

January 2006



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

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

First Session

Rome, 3 – 7 April 2006

Analysis of the Costs of Standards Committee Meetings being held in Several Languages

Agenda Item 11.5.2 of the Provisional Agenda

1. At ICPM-7, the IPPC Secretariat was asked to make an analysis of the costs involved in conducting the Standards Committee in the five official FAO languages and the activities of the work programme that would be affected. In light of the discussion, part of Rule 9 of the Rules of Procedures of the Standards Committee, providing that SC meetings are held in all FAO languages, was bracketed. The analysis would be presented to the next ICPM and discussion could take place as to whether the square brackets could be removed.
2. The Secretariat was requested to take the following alternatives into account, without excluding others:
 1. interpretation of the five official languages during the session and translation of the main documents;
 2. same as above, but only in English, French and Spanish;
 3. interpretation for the five official languages without translating documents from English into the other languages;
 4. same as above, but interpretation only for English, French and Spanish;
 5. assessment of possible cost of translation and interpretation in other venues outside FAO Headquarters and especially places where daily allowances are lower.
3. The possible impacts of each of the alternatives on the work programme of the IPPC were to be assessed, as well as the possibility to pay only economy class tickets for SC members (paragraph 56 of the report of ICPM-7).

Basic elements for the analysis

4. The required analysis was based on the SC meetings in 2005. It used the assumption that translations were made by FAO services, even if translation or revision of standards in some languages was currently done outside FAO. It took account of the various tasks and outcomes at the April and November meetings of the SC. In 2005, the SC met for one week in April and both the SC-7 and SC met for one week each in November (see also CPM 2006/INF/6).

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

5. It was assumed that the SC-7 would work with the English version of draft ISPMs. For timing reasons, it would not be possible to provide to the SC the SC-7 redrafts in several languages. In addition, it was assumed that the redrafting would be done on English texts, and that translations would be adjusted after meetings, for the following reasons:

- During a session, it is logistically impossible to redraft standards in three or five languages at the same time.
- Modifying the drafts between sessions for the next day would require additional coordination resources and overtime translation. This is done for the CPM but the amount of revision done during SC is much bigger.

Translation requirements for SC meetings

6. The following main documents were identified as requiring translation:

- April 2005 (see Annex 1)
 - 10 draft ISPMs
 - 16 other documents (including procedures, guidelines and specifications)
 - Report of the meeting (including modified documents)
 - Adjustment of draft standards for the report and country consultation.
- November 2005 (see Annex 2)
 - 32 documents (including procedures, guidelines and specifications)
 - Report (including modified documents. Further revision of standards for adoption at the CPM would be done in the framework of CPM preparation.)

Note: standards for SC consideration would have been translated for country consultation. Translation of all country comments was not considered, due to the volume and to the fact that comments are considered mostly by stewards and the SC-7, and not by the SC.

7. The base rate for FAO translation is \$0.46 per word, which is higher than outside translation rates, but ensures quality and respect of deadlines. The FAO rate can be higher or lower depending on the time between submission for translation and the meeting.

Interpretation

8. FAO interpretation is charged by sessions of 3 hours. The current SC meetings normally allow for 7-8 hours per day. The assumption of 1.5 teams of interpreters working for five days with 12 sessions available was used to determine cost.

Details of costs

9. The costs were calculated (see Annex 3) for the options outlined in paragraph 2, undertaken at FAO, Rome. The costs of the options are summarized in Table 1.

Additional considerations

10. Translation or interpretation in several languages would enable the selection of SC members with little or no knowledge of English, thereby being able to select on expertise only, rather than for expertise and language ability, which would give regions a wider choice when nominating members. It would also assist some SC members to take a more active part in discussions when English is not their mother tongue.

11. The following constraints would add indirect costs to the meetings:

- i) *Interpretation:*
 - Slowing down meetings, i.e. more meetings needed for the same volume of work
 - Interpretation would have to be booked in advance, without knowing if the SC members benefiting from that language would attend the meeting.
 - SC discussions on standards often relate to detailed redrafting of the text. It would be difficult for participants to get a correct reflection of the details of the discussion, and to perform their duties as SC members.

