



International Plant Protection Convention
Protecting the world's plant resources from pests

Rome, Italy
3-7 December 2012

Report of the 1st Meeting of the IPPC Capacity Development Committee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| I. | Opening of the Meeting | 3 |
| II. | Adoption of the Agenda | 3 |
| III. | Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur | 3 |
| IV. | Update from the IPPC Secretariat | 3 |
| | Agenda Item 1: Work Plan and Strategies..... | 4 |
| 1.1 | Operationalization of the IPPC Capacity Development Committee (CDC) | 4 |
| 1.2 | Procedural issues..... | 4 |
| 1.3 | Preparation of a long-term work plan | 7 |
| | Agenda Item 2: Capacity Development Activities | 8 |
| 2.1 | STDF Project 350 “Global Phytosanitary Manuals, Standard Operating Procedures and Training Kits Project” | 8 |
| 2.2 | STDF Project 401 “Training of Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) Facilitators” ... | 10 |
| 2.3 | STDF Project 402 “Training of trainers for Phytosanitary Capacity Development” | 11 |
| 2.4 | Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) | 11 |
| | Agenda Item 3: Creation of new proposals..... | 12 |
| 3.1. | ISPM No. 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) | 12 |
| 3.2 | Project and Activities Proposals | 13 |
| 3.3 | Other Proposals..... | 13 |
| | Agenda Item 4: Information and decisions | 13 |
| 4.1 | Phytosanitary Technical Resources web page | 13 |
| 4.2 | Compiled phytosanitary technical resources | 14 |
| | Agenda Item 5: Any Other Matters..... | 14 |
| 5.1 | Regional workshops on draft ISPMs..... | 14 |
| 5.2 | Consideration of Technical Manuals..... | 15 |
| V. | Date and venue of the next meeting | 16 |
| VI. | Review and adoption of the report..... | 16 |
| | APPENDIX 1: Agenda | 17 |
| | APPENDIX 2: List of Participants..... | 19 |
| | APPENDIX 3: Functions of the CDC Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur | 23 |
| | APPENDIX 4: CDC procedures and criteria for the production and oversight of technical resources .. | 24 |

I. OPENING OF THE MEETING

The Secretary of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), Mr Yukio Yukoi, welcomed all participants to the first meeting of the Capacity Development Committee (CDC). He noted the importance of collaboration to develop phytosanitary capacity on national, regional, and global levels and that collaboration is essential to use limited resources more efficiently. The Secretary gratefully thanked the Italian Directorate of Rural Development Office V in Rome, Italy for hosting the meeting. He noted that this was one of the first IPPC meetings to take place in Rome outside of the FAO, and welcomed Italy's contributions to organizing the event.

The Director of the Italian Directorate of Rural Development Office V (Plant Production and Protection), Mr Bruno Faraglia, welcomed the group. He highlighted this launch of the committee as well as the IPPC's 60 Year Anniversary in 2012 as milestones for the global framework to prevent pest introduction and spread on a global level. He recalled that Italy has had significant experiences with plant pests such as the red palm weevil, and based on this recognizes the importance of prevention in plant health. He also noted that Italy has developed a strong national system for implementing ISPM No. 15 on wood packaging material.

The IPPC Capacity Development Officer (CD Officer) expressed her gratitude to the Secretariat's administrative team for arranging for the meeting during a complex transition to the Food and Agriculture Organization's new administrative system. The IPPC Secretariat noted this inaugural meeting as a significant step for capacity development in the IPPC framework, and announced that press releases had been issued by the IPPC and FAO.

The IPPC Secretariat informed the participants of logistical arrangements for the meeting, including a dinner to celebrate the launch of the CDC.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The IPPC Secretariat presented the agenda, which was adopted by the meeting participants without modification (Appendix 1).

All participants introduced themselves and briefly described their background and expertise, which ranged from technical to managerial. A list of participants and their contact details are included in this report (Appendix 2).

III. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSON AND RAPPORTEUR

The IPPC Secretariat invited the participants to nominate a chairperson and vice-chairperson for the Capacity Development Committee (CDC). The members selected Mr Corne van Alphen as the chairperson and Ms Nagat Mubarak El Tayeb as the vice-chairperson. Ms Shelia Harvey was selected as the rapporteur. The group noted that the responsibilities of the chairperson, vice chairperson and rapporteur would be reviewed under agenda item 1.2 (Procedural Issues).

IV. UPDATE FROM THE IPPC SECRETARIAT

The CD Officer provided the CDC members with updates on Secretariat finances and staffing, and introduced new members of the Secretariat's capacity development team:

- Mr Yuji Kitahara joined the Capacity Development team as a long-term secondment from the Japanese government. The Secretariat expressed the importance of long term staffing to the functioning of the Secretariat and thanked Japan for this contribution of a 2-year, extendable commitment.

- A new consultant, Ms Sonya Hammons, will support the Capacity Development team to manage projects.
- Mr Washington Otieno has been rehired as a consultant to manage projects.

The CD Officer informed the group that the short term consultants are funded through the Australian trust fund, and that additional staffing is funded through revenue generated by IPPC Secretariat expertise that is provided to FAO technical assistance projects.

The CD Officer noted that FAO is in the process of redeveloping its strategic objectives, and that the Secretariat will evaluate how to incorporate the IPPC and its capacity development activities into the broader FAO framework. She highlighted that the IPPC has actively presented concept notes for additional funding to support the capacity development work plan, and that in the future the CDC's input will be requested for project proposals.

Several CDC members expressed appreciation for the update on the specific roles of the new staff, and noted their support for the strategic planning of future funding to fit into long term plans.

AGENDA ITEM 1: WORK PLAN AND STRATEGIES

1.1 Operationalization of the IPPC Capacity Development Committee (CDC)

The list of CDC members and alternates was presented to the group. It was noted that almost all of the members and alternates had submitted the required statements of commitment and that those remaining would be submitted shortly. It was noted that in this first meeting of the CDC, the members of the expert working group on capacity development (EWGCD) were also present and participating. The CD Officer highlighted that, while the seven CDC members come from all seven FAO regions, they were selected based on their expertise in capacity development rather than through a diplomatic representation process.

The chairperson reminded the group that several regions still need to nominate alternate members for the CDC.

One member asked for clarification of how an alternate would be replaced, if necessary. The CD Officer noted that the Bureau had made the original selection of members, therefore a region could present the need to replace an alternate to the Secretariat who would then communicate this to the Bureau. It was emphasized that the nomination of alternate CDC members does not need to be discussed at the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM).

