



*REPORT*

Meeting  
4-7 October 2011

**Report of the 13<sup>th</sup>  
CPM informal  
working group on  
Strategic Planning  
and Technical  
Assistance  
October 2011**



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of FAO.

## CONTENTS

1. Opening of the meeting .....	5
2. Adoption of the agenda .....	5
3. Housekeeping .....	5
3.1 Documents list .....	5
3.2 Participants list .....	5
3.3 Local information .....	5
4. Bureau Update .....	6
5. Secretariat's Report .....	6
6. Strategic and Medium Term Plans .....	8
6.1 CPM strategy and medium term plan .....	8
6.2 Communication strategy and medium term plan .....	9
6.3 Resource mobilization strategy .....	9
6.4 Capacity Development work plan and budget .....	11
7. IPPC Standard Setting Focus Group .....	12
7.1 Report of the Focus Group .....	12
8. Prioritization of Topics and Priorities in the IPPC Standard Setting Programme .....	16
9. Article XIV Body Update .....	17
10. IPPC Partnership Programme .....	17
11. Rules for Observers at CPM and subsidiary body meetings .....	17
12. Aquatic Species .....	18
13. Capacity Development .....	18
13.1 Call for technical resources .....	18
13.2 Regional workshops on draft ISPMs .....	19
14. Other business .....	19
14.1 IPPC budget .....	19
14.2 Australia Papers .....	19
14.3 CPM Side Sessions and Speakers .....	20
14.4 CPM Chairperson .....	21
14.5 60 <sup>th</sup> Anniversary celebration of the IPPC .....	21
15. Next meeting .....	21
Annex 1 – Agenda .....	22
Annex 2 – Documents List .....	23
Annex 3 - Participants List .....	24



## 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

The Secretary to the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) welcomed all the participants to the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) informal working group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) and regretted to inform the group that the CPM Chairperson was unable to attend.

The Secretary welcomed all the participants to the meeting and introduced the new IPPC Coordinator, Mr Fedchock, who will begin working for the IPPC Secretariat in November 2011. He also introduced other Secretariat staff who would be attending the meeting and thanked CPM members for their in-kind contributions of human resources.

The Secretary informed the participants that the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) have elected a new Director-General, Mr Graziano da Silva, who will start in January 2012.

The Secretary also noted that the IPPC will be 60 years old in 2012 and that he would like to discuss some options for celebrating this important milestone.

The Secretary turned the meeting over to the Chair of the SPTA meeting, Ms Yim (Bureau Vice-Chairperson), who had been chosen for this role by the Bureau at its June 2011 meeting.

## 2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The participants reviewed the agenda<sup>1</sup> and noted the discussion papers received regarding the role of the SPTA and Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement (SBDS). The participants also wanted to discuss the following points: the Secretariat budget, the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the IPPC and CPM-7 (2012) side session speakers. These items were added to the agenda under *Section 14. Other Business* and the modified agenda was adopted as presented in Appendix 1.

## 3. HOUSEKEEPING

### 3.1 Documents list

The documents for the meeting were reviewed (see documents list<sup>2</sup> in Appendix 2). It was noted that many documents that covered important issues were not available well in advance which made it difficult for participants to collaborate on these issues prior to the meeting. The Secretariat was requested to follow the guidance established by the Bureau and ensure that meeting documents are made available at least two weeks prior to the meeting. The Secretary acknowledged this and said he would strive to meet these expectations in the future.

### 3.2 Participants list

The participants reviewed and updated their contact information<sup>3</sup>. They were reminded to also update their contact information on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP – [www.ippc.int](http://www.ippc.int)). The list of participants is attached in Appendix 3.

### 3.3 Local information

The IPPC Secretariat reviewed the local information document<sup>4</sup> and provided logistical support to the meeting participants.

---

<sup>1</sup> SPTA 2011/01

<sup>2</sup> SPTA 2011/03

<sup>3</sup> SPTA 2011/05

#### 4. BUREAU UPDATE

In the absence of the Chair of the Bureau, one of the Vice Chairs, Mr Ashby (United Kingdom), gave a brief verbal update of the 2011 Bureau meetings. He noted the 2011 June Bureau meeting report was still not finalized and posted on the IPP but that it would be posted soon. He also noted that the Bureau had met the day before the start of this meeting, mostly to prepare for this meeting. The Bureau will meet again at the end of this meeting to discuss strategies and ways to move forward based on SPTA decisions.

One participant asked about the concerns of the Nagoya Protocol (NP) and it was explained that there could be some concern that the NP may be in contradiction to the IPPC and that the Secretariat would be seeking a legal opinion from FAO legal services. In addition, the IPPC may also need to seek direction from the CPM on this issue.

As next year will be the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the IPPC, it was felt that the SPTA should focus on raising awareness of the IPPC through the development of an effective communication strategy.

#### 5. SECRETARIAT'S REPORT

The Secretary presented the document<sup>5</sup>, identified the major items achieved and noted that points stating *Ongoing* indicated that there had been signification work in these area, but that they were not yet completed as many of them are longer-term projects.

##### *Goal 1: Standard Setting and Implementation*

One participant questioned the need of a Chinese Language Review Group (LRG), as only one contracting party utilizes this LRG. The Standard Setting Officer noted that Chinese is a complex language and that there are still some issues of language preferences that need to be sorted.

Regarding the development of a strategic plan for Standard Setting, it was suggested that this be deferred until the IPPC Strategic Framework was adopted by the CPM-7 (2012).

There was some discussion on how other international organizations such as the CBD and WTO-SPS are looking at IPPC standards and considering their relevance, and how they should be implemented. There was also discussion on the need for guides on how to implement IPPC standards for other sectors like the Forestry guide. It was felt this would be stressing the importance of IPPC standards but it also raised concerns that others may not interpret and implement IPPC standards as intended. It was felt the new communications strategy should take this issue into account.

##### *Goal 2: Information Exchange*

The Secretary noted that for Information Exchange, some items were pending because of unexpected staff shortages. Some participants felt that the work programme should be managed in such a way as to not raise unrealistic expectations.

It was again noted that many meeting documents were not available in a timely manner but efforts are underway to correct this. One participant noted that reports that are presented in bullet fashion make it much easier for people who are non-English mother tongue to understand.

##### *Goal 3: SBDS*

One participant noted that the SBDS is possibly being under-utilized and suggested that it could expand its role to address some of the implementation review and support system (IRSS) issues. One participant questioned what the status of the current dispute was. The Secretariat responded saying that

---

<sup>4</sup> SPTA 2011/02

<sup>5</sup> SPTA 2011/15

dedicated resources needed to be allocated to this area to help strengthen its role. The current dispute was moving slowly and those involved needed frequent follow up, which is resource intensive.

#### ***Goal 4: Capacity Development***

One participant considered the Regional Workshops reviewing draft ISPMs to be very important and suggested that the workshop for the Russian speaking countries should also be delivered in English, since many countries in this European region, such as those in Central Europe, could benefit from the workshop. One The Secretariat noted that the translation and interpretation costs would be very high. One participant felt there was no need for simultaneous interpretation as whisper interpretation is often used.

It was noted that the Secretariat is working on several projects. The Secretariat reminded the SPTA that new IPPC projects were under development and since concentration is on these projects, the Secretariat will not be able to provide support for projects in individual countries.

