



منظمة الأغذية  
والزراعة  
للأمم المتحدة

联合国  
粮食及  
农业组织

Food  
and  
Agriculture  
Organization  
of  
the  
United  
Nations

Organisation  
des  
Nations  
Unies  
pour  
l'alimentation  
et  
l'agriculture

Organización  
de las  
Naciones  
Unidas  
para la  
Agricultura  
y la  
Alimentación

## INTERIM COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

### Fifth Session

Rome, 7-11 April 2003

### IPPC Budget from FAO Regular Programme Funds (Report of the Secretariat)

### Agenda Item 4.1 of the Provisional Agenda

1. The budget for FAO's work on the IPPC and the costs for the Secretariat functions are provided by the Regular Programme of the Organization (RP). FAO's regular budget is ultimately approved by the FAO Conference, which consists of all FAO Members. The Conference meets biennially. The budget is biennial—the budget cycles are 2002-2003, 2004-2005, etc. Accounts of FAO, including trust fund accounts, are audited by an internal and an external auditor; the latter is appointed by the FAO Conference. The accounts of the Organization are considered by the Finance Committee, the FAO Council and are ultimately approved by the Conference.
2. The programming process of the Organization can be described as involving essentially two phases and related major documents:
  - The "Medium Term Plan" is a six year rolling costed programme that is prepared and updated each biennium. This is considered by the Governing Bodies of the Organization and ultimately adopted by the FAO Council, on behalf of the Conference.
  - The "Programme of Work and Budget (PWB)" is a biennial budget that is prepared on the basis of the medium term plan. The preparation of the PWB starts in the year before its adoption. The budget proposals are considered by the Organization's Programme and Finance Committees and the FAO Council (a subsidiary body of the Conference, which consists of selected Members) before they are submitted to the Conference.
3. Consequently, the budget for 2002-2003 was approved in 2001. The budget for 2004-2005 will be considered in summary form by FAO's Programme and Finance Committees in May 2003 and by the FAO Council in June 2003. A full PWB is then to be prepared, considered by the same Bodies in September and November 2003 and submitted for adoption to the FAO Conference in November 2003. Two possible funding levels have been considered by the FAO Secretariat in the summary PWB proposals for 2004-2005 for the whole Organization,

For reasons of economy, this document is produced in a limited number of copies. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring it to the meetings and to refrain from asking for additional copies, unless strictly indispensable.

Most FAO meeting documents are available on Internet at [www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org)

---

and hence by the IPPC secretariat in preparing this paper: a zero real growth budget (no increase after factoring of anticipated cost increases, e.g. due to inflation) and an overall real growth budget (allowing for some growth, after adjustment for inflation).<sup>1</sup>

4. The Organization supports the implementation of the IPPC from its Regular Programme budget in several ways:
  - a) Funding that is directly available to the Secretariat: This provides for standard setting, information exchange, support to technical assistance and cooperation, and liaison with other organizations; in short, the strategic directions as identified in the business plan, plus technical support to projects and support from Headquarters to FAO-operated secretariats of Regional Organizations. However, it cannot provide funding for participation in the ICPM.
  - b) Funding of part of the time and the activities of Plant Protection officers in Regional and Sub-regional offices (Regional: Near East, Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America; Sub-regional: Caribbean, Northwest Africa, Southern Africa and Pacific). These concern the funding of secretariat functions to the Asian and Pacific Plant Protection Organization and the Caribbean Plant Protection Organization, support to Secretariat activities in the region and the sub-region, and support to technical cooperation and capacity building to countries in the region.
  - c) At the request of developing Member countries and countries with economies in transition, support to their national capacity building essentially through projects under FAO's Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP), which are funded from the RP.

The present paper only concerns RP funding as under *a*). An indication is also provided on the extra-budgetary resources available to the Organization.