1.2 Procedural issues

1.2.1 Role of CDC Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur

The group reviewed a paper on proposed roles of the chairperson, vice-chairperson and rapporteur. The group agreed that the CDC would elect its chairperson and vice-chairperson from among its membership. The group determined that it was not necessary to pre-define whether a developing and developed country representative should be in the roles of chair and vice-chair, as these roles would be selected based on expertise rather than political representation. It was agreed that the chairperson of the CDC would assist the Secretariat to develop the CPM papers related to capacity development. The agreed functions of the chair, vice-chair and rapporteur are included in Appendix 3.

1.2.2 Procedural issues resulting from Bureau and CPM decisions

The IPPC Secretariat presented a paper on outstanding procedural issues for the CDC to address during the meeting, including decisions from the Bureau's June 2012 meeting and the 2012 CPM. The group addressed these issues as outlined below.

1.2.3 Roles of the CDC and Standards Committee in implementation

The Bureau discussed the roles of the CDC and Standards Committee (SC) with regard to implementation at its June 2012 meeting. The Bureau agreed that the SC role is to develop new standards, and that implementation of standards falls within the Capacity Development area of the IPPC. That said, the Bureau also agreed that the SC should ensure that the standards in development are clear to understand and feasible to implement. However, development of training materials would not be considered part of the SC's responsibilities.

International standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs) are developed by drafting groups (ongoing technical panels or ad hoc expert working groups), supervised by the SC. These drafting groups will be requested to identify possible limitations to implementation of new ISPMs during the drafting process, and this information will be transmitted to the SC. If the SC considers the implementation concerns to be relevant, it will forward this information to the IPPC Secretariat for their consideration and presentation to the CDC if appropriate.

In this way, implementation can be considered early in the process of developing new standards. For ISPMs that have already been adopted, the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) analyzes the challenges of implementation and recommends actions. The recommendations related to capacity development will be presented to the CDC.

This clarification of the roles between the SC and the CDC ensures that the CDC will address issues in which enhanced capacity will enable implementation of a standard. Issues related to lack of clarity in a standard and/or operational issues that would not be improved through capacity development will not be tabled for the CDC to discuss. The CDC members noted that implementation issues that the drafting groups and SC identify will filter through the Secretariat. The CDC expressed support for this process as a way to promote interaction between standards development and implementation.

A member asked for clarification with regard to whether the CDC could provide comments on draft standards before adoption. The CD Officer noted that this had not been discussed previously, but may be possible. She noted that electronic communication among CDC members would be the preferred method for coordinating these comments.

1.2.4 Frequency of CDC meetings

The CD Officer suggested that the group conduct face-to-face meetings twice per year, and to work on an ongoing basis using electronic communication and teleconferences. The group agreed to a provisional schedule of meetings as follows:

- face-to-face meetings: May and November annually
- teleconferences: before CPM, before the May CDC meeting, approximately July, and before the November CDC meeting
- electronic communication: ongoing, as needed.

The group agreed that identification of an agenda and key discussion issues in advance of teleconferences would be helpful in order to prepare input in advance.

1.2.5 Observers

The group discussed its perspective on observers, recognizing the value of having an open forum. The group also noted the challenges to manage an expert meeting with a large number of participants, as well as potential proprietary concerns with including non-members in discussions of

sensitive information related to some agenda items. It was noted that the CPM rule on observers apply only to the CPM, and that other bodies must develop their own rules on the matter. It was noted that observer status applies to an institution, while “invited experts” are invited in their personal capacity and their participation must be approved by the group’s members.

The group agreed that the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) Secretariat should be a permanent observer to the CDC, meaning that a separate invitation need not be issued for each meeting. As of now, the STDF is the only organization with permanent observer status to the CDC. The group agreed to address rules on observers in a more general way at a future meeting.

1.2.6 Decision-making

The group agreed to operate based on consensus and that the meeting report would describe the differing views when agreement was not reached. One participant noted that achieving consensus can be challenging, and may slow decisions and distract from the group’s intent to produce results. The group agreed that if the areas of disagreement are technical in nature, that invited experts may provide a useful perspective. It was noted that teleconferences can be useful to identify potential areas of non-agreement before the meeting, thus allowing time to coordinate the input of an invited expert if necessary. It was noted that the role of the chairperson would include facilitation of discussions to achieve consensus whenever possible during CDC discussions.

1.2.7 Confidentiality/privacy

The group discussed the confidential and/or private nature of some of the meeting content (for example: information in project proposals, Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) results, experts' contact information, specifications for lab equipment, etc). It was noted that the CDC reports will be public, therefore sensitive information will be maintained separately for the CDC members only. One participant noted that in the IPPC Financial Committee the members clearly note what information is confidential. The CDC members agreed that they would each be responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of sensitive information discussed through the Committee’s work.

The members specifically identified the following types of information as confidential: PCE results (which would be available to CDC members only with the relevant country’s permission), consultants’ personal information, trademarked info/business practices/other proprietary information, and text of projects in preparation.

1.2.8 Development of Technical Resources

The CDC discussed procedures and criteria for the production and oversight of technical resources for capacity development such as manuals, standard operating procedures and training materials. Due to different origins of the technical resources (some of which were developed by national agencies and submitted in response to the Secretariat’s call for technical resources), some resources will be reviewed and noted by the CDC but not formally approved. CPM-7 (2012) requested information on how the CDC will “review and note” these technical resources that are not developed with IPPC involvement. It was noted that more experience would be beneficial in order to develop a detailed process, but that an initial plan could be established and presented to the CPM through the Secretariat’s report to CPM (see Appendix 4).

The group reviewed the criteria for development of technical resources that the EWGCD had discussed at its June 2012 meeting. The group agreed that the criteria was a checklist and that the criteria were not weighted.

The Secretariat has begun to publish technical resources on the <http://www.phytosanitary.info> website based on the criteria of exemptions that the EWGCD had agreed upon (for example, bilateral agreements, diagnostic protocols, etc are not reviewed by the CDC).

The criteria for development of resources will be useful for the manuals to be produced in the future.

1.2.9 Reporting to the CPM

The Bureau clarified at its November 2012 meeting that since the CDC is a committee but not a subsidiary body, it should not report directly to the CPM. Therefore, the report of the CDC and all past CDC activities will be included in the IPPC Secretariat's report to the CPM. Future activities and plans for the CDC will be reported in a separate CPM paper and agenda item on Capacity Development.

The CD Officer noted that subsidiary bodies extend a standing invitation to a Bureau member to participate in meetings, but that the CDC is not a subsidiary body. The CDC noted the value of the Bureau's involvement in broader IPPC discussions, and welcomed the participation of a Bureau member at CDC meetings.