- (1) One participant emphasized that capacity building remains a high profile area, especially now with the regional blocks developing and the increased need for harmonisation. The SPTA recognized the need for a Central European Regional Workshop in English and Russian and requested the Secretariat to investigate if it could find the additional resources

#### ***Goal 5: The CPM and a sustainable IPPC***

The Secretary gave an update on staffing and explained a variety of “in-kind” contributions that contracting parties were making in terms of providing staff to help the Secretariat deliver the work programme. Some contributions were small while others offered staff for up to two years. He also noted the current status of recruitment for the 2011 and that the IPPC Coordinator and Standard Setting General Services staff recruitment had been completed. The P3 position in Standard Setting is in the final stages of recruitment. The Secretariat explained that expected levels of staffing for 2012 would be included in the 2012 budget papers. The SPTA felt that a staff chart, which included all the different types of staff working in the Secretariat, would be helpful.

- (2) The Secretariat will develop a staff chart which will display all the different types of staff working in the Secretariat.

It was noted that the CPM-6 (2011) requested a paper on the merits and consequences of the IPPC being more autonomous in the future and the SPTA should keep this in mind when making strategic decisions during the meeting.

The status of the Voluntary Funding Agreements was discussed. There has only been limited work on this task, but the Secretary will actively follow up on this with contracting parties and regional organizations before the end of the year.

#### ***Goal 6: Partners***

In regards to international cooperation between the IPPC and other organizations, the SPTA thought it would be useful to develop a strategy for this work as it was felt that the Secretariat is responding to the needs of others rather than driving own partnerships.

- (3) The Secretariat will develop a concept note of what is expected when meeting with relevant international organizations. The IPPC Secretariat, Bureau members, etc. can refer to this document to help ensure a more consistent IPPC message is delivered when meeting with partners. This should also be considered when developing a communications strategy.

#### ***Goal 7: Review***

The Secretary noted that the project of IRSS had commenced. One Bureau member asked whether the IRSS Help Desk Lead was hired as a full time staff person and fully funded by the EU funding. It was

noted that at this time there is not someone hired to be the Help Desk Lead but that the current IRSS Officer was taking on this task until some short-term staff could be hired.

## 6. STRATEGIC AND MEDIUM TERM PLANS

The Secretary thanked all the participants who had made contributions in the last year.

A paper<sup>6</sup> on work planning of the IPPC in the context of FAO was provided. The participants thanked the Secretariat for providing this paper which allowed the SPTA to more easily see how the IPPC fits within the FAO Strategic Framework. The IPPC Secretariat is under the Organizational Result OR2: Transboundary pests, which are under the Strategic Objective SOA: Sustainable intensification of crop production. Some participants felt it could also be related to a number of other strategic objectives and the Secretary explained that the IPPC work could also be linked to various unit results in other areas.

It was noted that the meeting reporting objectives target for some areas was low but the Secretariat explained that that only about 33 percent of contracting parties (CPs) comply with 60 percent of reporting obligations.

There was also a concern that there was no medium term plan for the IPPC, only a long-term plan. The Secretariat noted that it is now following the FAO system of short, medium, and long-term planning and presented the medium term plan, which follows the new FAO format. There were concerns of how realistic the medium term plan is, and the SPTA suggested that the IPPC Secretariat should have targets that could be met and improved, and that in some cases a two year cycle might not be long enough because some activities last longer. A small group was formed to assist in reviewing the medium term plan. The SPTA nominated Ms Rymer (Australia), Mr Stubbings (Canada), Mr Van Alphen (Netherlands), Mr Fukushima (Japan) and Mr Greifer (USA) for this group, which will review the document and provide comments to Mr Nowell (IPPC Secretariat).

The SPTA:

- (4) *agreed* to continue the development of a medium term plan under the IPPC Strategic Framework with the assistance of selected SPTA participants.
- (5) *agreed* to present this to CPM.

### 6.1 CPM strategy and medium term plan

The paper on the IPPC Strategic Framework (SF) 2012-2019<sup>7</sup> was presented. The goal of developing this was to be in-line with the FAO strategic framework. The SPTA thanked the authors of the paper, Mr Hedley (New Zealand) and Mr Greifer (USA), for drafting the document and for incorporating all the comments that had been received while noting that the document is easy to read, simple to understand, and very well-written.

There was general discussion about the purpose of the SF. Most felt it should give all stakeholders an idea of the long-term direction. It was recalled from CPM discussions that the SF was to help highlight the importance and relevance of the IPPC to the CPM and FAO, rather than serve as a reporting tool and that it should not become too complex of a document serving a multitude of functions. The audience of the SF is very broad; it is not limited to the Secretariat, so there is no need to include more reporting and measuring. It should be made clear that everyone is involved in delivering this plan and often other stakeholders are responsible for carrying out certain activities. It was also noted that the SF should be used as a guide for the short, medium, and long-term IPPC work plans. Some participants felt it was important not to make promises that cannot be delivered, but others felt this level of detail

---

<sup>6</sup> SPTA 2011/09

<sup>7</sup> SPTA 2011/04



would not be provided in the SF. It was agreed to modify the conclusion to state that, in order to work cohesively in the direction of the SF, long-term funding was essential.

It was furthermore noted that in this document Strategic Objective A is not the only FAO Strategic Objective that should be referred to, but that also other Strategic Objectives, relevant to the IPPC, should be referenced.

There was a suggestion to include, in the Executive Summary, an impact message such as “If you do not invest in the IPPC, then you cannot deliver on poverty and hunger alleviation, sustainability, crop intensification, etc.” Some statements from the conclusion section should be moved to the Executive Summary to develop a stronger impact message.

It was suggested that the term *knowledge* was now used instead of *information* to be in line with FAO. Some participants considered the term *knowledge* not appropriate because it can be interpreted in many ways and is a more bureaucratic term. The term *information* was used in most cases.

There was concern that the role of the regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs), in the context of this strategy, is not present and should be added. This would encourage RPPOs to further collaborate with the IPPC. The SPTA agreed that RPPOs should be added. It was agreed to add additional references to the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

It was also felt that there was some mixing of the terms: implementation and compliance, and this should be modified considering the CPM has decided that it would focus on implementation rather than compliance. It was suggested that the implementation of IPPC standards should be actively reviewed and supported, the text was adjusted accordingly.

It was also noted that the terminology could be more precise as in some places; wild flora was referred to rather than environmental protection and this could be confusing. It was agreed to use wording that linked to the issue of invasive plants.

The preparation of the medium term plan would be a large amount of work and some SPTA participants offered to assist the Secretariat (Mr Van Alphen (the Netherlands), Ms Rymer (Australia), Mr Hedley (New Zealand), Mr Griefer (USA) and a representative from Japan (name to follow).

The Strategic Framework was revised based on comments from the SPTA participants. Other specific comments should be provided to the Secretariat.

## 6.2 Communication strategy and medium term plan

The Secretariat presented the paper<sup>8</sup>, explained some of the points being considered for the IPPC communication strategy and questioned whether a medium term plan should be created from this strategy or to be included in the current SF. Some participants felt there was no need to align the communications strategy with the specific points in the SF. Others felt that the SF has a communications component, so there is a mandate to develop a communications strategy.

The SPTA:

- (6) *agreed* that, if there are communication strategies for the individual IPPC activities, then they should be incorporated in the current SF
- (7) *agreed* to follow the resource mobilization strategy outline.

## 6.3 Resource mobilization strategy

The authors presented the paper and gave a brief overview of the document. The SPTA thanked the authors of the paper<sup>9</sup>, Mr Lopian (Finland) and Mr Fedchock (USA) for drafting the document. They

<sup>8</sup> SPTA 2011/18

<sup>9</sup> SPTA 2011/06

noted that the paper was written to the target audience of the CPM, and that the CPM would adopt the resource mobilization strategy (RMS).

