

February 2004



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

E

INTERIM COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Sixth Session

Rome, 29 March – 2 April 2004

Financial Report

Agenda Item 8.3 of the Provisional Agenda

1. The budget of FAO's work on the IPPC and the costs for the Secretariat functions are provided by the Regular Programme (RP) budget of the Organization. The RP is funded through a mandatory assessed contribution by all Member countries.
2. The Organization supports the implementation of the IPPC from its RP budget in several ways:
 - (i) Funding 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 Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM) or any other intergovernmental meeting.
 - (ii) Funding of the proportion of the time and activities of Plant Protection officers spent in Regional and Sub-regional offices (Regional: Near East, Africa, Asia and the Pacific, South America, Sub-regional: Caribbean, Northwest Africa, Southern Africa and Pacific). This includes funding of secretariat functions to the Asian and Pacific Plant Protection Organization and the Caribbean Plant Protection Organization, support to Secretariat activities in the regions and the sub-regions, and support to technical cooperation and capacity building to countries in a particular region.
 - (iii) At the request of developing Member countries and countries with economies in transition, support to their national capacity building through Technical Cooperation Projects, which are funded from the RP.

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

3. The present paper concerns RP funding as under (i). An indication is also provided on the extra-budgetary resources that were available to the Secretariat. The budget for 2002-2003 was approved by the FAO Conference in 2001.

Expenditure in 2003

4. An estimate of expenditure in 2003 is provided in Table 2. For comparison, expenditure for 2002 is provided in Table 1. This expenditure was already reported to the Fifth Session of the ICPM.

5. Under the heading "Harmonization", contracts are very high compared with 2002. This is a direct reflection of the costs for registration of the mark for ISPM No. 15. Furthermore, the costs for chargeback remain high. This reflects the costs for translation and interpretation related to the ICPM which are in the range of US\$ 200,000.

6. The expenditure in 2003 was substantially higher than the original allocation of US\$ 977,700. To meet the requirements of the IPPC, and in response to discussions in the Programme Committee and in FAO Council, transfers were made within the Plant Protection Service. During the year, additional resources became also available from arrears (contributions that have become available from earlier budget periods). Furthermore, the IPPC Secretariat received reimbursements for work on capacity building projects in 2003 and for some of the projects carried out in 2001 and 2002. An overview of the sources of funds is provided in Table 3.

Extra-budgetary resources available in 2003

1. The Government of Canada provided for one staff member and operational costs up to October.
2. The UK provided for a staff member under FAO's academic exchange programme until April.
3. The European Community (Trade Directorate) made US\$ 75,000 available for participation of developing countries in standard setting. These funds were almost all used to provide for the participation of representatives of developing countries in ICPM 5.
4. A project to support the development and application of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation was paid from FAO's Prevention of Food Losses trust fund. Total expenditure in 2003 was approximately US\$ 97,000..
5. The Government of the USA made funds available for a Junior Professional Officer until July 2003.
6. The Government of Japan provided for a Junior Professional Officer, who joined in February 2003.
7. Two regional consultations on draft ISPMs were funded by extra-budgetary resources (NAPPO and Australia).
8. COSAVE provided funding for the Expert Working Group on Citrus Canker Systems Approach.
9. The Near-East Technical Consultation on Draft ISPMs was paid for by Plant Protection funds available in the Regional office of FAO.
10. The German Government contributed US\$202,000 to the IPPC Secretariat to hold a workshop entitled "Invasive Alien Species and the International Plant Protection Convention". This workshop was held in Braunschweig, Germany in September 2003. Funds were used to facilitate the participation of countries requiring assistance and to cover most of the administrative costs. There were approximately 110 participants, representing 60 countries, with 57 from developing countries and 53 from developed countries.

Table 1: Estimated expenditure over 2002.

	Staff	Consultants	Contracts	Travel	Equipment	GOE	Charge-back	Total Non-staff	Total
Harmonization	208027	65318	33146	127898	3992	10545	246901	487800	695827
Information exchange	104166	1001	0	1945	4177	250	10580	17953	122119
Collaboration and liaison	113360	0	0	22344	0	148	0	22492	135852
Technical assistance	126317	7440	0	21585	0	0	0	29025	155342
Total	551870	73759	33146	173772	8169	10943	257481	557270	1109140

Note: Chargeback includes costs for translation and interpretation for the ICPM

Table 2: Estimated expenditure over 2003.

	Staff	Consultants	Contracts	Travel	Equipment	GOE	Charge-back	Total Non-staff	Total
Harmonization	207929	58186	159743	138237	18869	54185	275563	704784	912713
Information exchange	107303	54025	1032	5608	0	0	0	60665	167967
Collaboration and liaison	115794	1000	0	18901	0	2290	0	22191	137986
Technical assistance	125615	27	0	39419	0	0	0	39446	165061
Total	556641	113238	160775	202165	18869	56475	275563	827086	1383727

Notes: Contracts include printing costs of ISPMs

Chargeback includes costs for translation and interpretation for the ICPM

Travel for technical assistance includes costs of the Technical Consultation on Draft ISPMs in Dakar

Table 3: Sources of funds for the 2003 expenditure in 1000's of US\$.

Regular Programme fund allocation	977
Arrears funds	106
Earned back through projects	163
Reallocation within the Plant Protection Service	136
Total	1382