1.2.10 Implementation Review and Support System Triennial Review

Group

The Secretariat reminded the group that the IRSS is an EU-funded project to analyse the implementation of the IPPC and provide a help desk and recommended actions to assist with implementation. This project will produce an implementation report every three years that includes conclusions from analyses of ISPMs, data from IPP training, and studies such as those completed on aquatic plants and e-commerce. The IRSS Triennial Review Group (TRG) was established in March 2012 and will provide guidance to develop the triennial IRSS report. The group includes representatives of CPM subsidiary bodies, the Bureau and the core group members of the IPPC Secretariat. The triennial review group meets once a year, just before CPM. Although the CDC is not an official subsidiary body, it has been invited to participate in the Triennial Review Group in order to link capacity development with the IRSS' work on implementation. Ms Shelia Harvey had represented the EWG on Capacity Development on the triennial review group in 2012, and the CDC agreed for Ms Harvey to continue represent the CDC at future triennial review group meetings.

1.3 Preparation of a long-term work plan

The chairperson and CD Officer introduced the topic, noting that the goal would be to develop a long term work plan for the CDC that integrates relevant elements of the IPPC Strategic Framework, the IPPC Capacity Development Strategy, and builds upon the Capacity Development Short Term Work Plan that was developed in 2010.

Regarding the specific meaning of "long term", the group agreed that the plan should extend to the same time frame as the IPPC strategic framework (2019), and that a short-medium term work plan would be developed to provide benchmarks for success towards the long term plan. The group agreed that the final version should be as user-friendly as possible in order to communicate the CDC's plans clearly to the Bureau, the CPM and donors.

The group reviewed the long term work plan that had been agreed upon as part of the IPPC Capacity Development Strategy (Table 3 of the EWGCD May 2012 report), and compared these activities with the content of the IPPC Strategic Framework (available at: https://www.ippc.int/file_uploaded/1344410402_IPPC_StrategicFramework_e_W.pdf). After some discussion, the group agreed that the long term work plan as originally drafted fit well within the IPPC Strategic Framework, as all of the capacity development activities listed contributed to the IPPC strategic objectives to develop phytosanitary capacity for members (D), enhance food security (A), protect biodiversity (B), and facilitate economic development (C). Therefore, close cooperation/collaboration is needed between the IPPC's capacity development activities and other work areas of the IPPC, in particular standard setting and information exchange. The group also

reviewed the EWG CD's short term work plan and identified which activities should be considered long term or ongoing activities.

The group reviewed the long term work plan and agreed to send additional specific comments to the Secretariat by the end of 2012. The Secretariat, chair and other interested CDC members would then finalize a revised version for circulation among CDC members and presentation to the CPM-8 (2013). The work plan will fit within the strategic areas of the approved capacity development strategy, and will be a living document that will be a recurring agenda item of the CDC meetings for regular updating.

The CDC agreed to review the capacity development strategy mid-way through the long term planning cycle, in 2016.

AGENDA ITEM 2: CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

2.1 STDF Project 350 "Global Phytosanitary Manuals, Standard Operating Procedures and Training Kits Project"

The Secretariat introduced a paper on the background, status and next steps for the project STDF 350 "Global Phytosanitary Manuals, Standard Operating Procedures and Training Kits". The Secretariat reminded the group that this project had been developed through the EWG on Capacity Development to create technical resources that would fill gaps in resources to assist with phytosanitary capacity development and implementation of the IPPC. The list of resources to be developed was established based on criteria for prioritization that the EWG CD agreed on at their May 2012 meeting. The intent was to avoid overlapping with the resources that had been gathered through the call for technical resources (this permanent call was initially issued in July 2012), and to focus on key issues for IPPC implementation such as establishing a National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO).

The Secretariat noted that at the May 2012 meeting, the EWGCD had agreed to forward suggestions of possible consultants to the Secretariat. Up until the December 2012 meeting, approximately 20 potential collaborators had been identified. The Secretariat again encouraged the CDC to send suggestions of collaborators, and noted that regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) had also been requested to make suggestions. The Secretariat noted that it was maintaining a file of the possible collaborators, and that potential collaborators would be able to indicate their interest directly through the online roster of consultants when that system is launched.

It was clarified that incorporating a consultant into the roster in no way indicates an offer or likelihood of contractual work, and that a range of arrangements, including in-kind contributions of human resources, would be pursued. In addition, the Secretariat noted that the terms of reference would provide the basis of the selection of consultants and service providers, and encouraged the CDC to review the terms of reference carefully to ensure that the content and expertise reflected the intended outcomes of the projects accurately. Finally, it was clarified that the task of developing these technical resources may involve groups of consultants or other service providers such as academic institutions. Some CDC members asked how the consultants would be selected. The Secretariat clarified that selections would be made based on the requirements listed in the terms of reference and the content of the experts' CVs.

Work Plan

The group reviewed a work plan for the STDF project 350 and noted the high volume of work required to produce 20 technical resources within the project period (2014). Some members expressed concern for quality while working on such a compressed schedule, while others noted that the information for many of these resources were already well developed. The group discussed the possibility of requesting an extension from the STDF, as well as prioritizing some of the technical

resources to be developed first and to proceed with others in phases. It was noted that the resources would in many cases be developed by a number of collaborators, and that due to their availability the timeline would inevitably be staggered so that not all of the resources would require comments from the CDC simultaneously. Finally the CDC agreed to proceed with the original timeframe of developing 20 resources by the conclusion of the project period, with a view to evaluate the status at the next CDC meeting. The CDC would then decide whether to request additional time by the STDF's extension deadline of October 2013.

The CDC agreed that it would like to provide input to the draft technical resources both at an early stage in which a service provider has produced an outline, as well as on a more developed stage of the draft. The Secretariat reminded the group that this input would be extremely valuable, and would also require significant commitment in order to review at least two phases of 20 resources during the next year. It was agreed that these consultations would take place primarily through electronic communication, and that deadlines for comments would be set by the Secretariat with agreement from the CDC chairperson, acknowledging that more complex documents may require a longer period of time for comments. The Secretariat encouraged CDC members to consult with other experts in their networks during this comment period, and the CDC agreed. It was agreed that lack of response to the request for comments would be considered support for the document without modification.

Information kit on pest risk analysis

The CDC reviewed in detail the terms of reference for a service provider to develop advocacy materials on pest risk analysis. The group noted that the purpose and content of this technical resource had evolved. Initially this had been envisaged as a basic course on pest risk analysis, while as currently drafted it focused on communicating the importance of pest risk analysis as a basis of the IPPC framework and the value of investing in the systems required for pest risk analysis. The group agreed with this approach, noting that messaging on the value of pest risk analysis for high-level policymakers as well as private sector stakeholders would be useful, and agreed on a refined version of the terms of reference. The Secretariat encouraged the CDC members to contribute resources on cost/benefit analyses and other justifications for investment in pest risk analysis that can be used as a basis to develop this resource.