Some concerns were raised regarding the point: F2 *Creating an additional funding instrument through royalties on Phytosanitary Certificates* and that this may cause a problem for developing countries with weak currencies. Some participants felt that the burden of the cost would be on the producer who benefits the most from the use of Phytosanitary Certificates. It was also felt that an in-depth cost-benefit analysis would need to be done.

There were some questions about practicalities of Section IV: *Revising the IPPC*. The authors noted that the IPPC should only be revised to accommodate the RMS if the IPPC was being revised for another reason in the future.

There was a discussion on whether to list all possible activities or to be selective. Some participants felt it might be better to divide the decisions into short-term (those that are feasible immediately) and long-term (those that required more analysis). It was noted that text should be left flexible enough that the IPPC Secretariat may work on issues not precisely listed in this document, as the Secretariat does spend time working on projects for other organizations. It was also felt that maybe the Secretariat should charge these organizations for the Secretariat input.

There was some discussion on the formation of a group to provide oversight or input to the RMS, some participants felt it should be a sub-set of the Bureau while others felt it should be composed of volunteers with more specific financial and fund raising expertise. Some felt that a more formal financial committee should be formed to provide oversight in order to bestow confidence to donors. There was further discussion on the oversight of funds provided by FAO and other donors and on the fact that a more formal oversight committee would have to limit their scope to oversight of funds the CPM has control over, such as the IPPC Trust Fund.

Participants felt that a non-permanent body should be formed to discuss this issue further and define the scope of the body. A small group composed of Mr Lopian (Finland), Ms Ranson (Australia), Ms Bech (USA), Mr Ashby (UK), Mr Onsando (Kenya) and the IPPC Secretary and future Coordinator should consider this further, possibly electronically.

The SPTA:

- |  |
|--|
| (8) <i>agreed</i> there should be a financial committee that plays a financial oversight and reporting role but not a planning role. This group should also play a role of champion for fund raising but the body should not be permanent. A small group of SPTA participants would consider this issue further. |
|--|

It was noted that the development of a communication strategies should be done in combination with other areas as it is not stand-alone.

In-kind contributions were discussed and it was noted that this is very difficult for some developing countries to participate. It was agreed to work within existing FAO programmes such as internships etc. as much as possible. It was also noted that the different types of programmes and how to participate in them needs to be more clearly communicated. There were also concerns that some counties could influence the work programme in this way but the SPTA participants felt that the priority would be given to activities in the CPM approved operation plan.

The roster of experts was discussed and there were concerns that this could be very resource intensive. The Secretariat explained that it was intended only to put in place a mechanism to ensure that certain experts were screened first such as for PRA training or to facilitate the use of the PCE tool.

There was some discussion on how to strengthen institutional instruments but it was felt this was being investigated under the Article XIV body discussion and most of these issues are long-term.

There was an in-depth discussion on revising the IPPC. It was felt that a good analysis should be conducted before presenting this idea further. It was recognized that it was good to be challenged and that many other issues should also be consider such as developing Protocol to deal with transboundary pests, not limiting to regulated pests.

The SPTA:

- (9) *agreed* that the RMS should not include the broader issues but simply mention that a revision of the IPPC would be needed, if it was decided to have a financial committee
- (10) *agreed* that further analysis or a “white paper” should be developed on this issue.

There was discussion on the proposal of a joint convention but this concept was felt to be very complex and it was noted that IPPC is the only international standard setting body that carries the strength of a convention. It was decided to remove this point from the RMS.

The SPTA:

- (11) *agreed* that the RMS did not need to be formatted with references to the SF
- (12) *agreed* to continue the development of the RMS taking into consideration the SPTA discussions.

#### 6.4 Capacity Development work plan and budget

The Secretariat Implementation Officer presented the IPPC Capacity Development work plan and budget<sup>10</sup>. It was noted that Appendix 1 to the work plan presents the current version of the IPPC national phytosanitary capacity development strategy which does not contain the Logical Framework (log frame) as a complementary document and that the number of outputs has changed from six to eight. The Secretariat mentioned that the log frame provided at CPM-5 (2010)<sup>11</sup> was not approved and CPM-5 (2010) requested that that consideration should be given to including it in the SF.

Information on the two expert working group on Phytosanitary Capacity Development (EWGPCD) meetings (October 2010 and May 2011) was provided. The Secretariat noted that the Capacity Development work plan and budget is a global capacity development work plan, a theoretical plan that includes what the whole phytosanitary community should do to build national capacity globally and in some cases the IPPC Secretariat is not the lead for certain activities.

The SPTA was pleased about how the work of Capacity Development has progressed in the last year.

One participant noted it might be valuable to create a more coherent strategic paper that clearly identifies what contracting parties need in order to implement the convention that is related to the Capacity Development Strategy and linked to a work plan.

There was not a clear understanding of the costing presented in the paper. It was clarified that the total cost was the cost for all involved and was not related to the cost the Secretariat would incur. Others agreed that this amount was not very large compared to other aid budgets but the challenge would be to target the efforts on where they are needed. It would also be important to find out what other resources are being spent in phytosanitary areas so that synergies could be created.

Many editorial changes, such as removing the costs and estimated timing were suggested.

In addition to proposed changes noted above, the SPTA:

- (13) *noted* the IPPC Capacity Development work plan and budget as a global strategy
- (14) *endorsed* the IPPC Capacity Development work plan and budget as a framework reflecting capacity needs

<sup>10</sup> SPTA 2011/10

<sup>11</sup> CPM-5 (2010) Report, paragraphs 102-104

- (15) *agreed* that this document could be used for approaching donors
- (16) *recommended* presenting the IPPC Capacity Development work plan and budget to the CPM after revising the document to include the changes proposed by the SPTA.

### ***Oversight body on Capacity Development***

The Secretariat informed the SPTA on the possible creation of an oversight body on Capacity Development. The concepts were discussed at the second EWGPCD and the EWGPCD drafted a Terms of Reference (TOR) and Rules of Procedure (ROP) as well it conducted a SWOT analysis. It was also noted that during the development of the TOR and ROP, the EWG reviewed the TOR and ROP of other CPM subsidiary bodies. Other points were discussed such as how to set this group up to avoid conflicts of interest by its members and to set up a process on how members would be selected.

Two alternative suggestions were presented<sup>12</sup> to the SPTA: a subsidiary body or technical committee. The IPPC Secretariat also presented the SWOT analysis, TOR, and ROP for both suggestions.

The SPTA noted that it is important to maintain the current momentum of work while keeping costs down. The Secretariat noted that it would be feasible to operate this body with USD 30 000 per year and in addition some work could also progress using virtual meeting tools. It was felt that this group should be skills based rather than based on regional representation. Some felt that a subsidiary body would provide continuity and have more recognition but it was noted that a technical committee might provide more flexibility and help keep costs down.

It was recommended the paper be revised before presentation to CPM. Some suggestions included changing the subsidiary body to a technical committee because this type of technical work demands expertise and a committee would be more skill-based and less bureaucratic. Additionally, CPM would not be required to confirm members.

The SPTA considered the name of the group because there was concern that it could be confused with other groups within FAO. There was also concern whether this group would have any connection with FAO in terms of rules, financing, etc. Regarding the importance of transparency, the SPTA suggested that this group be set up to allow the chairperson to report back to CPM, or, at a minimum, to be under the oversight of the Secretariat. The SPTA requested the Secretariat to develop a paper for CPM presenting the various options discussed.

