

Found only in file, not posted in IPP. Think this is the report: JATIN RAO

Third Meeting of the ICPM Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance
4-6 December 2001

-- Report Notes --

1. Resources

The IWG noted:

- technical assistance initiatives of the IPPC involve:
 - o increasing the participation of developing countries in standard-setting
 - o support to regional and national capacity building
- the increasing need for additional support in IPPC implementation
 - o updating PCE and development of new related tools
 - o operational guidance material and manuals
 - o regional workshops
- the need for additional core funding/staff of the Secretariat to ensure sustainability
- the effective use of additional funds depends on sufficient core resources
- resources come ~~from~~ either via FAO or directly from countries. Resources from FAO require long-term efforts at another level.

The IWG Proposed:

- Target 4-5 standards/year with basic support for information exchange (IPP) and technical assistance (PCE)
- Shift existing work programme resources to create two additional professional positions in the Secretariat. Encourage advance commitments from countries for volunteer professional officers (e.g., APOs)
- Establish a “bridging mechanism” for interim support until trust funds are operational
- Add work programme resources from trust funds. [note: needs review]

	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Work programme</u>
Current budget allocations	\$600,000	\$400,000
Proposed budget allocations	\$800,000	\$200,000 + \$300,000 min trust fund resources

Additional IPPC implementation costs:

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

- undertake analysis to show how resources are used/needed to help convince countries and FAO Conference to provide additional resources
- take a two-pronged approach to increasing resources – press for increases in FAO resources as well as direct contributions from countries. Long-term objective should be for FAO to provide adequate core resources.

2. Trust fund(s)

The working group recognized that the FAO Regular Programme budget provides the long-term sustainability to the IPPC Secretariat and the long-term objective for FAO should be to provide adequate resources to provide for core activities. The working group recommended that core resources should provide for four to five concept standards (or their equivalent in specific standards), together with an information system that meets the obligations under the IPPC and basic support for technical assistance. It noted that this would require the addition of two professional staff positions and a limited amount of non-

staff resources for the harmonization and information exchange programme (total fund required US\$ 350.000 per annum). The working group also identified the need for additional implementation funds that would include the organization of regional workshops on draft ISPMs, the preparation of guidance material and further development of material for self evaluation, which would require an additional US\$600.000 per annum.

The working group welcomed the formation of the working group among FAO WHO, WTO, Worldbank and OIE that would address national sanitary and phytosanitary capacity building. It requested that the ICPM be informed of its progress. The ICPM technical assistance programme would lay the foundation for and provide technical support to such a capacity building programme.

The working group considered the purpose of trust funding. It noted in particular, the requirements for increased participation of developing countries in the work of the standard setting organizations, as recognized in the INCLUDE RELEVANT REFERENCES(DOHA<SPS). The working group also recognized that funds from the Regular Programme of FAO are, at present not sufficient to produce the desired number of standards, to maintain the information exchange programme and to provide support to technical assistance.

The working group recommended the following purposes for trust-funding:

- extra-budgetary support to the Secretariat for the implementation of the core programme for harmonization (standard setting)
- participation of developing countries in standard setting
- implementation of the IPPC

The working group recommended the establishment of two trustfunds: a General fund and a Special fund.

The *General trustfund* would have assessed voluntary contributions to provide core resources to enable the implementation of the six strategic directions. It was recommended that the trustfund would have a time horizon of six years.

The *Special trustfund* would be funded through voluntary contributions for technical assistance, which would provide for participation of developing countries in standard setting and other aspects of IPPC implementation.

The Special trustfund would in particular provide for:

- attendance of developing country Members at meetings;
- a training programme and Internet access for information exchange;
- regional workshops on draft standards and implementing standards;
- development of guidance for countries to use in the evaluation of institutional and regulatory aspects of national systems.
- encouraging individual Members to utilize PCE and formulate national plans.

The Working Group recognized that it would take some time to establish the General Fund. It recommended that, as a bridging measure, the special Fund serve to fund the objectives of the General Fund, until the General Fund is operational.

The working group recognized that other special trustfunds might be established on an as-needed basis for specific purposes, including national capacity building; however, these fell outside the specific mandate of the working group.

The working group noted that the Organization had detailed procedures for designating responsibility for expenditure and for the accounting of trust funds, which included procedures on fungibility of funds among categories of expenditure, financial records and financial reporting, expenditure authorization, and administrative and operational charges. Furthermore, there were provisions for financial monitoring and auditing. It noted that the responsible budget holder in the Organization would be a member of the IPPC

Secretariat. However, FAO financial reports would not necessarily help to understand the costs of the outputs produced under a trust fund and therefore other reports will be required.

The working group also considered financial rules of the Indian Ocean Tuna Fish Commission, another FAO Article XIV body and the draft financial rules for the *Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade*, a United Nations Convention in which FAO and UNEP provide the Secretariat.