- FAO interpreters have knowledge of agricultural issues and terminology. Finding interpreters outside FAO with the appropriate language skills and background could be difficult.
- Any interpretation done by parties other than the FAO would need to meet the FAO standard.

ii) *Translation:*

- FAO translators have a general knowledge of agricultural issues and terminology. Finding translators outside the FAO with the same background could be difficult.
- Using the FAO translation group for meeting documents ensures that documents are ready within the required timeframes. Non-FAO translation agencies might not have the capacity to deal with the volume of translation and deadlines given.
- The FAO translation group does all the necessary coordination from receiving documents to delivering the translation. Extra resources would be required if the coordination was left to the Secretariat.
- Translations completed may not be required (i.e. those requiring the language may not be able to attend the meeting).
- The volume of documents to be printed for meetings would be higher (one set in English for each participant and an additional set in the language of their choice).

12. Any meeting held outside FAO headquarters would incur substantial additional costs in Secretariat time and travel.

Non-FAO services

13. COSAVE and EPPPO supplied information on the costs of interpretation for meetings that they had recently been involved with. These costs were substantially lower than FAO and are recorded in Table 1.

14. Due to time and resource constraints the Secretariat was unable to collect sufficient data to undertake a full comparison for all the language/translation/interpretation combinations

Budget prioritization

15. Table 2 is the 2006 prioritized budget agreed at the SPTA meeting (October 2005) for Strategic Direction 1. After prioritization of the IPPC budget the total funds appropriated for Strategic Direction 1 were US\$ 690,000. If the FAO five language translation and interpretation requirements were utilized (option 1 from paragraph 2 above), it would leave only US\$ 260,000 for the other standard setting activities.

16. The CPM is invited to:

1. *Note* the FAO costs associated with the various translation and interpretation combinations for the Standards Committee meeting.
2. *Note* that although costs outside FAO may be substantially less, there are associated disadvantages.
3. *Decide* what, if any, translation and/or interpretation would be appropriate for the Standards Committee meeting.
4. *Agree* that any contracting party who may wish to host a Standards Committee meeting and considers that they could meet the agreed CPM requirements for Standards Committee interpretation/translation (paragraph 16.3) develop a proposal with an associated budget for presentation to the Standards Committee through the SPTA.
5. *Agree*, in relation with paragraph 3, that, with the current financial difficulties experienced by the IPPC, Standards Committee members who receive financial support for travel costs receive such for economy class only.

ANNEX 1

SC April 2005 - List of documents and translations envisaged

Document	No. of pages	No. of words
Documents not translated		
Expert working group reports:		
Classification of commodities	2	570
Consignments in transit	3	742
Efficacy of phytosanitary measures	2	818
Formatting/drafting pest/commodity specific ISPMs	3	1,048
Revision of ISPM No. 1 (February 2004)	11	6,095
Revision of ISPM No. 1 (October 2004)	2	1,114
Revision of ISPM No. 2	2	868
Revision of ISPM No. 5	13	7,430
Technical panel reports:		
Diagnostic protocols	8	2,537
Forest quarantine	21	8,100
Fruit flies	5	1,744
Phytosanitary treatments	7	2,176
Other documents:		
Documents list	3	926
Participants list	4	1,186
Composition of working groups	1	224
Standards Committee membership and potential replacements	2	505
Status report on draft standards and specifications for standards	17	3,198
Timing of the annual work programme standards setting activities and proposed future meeting dates to 2010	2	271
Documents translated		
Procedures and other documents:		
Agenda	2	497
Report of SC November 2004 meeting	16	6,800
Administrative guidelines for the structure of standard setting documentation	11	3,759
Comments received on administrative documents returned to the SC (from ICPM-7)	3	1,795
Explanatory documents for ISPMs: Status and procedures	3	1,082
Instructions to authors of diagnostic protocols for pests	5	1,887
Procedures for production of diagnostic protocols	2	538
Procedures for production of phytosanitary treatments	2	620
Procedure for submission of treatments for forest quarantine	1	372
Proposal to extend the cycle for standard setting for concept standards	3	1,218
Proposal to improve the standard-setting process	5	1,708
Request form for treatments to be considered in the TP Phytosanitary treatments work programme for adoption as an international treatment	1	267
Specifications:		
Specification No. 17: Debarking	1	458
Specification No. 30: Pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence	1	499
Specification for TPs No. 3 Rev 1: TP Phytosanitary treatments	1	314
Specification for TPs No. 4 Rev 1: TP Forest quarantine	1	423
Draft ISPMs:		
Consignments in transit	8	2,355
Diagnostic protocols	9	3,016
Efficacy of phytosanitary measures	8	2,131
Formatting commodity specific standards	6	923
Formatting pest specific data sheets	7	1,371
Pest free areas for fruit flies	33	14,123