The SPTA:

- (17) *supported* the creation of an oversight group on Capacity Development to be approved by.
- (18) *recommended* the paper be revised before presentation to CPM, incorporating the changes proposed by the SPTA and presenting options discussed.

## **7. IPPC STANDARD SETTING FOCUS GROUP**

### **7.1 Report of the Focus Group**

The Standard Setting Officer presented the report<sup>13</sup> of the 2011 Focus Group (FG) on Improving the Standard Setting Process (SSP) and noted that the adoption of the IPPC SF may have a major impact on the recommendations in the FG Report. He explained the main recommendations. It was noted that it is difficult to maintain the balance between ensuring an open, transparent and inclusive system and an efficient process that does not require many resources.

The SPTA noted that issues related to languages (translation and interpretation) were identified but the FG felt these were issues outside their control and were not to be addressed in the recommendations.

<sup>12</sup> SPTA 2011/11

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=207776>

***Task 1: Examine the member consultation process, in particular the member consultation period ending 14 days prior to CPM. The group will also consider how to have a second member consultation in a more appropriate time***

### **Recommendations 1 to 5**

The SPTA came to a general agreement with Recommendation 1 that the CPM is not a drafting body. The SPTA noted that, by removing the evening drafting sessions, CPM members would be allowed to use this valuable time networking and strategizing.

The FG envisaged that the Standards Committee (SC) would be able to address all the substantial concerns in the November meeting following the regular 100-day member consultation and noted that a review period (similar to the 60-day proposed consultation) already exists but is being under-utilized. Recommendation 2 of the FG encourages the comments from the period ending 14 days prior to the CPM to be received before the November SC meeting. The SC would be made aware of any substantial concerns well in advance of the CPM so that it could decide whether a second member consultation would be required or whether the draft was generally acceptable for adoption.

The SPTA discussed the possibility that, in addition to substantial concerns, technical and editorial comments could still be submitted to the Secretariat. It was proposed that all substantial concerns should be sent to the Secretariat via the online comment system (OCS), these comments would then be forwarded to the Steward. Technical and editorial comments of less importance would be forwarded to the SC members from the member's region. If there are technical and editorial comments received at this time, then the SC would need assistance from the steward (or technical panel) to resolve them. It was noted that, at SC meetings, a lot of time is spent reviewing technical and editorial comments when the SC should be addressing more substantial comments.

One participant noted that editorial and technical comments should be submitted during the 100-day member consultation period and, once these are addressed, substantial comments and formal objections (FOs) should be submitted later in the SSP.

Concerns were expressed regarding the introduction of new terminology (i.e. *substantial concern* and *substantial comment*), as they may have very different meanings and felt it was better to maintain established terms.

There was concern that this new round of commenting would be difficult for national plant protection organizations (NPPO) and RPPOs to manage because the 100-day member consultation is at the same time. The Secretariat replied that a period similar to the proposed 60-day review period already exists and the proposal was just a way of formalizing it. There was also a concern that FOs could stop the process and no ISPMs would ever be adopted. However, according to the FG proposal, the SC still has many options including sending the draft back to the expert drafting group (EDG), to the steward, for another member consultation or to the CPM for a vote if necessary.

One participant questioned what would happen if the draft is completely different after the 100-day member consultation. It was explained that the current system already deals with this type of issue and that it is up to the SC to decide if the draft is very different from the initially circulated draft, and in these cases it should be sent for another member consultation.

Some participants were concerned that the new emphasis on the 60-day member consultation period would create more work for the SC and the Secretariat and noted that the 60-day member consultation period is only useful if all comments can be thoroughly analyzed. The Secretariat noted that it should not be more work than compiling comments 14 days prior to the CPM.

After reviewing the FG recommendations, the SPTA recommends the following:

Recommendation 2. Emphasize the existing 60-day member consultation period after the initial 100-day member consultation period. This review will allow CPM members 60 days to review SC-7 approved draft standards and should focus on substantial comments. All substantial comments would be submitted to the IPPC Secretariat via the OCS. Substantial comments would be forwarded to the steward. Any technical and editorial comments should be sent to the member's regional SC members and the steward. The SC would review the substantial comments submitted, revise the draft standard and communicate to the CPM, its responses to member comments. The member consultation period ending 14 days prior to the CPM would still be used, but only for formal objections that include supporting evidence for the formal objection.

***Task 2: Re-examine and streamline the approval process for draft ISPMs under the special process (Diagnostic Protocols (DPs) and Phytosanitary Treatments (PTs))***

The SPTA agreed with the Recommendations 6 to 11 as presented in the FG report and expressed preference of Recommendation 9A over 9B.

With regard to Recommendation 6, there was a query regarding the size of any technical revision and whether criteria should be developed for determining a substantial revision. The Secretariat noted that the SC makes the final decision on whether a draft is ready for adoption based on expert advice or whether it needs to be returned for further work, so there was no need to have criteria developed to determine what a substantial revision is.

***Task 3: Examine new efficiencies and expedited ways of achieving standard setting work and Look at any other possibilities for improving and streamlining the IPPC Standard Setting Process (SSP) not outlined above.***

The SPTA had general support for the Recommendations 12 to 30 as presented in the FG report.

**Recommendations 12 to 16**

The SPTA had general support for Recommendations 12 to 16.

There was concern about the SC using the IPPC Strategic Framework when reviewing submissions of topics because in Section 3.2.1 of the 2011 IPPC Procedure Manual is a list of *Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics*, which the SC uses to review the list and make it operational. It was noted that these criteria would still be used in addition to the IPPC Strategic Framework.

**Recommendation 17**

The SPTA had general support for Recommendation 17.

The SPTA determined the most effective form of the *Focus Group to develop a Framework for Standards* would be via a face-to-face meeting, about two or three days long, occurring immediately before or after an SC meeting or the CPM.

**Recommendation 18**

The SPTA had general support for Recommendation 18.

Questions were raised about funding the steward's assistants and whether their travel to SC meetings would be supported by the Secretariat. There was also concern whether the two assistants would instead create more work for the lead steward. The SPTA was informed that it was not intended that the steward's assistants would always participate in SC meetings. Their role would be to support the lead steward and provide a developmental opportunity. The SPTA also considered that there should be some flexibility as they may not be necessary in all cases.

Recommendation 18. The SC should be encouraged to assign a lead steward and two assistants (these two assistants could be from outside the SC, such as potential replacement SC members, ex-SC members or technical panel members) for each topic.

### **Recommendations 19 to 26**

The SPTA had general support for Recommendations 19 to 26.

The SPTA noted that the size of the SC membership has been discussed by the CPM and the SPTA recommends this not be discussed again as it was extensively discussed at ICPM-6 (2004) and that it was noted that regional representation is very important in the SC, along with expertise. The SPTA also agreed with staggering the terms of the SC to allow for old and new membership terms to overlap.

The SPTA discussed the purpose of the regional coordinators (RCs) and whether or not they are necessary. There was general agreement that the purpose of the RC was to enhance communication and information sharing in the region. It was explained that the FG was proposing ideas to ensure that SC members are representing the comments of the countries in their region and not only the views of the country the member is representing, that there is coordination within the region and that feedback is provided to countries on how the concerns had been addressed. It was suggested that the SC members not make the RC mandatory, but that the region should decide whether the RC is mandatory or rather have the steward's assistant liaison with the region facilitate the gathering of comments. However, it was noted that the specific tasks that the RC would perform should be outlined.

