



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

Fourth Session

Rome, 11-15 March 2002

ICPM Capacity (Resources)

Agenda Item 6.3 of the Provisional Agenda

1. The Third Session of the ICPM discussed the resources available for the work programme in the consideration of the Strategic Plan. The base level of implementation of a one-year work programme was noted as:

- one meeting of the ICPM
- one meeting of the Standards Committee
- two expert working groups to draft standards
- one Glossary/Review group
- one Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organisations
- one ICPM business meeting (e.g. the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement).

2. Proposals for additional administrative and technical bodies to support the ICPM included:

- replacing the Interim Standards Committee with a 20-member Standards Committee (including a 7-member Expert Working Group)
- establishment of a Subsidiary Body for Dispute Settlement
- establishment of a Support Group for information exchange
- an ad hoc Working Group on technical assistance.

3. It was noted that the level of implementation for the work programme depends on funding and personnel resources as well as the priorities set by the ICPM. It should also be recognised that aspects of the work programme require a degree of flexibility to accommodate changing circumstances.

4. The Third meeting of the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance held in Bangkok 4-6 December 2001 further discussed the resources of the ICPM. In addition to those items of the work programme listed above, the Informal Working Group noted:

- *The technical assistance initiatives of the ICPM.* These initiatives involve both increasing the participation of developing countries in standard-setting activities and promoting support to regional and national efforts towards capacity building.

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.

- *The increasing need for additional support in the implementation of the IPPC.* This could involve the updating of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) and the development of related tools, the development of operational guidance material and manuals and the holding of regional workshops.

5. The Informal Working Group emphasized that sustainability of the programme was essential and for this there was the need to provide additional core funding and full-time permanent staff for the Secretariat. If funds additional to the core funds are obtained, their effective use depends on there being sufficient core resources. It was noted that resources can be provided by FAO or directly from countries. The increase in base funding from FAO requires a long-term effort to develop support in decision-making bodies of the Organization.

6. After much discussion, the Informal Working Group decided to recommend a working programme to the ICPM that:

- targets 4-5 standards per year
- provides basic support to the information exchange programme (International Phytosanitary Portal - IPP)
- supports technical assistance initiatives (the development and use of the PCE).

7. The Informal Working Group recommends that the ICPM consider supporting two additional professional positions in the Secretariat by reallocating funds (approximately US\$200,000) from the existing "Work Programme" resources to the "Staff" resource line (see table below¹). To further strengthen the staff of the Secretariat, the Informal Working Group recommends that countries volunteer to commit professional officers (preferably with advance notification) e.g. Associate Professional Officers to assist with the work programme. These additional staff would be devoted to the core work programme.

	Staff	Work programme
Current budget allocations	US\$600,000	US\$400,000
Proposed budget allocations	US\$800,000	US\$200,000 + US\$300,000 trust fund

8. The reallocation of funds as recommended would create the need for at least US\$300,000 to support the work programme. It is suggested that these funds be supplied from a trust fund supported by ICPM Members. As discussed in ICPM02/14 (Trust fund options), it is recommended that the provision of funds for the programme of the ICPM be considered in several stages. The long-term objective is to ensure that core funding is provided by FAO on a permanent basis via the Regular Programme budget. In the interim, it is proposed that a General Trust Fund be established for voluntary assessed contributions from Members. A Special Trust Fund of ad hoc contributions is used as a bridging mechanism until the General Trust Fund becomes functional. Thereafter, the Special Trust Fund becomes the basis for any special initiatives or projects and a repository for ad hoc contributions outside the framework of the General Trust Fund.

9. It is noted that developing countries have considerable difficulties in the implementation of the many obligations included within the IPPC and the requirements of the ISPMs. The Informal Working Group recommends that the ICPM consider and support the establishment of this programme to assist developing countries. The level of annual funding estimated to be needed is:

¹ Costs reflected in the table are rough estimates that are projected by the Informal Working Group to demonstrate the general nature of the proposal. Actual costs will vary according to current budget conditions and other factors. More precise estimates will be provided by the Secretariat.