ANNEX 1 (continued)

Document	No. of pages	No. of words
<i>Documents translated (continued)</i>		
Revision of ISPM No. 1	10	3,133
Revision of ISPM No. 2	20	7,814
Submission and evaluation of phytosanitary treatments	10	3,244
Proposed revision to methyl bromide treatment schedule in Annex I of ISPM No. 15 (fast-track procedure)	2	609
Outcome of SC April 2005 meeting:		
Report of meeting (including modified documents)	29	10,459
Adjustment of draft standards for report and country consultation	40	20,000

Total no. of documents: 46

Total no. of pages: 348

Total no. of words: 130,967

Documents for translation: 28

Pages for translation: 240

Words for translation: 91,415

Draft ISPMs only: 113 pages, 38,719 words

ANNEX 2

SC November 2005 - List of documents and translations envisaged

Document	No. of pages	No. of words
Documents not translated		
Country comments on draft ISPMs:		
Consignments in transit	47	14,321
Diagnostic protocols for pests	54	16,867
Pest free areas for fruit flies	142	53,188
Phytosanitary treatments	46	16,718
Revision of ISPM No. 1	45	13,764
Proposed revision to methyl bromide schedule, Annex I of ISPM No. 15	10	2,939
Expert working group reports:		
Glossary Working Group meeting report (October 2005)	18	9,804
Technical panel reports:		
TP Fruit flies	6	2,001
TP Phytosanitary treatments	17	5,048
Other documents:		
Documents list	3	786
Participants list	3	1,143
Status report on draft standards and specifications for standards	17	3,565
Documents previously translated (including draft ISPMs):		
Report of SC April 2005 meeting	29	10,459
Administrative guidelines for the structure of standard-setting documentation	11	3,759
Comments received on administrative documents (from ICPM-7)	3	1,795
Instructions to authors of diagnostic protocols for pests	5	1,887
Procedure for production of diagnostic protocols	2	538
Procedure for production of phytosanitary treatments	2	620
Procedure for submission of treatments for forest quarantine	1	372
Proposal to improve the standard-setting process	5	1,708
Consignments in transit	7	1,917
Diagnostic protocols for pests	10	2,908
Pest free areas for fruit flies	33	13,869
Request form for treatments to be considered in the TP Phytosanitary treatments work programme for adoption as an international treatment	1	267
Requirements for the submission and evaluation of phytosanitary treatments	10	3,012
Revision of ISPM No. 1	9	2,996
Proposed revision to Methyl Bromide schedule, Annex I of ISPM No. 15	1	190
Documents translated		
Procedures and other documents:		
Agenda	3	964
Book of standards: Review of the definitions sections in each standard	15	6,472
Consequence for standard setting of the memorandum of cooperation between the IPPC and the CBD Secretariats	10	4,385
Draft paper to the SC supporting the use of the TP Glossary for the review of standards for consistency	1	507
Explanatory documents for ISPMs: Status, procedures and issues	5	1,723
Guidelines for stewards reviewing country comments	1	428
Procedures for identifying topics and developing specifications for inclusion in the standard setting work programme of the CPM	2	891
Proposed addition to the <i>Administrative guidelines</i> , to give guidance to EWGs on definitions in draft standards	1	282
Proposed standard setting work programme for CPM-1	3	684
Regional workshops for draft standards: Brief report	3	538

ANNEX 2 (continued)

Document	No. of pages	No. of words
Documents translated (continued)		
Reports from stewards on topics or draft standards under development	10	2,888
SPTA (2005) strategic priorities for topics for inclusion in the standard setting work programme of the CPM	1	367
Status of ISPMs on the work programme	4	1,374
Steward's reports on country comments for draft ISPMs	5	2,500
Submission form for CPM standard setting work programme topics	1	258
Technical Panels Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure	3	1,004
Topics for standards submitted by countries in 2005	14	4,155
Draft specifications:		
Area-wide suppression and eradication procedures for fruit flies (Tephritidae)	2	683
Compendium of phytosanitary treatments	1	293
Country of origin: Use of the term in existing ISPMs	1	174
Establishment and maintenance of pest free places of production and pest free production sites for fruit flies (Tephritidae)	2	549
Import of plant breeding material	1	407
Plants for planting	1	502
PRA for plants as pests	1	420
Pre-inspection and pre-clearance for regulated articles intended for export	1	350
Regulating stored products in international trade	2	334
Review of ISPMs for consistency	2	673
Soil and growing media in international trade	1	118
Supplement to ISPM No. 5: Guidelines on the understanding of "not widely distributed"	1	550
Supplement to ISPM No. 5: Appropriate level of protection	1	287
Trapping procedures for fruit flies (Tephritidae)	2	564
Technical Panel No. 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms	2	756
Outcome of SC November 2005 meeting:		
Report of meeting (including modified documents)	30	12,500