One participant expressed concern that the efficiency of the SSP may be compromised if more committees are added (such as an editorial team). It was explained that the reason the FG included the editorial team was to save time and avoid editorial comments by doing a thorough review of the drafts. The SPTA agreed to the concept of the editorial team, but it was noted that the editorial team should not necessarily only be members of the SC and that it would only be used when necessary.

Regarding the FG recommendation on sponsorship, the SPTA considered this was covered in the resource mobilization strategy, and therefore there would not need to be any changes in the standard setting process.

The SPTA recommends:

Recommendation 21. The CPM to encourage regions to consider assigning one SC member from each region to play a lead role in facilitating communication between the SC and countries within their regions

Recommendation 22. This recommendation was not endorsed as regions should determine their own methods of coordination and some aspects of this are covered in recommendation 21.

Recommendation 23. The Statement of Commitment should include a signature line for the immediate supervisor of the SC member to ensure the supervisor is well aware of the workload of the SC member.

Recommendation 25. Remove Recommendation 25 as it is already a requirement for SC members

### **Recommendations 27 to 30**

The SPTA suggested recommendations 27 and 28 be removed because these would be addressed under the Resource Mobilization Strategy.

It was noted that a set of questions or guidelines for biodiversity impact of ISPMs would provide assistance to EDGs in addressing the biodiversity task.

The SPTA had general support for recommendations 29 and 30.

## 8. PRIORITIZATION OF TOPICS AND PRIORITIES IN THE IPPC STANDARD SETTING PROGRAMME

The Secretariat presented the List of topics for IPPC standards<sup>14</sup> and outlined the proposed changes. Topics and priorities have been a major point of discussion at past CPM meetings and CPM-6 (2011) requested the SC to reprioritize the List of topics for IPPC standards to be in line with the proposed IPPC Strategic Framework, including possible additions, deletions and adjustment of priorities.

At its May 2011 meeting, the SC reviewed the List of topics for IPPC standards based on the IPPC Strategic Objectives. The SC reprioritization was presented to the Bureau in June 2011 and the Bureau agreed with the recommended reprioritization.

The SPTA found the presentation without the subjects for phytosanitary treatments, diagnostic protocols and glossary terms easier to follow and suggested this format is used for the list presented to the CPM.

The SPTA reviewed the list and agreed with the SC's recommendation.

It was suggested that each year the topic move up on the priority list because some topics tend to stay on the list for a long time without being reviewed. The Secretariat noted that the SC reviews the List of topics and priorities every year, so the SPTA agreed not to have automatic steps in the priorities.

The SPTA noted that all topics should have global applicability. It was also made clear that when a draft ISPM has been produced, according to a CPM recommendation, it is processed with a high priority. There were concerns that this could impact the overall purpose of the reprioritization exercise. The Secretariat explained the reason for this decision. A drafting group only begins drafting an ISPM on a topic that has an approved specification, but some of the high priority topics do not have an approved specification (this takes a few years). The reason for this CPM decision was to expedite the process so that, once resources (meetings, Secretariat time, edits, formats, SC reviews and sometimes translations) have been used to produce a draft ISPM, it would not sit on the shelf and become outdated while more recently drafted ISPMs, with a higher priority, were reviewed first.

It was also noted that before adding a topic to the List of topics it must be submitted with information provided on CPM adopted criteria. It is then reviewed by the SPTA (who sets the strategic objectives), then the SC discusses the submission and checks to see if the criteria is met and decides if it should be added to the List of topics. These recommendations are then presented to the CPM where it is again reviewed, discussed and finally the List of topics and proposed priorities are adopted. It was noted that, if some of the FG's recommendations were accepted, the SC would use the IPPC Strategic Framework when reviewing the submission of topics and, as a result, the submitted topics would no longer be presented to the SPTA.

The Secretariat noted that the FG also discussed the possibility to have sponsors provide financial support for the development of certain topics into ISPMs.

The SPTA:

- (19) *agreed* to the Reprioritization of Topics in the IPPC Standard Setting Programme
- (20) *noted* that criteria for topics should have more prominence and be added as a footnote.

---

<sup>14</sup> SPTA 2011/07



## 9. ARTICLE XIV BODY UPDATE

The Secretariat presented the paper<sup>15</sup> regarding the issue of operational autonomy from FAO of the statutory bodies stipulated under Article XIV and VI of FAO Basic Text, which continues to be a subject that is under increasing scrutiny in FAO and discussions on this subject are moving slowly. The Secretariat noted that this will be further discussed within FAO but in the meantime some information could be collected. There were also concerns that the IPPC Secretariat will have less funding from FAO if it becomes more independent and some concerns of the time it would take if, as a result of these discussions, the FAO Basic Text would need to be modified.

It was agreed that the Secretariat should hire a consultant, using funds provided by FAO, to do the analysis of the IPPC's possible operational autonomy. The SPTA reviewed the TOR for the consultant and stressed that the consultant should have an in-depth knowledge of FAO processes and have the skills and expertise to perform this task. It was also felt the TOR should indicate the areas where the consultant should explore in-depth. It was suggested the consultant be hired soon so that some work could be done, and a paper drafted, before CPM-7 (2012) considering the importance of the issue. Once the study is produced, this issue should be re-visited and decisions should be made on future positions.

## 10. IPPC PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMME

The Secretariat presented the paper on the establishment of an IPPC Partnership Programme<sup>16</sup>.

There were concerns that it may be too early to develop this programme and work in this area should wait until the IPPC SF has been adopted. Others felt the Secretariat would benefit from such a programme as it would not have to get constant CPM approval to work in this area.

It was proposed to produce an analysis that would show the possible synergies that could be developed with other bodies and organizations. However, the SPTA should first identify the areas that should be delivered on and a clear strategy that would be beneficial to help focus the Secretariat resources in the most efficient way.

It was also agreed that other strategies need to be completed first.

The SPTA:

(21) *recommends* this paper be re-presented after the IPPC Strategic Framework and resource mobilization strategy is adopted by the CPM.

## 11. RULES FOR OBSERVERS AT CPM AND SUBSIDIARY BODY MEETINGS

The Secretariat presented the paper<sup>17</sup> which proposes rules for observers at CPM and subsidiary body meetings. It was outlined that there is a need to clarify the different types of observers and what their roles and responsibilities are. We also need to clearly define what an international organization is. The SPTA agreed that further work should be done on this matter and thanked the Secretariat for initiating this work as concerns regarding observers has been raised at several CPM meetings.

The SPTA:

(22) *agrees* to the re-organization and clarification of Rules for Observers to the CPM and subsidiary body meetings and requested the Secretariat to prepare a paper for CPM.

<sup>15</sup> SPTA 2011/19

<sup>16</sup> SPTA 2011/14

<sup>17</sup> SPTA 2011/13

## 12. AQUATIC SPECIES

The Secretariat presented the paper<sup>18</sup> regarding the consideration of aquatic plants within the IPPC. Aquatic plants are within the scope of the IPPC, though there were some concerns about which aquatic plants are included (algae, etc.) and the real issue was more on the application of the IPPC in this regard (e.g. if NPPOs feel they are responsible for aquatic plants and many NPPOs have limited experience in dealing with them). This is where there could be gaps in the system which should be further analyzed. However, there were different ideas about how aquatic plants should be addressed, if this was an immediate priority or if a technical consultation was the best way forward. In general, the SPTA felt this was an important issue with an increasing profile.

