this report and its appendices as prepared by the OEWG are to be considered as preliminary draft materials for the purpose to guide the IPPC Secretariat in preparing a draft strategic pilot programme work plan.*



## **Appendix A - Terms of Reference for an Open-Ended Working Group on Implementation (agreed at CPM-9, 2014)**

### **A. Background**

1. The Commission on Phytosanitary Measures recognizes the need for emphasizing the importance of establishing a common vision, guiding principles and the process for establishing a more focused effort on implementation.

### **B. Purpose**

2. The purpose of the Open-Ended Working Group on Implementation is to provide guidance and advice on IPPC efforts to develop an implementation programme.

### **C. Duration**

3. The Open-ended working group will remain an active group until it completes its programme of work.

### **D. Functions**

4. The Open-Ended Working Group on Implementation will:

- 1) determine the scope of the programme,
- 2) how priorities will be determined,
- 3) the nature of support required for effective implementation,
- 4) how a global implementation programme might be organised,
- 5) the process of developing and managing an implementation programme,
- 6) coordination, approval, monitoring and reporting mechanisms, and
- 7) how to financially support the programme including realigning resources from other areas of the IPPC's work.
- 8) work with the Secretariat to develop a pilot work plan for the topic of surveillance.

### **E. Membership**

5. The OEWG participants shall be from contracting parties and have a good knowledge of:

- The capacity and capability needed to deliver the elements of a phytosanitary system,
- The IPPC, its objectives and structures,
- Planning funding and delivery of technical assistance
- Appropriate strategic planning and management experience
- A chair will be elected from the membership

6. Members should have sufficient time available to actively participate.

7. There should be members participating from every region.

## Appendix B - Agenda – OEWG on Implementation

Meeting objectives:		
To establish the required mechanisms to focus on implementation, and ensure the work of the Secretariat staff and CPM bodies are able to be coordinated and work together to deliver a coherent programme of work. The OEWG is also tasked to develop and define the scope of a pilot work plan to implement ISPM 6:1997(Guidelines for surveillance) (2009-004).		
August 4 (Monday)  Start time: 09:30	Introduction	
	Election of chair	
	Election of rapporteur	
	Consideration of agenda	
	Overview of CPM proposal on Implementation	
	Session 1: Determine the scope of the programme (ToR 4.1)	Participants provide a 5 minute overview of their understanding of implementation of IPPC and ISPMs in their countries or region
		General discussion on the scope: Elements that should comprise an ideal implementation programme (ToR 4.1)
		Discuss roles of IPPC structures and IPPC stakeholders in the programme (ToR4.1)
		Discuss how macro priorities of the programme might be determined. (ToR 4.2)
August 5 (Tuesday)	Session 2: Organization of a global implementation programme (ToR 4.4)	Discuss the process of developing and managing an implementation programme (ToR 4.5)
		Discuss possible approval, coordination, monitoring and reporting mechanisms (ToR 4.6)
	Session 3: How to financially support the programme including realigning resources from other areas of the IPPC's work.	Discuss the nature of support required for effective implementation (ToR 4.3 and 4.7)
August 6-7 (Wednesday and Thursday)	Session 4: Develop a pilot work plan to implement ISPM 6:1997. (ToR 4.8)	

## Appendix C - Participants list

	COUNTRY/ROLE	NAME, MAILING, ADDRESS, TELEPHONE	EMAIL ADDRESS
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>ALGERIA</b>	Ms Fatiha BENDDINE Deputy Director of Plant Protection Ministry of Agriculture & Rural Development Alghers, Algeria Phone: (+213) 23503151	<a href="mailto:fbenddine@hotmail.com">fbenddine@hotmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:Benddine.fatiha@minagri.dz">Benddine.fatiha@minagri.dz</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>ARGENTINA</b>	Mr Pablo CORTESE NPPO Surveillance Director Senasa Paseo Colón 315 Piso 4º Dpto. B Ciudad de Buenos Aires (1063) Argentina Phone: (+054) 11 41215183	<a href="mailto:pcortese@senasa.gov.ar">pcortese@senasa.gov.ar</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>BURKINA FASO</b>	Mme Mariam SOME DAMOUE Ingénieur Agronome Chargée du Contrôle Phytosanitaire Direction de la Protection des Végétaux 01 B.P. 5362 Ouagadougou Burkina Faso Phone: (+226) 50361915 Fax: (+226) 50375805	<a href="mailto:mariamsome@yahoo.fr">mariamsome@yahoo.fr</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CONGO</b>	Mme Alphonsine LOUHOUARI TOKOZABA Chef de Service de la Protection des Végétaux Point de Contact CIPV Direction Générale de l'Agriculture Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage (MAE) 6, rue Louis Tréchet B.P. 2453 Brazzaville, Congo Phone: (+242) 040055705 (+242) 010465361	<a href="mailto:louhouari@yahoo.fr">louhouari@yahoo.fr</a>