#### **A. OBJECTIVE OF THE PAPER**

5. Reporting on budget and expenditure to the ICPM is not an objective in itself, as budget decisions and approval of accounts on the Regular Programme lie with the FAO Conference, and advice on the approval of budgets and accounts lies with FAO Council and the Programme and Finance Committees. The present report, in combination with the business plan as prepared by the Business Plan Focus Team (ICPM 03/16 Annex I), serves to provide an understanding of the level of funding available in the recent past, and possible levels for the near future, and the outputs that can be realized with such funding. It also indicates the additional resources that would be required to meet a work programme as adopted by the ICPM at its fourth session (ICPM 02/Report, para. 75), namely one which:

- targets 4-5 standards per year;
- provides basic support to the information exchange programme (International Phytosanitary Portal); and
- supports technical assistance initiatives (including the development and use of the phytosanitary capacity evaluation [PCE]).

6. The paper may also help the ICPM to make a recommendation regarding resource requirements to the FAO Council at its One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Session in June 2003.

7. If a multi-donor trust fund (see ICPM 03/17) were established to enable the ICPM to make recommendations for expenditure from, and a call for, contributions to a multi-donor trust fund, the paper may also be of assistance to determine further the level of transparency that the ICPM would require. If such trust fund were not established, the need for future detailed financial reporting to the ICPM would not be evident.

---

<sup>1</sup> Figures provided in the attached tables are provisional only, as the accounts of 2002 and budget proposals for 2003 and 2004-2005 had not been finalized by the time of writing this paper. Therefore figures in the summary of the programme and budget may vary from the ones presented here.

## **B. FUTURE PROCEDURES FOR BUDGET PLANNING AND REPORTING**

8. The ICPM at its fourth session requested that the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) examine the need for procedures for planning, reviewing and the evaluation of budget procedures. The SPTA recommended that:

*Step 1, April:* ICPM establishes work programme priorities for the following year (e.g. in 2003 the ICPM will determine priorities for 2004) and is informed by the Secretariat of the current FAO budget (2003). The ICPM requests the adoption of the proposed budget for any Trust Fund activities.

*Step 2, Costs* for the future work programme (2004) is estimated by the Secretariat according to:

- core function costs based on the anticipated or known contribution of FAO (subject to FAO Conference decision), plus
- additional costs anticipated to meet the desired work programme.

*Step 3, October:* The SPTA reviews the programme budget provided by the Secretariat (for 2004) and recommends adjustments as appropriate. The SPTA also recommends a new work programme for one year ahead (2005).

*Step 4, November/December:* Bureau reviews recommendations of the SPTA (for 2005) for core FAO funding and Trust Funds, and agrees on a proposal to submit to the ICPM for its consideration (core FAO funding) or approval (Trust Funds).

9. In the present paper, the Secretariat has tried to follow the above recommendations where possible; however, it should be recognized that funding by FAO at the time of writing the paper is yet to be decided. The Secretariat also wishes to point out that the usefulness of the recommended procedure is related to the existence of an independent trust fund (see para. 7 above).

## **C. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORK PROGRAMME OVER 2002**

10. A work programme for 2002 was adopted by the Fifth Session of the ICPM. However, because of financial shortfalls several outputs could not be realized. These shortfalls were partly predicted: the programme of work for 2002 was too ambitious for the resources available through the FAO Regular Programme. Additional factors contributing to the shortfall were that the session of the ICPM was more expensive than anticipated because of the large volume of documents that needed translation and extra sessions required during the meeting. Furthermore, an additional session of the Standards Committee and a session of its group of seven (SC-7) were not included in the budgeted. Fortunately, some of the preparation of working group meetings and other activities had been undertaken in advance in 2001. The Secretariat, after consultation with the bureau, postponed three working groups on ISPMs, cancelled a meeting to review the International Phytosanitary Portal, and cancelled Secretariat Participation in various RPPO meetings and WTO training events (except where external funds for participation became available) and reduced the numbers of new standards printed in “green book” format. Even with these adjustments, over-expenditure occurred which was absorbed by FAO through a redirection of resources in the Plant Protection Service and in the Agriculture Department.

11. The various activities of the Secretariat are indicated below. A full review of the work programme and its outputs is provided under agenda item 4 of the provisional agenda of the ICPM (ICPM 03/1). The activities are reported according to the major outputs as identified in FAO's Programme of Work and Budget 2002–2003.