It was noted it might be best to start with an analysis. In the meantime, the Secretariat should continue discussions with the CBD regarding aquatic plants. It was noted that there is a recommendation being considered by the CBD to request the IPPC to develop a standard on aquatic plants, broaden the application of the IPPC to cover algae. There was a suggestion that the IPPC Secretariat should prepare a strategy and work plan to propose to the CBD to address the issues related to aquatic plants. It was noted that both aquatic plants as crops and aquatic plants as pests should be considered and some participants felt that work already done by FAO or the International Maritime Organization (IMO) in this area should be considered.

Some felt that a guide, similar to the FAO Forestry guide on the implementation of ISPMs, might be a good way to go because it would give guidance to the various national organizations involved in management of aquatic plants.

It was felt that the IPPC should request financial assistance from the CBD to begin developing and revising standards addressing aquatic plants. It was also noted that the IRSS could possibly fund some of this work.

The SPTA agreed that a policy statement on aquatic plants was needed and that a consultant should be hired to produce a paper on this topic.

The SPTA:

- (23) *recommends* that a scoping study be developed on aquatic plants and be presented to the CPM
- (24) *recommends* that, in the future, a small ad-hoc group be formed investigate to what extent aquatic plants are already covered by the IPPC and to identify possible gaps. The CBD, IMO, FAO, etc. could be invited to participate in this ad-hoc group. The Secretariat will develop a proposal for the ad-hoc group (including background information, scope, study, etc.) and present this to the CBD and request financial support.

## 13. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

### 13.1 Call for technical resources

The Secretariat gave a verbal update on calls for technical resources. The Capacity Development group has been working closely with the Information Exchange group to develop the IPPC Secretariat Resources page where a variety of technical information will be posted such as national diagnostic protocols and technical manuals as well as some phytosanitary e-learning modules.

The SPTA questioned how the Secretariat has been collecting material for the website. The Secretariat informed the group that they had already made a call, with the guidance from the EWG on Capacity Development, and that information provided would be used to populate the IPPC Secretariat Resources page. The call resulted in about 160 documents and links. The number of submissions in response to the call was less than expected. However, the information provided looks to be very useful. The SPTA suggested that this type of information could be submitted to the Secretariat at any

---

<sup>18</sup> SPTA 2011/08

time and that a specific call might not be necessary. It was noted that a second call had been made and the deadline for submissions extended. If the response is still low, the Secretariat may contact contracting parties directly.

The SPTA:

- (25) *concludes* that the collection of phytosanitary technical resources should be continued
- (26) *requests* the EWGPCD to review and put forward the relevant material to be posted on the IPPC Secretariat Resources page.

### **13.2 Regional workshops on draft ISPMs**

It was noted that the regional workshops were very successful this year and, with the help of the OCS, generated and shared workshop comments with the participants. It was also noted that seven workshops were held, in spite of the Secretariat's limited resources for this purpose.

There was concern that there was not an SC member present at each workshops and it was suggested to install a rule that at least one SC member should be present. It was noted the CPM can encourage the presence of SC members at workshops, but not force them to attend. It was proposed that the SC members could attend these workshops by using funding from the workshop organizers.

The Secretariat noted that there needed to be more oversight of the agendas and the content of future workshops. The 2012 budget should include resources for all the regional workshops planned for 2012.

## **14. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **14.1 IPPC budget**

The Secretariat presented the IPPC Secretariat financial report for 2011 and the budget for 2012. The SPTA was very pleased with the detailed reports. Because the SPTA is responsible for reviewing the budget of the IPPC Trust Fund, the SPTA requested that written information on the financial report for 2011 and the budget for 2012 be distributed and in the future presented as a working paper in advance.

The Secretariat stated that the IPPC Capacity Development trust fund is also now established, but that contributions can only be used for capacity development.

The 2012 budget was discussed and it was noted that the regular budget should be in relation to the overall activities. Staff costs are high and the CPM meeting costs over USD 600 000 for non-staff expenditures. One participant raised concern about the amount of staff costs coming out of the regular programme because it leaves fewer funds for operations. The acting coordinator reminded the SPTA that this was a decision from some years ago: no programmes could be delivered without adequate staff. There was also concern about the funding of technical panels (TP), because there are five TPs but funds are not allocated for all five TP to meet in person. The TPs have expressed frustration that meetings are being cancelled and they have noted that if TP meetings are again cancelled in 2012, then the programme should end.

### **14.2 Australia Papers**

Ms Ransom (Australia) presented the discussion papers<sup>19</sup> from Australia.

#### ***The IPPC Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement***

It was noted that there is a current official dispute but that there are no Secretariat resources available to facilitate the IPPC Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement (SBDS) process. The Secretariat noted that the 2012 SBDS meeting will be held with the meeting objective to review the SBDS process and

<sup>19</sup> SPTA 2011/16, 17

provide suggestions for improvement. However, some participants were concerned that the SBDS process should not be revised until a dispute had been sent through the process.

The SPTA noted the SBDS system was originally created to assist NPPOs with technical difficulties but some national stakeholders felt that the WTO-SPS is a more comfortable platform to address any dispute instead of the IPPC.

The SPTA

(27) *recommends* the SBDS reviews the four points raised by Australia and relates SBDS activities with the IRSS activities. The review should be initiated next year.

### **SPTA**

Some participants considered the SPTA very important, needed to develop strategies for CPM and as a filter of items going to CPM. Also, with the participation in the SPTA being open, is a very valuable in-kind contribution to the IPPC Secretariat.

The SPTA assists the Secretariat by reviewing draft CPM documents and by identifying regional concerns and resolving potential issues. The SPTA also provides an insight into the IPPC processes and is an entry-level for future Bureau members. The Secretariat finds the work of the SPTA very helpful because it provides an opportunity to discuss strategies.

Some felt the title of the SPTA should be changed to not include Technical Assistance, which is not a specific activity of the group. It was noted that the SPTA does do some technical assistance when recommending technical consultations working groups, etc., so the title would not necessarily be changed. After further discussion, it was agreed that the central objective of this group was strategic and all areas of the Secretariat should be considered. It was concluded that this group should be called the Ad-hoc Group on Strategic Planning (SP).

The SPTA:

(28) *requests* the CPM to consider changing the name of the CPM informal working group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) to the Ad-hoc Group on Strategic Planning (SP).

### **14.3 CPM Side Sessions and Speakers**

The SPTA discussed CPM-7 (2012) side sessions and speakers.

In regards to side sessions the SPTA felt CPM members would benefit being provided an update on the progress on the draft ISPM on Sea Containers and the issues identified in the scoping study on aquatic plants.

There was a suggestion that one of the CPM evening sessions could provide an opportunity for CPM members to discuss an important issue and it was agreed that the topic should be related to the implementation of ISPM 15. 2009. *Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade.*

The content of the Thursday afternoon Science Section, to be held at CPM-7 (2012), was discussed and it was decided to allow some time for the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebrations but the SPTA also felt it would be important to provide an opportunity for CPM members to reflect on the past 60 years and discuss emerging issues.

The SPTA:

(29) *recommends* a CPM-7 (2012) side session be held on the following two topics: sea containers and aquatic plants.

(30) *recommends* a CPM-7 (2012) evening session be on the implementation of ISPM 15:2009.

(31) *recommends* a half day symposium for celebrating the IPPC's 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary and for discussing emerging issues.

#### 14.4 CPM Chairperson

There was concern about the process for the selection and rotation of the CPM Chair and Vice-Chairs as there is no written procedure. Some SPTA participants felt that this would be beneficial and would allow those involved in the IPPC to decide on the process but felt it might not be appropriate for the selection at CPM-7 (2012). It was agreed that it would be beneficial to have some discussions on this issue and to present some options for further consideration. It was also agreed that the proposed CPM Bureau TOR and ROP, that had been previously presented to the CPM should be reviewed as it was felt the CPM Bureau would benefit from established TOR and ROP.