	COUNTRY/ROLE	NAME, MAILING, ADDRESS, TELEPHONE	EMAIL ADDRESS
<input type="checkbox"/>	LEBANON	Ms Rania EL HAYEK Chief of Import, Export & Plant Quarantine Service Ministry of Agriculture Beirut, Lebanon Phone: (+961) 1 849635 Mobile: (+961) 3 319671	<a href="mailto:rhayek@agriculture.gov.lb">rhayek@agriculture.gov.lb</a> <a href="mailto:boustany@yahoo.com">boustany@yahoo.com</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	LEBANON	Mr Charles ZARZOUR Chief Import, Export & Plant Product Ministry of Agriculture Beirut, Lebanon Phone: (+961) 3 666676	<a href="mailto:czarzour@agriculture.gov.lb">czarzour@agriculture.gov.lb</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	NETHERLANDS	Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN Ministry of Economic Affairs Directorate-General for Agro Plant Supply Chain and Food Quality Department PO Box 20401 2500 EK The Hague Netherlands Phone: (+31) 0 703785552 Mobile: (+31) 0 618596867	<a href="mailto:c.a.m.vanalphen@minez.nl">c.a.m.vanalphen@minez.nl</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	NEW ZEALAND	Mr John HEDLEY Principal Adviser International Policy Branch Ministry for Primary Industries PO Box 2526 Wellington New Zealand Phone: (+64) 29 8940428	<a href="mailto:john.hedley@mpi.govt.nz">john.hedley@mpi.govt.nz</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	NEW ZEALAND	Mr Peter THOMSON Director Plants, Food & Environment Regulation & Assurance Branch Ministry for Primary Industries PO Box 2526 Wellington New Zealand Phone: (+64) 48 940353	<a href="mailto:Peter.Thomson@mpi.govt.nz">Peter.Thomson@mpi.govt.nz</a>

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>PARAGUAY</b>	Sra Mirian Cristina GALEANO Jefa del Departamento de Cuarentena Vegetal Dirección de Protección Vegetal – SENAVE Asunción, Paraguay Phone: (+595) 21 441549 interno 2052	<a href="mailto:cristina.galeano@senave.gov.py">cristina.galeano@senave.gov.py</a>
--------------------------	-----------------	--	--

	<b>COUNTRY/ROLE</b>	<b>NAME, MAILING, ADDRESS, TELEPHONE</b>	<b>EMAIL ADDRESS</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>REPUBLIC OF KOREA</b>	Ms Kyu-Ock YIM Senior Researcher Export Management Division Department of Plant Quarantine Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs 178 Anyang-ro Manan-gu Anyang city, Gyunggi-do Phone: (+82) 31 4207664 Fax: (+82) 31 4207605	<a href="mailto:koyim@korea.kr">koyim@korea.kr</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>REPUBLIC OF KOREA</b>	Mr Sung Pae CHANG Assistant Director Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs 178 Anyang-ro Manan-gu Anyang city, Gyunggi-do Phone: (+82) 31 4207612 Fax: (+82) 31 4207605	<a href="mailto:gaul1148@korea.kr">gaul1148@korea.kr</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>URUGUAY</b>	Sra Maria Inés ARES Asesora Técnica Dirección General de Servicios Agrícolas Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca Millan 4703 12300 Montevideo, Uruguay Phone: (+598) 23098410 Fax: (+598) 2309840	<a href="mailto:mares@mgap.gub.uy">mares@mgap.gub.uy</a>