The Secretariat noted that the International Advisory Group on Pest Risk Analysis (IAGPRA) had actively contributed to this set of terms of reference, and expressed gratitude for this valuable contribution. The Secretariat encouraged the CDC to consider other networks of experts that could contribute expertise to the development of technical resources under this project.

The group discussed the value of having these resources available in languages other than English, and noted that language issues had been discussed at CPM-7 (2012). The representative from the STDF noted that the STDF project review committee tends to consider requests for additional funds for a project as a flaw in the project design, and may impact the review of other projects that have been submitted by the same institution. The Secretariat recommended that other sources for funding for translation be pursued, and advised that it was actively pursuing options in this regard.

It was suggested that the CDC consider how to encourage and monitor the use of these technical resources.

Manual on dielectric heating

The Secretariat noted that the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments and International Forest Research Quarantine Group had collaborated on development of guidance information on dielectric heating. It was noted that a company involved in the development of data for studies on dielectric heating was based in Italy. It was noted that this treatment is considered to be effective and will likely be adopted by the CPM in the near future. Some members questioned whether a manual should be produced prior to a treatment's adoption by the CPM. The Secretariat emphasized that

although this treatment is not yet approved by the CPM or being used on a commercial scale, the CPM is interested in actively pursuing alternatives to methyl bromide for treatment of wood packaging material.

The CDC agreed to review the draft guidance and provide comments on its relevance and appropriateness, as well as suggestions for improvements, by the end of January 2013.

Manual on surveillance

The IRSS officer reviewed the outputs of the global symposium on surveillance hosted by the Republic of Korea, the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission and the IPPC in November 2012. This symposium included participation from FAO, the IPPC and country and regional representatives to discuss the results of the global survey on ISPM No. 6 (Guidelines for surveillance) and ways forward to strengthen implementation of surveillance systems. The Secretariat noted that this process of hosting a workshop to draft the outline for a manual based on IRSS analysis was an effective process and produced a high quality product.

The symposium considered that a manual on surveillance would be a valuable global resource, and prepared a detailed table of contents as a structured outline for what a manual on this topic should include. This draft structure took a variety of experiences and development levels into account. The symposium participants envisioned that the manual would be a non-prescriptive template that could be adapted to the national context.

The Secretariat noted that this technical resource would be a complex project, and that prioritization of the many elements may be needed as there may not be sufficient funding in STDF 350 to support development of all elements of this tool. The CDC noted Australia's interest in developing existing resources to include elements identified by the symposium. In addition, New Zealand has offered to contribute in-kind matching resources to develop the sections on diagnostics. The Secretariat indicated that it would explore the development of the manuals, taking into account the offers from Australia and New Zealand, within the framework of the agreed manual outline prepared at the symposium.

The CDC agreed that this would be a valuable technical resource to develop and that the Secretariat should explore options on how to move forward. Two CDC members emphasized that this resources would be extremely useful and valuable for their regions. The Secretariat then encouraged the CDC members to suggest specific existing resources that could contribute to this resource.

2.2 STDF Project 401 "Training of Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) Facilitators"

The CD Officer reminded the group that this project proposal for training of PCE facilitators had been submitted to the STDF. The STDF conditionally approved the project and provided specific areas for the Secretariat to strengthen prior to the project being contracted. In addition, the STDF clarified that future IPPC projects could be submitted directly with the IPPC as the applicant, rather than submitted through developing countries. Future IPPC project proposals submitted to the STDF will be evaluated by an independent expert appointed by the STDF Secretariat. The IPPC Secretariat expressed appreciation for this clarification of the process for the future. It was noted that the STDF funding is limited at this time and that approved projects will be contracted on a first-come-first-serve basis.

The CD Officer discussed the specific comments from the STDF Secretariat. For example, the STDF recommended that the proposal include relevant lessons learned from the OIE's training of Performance of Veterinary Services (PVS) facilitators, clarify criteria for selection of participants and selection of countries for national workshops, and revise of the budget. The EWGCD had in the past analyzed that the nature and operational details of the PVS and PCE tools were so different that it was not possible to apply relevant experiences and lessons learned across these tools. The primary

differences are related to the objectives, format, procedures for application, ownership of the data and financial issues. The CDC agreed that, due to many differences between the PCE and PVS tools, it would not be relevant to include lessons learned from the PVS experience, however it was agreed to indicate this reasoning in the text of the project proposal.

The group reviewed suggested modifications to the project proposal with regard to identification of candidates and indicators to measure long term success of the project, and agreed with these changes.

2.3 STDF Project 402 “Training of trainers for Phytosanitary Capacity Development”

The Secretariat received comments from the STDF on this project proposal.

The representative from the STDF provided context on the STDF’s comments, noting that there was particular concern about the sustainability of a training of trainers program. For example, it was suggested that more consideration be given on how to evaluate, maintain and improve the competencies of trained trainers, and how to ensure that trainers of trainers will continue to be active.

One CDC member highlighted the success of a collaboration in her region in which the lead institutions ensure that the trained trainers do in fact lead training activities when they return home. The IPPC Secretariat noted the importance of identifying concrete activities in which trained trainers can contribute soon after training. The Secretariat also noted that the roster of consultants will make these trainers accessible to be engaged for other projects, and that the roster can indicate which trainers have been accredited as master trainers. The Secretariat noted that it would like to avoid regional specialization of trainers, as sharing experiences across regions can be valuable. Finally, it was noted that as the lead in phytosanitary capacity development, the IPPC Secretariat is in a good position to engage master trainers in future activities.

The Secretariat expressed gratitude to the four countries that had submitted the project proposal to the STDF and would inform the countries that the revised version would be submitted to the STDF by the IPPC Secretariat.

2.4 Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)

The IRSS Officer presented an update of IRSS activities since initiation of the project.

The Secretariat indicated that there are two ongoing surveys, one on ISPM No. 13 (Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action) and the other a larger survey on the IPPC and its standards, the latter with a deadline of 15 February 2013. Results of the analysis of these surveys will be presented at CPM-8 (2013) as information papers. In relation to the larger survey on the IPPC and its standards, the Secretariat emphasized that data from this survey would be extremely valuable as a baseline for future comparison should the IRSS be extended through a second cycle. It was also noted that under the new FAO strategic planning processes the type of data produced by the IRSS could be very useful for developing scorecards to gauge improvements and the general level of implementation of contracting parties. These indicators could support IPPC's efforts in resource mobilization and to ensure strong coordination with FAO activities.