The SPTA felt that the current Bureau members should be asked to draft such guidance but it was also noted that if the Bureau could not reach consensus, these papers could be presented by countries.

The SPTA:

(32) <i>requests</i> the Bureau to draft a paper for CPM-7 (2012) on the selection and rotation of the CPM Chair and Vice-Chairs.
---

#### 14.5 60<sup>th</sup> Anniversary celebration of the IPPC

The IPPC Secretary presented some ideas to celebrate IPPC's 60<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. He also informed the SPTA that an internal Secretariat discussion and brainstorming sessions on how to celebrate had commenced. The IPPC Secretariat requested permission from the SPTA to continue work on the 60<sup>th</sup> Anniversary celebration.

The SPTA questioned whether there would be any support from the AGPM division. The Secretariat informed the SPTA that there are no extra-budgetary funds from the division to use towards the celebration but noted that FAO might have some unspent money at the end of this biennium.

The Secretary requested further thoughts and ideas from the SPTA on how to celebrate this event.

#### 15. NEXT MEETING

The IPPC Secretary thanked all the participants for attending the meeting and for providing important feedback and suggestions on IPPC strategic issues.

The participants thanked the Chair for his efforts in running a smooth meeting.

The Chair closed the meeting.

**Annex 1 – Agenda**

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT NO</b>
<b>1. Opening of the meeting</b>	
<b>2. Adoption of the agenda</b>	SPTA 2011/01
<b>3. Housekeeping</b>	
3.1 Documents list	SPTA 2011/03
3.2 Participants list	SPTA 2011/05
3.3 Local information	SPTA 2011/02
<b>4. Bureau Update</b>	
<b>5. Secretariat's Report</b>	SPTA 2011/15
<b>6. Strategic and Medium Term Plans</b>	
6.1 CPM Strategic and Medium Term Plan	SPTA 2011/04 SPTA 2011/09
6.2 Communication Strategic and Medium Term Plan	SPTA 2011/18
6.3 Resource Mobilization Strategic and Medium Term Plan	SPTA 2011/06
6.4 Capacity Development Work Plan and Budget	SPTA 2011/10 SPTA 2011/11
<b>7. IPPC Standard Setting Focus Group</b>	
7.1 Report of the FG	<a href="https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=207776">https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=207776</a>
<b>8. Prioritization of Topics and Priorities in the IPPC Standard Setting Programme</b>	SPTA 2011/07
<b>9. Article XIV Body Update</b>	SPTA 2011/19
<b>10. IPPC Partnership Programme</b>	SPTA 2011/14
<b>11. Rules for Observers at CPM and subsidiary body meetings</b>	SPTA 2011/13
<b>12. Aquatic Species</b>	SPTA 2011/08
<b>13. Capacity Development</b>	
13.1 Call for technical resources	
13.2 Draft ISPM Workshops	
<b>14. Other business</b>	SPTA 2011/16 SPTA 2011/17
<b>15. Next meeting</b>	

**Annex 2 – Documents List**

<b>DOCUMENT NUMBER SPTA 2011/XX</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TITLE</b>	<b>DATE POSTED</b>
01	2	Provisional agenda (updated regularly)	28-09-2011
02	3.3	Local information	28-09-2011
03	3.1	Documents list (updated regularly)	28-09-2011
04	6.1	CPM Strategic and Medium Term Plan	25-08-2011
05	3.2	Participants list-DRAFT	27-09-2011
06	6.3	Resource Mobilization for the IPPC	22-09-2011
07	8	Prioritization of Topics and Priorities in the IPPC Standard Setting Programme	25-09-2011
08	12	Aquatic species	25-09-2011
09	6.1	FAO Strategic Objectives and Work Planning	27-09-2011
10	6.4	Capacity Development Work Plan and Budget	28-09-2011
11	6.4	Oversight Body on Capacity Development	28-09-2011
12	7.1	Report of the FG	27-09-2011
13	11	Rules for Observers at CPM and subsidiary body meetings	28-09-2011
14	10	IPPC Partnership Programme	29-09-2011
15	5	Summary Monitoring Report for Operational Plan of Commission on Phytosanitary Measures for 2011	30-09-2011
16	14	Australian paper: SBDS	03-10-2011
17	14	Australian paper: SPTA	03-10-2011
18	6.2	Communication Strategic and Medium Term Plan	03-10-2011
19	9	Article XIV Body Update	03-10-2011

**Annex 3 - Participants List**

Member of the Bureau	<p><b>Mr Francisco GUTIERREZ</b>  Director of Plant Health  Plant Health Department  Belize Agricultural Health Authority  Central Farm, Cayo District  <b>BELIZE</b>  Tel: +501 824-4899  Mobile: (+501) 604-0319  Fax: (+501) 824-3773</p>	<a href="mailto:frankpest@yahoo.com">frankpest@yahoo.com</a>
Vice-Chairperson of the Bureau	<p><b>Ms Kyu-Ock YIM</b>  Dept. of Plant Quarantine  Animal, Plant &amp; Fisheries Quarantine &amp; Inspection Agency  MIFAFF  <b>KOREA, REPUBLIC OF</b>  Tel: (+82) 31-420-7605  Fax: (+82) 31-420-7605</p>	<a href="mailto:koyim@korea.kr">koyim@korea.kr</a>
Member of the Bureau	<p><b>Mr John HEDLEY</b>  Principal Adviser, International Organisations  International Policy  Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  Pastoral House 25 The Terrace  PO Box 2526 Wellington  <b>NEW ZEALAND</b>  Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428  Fax: (+64) 4 894 0736  Mobile: (+64) 29894 0428</p>	<a href="mailto:john.hedley@maf.govt.nz">john.hedley@maf.govt.nz</a>
Vice-Chairperson of the Bureau	<p><b>Mr Steve ASHBY</b>  Food and Environment Research Agency, (FERA),  DEFRA  Plant Health Policy Programme -  Sand Hutton - York  YO41 1LZ  <b>UNITED KINGDOM</b>  Tel: (+44) 1904 465633  Mobile: (+44) 7881 994770</p>	<a href="mailto:steve.ashby@fera.gsi.gov.uk">steve.ashby@fera.gsi.gov.uk</a>
Member of the Bureau	<p><b>Mr John GREIFER</b>  Associate Deputy Administrator  International Services, Animal Plant Health  Inspection Service  U.S. Department of Agriculture  RM 1132 South Building, USDA  1400 Independence Ave.  Washington, DC 20250  <b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</b>  Tel.: (+1) 202-720-7677  Fax: (+1) 202-690-2861</p>	<a href="mailto:john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov">john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov</a>