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>VIETNAM</b>	Mr Nguyen Xuan HONG Director General Plant Protection Department Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development 149 Ho Duc Di Street Hanoi, Vietnam Fax: (+84) 4 35330043	<a href="mailto:hongnx.bvtv@mard.gov.vn">hongnx.bvtv@mard.gov.vn</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>ZAMBIA</b>	Ms Maimouna Saidi ABASS Agricultural Research Officer / Plant Health Officer Plant Quarantine and Phytosanitary Service Private bag 7 Chilanga, Zambia Phone: (+260) 211 278141 Fax: (+260) 211 278130	<a href="mailto:viczhane@gmail.com">viczhane@gmail.com</a>

	<b>COUNTRY/ROLE</b>	<b>NAME, MAILING, ADDRESS, TELEPHONE</b>	<b>EMAIL ADDRESS</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>IPPC SECRETARIAT</b>	Mr Yukio YOKOI Secretary International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Phone: (+39) 06 57053588	<a href="mailto:Yukio.Yokoi@fao.org">Yukio.Yokoi@fao.org</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>IPPC SECRETARIAT</b>	Mr Craig FEDCHOCK Coordinator International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Phone: (+39) 06 57052534	<a href="mailto:Craig.Fedchock@fao.org">Craig.Fedchock@fao.org</a>

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>IPPC SECRETARIAT</b>	Ms Ana PERALTA Capacity Development Officer International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Phone: (+39) 06 57055322	<a href="mailto:Ana.Peralta@fao.org">Ana.Peralta@fao.org</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>IPPC SECRETARIAT</b>	Mr Orlando SOSA Implementation Review and Support System Officer International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Phone: (+39) 06 57053613	<a href="mailto:Orlando.Sosa@fao.org">Orlando.Sosa@fao.org</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>IPPC SECRETARIAT</b>	Mr Brent LARSON Standards Officer International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Phone: (+39) 06 57054915	<a href="mailto:Brent.Larson@fao.org">Brent.Larson@fao.org</a>

	<b>COUNTRY/ROLE</b>	<b>NAME, MAILING, ADDRESS, TELEPHONE</b>	<b>EMAIL ADDRESS</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>IPPC SECRETARIAT</b>	Mr David NOWELL Information Exchange Officer International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Phone: (+39) 06 57052034	<a href="mailto:Dave.Nowell@fao.org">Dave.Nowell@fao.org</a>

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>IPPC SECRETARIAT</b>	Ms Adriana MOREIRA Programme Officer International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Phone: (+39) 06 57055809	<a href="mailto:Adriana.Moreira@fao.org">Adriana.Moreira@fao.org</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>IPPC SECRETARIAT</b>	Ms Dorota BUZON Programme Officer International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Phone: (+39) 06 57054386	<a href="mailto:Dorota.Buzon@fao.org">Dorota.Buzon@fao.org</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>IPPC SECRETARIAT</b>	Ms Sonya HAMMONS Capacity Development Consultant International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Phone: (+39) 06 57054362	<a href="mailto:Sonya.Hammons@fao.org">Sonya.Hammons@fao.org</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>OBSERVER</b>	Mr Nico VAN OPSTAL Agricultural Counsellor Embassy of the Netherlands 7 rue Eblé 75007 Paris, France Phone: (+33) 1 40623353	<a href="mailto:Nico.Van.Opstal@minbuza.nl">Nico.Van.Opstal@minbuza.nl</a>



## **Appendix D - Elements that comprise an ideal implementation programme**

### **Projects/Activities**

- Monitoring
- Evaluation
- Impact assessment
- Reporting
- Promotional component
- Training programmes
- Identification of resources
- Identification of beneficiaries of the programme
- Measuring results
- Case studies
- Preparation of manuals, guidelines
- Regional workshops
- Harmonization of national regulations with international standards
- Development of a communications plan.

### **Characteristics**

- Stable and sustainable resourcing of components
- Good information exchange with effective communication with external stakeholders
- Clear and precise objectives with clear justification
- Simple indicators, meaningful and verifiable
- Demonstrable results and contribution to national and global priorities
- Supported by RPPOs
- Allocation of resources with priorities
- Strong contracting party commitment
- Stakeholder relationship development
- Cost efficient.