Total no. of documents: 60

Total no. of pages: 670

Total no. of words: 235,021

Documents for translation: 33

Pages for translation: 133

Words for translation: 48,580

ANNEX 3

**Calculations of the cost of translation and interpretation of Standards Committee meetings
being held in several languages (FAO)**

April meeting

• Translation costs	
○ US \$0.468/word (base rate)	US\$
▪ 10 draft ISPMs: 38,719 words	= 18,120
▪ 16 other documents: 22,237 words	= 10,407
▪ Report (including modified documents): 10,459 words	= 4,895
▪ Adjusted standards in report and for country consultation: 20,000 words	= 9,360
Total translation costs for one language	= 42,782
Total translation costs - Arabic, Chinese, French, Spanish (x4)	= 171,128
Total translation costs - French, Spanish (x2)	= 85,564
Total translation costs - Stds only 4 languages	= 72,480
Total translation costs - Stds only 2 languages	= 36,240
• Interpretation	
○ five days for five languages	= 83,600
○ five days for three languages	= 39,600

November meeting

• Translation costs	
US \$0.468/word	
▪ 32 other documents: 36,080 words	= 16,885
▪ Report (including modified documents): 12,500 words	= 5,850
Total translation cost for one language	= 22,735
Total translation costs - Arabic, Chinese, French, Spanish (x4)	= 90,940
Total translation costs - French, Spanish (x2)	= 45,470
• Interpretation	
○ five days for five languages	= 83,600
○ five days for three languages	= 39,600

Total 2005 (translation) – five languages	= 262,068
Total 2005 (translation – standards only) - five languages	= 72,480
Total 2005 (translation) – three languages	= 131,034
Total 2005 (translation – standards only) - three languages	= 36,240
Total 2005 interpretation – five languages	= 167,200
Total 2005 interpretation – three languages	= 79,200

TABLE 1

Summary of the costs (US\$) of the two Standards Committee meetings (5 days each) being held in several languages

		Five languages (5 days)	Standards only	Three languages (5 days)	Standards only
FAO*	Translation	262,068	72,480	131,034	36,240
	Interpretation*	167,200	0	79,200	0
Total FAO		429,268	72,480	210,234	36,240
Other					
	Translation				
	Interpretation	98,000 (COSAVE**)		29,400 (COSAVE) 55,967 (EPPO***)	

* FAO interpretation - Cost for 1½ teams, 5 languages, 5 days with 12 sessions available would be US\$83,600. The cost of 1½ teams, 3 languages (English/French/Spanish), 5 days with 12 sessions available would be US\$39,600.

** COSAVE - Argentina (Buenos Aires): US\$490 per interpreter per day. Requires two interpreters per language, therefore US\$980 per interpretation per day. Five languages have 10 interpretation combinations and three languages have three.

*** EPPO - Interpretation fees paid to UNESCO for the EPPO Council Session (September 2005) - €13,824 (US\$16,790) for 6 interpreters (French, English and Russian) for 3 days.

TABLE 2

Prioritized budget for Strategic Direction 1

Estimated expenditure 2006 to fulfill the business plan (US\$)		Available resource Reg Prgm	Available resource Trust Funds
Dir. 1 Standard setting	(required resource)		
4 Technical Panel meetings	120,000	50,000	10,000
8 EWG meetings	225,000	80,000	20,000
Explanatory documents (standards)	30,000	0	
Translation for stds	100,000	100,000	
2 SC meetings	140,000	90,000	40,000
ICPM	240,000	240,000	
Consultants/miscellaneous	40,000	30,000	
2 PSA staff	100,000	0	
legal	50,000	0	
Publications	30,000	30,000	
Consultant	50,000	0	
Total	1,155,000	620,000	70,000