Member of the Bureau	<p><b>Mr Arundel SAKALA</b> National Coordinator Plant Quarantine and Phytosanitary Service Zambia Agriculture Research Institute Mount Makulu Research Station Private Bag 07 Chilanga <b>ZAMBIA</b> Tel: (+260) 1 278 141 / 278 130 Fax: (+260) 1 278141 / 278 130</p>	<p><a href="mailto:mwati1lango@gmail.com">mwati1lango@gmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:zaridirector@zari.gov.zm">zaridirector@zari.gov.zm</a></p>
	<p><b>Mr Diego QUIROGA</b> Director Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA Paseo Colón 315, Piso 4º Dpto. B Ciudad de Buenos Aires (1063) <b>ARGENTINA</b> Tel. (+541) 1 4121 5495/5176</p>	<p><a href="mailto:dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar">dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar</a></p>
	<p><b>Ms Lois RANSOM</b> Chief Plant Protection Officer Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry GPO Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601 <b>AUSTRALIA</b> Tel:(+61) 2 6272 4888 Fax:(+61) 2 6272 5835</p>	<p><a href="mailto:lois.ransom@daff.gov.au">lois.ransom@daff.gov.au</a></p>
	<p><b>Mr Greg STUBBINGS</b> Director, Office of the Chief Plant Health Officer Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 <b>CANADA</b> Tel:(613) 773-7247 Fax: (613) 773-7204</p>	<p><a href="mailto:Greg.Stubbings@inspection.gc.ca">Greg.Stubbings@inspection.gc.ca</a></p>
	<p><b>Mr Ebbe NORDBO</b> Frø og Planter Ministeriet for Fødevarer, Landbrug og Fiskeri Plantedirektoratet Skovbrynet 20, 2800 Kgs. Lyngby <b>DENMARK</b> Tel.: (+45) 45 26 36 00 Fax (+45) 45 26 36 10</p>	<p><a href="mailto:eno@pdir.dk">eno@pdir.dk</a></p>
	<p><b>Mr Ralf LOPIAN</b> Senior Advisor Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Department of Food and Health Mariankatu 23, Helsinki <b>FINLAND</b> Tel: (+358) 9 16052449 Fax: (+358) 9 16052443</p>	<p><a href="mailto:ralf.lopian@mmm.fi">ralf.lopian@mmm.fi</a></p>

	<p><b>Ms Sabrina PINTUS</b>  Officer of the Central Plant Health Service  General Directorate for Rural Development,  Infrastructures and Services  Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry Policy  Via XX Settembre 20  00187 Rome  <b>ITALY</b>  Tel (+39) 06 46656192  Fax (+39) 06 4881707</p>	<p><a href="mailto:s.pintus@mpaaf.gov.it">s.pintus@mpaaf.gov.it</a></p>
	<p><b>Mr Masato FUKUSHIMA</b>  Director of Plant Protection Office  Plant Protection Division  Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries  1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  Tokyo  <b>JAPAN</b>  Tel: (+81) 3-3502-5978  Fax: (+81) 3-3502-3386</p>	<p><a href="mailto:masato_fukushima@nm.maff.go.jp">masato_fukushima@nm.maff.go.jp</a></p>
	<p><b>Mr Shoichi FUJITA</b>  Plant Protection Officer  Kobe Plant Protection Station  Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries  Address; 1-1 Hatoba-chou  Tyuou-ku, Kobe  <b>JAPAN</b>  Tel: (+81) 78-331-2386  Fax: (+81) 78-391-1757</p>	<p><a href="mailto:fujitas@pps.maff.go.jp">fujitas@pps.maff.go.jp</a></p>
	<p><b>Mr James M. ONSANDO</b>  Managing Director  Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS)  P. O. Box 49592  Nairobi  <b>KENYA</b>  Tel: (+254) 020 3597201/3  Fax: (+254) 020 3536175</p>	<p><a href="mailto:director@kephis.org">director@kephis.org</a></p>
	<p><b>Ms Hongsook PARK</b>  Assistant Director  Export Management Division  Plant Quarantine Department  Animal, Plant and Fisheries Quarantine and  Inspection Agency  433-1, Anyang6-dong, Manan-gu, Anyang,  Gyeonggi-do  <b>KOREA, REPUBLIC OF</b></p>	<p><a href="mailto:hspark101@korea.kr">hspark101@korea.kr</a></p>

	<p><b>Mr Mekki CHOUIBANI</b> Executive Director of NEPPO Avenue Hadj Ahmed Cherkaoui. Agdal. Rabat <b>MOROCCO</b> Tel.: +212 (0)537766536 Tel./Fax: +212 (0)537776598 GSM: + (0) 212 673997808</p>	<p><a href="mailto:hq.neppo@gmail.com">hq.neppo@gmail.com</a></p>
	<p><b>Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN</b> Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation Department of Agriculture, Agribusiness and Fisheries Bezuidenhoutseweg 73 Den Haag – 2500 EK <b>NETHERLANDS</b> Tel: (+31) 70 3785552 Fax:(+31) 70 3786123</p>	<p><a href="mailto:c.a.m.van.alphen@minlnv.nl">c.a.m.van.alphen@minlnv.nl</a></p>
	<p><b>Ms Olufunke Olusola AWOSUSI</b> Head, Post Entry Quarantine Inspection and Surveillance Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service Moor Plantation, P.M.B. 5672 Ibadan <b>NIGERIA</b> Tel: +234 805 9608494</p>	<p><a href="mailto:awosusifunke@yahoo.com">awosusifunke@yahoo.com</a></p>
	<p><b>Mr Javier TRUJILLO ARRIAGA</b> Director, Plant Health Officer for Mexico Secretariat of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fisheries, and Food (SAGARPA) Plant Health, Food Safety and Agricultural Food Quality National Service (SENASICA) Guillermo Pérez Valenzuela No. 127 Col. Del Carmen, Coyoacan, C. P. 04100 <b>MÉXICO</b> Tel: (+55) 5090 3000 ex 51319</p>	<p><a href="mailto:trujillo@senasica.gob.mx">trujillo@senasica.gob.mx</a></p>
	<p><b>Ms Rebecca BECH</b> Deputy Administrator APHIS' Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) Program US Department of Agriculture 1400 Independence Avenue SW Room 302-E, Washington, DC, 20250 <b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</b> Tel: (+1) 202 720 5601</p>	<p><a href="mailto:rebecca.a.bech@aphis.usda.gov">rebecca.a.bech@aphis.usda.gov</a></p>
	<p><b>Ms Jane CHARD</b> Head of Branch - Plant Health Science and Advice for Scottish Agriculture (SASA) Roddinglaw Road, Edinburgh, EH12 9FJ <b>UNITED KINGDOM</b> Tel: (+44) 131 244 8863 Fax: (+44) 131 244 8940</p>	<p><a href="mailto:Jane.Chard@sasa.gsi.gov.uk">Jane.Chard@sasa.gsi.gov.uk</a></p>

IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr. Yukio YOKOI</b> Secretary to the IPPC  <b>Mr. David NOWELL</b> Information Exchange Officer/ Acting Coordinator  <b>Mr. Brent LARSON</b> Standards Setting Officer  <b>Ms Ana PERALTA</b> Implementation Officer  <b>Mr Orlando SOSA</b> Agricultural Officer  <b>Ms Stephanie DUBON</b> Associate Professional Officer	<a href="mailto:yukio.yokoi@fao.org">yukio.yokoi@fao.org</a>  <a href="mailto:dave.nowell@fao.org">dave.nowell@fao.org</a>  <a href="mailto:brent.larson@fao.org">brent.larson@fao.org</a>  <a href="mailto:ana.peralta@fao.org">ana.peralta@fao.org</a>  <a href="mailto:orlando.sosa@fao.org">orlando.sosa@fao.org</a>  <a href="mailto:stephanie.dubon@fao.org">stephanie.dubon@fao.org</a>
Resource Person	<b>Mr Craig FEDCHOCK</b> Consultant	<a href="mailto:craig@fedchock.com">craig@fedchock.com</a>
Resource Person	<b>Ms Marta MASQUE BARRI</b> Consultant	<a href="mailto:martamasquebarri@gmail.com">martamasquebarri@gmail.com</a>