The working group recommended that additional financial rules be established for the trust funds to take into account the special nature of the outputs and the funding, in particular that funding is received from many sources. It recommended the financial rules include articles that provide for:

- an annual budget proposal to be submitted by the Secretariat to the ICPM;
- the annual budget to be submitted to the ICPM in the year before its execution;
- the budget proposal to be considered by a review body before submission to the ICPM. The Working Group identified several options for this body: This could either be the bureau, a bureau extended with regional representatives, or the strategy working group. It recognized that, if the strategy working group were the preferred option, this would need to be a more formal group ~~then than~~ it is now,
- the ICPM to adopt the budget, according to article VI of its rules of procedure;
- the accounting period be a calendar year.
- unexpended funds be carried over to the next budgetary period;
- financial reports be submitted to the ICPM on an annual basis and that these reports include links to objectives, activities, and outputs, as they relate to strategic directions.
- other reports be submitted as required by the ICPM;
- priorities be determined by the ICPM to take account of possible shortfalls in funding;

For the Special Fund, as contributions will be received from many sources at irregular intervals, the working group recommended that:

- earmarking of individual budget contributions for specific outputs only be possible to fund outputs approved by the ICPM;
- if additional funds exist, expenditure from the trust fund over the budgetary period under consideration not exceed 10% of the approved budget.

The Working Group recommended that the financial rules for the General Fund have additional articles to stipulate that:

- payments from the trust fund may be authorized only to the amounts so approved;
- a scale of contributions to be adopted by the ICPM by consensus;
- a payment schedule be set by the ICPM.

The Working Group recommended that the Secretariat submit draft financial rules for both the General Fund and the Special Fund to the next session of the ICPM. [As there was a brief discussion on this, suggest something like to following] The IWG considered the UN scale of contributions would be appropriate.

3. Procedures for identifying topics and priorities for standards

[I assume you will insert a chapeau here, so I suggest you refer to the policy guidance provided in the report of ICPM 1, otherwise point d. might be a bit cryptic]

- a. IWG recommends strategic priorities (Oct)
- b. Strategic priorities identified by the IWG are reviewed and adopted by the ICPM (Apr)
- c. Secretariat requests submissions for new topics at the time draft standards are sent for consultation communicating recommendations adopted by ICPM (Jun)

- d. Standards Committee reviews topics taking account of policy guidance from the IWG/ICPM and makes recommendations to submit to the ICPM (Nov)
- e. ICPM reviews recommendations and decides topics and priorities for the work programme (Apr)

4. Rules for directed financial assistance for standard-setting (sponsorship of standards)

[I think it would be more accurate to re-order these two points, to indicate that the issue of funding of priority setting was an important consideration in the establishment of the rules. Also, I suggest some other changes as the latter 3 dot points don't seem to sit well grammatically with the chapeau.]

The IWG recommends removing "the availability funds" as a criteria for setting priorities (c.f. Report of ICPM-21). Working on an assumption that this would be accepted, the IWG developed the following rules.

The provision of external resources for standard-setting should be used for the priorities approved by the ICPM. Standard setting processes so funded should:

- fit with the capacity of the Secretariat (not create an undue resource drain)
- not displace core programme priorities
- follow normal procedures, policies, and practice and not be modified according to preferences of the funding entity

The IWG recommends removing "the availability funds" as a criteria for setting priorities (c.f. Report of ICPM-2).

5. Review of the Mission statement and Strategic directions

The IWG recommends:

- no changes in the Mission statement or the titles of the strategic directions
- the strategic directions be reviewed by a small group for clarity, editing, and detail to improve understanding. Indicate outputs rather than actions and opportunities for measurements. (Carberry, Hedley, Lopian, & Secretariat)
- the Secretariat should prepare a financial analysis as regards resources devoted to strategic directions for purposes of preparing and updating a business plan and to facilitate future discussions on strategic planning (c.f. Goal 5.6)
- high priority be given to the development of standards on "efficacy of measures" and "equivalency" to facilitate the development of associated specific standards

Recommendations for changes in the goals

[present in table form with changes indicated] [Good idea! It would also be instructive if you could work in the annotations (ie as a stand-alone goal) below), say as footnotes]

SD-1:

- Amend 1.1 to indicate target of 5 standards/year (as a stand-alone goal)
- Amend existing 1.1.1 to "ensure that ISPMs take account of protection of the environment" and change ~~form from~~ a sub-goal to a stand-alone goal
- Add new 1.2 regarding improvement of the standard-setting mechanism and include existing 1.1.2 and 1.1.3.
- Amend 1.1.2 to add "...concept and specific" standards; change timing to 2002; change means to ICPM-4 [for adoption] [need to align the words with the next one]
- Amend 1.1.3 to change means "for adoption by ICPM-4"