### *Harmonization*

12. The ICPM met from 11 to 15 March 2002.

13. The Standards Committee met in full twice in May and in November. The SC-7, which was selected by the Standards Committee from its membership at its first session, met before the

second meeting of the Standards Committee in November. Three working groups met: Pest risk analysis for living modified organisms (LMOs) (funded by Canada as RP resources were not available); Efficacy of measures; and the Glossary Working Group—including the drafting of a supplement on potential economic importance.

14. ISPM No. 3, *Code of conduct for the import and release of exotic biological control agents* has direct implications on the conservation of biodiversity. Therefore, it was possible to initiate activities on its updating through the Biodiversity Priority Area for Interdisciplinary Action in FAO.

15. The Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance working group met in October.

16. Meetings to discuss draft standards were held in Southeast Asia, Eastern Africa and the Caribbean. Funding for the first meeting was made available by New Zealand, while the preparation of the two other meetings was subcontracted in advance in 2001. The Secretariat also provided technical support to the same activity in Latin America, which was directly funded by the United States of America.

#### *Information exchange*

17. The development of the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) continued, and a full report is provided in ICPM 03/6. Funding remained very limited and it was not possible to hold a meeting of the support group of the IPP. Canada funded a visiting scientist from November onwards. He provides major inputs in the development of the IPP. Work also continued on the Information Portal for Food Safety and Agricultural Health, of which the IPP is a constituent part. The chairmanship of this overall system is provided by the IPPC.

18. The *Guide to the IPPC* and a brochure on the IPPC were re-edited, translated and printed in five languages.

#### *Technical assistance and capacity building*

19. The development of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) tool continued. The PCE was extensively used in TCP projects of FAO. Through funding of the Prevention of Food Losses programme, further work on PCE development was undertaken and an expert group on PCE met.

20. Technical assistance and support to capacity building continued to be provided. The Secretariat participated in the establishment of the Standard Development and Trade Facility at WTO (SDTF), which is a joint undertaking between FAO, WHO, World Bank, OIE and WTO, with the participation of Codex and IPPC. The concept paper on the establishment of the SDTF will be provided at the meeting. The Secretariat also provided expertise to training activities of the WTO.

21. The Secretariat also participated in the preparation of a comprehensive programme document on technical assistance and capacity building on biotechnology, food safety, animal health and plant health, which was developed at the initiative of the Director-General of FAO.

#### *Coordination among RPPOs and liaison*

22. The Secretariat participated in meetings of the CBD and the WTO SPS Committee.

23. The Regional Plant Protection Organizations met in December 2002.

### **D. EXTRA BUDGETARY RESOURCES**

24. In 2000, extra-budgetary resources were provided by Canada for the organization of the working group on pest risk analysis for genetically modified organisms, while from November a staff member and operating funds were provided for a period of one year. New Zealand provided a staff member under FAO's staff exchange programme until February. New Zealand also provided funds for a meeting on the evaluation of draft ISPMs in Southeast Asia. The USA continued to fund an associate professional officer for the year. The United Kingdom provided for

a staff member under FAO staff exchange programme starting in October. A project to support the development and application of the PCE, paid from FAO's Prevention of Food Losses trust fund, started in August. A total of US\$422 000 is available for a period of two years.

### **E. BUDGET FOR 2003 AND OTHER RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR 2003**

25. The SPTA at its fourth session recommended priorities for activities. These recommended activities primarily provide indications for standard setting, liaison and strategic planning. There is also a need for the continuation of activities on information exchange and on technical assistance, in particular the development of the PCE, the support to technical assistance and capacity building both of FAO and in cooperation with other organizations.

26. The overall RP resources available in 2003 are shown in Table 2. These resources are not shown according to strategic directions but according to the main outputs identified in the Programme of Work and Budget of FAO for 2002-2003. The budget is higher than foreseen in the approved FAO's Programme of Work and Budget for 2002-2003. To meet the requirements of the IPPC, and in response to discussions in the Programme Committee and in FAO Council, transfers have been made within the Plant Protection Service. The following issues should be noted:

#### Harmonization:

- The costs for the ICPM may be higher than anticipated.
- A total of three to four working groups is anticipated.
- No RP funding is available for regional working groups to discuss the draft standards.