## **Appendix E - Other key priorities for future implementation programmes**

These priorities were discussion points only and not details were provided. They were prepared to identify the broad range of topics across which implementation is needed – highlighting the challenges to CPM in selecting future topics for implementation programmes.

- Enhancing the information exchange mechanism especially in the area of pest status
- Modernization of plant health legislation; New general phytosanitary legislation
- Enhanced understanding of the Convention and ISPMs (awareness raising)
- Declaration of pest free areas; Pest free places of production; Pest free areas
- Accreditation of external services for inspection
- Pest management
- Development of capacities of different stakeholders ,
- Reinforcing staff capacities, legislation, human resources, training
- PRA
- Country evaluation (PCE)
- NPPO establishment; Updating the structure of the NPPO; Creating and strengthening human resources; Equipping of border control posts for diagnostics and inspection
- Phytosanitary certification; Certification; Inspection and certification based on PRA
- National obligations of the convention in particular pest reporting
- Notification
- National information
- Evaluation
- Contact points
- Establishing national political will
- Diagnostics
- Terminology/naming convention of plant pests

**Appendix F - Elements of a Strategic work plan for Implementation of a specific topic**

- 2) Problem identification, definition
- 3) Scope
- 4) Objectives
- 5) Expected results
- 6) Feasibility
- 7) Timeframes
- 8) Risk profile
- 9) Monitoring and evaluation
- 10) Activities
- 11) Resources needed (human and financial)
- 12) Stakeholder involvement
- 13) Technical review
- 14) Budget
- 15) Management structure and activities:
  - a. Participants, roles, responsibilities and levels of authority
  - b. Description of decision-making process
  - c. Communication/advocacy/inform and promote
  - d. Coordination
  - e. Evaluation programme (pre and post)
- 16) Project variation
- 17) Linkages with organizations, higher level objectives

## Appendix G - Proposed steps for development, approval and management of a strategic work plan development

Who	What
Contracting parties and RPPOs	Provide information and input to support analysis of implementation status, challenges, and opportunities
Secretariat	Leads analysis of options for implementation programme priorities
	Proposes 1-2 priorities and puts together high-level description of work plan and submits to CPM (1-6 of the work plan elements)
CPM year 1	Select priority;  Approves the high-level description of the work plan  CPM delegates development of work plan to Secretariat (with experts as needed) and guidance on operational management to Bureau
Secretariat	Develops the detailed plan; supported by experts to provide advice as needed (composition of the advisors may vary depending on topic area and the status of the programme)
CPM year 2	A summary version of the plan is made available to inform CPM with a full plan available on line. A side session could be held for discussion on how contracting parties can contribute actively to the next steps.

### Approval

Who	What
CPM	High-level workplan approved at the time of selection of priority  At that point, the programme is considered approved, and Secretariat develops detailed workplan and leads next steps

### Management

Who	What
Secretariat (adequately resourced, with experts to provide advice as needed)	Leads and manages the programme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy</li> <li>• Financial management</li> <li>• Strategic planning</li> <li>• Operational planning and coordination</li> <li>• Monitoring</li> <li>• Communications</li> <li>• Resource mobilization</li> <li>• Reporting</li> </ul>
Contracting parties, RPPOs	Commitment to the implementing the strategic work plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy (mobilizing funding and resources to national programmes, implementation programme, partnerships; for IPPC funding)</li> <li>• Monitoring implementation status in-country</li> <li>• Communication on programme goals, value, challenges</li> <li>• Reporting achievements (to Secretariat, within country, and to donors)</li> <li>• Contributing resources eg for translation of</li> </ul>

---

	documents
Bureau	Provides guidance
Financial Committee, with experts to provide advice as needed	Resource mobilization

## **Appendix H - Draft Strategic Work Plan for pilot programme on surveillance for further development**

### **A. SITUATION ANALYSIS**

Many countries do not know their pest situation because of a lack of understanding of the ISPM, or the lack of human and financial resources and other factors.

This programme is intended to help countries know what pests are present nationally in order to facilitate trade, produce PRAs, protect plant health, produce a regulated pest list, and to determine pest status in country, region, and world. An international agreement is in place (IPPC) to address this issue, and surveillance is a foundational element of that system. Through years of consultation and analysis, it has been demonstrated that many countries have challenges knowing their pest situation.