The IRSS officer indicated that drafting of the questionnaires for ISPM Nos. 17 (Pest Reporting) and ISPM No. 19 (Guidelines on lists of regulated pests) were well underway and that feedback on them will be sought from the CDC, SC and TRG within the first quarter of 2013. The surveys are projected to be launched to contracting parties for their responses during the mid-year period in 2013.

The Secretariat went on to make several presentations as follows:

A compilation in tabular format of recommendations for possible capacity development activities based on IRSS analyses of ISPM Nos. 4, 6, 8, 13, additional studies done on aquatic plants and internet trade in plants as well as observations made by participants at a 2005 workshop on ISPM 15 has been developed. With the exception of ISPM No. 13, the recommendations presented were the same as those shared with the EWGCD in May 2012. The IRSS officer encouraged the CDC to consider these recommendations particularly in light of the development of its short and long term work programme. The table of recommendations will be presented to CPM- 8 (2013) for information and consideration.

A presentation was made on a revamped IRSS webpage that showcases the major features of the programme that include an activities and document repository, the IRSS Helpdesk including the newly designed Question and Answer Forum, the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) and the link to the Phytosanitary resources page. Under the Q&A Forum, the IRSS Officer demonstrated the overall functionality of this feature, and encouraged NPPOs and others to participate and promote this. Several participants agreed that these features offered significant opportunities for collaboration and strengthened efficiency.

The ISPM No. 13 survey was conducted at the request of the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement (SBDS), the results of which will be used as a basis to revise the role and function of the SBDS. While the survey and analysis was completed within the timeframe requested, the SBDS meeting to consider the results was postponed to the first quarter of 2013. In light of the postponement, the IRSS extended the survey until December 2012 to allow more NPPOs to contribute their responses. An initial report has been drafted based on responses received to date but a final version will be prepared in time for the SBDS meeting tentatively rescheduled for February 2013. The Secretariat presented a preliminary analysis based on current available data compiled from 50 country responses. The results indicated that weak information exchange between countries was a major limiting factor in communication of significant non-compliance, as were difficulties in retrieving phytosanitary import requirements, and the frequently ad-hoc nature of responding to cases of non-compliance. Concrete actions recommended by the CDC included: planning of workshops/trainings on how to apply ISPM No. 13 (with a focus on operations) and the development of standard operating procedures and other guidance materials in regards to notifications. The CDC also proposed making a call to NPPOs to provide examples of their notification formats for conversion into generic template which could be posted on the phytosanitary resources page for use as reference material by other countries.

The group had an extensive discussion on other options for capacity development to support implementation without overlapping with information exchange obligations under the IPPC. The STDF representative reported that, in line with the rapid progress of the WTO trade facilitation negotiations, the STDF is planning to work on linkages between trade facilitation and Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) issues in 2013. The group discussed options of how to contribute to this initiative while conveying the message that efficient trade should not come at the expense of increased risk. The IPPC Secretariat agreed to keep the CDC informed of developments related to this topic. A discussion on the "single window" model of import regulation emerged and was added to agenda item 3.3.

AGENDA ITEM 3: CREATION OF NEW PROPOSALS

3.1. ISPM No. 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade)

The CD Officer provided background information on the registration of the ISPM No. 15 mark. It was noted that the IPPC has encouraged contracting parties to register and maintain registration of the ISPM No. 15 mark in its countries to ensure the mark's integrity, but that the IPPC cannot manage or calculate registration costs as these depend on complex external legal processes. A project proposal

on activities to develop operational capacity for implementation of ISPM No. 15 is in the planning stages. The CDC members were asked to clarify whether the cost of registering the mark should be included in the budget of the proposal. The participants were reminded that the IPPC considers registration of the mark a national responsibility and that the costs can be extremely unpredictable, and that the original intent of the project was to strengthen operational capacities. The CDC members agreed that the cost of the registration of the mark should not be included in the cost of the project. An initial version of the project proposal on ISPM No. 15 will be presented in the next meeting of the CDC in May 2013.

3.2 Project and Activities Proposals

The Secretariat noted that the CDC is a new structure of the CPM, and that the Secretariat looks forward to working closely with the CDC to collaborate on future proposals for funding to support the capacity development work plan.

The Secretariat noted that it had proposed several project proposals to the European Commission during the past year and presented one of the proposals as an example. The CD Officer asked the CDC to consider whether the format of these proposals could be used as a basis for a databank of project concepts to be developed in the future. The CDC agreed to consider this and to include the development of projects and activities as a standing agenda item at the next meeting.

A meeting participant presented a draft project proposal for submission to the STDF on information systems for surveillance and pest reporting and requested CDC input to ensure that the proposal was going in an appropriate direction. The group offered suggestions for improvement, and two of the participants agreed to collaborate on a revised version. The CDC agreed to send comments on the revised version by the end of December 2012 to enable final submission by the applicant in mid-January 2013.

3.3 Other Proposals

The group discussed the relevance of the “single window” model of import regulation in which customs, SPS and other relevant agencies operate jointly to facilitate efficient import processes while minimizing risks to plant and animal health. Several participants noted the strong pressures from high-level policymakers and industry to reduce regulations in order to facilitate trade. The CDC discussed options to enhance coordination while minimizing risk. It was noted that a recurring challenge can be to ensure that NPPOs remain involved in import of all regulated articles, not just plant products. It was suggested that a video produced by the STDF Secretariat provided useful context that could be used to educate potential partners in both governments and the private sector. A participant considered that while a “one window” consolidation model could make import regulations more streamlined for the private sector, this could also incentivize importers to bypass “the window” and avoid regulation.

After an extensive discussion of how to explore the benefits and operationalization of this model, and how to empower NPPOs to operate on the same level of respect as other regulatory agencies, the group agreed to suggest a CPM side session on the “single window” model to reach NPPOs.

AGENDA ITEM 4: INFORMATION AND DECISIONS

4.1 Phytosanitary Technical Resources web page

The Secretariat presented the newly released www.phytosanitary.info site and presented the tools available on the page. The Secretariat presented the roster of consultants and explained that this

tool would allow for consultants with phytosanitary expertise to be listed on one place. Inclusion in the roster would neither guarantee employment nor indicate the IPPC's endorsement of the consultant, but would be a convenient clearinghouse.