#### Information:

- Very little RP funding is available for increased access to the IPP by developing countries, which will severely reduce the effectiveness of the IPP.
- A small amount is budgeted for the development of manuals.

#### Technical assistance:

- It is foreseen that most of the costs for the PCE will be met from extra-budgetary funds, including training.
- Liaison with RPPOs and international organizations is important, but will need to be limited to an absolute minimum.
- Support to APPPC and CPPC will be relatively high over 2003 as these will have their annual meeting in 2003.

### **F. EXTRA-BUDGETARY RESOURCES AVAILABLE IN 2003**

27. At the time of writing of this paper, extra-budgetary resources are available as follows:
- The Government of Canada provides for one staff member under FAO's exchange programme together with operating funds, until October 2003.
  - The UK provides for a staff member under FAO's exchange programme until April 2003.
  - The European Community (Trade Directorate) made US\$75 000 available for participation of developing countries in standard setting. These funds are used to allow for increased participation by developed countries in the ICPM.
  - The project to support the development and application of the PCE paid from FAO's Prevention of Food Losses trust fund will continue over the year.
  - The Government of the USA made funds available for an associate professional staff member until June 2003.
  - The Government of Japan will provide an associate professional officer.

### **G. RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS IN 2004-2005**

28. At its fourth session, the ICPM agreed that the Secretariat should prepare a financial analysis as regards resources devoted to strategic directions for the purposes of preparing and updating a business plan and to facilitate future discussions on strategic planning. A business plan

team, consisting of the Bureau and Mr Carberry (Canada) met in June at FAO to prepare a business plan (ICPM 03/16 Annex I). The plan recommends an increase in resources to the IPPC Secretariat of approximately US\$1 000 000 per annum. A corresponding possible budget with further details than in the business plan is attached as Table 4. The budget provides for staff and non-staff resources to produce a specific number of outputs in relation to the six strategic directions, in particular:

*Strategic Direction 1: Development, adoption and monitoring of the implementation of international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs)*

- The annual session of the ICPM
- The Standards Committee
- Six meetings of working groups
- Regional meetings of working groups to discuss the drafts of new standards
- Facilitation of the elaboration of explanatory documents of standards
- Regular planning of the activities through the SPTA or a comparable mechanism

*Strategic Direction 2: Information exchange*

- Development and maintenance of the IPP
- Promotion of increased access and use of the IPPC.

*Strategic Direction 3: Dispute settlement*

- Activities are difficult to predict—only limited staff time is foreseen

*Strategic Direction 4: Development of phytosanitary capacity of Members by promoting the provision of technical assistance*

- Development and maintenance of methods and tools for assessment of needs and training tools in particular for developing countries (PCE)

*Strategic Direction 5: Maintenance of an effective and efficient administrative framework*

*Strategic Direction 6: Promotion of IPPC and cooperation with other international bodies*

- Promotion of the IPPC, cooperation with relevant international organizations and provision for coordination among RPPOs

29. The budget also provides for an increase in staffing. In particular, it allows for:

- a full-time Secretary
- three additional professional officers
- an additional general service staff member.

## **H. POSSIBLE REGULAR BUDGET SCENARIOS FOR FAO**

30. The Organization's Medium Term Plan for 2004-2009 contemplated coverage of half of the costs of the increases above current levels in 2004-2005 while the full amount was indicated for 2006-2007. These increases are clearly dependent on an increase in the overall budget of the Organization.

31. The Medium Term Plan was discussed in September 2002 by FAO's Programme Committee, which strongly supported an increase in resources for the IPPC, based on the business plan. The recommendation was strongly supported by the One Hundred and Twenty-third Session of the Council, which met from 28 October to 2 November 2002 (CL 123/REP-Revised, para. 75).

32. The level of FAO's biennial budget for 2004-2005 is as yet unknown, in particular whether there would be a real increase over 2002-2003. If there was no budget increase beyond inflation, the FAO Secretariat proposes in the summary PWB 2004-2005 an increase of US\$500 000 over the biennium, through an internal shift of resources, both inside the Plant Protection Service and in the Agriculture Department. Such a shift of resources would allow for the addition of a staff member to the Secretariat and provide an increase in non-staff resources. This would bring the level of outputs to the level of 2003, but on a more sustainable basis.