### **B. HIGH-LEVEL GOAL**

Functional national surveillance programmes that improve the global pest reporting system, so as to meet the goal of the IPPC to prevent the spread and introduction of pests.

### **C. OBJECTIVE OF THE PILOT PROGRAMME**

To facilitate the practical implementation of surveillance based on IPPC standards to contribute to the prevention of the spread and introduction of plant pests and enable more countries to share information on pest status in order to support food security, facilitate trade, and protect the environment.

The purpose of establishing a pilot programme is to enable the IPPC Secretariat, CPM and member countries to test a new approach for improving the implementation of the IPPC and its' standards in a simple, carefully-planned and coordinated way.

### **D. SCOPE OF THE PROGRAMME**

This will be a pilot of a global programme. It will develop tools and resources that can be used by all countries. Some workshops may be delivered at a regional level. At national level, implementation of specific programmes in their country can be initiated by the contracting party.

- Duration (3 years. From the time of having resources?)
- Countries wishing to participate actively should:
  - o Have surveillance as part of NPPO or RPPO priorities
  - o Express desire to participate at the commencement of the pilot programme and demonstrate commitment to participate actively
- Extent of activities
  - o Because this is a pilot programme, it will engage in a limited selection of activities

---

## **E. POTENTIAL ACTIVITIES TO TAKE PLACE WITHIN PILOT PROGRAMME**

### **NPPO Management**

1. Country-level evaluation of implementation of ISPM 6 (global programme develops tools and guidance for the evaluation; contracting parties conduct and report on the evaluation; global programme encourages, monitors and analyzes the extent of contracting party delivery)
2. Sustainable resourcing of national programmes (human, financial and infrastructure resources) (planning tools, resource mobilization resources, management training)

### **Advocacy and communications**

3. Advocacy activity on the value of pest surveillance and national responsibilities, support for institutional development of surveillance capacities, policies and the resources needed (need to compile evidence, case studies, best practices, success stories)
4. Regional workshops to share experiences

### **Technical**

5. Support regional initiatives for development of systems for data collection, and management; training on how to use them
6. Enhance information exchange mechanisms on pest status between contracting parties
7. Developing national and regional expert networks to share information on pest status (including e-groups)
8. Technical manuals and guidelines
  - a. Guidelines for common understanding of general surveillance (how to use the information – understand the multiple uses)
  - b. Guidance on collection and validation of information at country level (how to do general surveillance)
  - c. Guidance on specific surveillance including delimitation and trace-back
  - d. How to manage NPPO relationship with RPPOs and other groups (universities, private sector etc.) to collect, manage and validate information.
9. Improvement and alignment of standards related to surveillance

### **Policy**

10. Support NPPOs to engage with relevant resources to support development/updating of national legislative/policy/regulations

## F. INDICATORS OF SUCCESS

After three years, there should be:

- Improved pest reporting with an increase in the number of contracting parties with updated pest lists
- Improved quality of pest reports
- Improved access to information on pest status of other countries
- Legislation more suited to support surveillance
- Improved level of implementation perceived in national-level evaluations
- Evaluation of the programme in workshops
- Database systems improved
- Databases for surveillance in use by more contracting parties
- Infrastructure available
- Capacities improved
- More high-level authorities convinced of importance of surveillance
- Improved diagnostic capacities
- More resources being applied to surveillance
- Evidence of timely and appropriate responses to pest outbreaks
- Country feedback says that surveillance programme has improved
- Country feedback says that other countries' surveillance programmes have improved
- Impact on market access for developing countries
- Increase in countries with updated pest lists
- Large number of success stories from countries

Where available baseline information should be used to measure success. Also consider longer term impact/indicators.

### **Factors that might cause the programme not to succeed**

- no awareness at decision-maker level to make time, resources etc available to do surveillance and participate in programme
- countries hesitant to provide pest information because of trade concerns



- CPM not able to decide on priorities for work programme
- Lack of funding (at global programme and national level, and Secretariat)
- Civil conflict, political instability, natural disasters
- instability of human resources and organization
- limited cooperation and coordination between national stakeholders
- lack of alignment between IPPC and RPPOs and others
- limited coordination within Secretariat
- inability to promote the value of the programme (including availability of information)
- complexity of the issue giving rise to management and communication failure.