4.2 Compiled phytosanitary technical resources

The Secretariat presented the initial website compilation of technical resources, including some that were received in response to the call for technical resources that was issued in July 2012. Some of the technical resources require review by the CDC for consistency with the IPPC, but others (such as diagnostic protocols and bilateral agreements) will be posted directly without review based on agreed criteria.

The Secretariat noted that the contracting parties had been invited to provide technical resources in any language, and that this could raise challenges for reviewing those resources for consistency with the IPPC. The Secretariat asked for guidance on how to proceed with a review of resources in other languages, specifically languages that no CDC members speak. The CDC agreed that the resources should not be posted until the Secretariat selects reviewers from NPPOs who would assist on an in-kind basis, on a flexible schedule.

It was noted that it may be useful to have a system of prioritization to review the many resources that that require review for consistency with the IPPC.

The Secretariat highlighted several materials on the website, such as the IPPC video and pest risk analysis e-learning tool as materials to use in regional workshops and for advocacy. It was noted that over 300 individuals had been trained in pest risk analysis using this e-learning tool, and that many French-speaking countries had requested for the pest risk analysis materials to be made available in their language.

The Secretariat guided the CDC members through the functionalities of [Yammer](#), an online networking tool. This tool can be used on computers and smartphones to collaboratively edit documents and hold discussion fora. This tool will be used by the CDC to provide input on draft documents such as the technical resources in development under STDF project 350. The Secretariat urged CDC members to sign up and verify that they can utilize this platform in their countries. The CDC members agreed.

The Secretariat reminded the group that at the EWGCD meeting in May 2012 the group agreed to promote the www.phytosanitary.info resource page. The Secretariat encouraged the CDC members to promote the use of the page and its resources and the members agreed.

AGENDA ITEM 5: ANY OTHER MATTERS

5.1 Regional workshops on draft ISPMs

The CD Officer reported that the Secretariat led seven regional workshops in 2012. She noted that the primary purpose of these workshops had historically been to develop comments on draft ISPMs. However, since the launch of the Online Comment System, much coordination of comments can take place remotely. She also noted that the Secretariat provides remote training on use of the online system, and that there has been extensive use of the system by contracting parties. Due to the widespread use of the system, the availability of remote training options, and the fact that only contact points or their representatives are authorized to use the system, the Secretariat does not support countries' requests for in-person training on the online comment system. This means that there is an opportunity to incorporate a broader range of topics into regional workshops beyond comments on ISPMs, and that this is extremely valuable due to the IPPC Secretariat's limited opportunities to interact directly with its members.

The CD Officer emphasized that in order to continue to use resources efficiently and ensure that the workshops are effective, workshop hosts must commit to the location, dates and duration well in advance and without last-minute modifications.

The Secretariat will present the planned content of the regional workshops to CPM-8 (2013) and will include a list of commitments to which the local organizers should agree.

The CD Officer noted that the EU trust fund supports two regional workshops per year, and requested the CDC's input on which regional workshops to fund in 2013. The group listed the seven regions and noted that there were funding challenges for regional workshops in three regions: the Caribbean (no funding identified), Central Europe/Central Asia/Caucases (no funding identified), and the Near East (partial funding only from the FAO regional office). The Secretariat suggested that splitting resources from the EU trust fund to support these three regions would be an efficient use of the funds. The CDC supported the Secretariat making this proposal to the EC.

The Secretariat asked the CDC for ideas on content of regional workshops. The Secretariat noted that the Bureau suggested including certain discussion items, such as a question about how useful the adopted diagnostic protocols have been to contracting parties. The group agreed that future IRSS surveys should include an option to suggest topics for discussion at regional workshops, as well as to identify technical resources or other capacity development actions that would enhance implementation. The group also suggested that regional workshops would be an effective venue to gain feedback on a select number of high-priority technical resources.

5.2 Consideration of Technical Manuals

The CD Officer provided background on the development of three draft manuals. She noted that at the end of FAO's two-year fiscal cycle, surplus funds can sometimes be transferred to an external collaborator through a letter of agreement. The Secretariat used this process to contract service providers to produce manuals on market access, transit manual and equivalence. Drafts for the manuals on transit and market access have been made available to the RPPOs and CDC for review.

The group discussed comments on these manuals. Specific areas of discussion included whether the manuals should link to a specific standard, or be based on a theme and elaborate connections with other relevant ISPMs (such as pest risk analysis). The group agreed that addressing a topic area would be most easily accessible for users. The group noted the importance of making IPPC-related information more easily understandable without providing recommendations or guidance beyond what has been agreed through the standard-setting process. To address this, the group suggested that manual authors clearly distinguish between text of ISPMs and more interpretive guidance. The group also suggested that the Secretariat encourage authors to include visual elements such as decision trees, possibly as companion documents with references to the relevant manual sections, and to consult directly with NPPOs for input during the drafting process. The group also discussed the value of including clear examples of successful models also emphasizing the value of flexibility so that examples are not viewed as being prescriptive.

The CD Officer noted that CDC guidance on the intended audience for these materials would be useful, as they were initially developed with IPPC members in mind rather than other stakeholders such as the private sector. The group noted that a common format for the many technical resources in development would be helpful.

The group agreed that the two draft manuals would be made available to the CDC members online and that comments would be sent to the Secretariat by the end of December 2012.

V. DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The group noted its informal agreement to alternate meetings in Rome with external locations. The Secretariat agreed to explore the option of holding the second meeting of the CDC in Malaysia 27 – 31 May 2013.

VI. REVIEW AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

The participants reviewed and adopted the meeting report. The chairperson expressed gratitude for the opportunity, and invited all participants to provide feedback on the substance and organization of the meeting to continue the group's positive trend of growth. The chairperson also thanked the Bureau member for her participation and input as a valuable link between the CDC and the broader IPPC framework. He thanked the departing EWGCD members for their participation and encouraged them to continue to provide input. Finally, he thanked the Italian Directorate of Rural Development's Office V (Plant Production and Protection) for hosting the meeting, the Secretariat staff for their coordination, and all meeting participants for their active participation. The departing members from the EWGCD expressed appreciation for the opportunity to collaborate with this active and innovative group, and expressed interest in continuing to participate.

The Secretariat highlighted the exciting step of this inaugural meeting of the IPPC's first standing group on capacity development, noting that the IPPC framework is as strong as its weakest members and that this group will be key to strengthening implementation. The Secretariat thanked the participants for their active engagement and invited all to continue to remain actively involved, especially to complete work plan tasks in between face-to-face meetings.