---

Nevertheless, even at this higher resource level, many of the activities identified in the business plan cannot be executed. This so-called “zero real growth” budget is shown in Table 3, although it does provide for limited growth in resources for the activities addressed in this document.

33. If the level of FAO’s biennial budget increases beyond inflation (real growth), the FAO Secretariat proposes retaining the high level of priority given to the IPPC through meeting the full business plan budget. This budget is shown in Table 4.

34. The ICPM is invited to:

1. *Note and comment* on the budget report, in particular the new format for budget reporting.

**Table 1: Provisional expenditure over 2002 (in USD)**

	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Consultants<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Contracts<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Travel<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Equipment</b>	<b>GOE<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>Chargeback<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>Total Non-staff</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Harmonization</b>	208 027	65 318	33 146	127 898	3 992	10 545	246 901	487 800	695 827
<b>Information exchange</b>	104 166	1 001	0	1 945	4 177	250	10 580	17 953	122 119
<b>Collaboration and liaison</b>	113 360	0	0	22 344	0	148	0	22 492	135 852
<b>Technical assistance</b>	126 317	7 440	0	21 585	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	551 870	73 759	33 146	173 772	8 169	10 943	257 481	528 245	953 798

---

<sup>2</sup> Consultants—includes a component for translation of standards

<sup>3</sup> Contracts—include publications

<sup>4</sup> Travel—includes a component for regional standard evaluation and a component for efficacy working group

<sup>5</sup> GOE—general operating expenses

<sup>6</sup> Chargeback—FAO system for charges for in-house services and includes costs for translation and interpretation for the ICPM



Table 2: Provisional budget 2003 (in USD)

	Consultants	Contracts	Travel	Equipment	GOE	Chargeback	Non-staff	Non-staff	Staff	Total
<b>Harmonization</b>								356 800	205 313	562 113
ICPM	3 000	1 000	3 000	500	4 200	120 000	131 700	0	0	0
Standards Committee	1 000	0	60 000	2 000	1 600	500	65 100	0	0	0
Standards (publications)	15 000	30 000	0	0	3 000	0	4 800	0	0	0
Working groups	0	80 000	15 000	0	0	0	95 000	0	0	0
SPTA	0	0	15 000	0	2 000	0	17 000	0	0	0
Regional standards/ evaluation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Information exchange</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92 000	120 946	212 946
IPP	40 000	0	15 000	5 000	2 000	0	62 000	0	0	0
Increased access	0	0	10 000	0	0	0	10 000	0	0	0
Inter-agency collaboration	0	0	10 000	0	0	0	10 000	0	0	0
Manuals	5 000	5 000	0	0	0	0	10 000	0	0	0
<b>Technical assistance</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25 500	110 368	135 868
PCE	2 500	0	2 500	2 500	1 000	0	8 500	0	0	0
Promote TA	0	0	10 000	2 000	0	0	12 000	0	0	0
Participation	0	0	5 000	0	0	0	5 000	0	0	0

**Table 2: Provisional budget 2003 (in USD), continued**

	<b>Consultants</b>	<b>Contracts</b>	<b>Travel</b>	<b>Equipment</b>	<b>GOE</b>	<b>Chargeback</b>	<b>Non-staff</b>	<b>Non-staff</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Liaison</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53 500	122 473	175 973
RPP0 meeting	0	0	15 000	0	1 000	0	16 000	0	0	0
Liaison	0	0	25 000	0	2 000	0	27 000	0	0	0
Support APPC/CPPC	0	0	10 000	0	500	0	10 500	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	66 500	116 000	195 500	12 000	17 300	120 500	484 600	527 800	559 100	1 086 900