Additional IPPC implementation costs:

- regional workshops on draft ISPMs	US\$250,000
- guidance materials/operational manuals	US\$150,000
- PCE development	US\$ 50,000

10. The Informal Working Group recommended that the Secretariat and concerned Members undertake an analysis to help clarify the need for additional resources and to show how they would be used in the work programme for standard development, information management, and IPPC implementation. The purpose of the analysis would be to promote an understanding of the ICPM's financial programme among countries, donor organizations, and the FAO Conference.

Analysis of resource requirements by the Secretariat

11. The additional costs have been provided under two headings, "additional costs to the core work programme" and "additional costs for IPPC implementation assistance". It is envisaged that the addition to core work programme would be eventually funded by the General Trust Fund and the addition to IPPC implementation assistance would be funded by the Special Trust Fund (see also ICPM 02/14).

Additional core work programme resources

12. It is envisaged that a P4 and a P3 staff member be recruited to assist in the standard-setting programme and information exchange. Furthermore, funds would be provided to increase the number of working groups for standard setting, to provide full funding for the Standards Committee, for additional standards and for support to the Commission's activities, in particular for meetings that may be necessary for dispute settlement and for strategic planning.

13. The Informal Working Group did not address the needs for the information programme, which are less easy to determine. As an initial estimate, an additional US\$ 50,000 of non-staff resources is foreseen for that programme. The staff time for the information programme is also given; this will increase as many regular contacts with NPPOs will be required.

Additional IPPC implementation assistance resources

14. In the WTO SPS Committee and in several FAO bodies, it has been noted that countries have difficulty participating in the standard-setting bodies. Therefore, it is proposed that funding from the Special Trust Fund be made available to support the participation of developing countries in the ICPM. It is also foreseen that there will be regional meetings each year for information exchange and to evaluate draft standards. Furthermore, a limited amount of money may be made available for the provision of equipment.

15. The increase in IPPC implementation assistance programmes will make it necessary to recruit a further P3 staff member and a General Service staff member.

Table 1. Illustrative budget for future years (in US\$ '000s)

	RP ² budget		Harmonization		Capacity	
	Staff	Non-staff	Staff	Non-staff	Staff	Non-staff
General costs	86	20	75		14	
Interim Commission	47	125	15	30	2	180 ³
Working groups	61	80	63	75		
Standards Committee	33	40	15	10		
Publication standards	25	22	19	15		
Support to Commission activities	33	20	6	50		
Technical consultation	13	10				
Collaboration with RPPOs	15	10	4	7		
Support APPPC and CPPC	9	15				
Other liaison (WTO/CBD) and collaboration with NPPOs	27	29	11	7		
Information exchange	81	50	43	50	56	250
Manuals, etc.	10	8	10			125
Support to capacity building (including regional meetings)	99	10			59	50 200
Total	539	439	261	244	131	805

16. The ICPM is invited to:

1. *Adopt* a work programme for the ICPM that:
 - targets 4-5 standards per year
 - provides basic support to the information exchange programme (International Phytosanitary Portal - IPP)
 - supports technical assistance initiatives (the development and use of the PCE).
2. *Endorse* the creation of two additional Professional Officer positions in the Secretariat by reallocating funds from the existing "Work Programme" resources to "Staff" resources subject to establishment of the trust fund.

² RP budget as in 2002

³ Payment for approximately 60 countries

-
3. *Urge* countries to volunteer to commit professional officers to assist with the work programme (e.g. Associate Professional Officers).
 4. *Establish* an IPPC implementation programme to assist developing countries.
 5. *Endorse* the creation of one additional Professional Officer position and one General Service position in the Secretariat subject to establishment of the trust fund.
 6. *Endorse* the undertaking of an analysis to show the need for additional resources and to show how they would be used in the work programme for standard development and information management, and in the IPPC implementation assistance.