APPENDIX 1: AGENDA

| Monday 3 December 2012 | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|---|------------------|
| Agenda Item | Time | | Documents |
| | 09:00-09:50 | Formal opening of the session (Representative Mr Bruno Farglia, Ministry of Agriculture, Italy and IPPC Secretary Mr Yokoi - purpose of the meeting - introductions - local and logistical information | |
| | 09:00-10:00 | Brief presentation of each participant | |
| | 10:00-10:30 | Group photo Coffee break | |
| | 10:30-10:45 | II. Adoption of the agenda | |
| | | III. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur | |
| | 10:45-11:00 | IV. Update from the IPPC Secretariat | |
| 1.1 | 11:00-12:30 | Agenda Item 1: Work plan and strategies 1.1 Operationalization of the IPPC Capacity Development Committee(CDC) - Presentation of the CDC members. - Declaration documents for nominees for the membership of the CDC | |
| | 12:30-13:30 | Lunch | |
| 1.2 | 13:30-15:30 | 1.2 Procedural issues -1.2.1 Role of CDC Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur -1.2.2 Procedural issues resulting from Bureau and CPM decisions. -1.2.3 Roles of CDC and SC in implementation -1.2.4 Frequency of meetings -1.2.5 Observes -1.2.6 Decision-making -1.2.7 Confidentiality/privacy -1.2.8 Development of Technical Resources -1.2.9 Reporting to CPM -1.2.10 IRSS Triennial Group | |
| 1.3 | 15:45-18:00 | 1.3 Preparation of a long-term work plan | |
| Tuesday 4 December 2012 | | | |
| 1.1 | 09:00-10:40 | 1.3 Preparation of a long-term work plan | |
| | 10:40-11:00 | Coffee break | |
| 1.1 | 11:00-12:30 | 1.3 Preparation of a long-term work plan | |
| | 12:30-13:30 | Lunch | |
| 1.1 | 13:30-18:00 | 1.3 Preparation of a long-term work plan | |
| Wednesday 5 December 2012 | | | |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| 2.1 | 09:00-10:40 | Agenda Item 2. Capacity Development Activities 2.1 STDF Project 350 “ Global Phytosanitary Manuals, Standard Operating Procedures and Training Kits Project | |
| | 10:40-11:00 | Coffee break | |
| 2.1 | 11:00-12:30 | 2.1 SDF Project 350 “ Global Phytosanitary Manuals, Standard Operating Procedures and Training Kits Project | |
| | 12:30-13:30 | Lunch | |
| 2.2 | 13:30-15:30 | 2.2 STDF Project 401 “ Training of Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) Facilitators” | |
| 2.3 | 15:45-18:00 | 2.3 STDF Project 402”Training of trainers for Phytosanitary Capacity Development” | |
| Thursday 6 December 2012 | | | |
| 2.4 | 09:00-10:40 | 2.4 Implementation Review and Support System - Update on IRSS activities - ISPM 13-general report - Recommendations on future actions | |
| | 10:40- 11:00 | Coffee Break | |
| 3 | 11:00-12.30 | Agenda Item 3: Creation of new proposals 3.1 ISPM No. 15: Possible actions and initiatives 3.2 Project and Activities Proposals 3.3 Other proposals | |
| | 12:30-13:30 | Lunch | |
| 4 | 16:15-18:00 | Agenda Item 4: Information and decision 4.1 Phytosanitary Technical Resources web page 4.2 Compiled Phytosanitary technical resources | |
| | 20.00 | Official dinner: Launching of the Capacity Development Committee (CDC). More information and details to be provided later | |
| Friday 7 December 2012 | | | |
| 5.1 | 09:00-10:40 | Agenda Item 5: Any other matters 5.1 Regional Workshops on draft ISPMs | |
| | 10:40- 11:00 | Coffee Break | |
| 5.2 | 11:00-12.30 | 5.2 Consideration of technical resources | |
| | 12:30-13:30 | Lunch | |
| | 13:30-13:45 | V. Date and venue of the next meeting | |
| | 13:45-16:30 | VI. Review and adoption of report | |

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

| Participant role | Name, mailing, address, telephone | Email address |
|--|--|--|
| EWG CD Member representing: Africa | Mr Similo George MAVIMBELA Research Officer Agricultural Research and Specialist Services Ministry of Agriculture Swaziland Phone: 00268 2527 4095 Mobile : 00268 7605 0780 Fax : 00268 2527 4070 | seemelo@yahoo.com ; similogm@swazi.net ; |
| CDC Member representing: Africa | Ms Stella Nonyem ORAKA Plant Pathologist Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service Plant Quarantine Unit 5th Floor Federal Secretariat Port Harcourt, Rivers State Nigeria Phone : 08033323526 08056698645 | stellaoraka@yahoo.com ; |
| CDC Member representing: Asia | Mr Haw Leng HO Office of the Crop Protection and Quarantine Division Department of Agriculture 3rd Floor, Wisma Tani Jalan Sultan Salahuddin 50632 Kuala Lumpur Malaysia Tel: 6 03 20301415 Fax : 6 03 26977164 | hawlengho@doa.gov.my ; hawlengho@yahoo.com ; |
| CDC Member representing: Europe | Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN Coordinating policy officer plant health Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation Netherlands Directorate-General for Agro Plant Supply Chain and Food Quality Department T: + 31 - 703785552 M: + 31 - 618596867 | c.a.m.vanalphen@mineleni.nl ; |

| Participant role | Name, mailing, address, telephone | Email address |
|---|---|--|
| CDC Member representing: Latin America and the Caribbean | Ms Shelia Yvonne HARVEY Chief Plant Quarantine Produce Officer Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries 193 Old Hope Rd. Kingston 6, Jamaica Tel: 1-876-977-0637 Mobile: 1-876-507-7951 Fax:1-876-977-6992 | syharvey@moa.gov.jm ; sheharv@yahoo.com ; |
| CDC Member representing: Near East | Ms Nagat Mubarak EL TAYEB Director, Plant Quarantine Ministry of Agriculture Plant Protection General Directorate PO Box 14 Khartoum North Sudan Tel: 249 185 33 9442 Fax: 249 185 339423 | neltayb@yahoo.com ; |
| CDC Member representing: North America | Mr Marc GILKEY U.S. Mission to the European Union U.S. Department of Agriculture-APHIS Rue Zinner 13, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium Phone: (+32) 2 8115182 | Marc.C.Gilkey@aphis.usda.gov ; |
| EWG CD Member representing: North America | Ms Parul PATEL USDA-APHIS-PPQ PPQ Liaison to APHIS-IS, ITRCB Lacey Act Program 4700 River Road Riverdale, MD. 20737 301-851-2351 (VOIP) | Parul.R.Patel@aphis.usda.gov ; |
| CDC Member representing: Pacific | Ms Sally JENNINGS Policy Analyst International Standard Organisations International Policy Ministry for Primary Industries Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace PO Box 2526 Wellington, New Zealand Work Telephone: 64-4-894 0431 Work Facsimile: 64-4-894 0733 Mobile: +64 29-894 0431 | Sally.Jennings@mpi.govt.nz ; |