**Table 3: Provisional zero real growth budget 2004-2005 (in USD)**

	Consultants	Contracts	Travel	Equipment	GOE	Chargeback	Non-staff	Staff cost	Non-staff/ direction	Totals/ directions
<b>Direction 1</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	362 738	739 000	1 101 738
ICPM	16 000	2 000	6 000	0	4 000	295 000	323 000	0	0	0
Standards Committee	2 000	0	130 000	0	2 000	0	134 000	0	0	0
Standards (publications)	30 000	60 000	0	0	2 000	0	92 000	0	0	0
Working groups	0	160 000	30 000	0	0	0	190 000	0	0	0
Regional meetings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Direction 2</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	298 477	182 000	480 477
Info exchange	100 000	0	30 000	8 000	4 000	0	142 000	0	0	0
Increased access	0	0	40 000	0	0	0	40 000	0	0	0
<b>Direction 3</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12 642	0	12 642
<b>Direction 4</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134 556	75 000	209 556
PCE	0	23 000	20 000	0	0	0	43 000	0	0	0
Promote TA	0	0	32 000	0	0	0	32 000	0	0	0
<b>Direction 5</b>	0	0	30 000	9 000	18 000	0	57 000	149 945	57 000	206 945
<b>Direction 6</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81 718	90 000	171 718
International liaison	0	0	50 000	0	0	0	50 000	0	0	0
Outreach	10 000	0	10 000	0	0	0	20 000	0	0	0
RPPOs	0	0	20 000	0	0	0	20 000	0	0	0

**Table 3: Provisional zero real growth budget 2004-2005 (in USD), continued**

	<b>Consultants</b>	<b>Contracts</b>	<b>Travel</b>	<b>Equipment</b>	<b>GOE</b>	<b>Chargeback</b>	<b>Non-staff</b>	<b>Staff cost</b>	<b>Non-staff/ direction</b>	<b>Totals/ directions</b>
<b>Support RPPOs</b>	0	0	30 000	0	0	0	30 000	13 770	30 000	43 770
<b>Project support</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	256 276	0	256 276
<b>Totals</b>	158 000	245 000	428 000	17 000	30 000	295 000	1 173 000	1 310 122	1 173 000	2 483 122

**Table 4: Provisional real growth budget 2004-2005 (in USD)**

	Consultants	Contracts	Travel	Equipment	GOE	Chargeback	Totals	Staff cost	Non-staff/ direction	Totals/ direction
<b>Direction 1</b>										
ICPM	0	5 000	40 000	0	10 000	370 000	<b>425 000</b>	517 663	1 495 000	2 012 663
Standards Committee	0	0	130 000	0	4 000	0	<b>134 000</b>	0	0	0
Standards (publications)	70 000	100 000	0	0	0	0	<b>170 000</b>	0	0	0
Working groups	0	300 000	100 000	0	4 000	0	<b>404 000</b>	0	0	0
Regional meetings	50 000	0	310 000	0	2 000	0	<b>362 000</b>	0	0	0
<b>Direction 2</b>										
Info exchange	98 000	100 000	20 000	10 000	10 000	0	<b>238 000</b>	458 521	284 000	742 522
Increased access	2 000	0	44 000	0	0	0	<b>46 000</b>	0	0	0
<b>Direction 3</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	18 150	0	18 150
<b>Direction 4</b>										
PCE	100 000	0	26 000	0	0	0	<b>126 000</b>	206 510	156 000	362 510
Promote TA	10 000	0	20 000	0	0	0	<b>30 000</b>	0	0	0
<b>Direction 5</b>	0	0	0	20 000	49 000	0	<b>69 000</b>	221 518	69 000	290 518
<b>Direction 6</b>										
International liaison	0	0	60 000	0	0	0	<b>60 000</b>	170 109	104 000	274 109
Outreach	20 000	0	4 000	0	0	0	<b>24 000</b>	0	0	0
RPPOs	0	0	10 000	0	10 000	0	<b>20 000</b>	0	0	0

**Table 4: Provisional real growth budget 2004-2005 (in USD), continued**

	<b>Consultants</b>	<b>Contracts</b>	<b>Travel</b>	<b>Equipment</b>	<b>GOE</b>	<b>Chargeback</b>	<b>Totals</b>	<b>Staff cost</b>	<b>Non-staff/ direction</b>	<b>Totals/ direction</b>
<b>Support RPPOs</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	13 770	0	13 770
<b>Field support</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	283 816	0	283 816
<b>Totals</b>	350 000	505 000	764 000	30 000	89 000	370 000	<b>2 108 000</b>	18 900 057	2 108 000	3 998 058