| Participant role | Name, mailing, address, telephone | Email address |
|---|--|--|
| EWG CD Member representing: Pacific | Mr Ian NAUMANN Director, SPS Capacity Building Program Plant Biosecurity Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 Phone: 02- 6272 3442 Fax: 02- 6272 3307 Mobile: 0412 678 463 | ian.naumann@daff.gov.au ; |
| CPM Bureau Member, Observer | Ms Kyu-Ock YIM Agricultural Researcher Export Management Division Dept. of Plant Quarantine Animal, Plant and Fishereis Quarantine and Inspection Agency/MIFAFF 178 Anyang-ro, Manan-gu Anyang city, Gyunggi-do Rep. of Korea Tel:82-31-420-7665 CP: 82-10-8752-3132 | koyim@korea.kr |
| Observer | Ms Kenza LE MENTEC Economic Affairs Officer Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) Agriculture and Commodities Division World Trade Organisation Rue de Lausanne, 154 CH 1211 Genève 21, Suisse Tel: + 41 22 739 65 38 Fax: + 41 22 739 57 60 | kenza.lementec@wto.org ; |
| IPPC Secretariat | Ms Ana PERALTA Capacity Development Officer International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: +39 06 5705 5322 | Ana.Peralta@fao.org ; |

| Participant role | Name, mailing, address, telephone | Email address |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| IPPC Secretariat | Mr Orlando SOSA Implementation Review and Support System Officer (IRSS) IPPC Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: +39 06 5705 53613 | Orlando.Sosa@fao.org ; |
| IPPC Secretariat | Ms Johanna GARDESTEN Capacity Development Officer IPPC Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: +39 06 5705 53768 | Johanna.Gardesten@fao.org ; |
| IPPC Secretariat | Ms Sonya HAMMONS IPPC Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: +39 06 5705 54362 | Sonya.Hammons@fao.org ; |
| IPPC Secretariat | Mr Yuji KITAHARA IPPC Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: +39 06 5705 54402 | Yuji.Kitahara@fao.org ; |
| IPPC Secretariat | Ms Nadia VILLASENOR IRSS- Analyst IPPC Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: +39 06 5705 53035 | Nadia.Villasenor@fao.org ; |

APPENDIX 3: FUNCTIONS OF THE CDC CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSON AND RAPPORTEUR

The CDC has agreed on the functions of the CDC Chair, Vice-Chair and Rapporteur.

Chairperson

The Chairperson of the CDC is elected in accordance with the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for the CDC. The main functions of the Chairperson are to:

- manage the CDC during meetings, including managing interventions of observers and invited experts
- provide guidance on the affairs of the CDC
- help ensure participation of CDC members and facilitate dialogue and understanding among CDC members
- help the Secretariat to prepare the agenda and report of the meetings, and reporting to the CPM
- assist the Secretariat to liaise with other IPPC areas to identify and resolve overlaps in their work programmes and functions
- provide input to the strategic planning and administration of the IPPC on issues related to capacity-development
- finalize decisions taken via electronic means and address cases of lack of consensus during CDC discussions via electronic means.

Vice-Chairperson

The Vice-Chairperson of the CDC is elected in accordance with the Terms of reference and Rules of procedure for the CDC. The main function of the Vice-Chairperson is to assist and replace the CDC Chairperson as necessary.

Rapporteur

The Rapporteur of a CDC meeting is elected by the CDC members participating in that meeting. The main functions of the Rapporteur are to:

- ensure that the report prepared by the Secretariat is an accurate record of the CDC discussions and decisions of the meeting
- assist the Secretariat in drafting, reviewing and finalizing the CDC meeting report
- facilitate the CDC e-mail discussions in relation to points of the CDC reports.

APPENDIX 4: CDC PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR THE PRODUCTION AND OVERSIGHT OF TECHNICAL RESOURCES

The checklist for review and production of technical resources agreed by the CDC are:

1. Whether the product addresses core functions of the IPPC.
2. Whether the product relates to NPPO management.
3. Global applicability of the resource.
4. Whether the product addresses emerging and urgent topics.
5. Whether the product can be considered a general manual.
6. Whether the product address multiple areas of interest or activities.
7. Whether other options of related technical resource are not available.
8. Whether there is very little or no material available to address urgent topics.

Initiation of the discussion and decision-making

To initiate a discussion via electronic means or in face-to-face meetings, the Secretariat shall submit the identified resource with a proposed timeline for discussion to the CDC members. In consultation with the Chair, the Secretariat establishes the issue for discussion and the timeline. If a decision is needed as a result of the discussion, the Chair will provide a summary of the discussion and a proposed decision to the CDC.

Types of discussion and decisions that the CDC can make

The types of discussions and decisions listed that may be made through the use of electronic communication or in face-to-face meetings may include (but are not limited to):

- preparation of project proposals
- guidance on IPPC capacity development activities
- preparation of proposals for the IRSS
- review and note technical resources for inclusion in the phyto resources page
- consideration of requests for attendance by observers and invited experts

Rules for agreement

If there are no comments by the deadline, the CDC is considered to be in consensus and a course of action in line with the proposal should be taken.

If one or more members raise comments before the deadline, the Secretariat compiles them. If the comments are compatible, the Secretariat sends a second version of the proposal for consideration.

If the comments are incompatible, the CDC chair should summarize the issues, reformulate the proposal and submit for another round of consultation among members in order to try to reach consensus.

If there is still no consensus, the chair should communicate what he/she feels are the main points to the CDC in a face-to-face meeting to discuss the way forward, with input from experts, as appropriate.

IPPC

The international Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) is an international plant health agreement that aims to protect cultivated and wild plants by preventing the introduction and spread of pests. International travel and trade are greater than ever before. As people and commodities move around the world, organisms that present risk to plants travel with them.

Organization

- ◆ The number of contracting party signatories to the Convention exceeds 177.
- ◆ Each contracting party has a National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) and an official IPPC contact point.
- ◆ 10 Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) have been established to coordinate NPPOs in various regions of the world.
- ◆ IPPC liaises with relevant international organizations to help build regional and national capacities.
- ◆ The Secretariat is provided by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO-UN).



International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy

Tel: +39 06 5705 4812 - Fax: +39 06 5705 4819

Email: ippc@fao.org - Web: www.ippc.int

The IPPC Secretariat is
hosted and provided by