Formatted

- Amend 1.1.4 to “promote the development of specific standards where relevant concept standards are in place and give priority to the development of concept standards where necessary for the preparation of specific standards in priority areas (also move to new 1.1)
- Amend existing 1.2.1 to remove “exploratory discussion” from the means and add ICPM working group
- Amend 1.3 to indicate timing is 2002, priority is high, means is ICPM
- Add 1.3.1 for developing procedures for monitoring; timing is 2002, priority is high, means is ICPM
- Place existing 1.3.2 under 1.1 [\[Can this be deleted in favour of the last dot point, or vice versa?\]](#)
- Create new 1.4 for “facilitating implementation of standards” and add existing 1.3.1, 1.3.2 and 1.3.3; timing is ongoing; priority is medium; means is the ICPM
- Create new 1.1.5 from existing 1.3.2

SD-2:

- Amend 2.2 to replace “central linkage mechanism” with “IPP” to reflect the adoption by ICPM of IPP as the central linkage mechanism for the IPPC. Amend timing to 2002.
- Amend timing of 2.3 to extend to 2003
- Amend 2.4 to indicate need for adoption of the draft standard on pest reporting by the ICPM

SD-3:

- Ongoing – change timing to 2003s (pending formation of the Subsidiary Body)

SD-4:

- Change chapeau to add “...especially to developing contracting parties”
- Amend 4.1 to “develop and maintain methods and tools...”
- Amend 4.1.1 to indicate timing as ongoing
- Amend 4.3 to indicate timing is ongoing
- Add sub-goal 4.3.1 for preparation of a checklist on phytosanitary legal and associated institutional issues; timing is 2002; priority is high; means is the Secretariat
- Amend 4.4 to “establishment of systems that attract from donors for technical assistance programs”; add Secretariat to the means
- Amend timing of 4.5.1 to 2003 (need to establish IPP first)
- Amend timing of 4.6 to 2002

SD-5:

- Amend means in 5.1 to indicate efforts by FAO to encourage acceptance (regional plant protection officers and FAO reps)
- 5.3 implies reporting to the ICPM by the Secretariat
- Amend 5.4 to indicate timing 2002 or later
- Amend 5.5 to indicate timing 2002 or later
- Amend 5.6 to indicate timing 2002 and ongoing
- Amend 5.7.1 to indicate the need for reporting by Secretariat on the implementation of the strategic plan

SD-6:

- Remove 6.1.1 – no longer relevant

6. Technical Assistance

The IWG notes that the PCE is a self-assessment tool that works best when used in cooperation with an ~~expert~~-facilitator [with expert knowledge of the International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures](#) and with relevant high-level national experts involved.

 Recommendations of the IWG:

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

- update the PCE to account for new standards [and to add analysis components] [This begs the question of what analysis functions are possible with the database/online version versus the CD version. Perhaps the chapeau should refer to the view that the CD version was preferred on cost, despite the loss of high end analysis capabilities, such as inter-country comparisons.]
- continue to use the IWG as the ad hoc WG on Technical Assistance
- prepare multilingual versions of PCE (after the English version is updated)
- develop a format within the PCE to assist countries to identify technical assistance
- create a cadre of expert facilitators for PCE
- develop guidelines for the use of PCE
- create a CD-ROM with the PCE and other relevant information priorities of a general nature that can be addressed by the ICPM (c.f. report of ICPM-3, Appendix XIV, para. 10, point 4)
- use the IWG to develop recommendations for meeting priority needs (c.f. ***point 5)
- empower the IWG to review and amend ...when appropriate

7. Recommended programme of work

- annual ICPM meeting
- 2 meetings of the Standards Committee

SD-1:

Priorities for standard setting-

- Efficacy of measures (new)
- LMOs (new)
- PRA for RNQP (new)
- Glossary, including economic impacts (ongoing)
- Citrus canker (complete drafting)
- Pest listing (complete drafting)
- Principles (revision)
- PRA (revision)
- [add remaining stds for which drafts exist]

Recommendations for other aspects of the standard-setting programme-

- Complete explanatory document for Systems approaches
- WG on monitoring implementation of standards
- Implement stewardship concept for new standards (normally a member of the Standards Committee)
- Use stewardship concept on a trial basis for the revision of standards (as a means to try to save resources -- begin with revision of ISPM 2)

SD-2:

- Continue development of the IPP
- Meeting of the IPP support group

SD-3:

- No additions except possible first meeting of the Subsidiary Body at ICPM-4

SD-4:

- Update and enhance PCE (multilingual)
- Create CD-ROM (including other relevant information)
- Workshop for training PCE experts

SD-5:

- Meeting of the Business Plan Focus Team to finalize a business plan and edit the strategic plan for clarity (see recommendation in point 5 above)

SD-6:

- Secretariat to report to ICPM on progress for Goal 6.2

8. Budget

- show extra-budgetary contributions separately
- clarify portion of staff time devoted to ICPM
- clearly indicate shortfall and items affected

9. Calendar of work

2002	Standard-setting	Other
Jan		
Feb	Glossary WG	
Mar		ICPM-4 (subsidiary body for dispute sett?)
Apr	Citrus canker & pest listing WGs	Information support
May	SC-1; Review of Principles WG	Monitoring group
Jun	LMOs WG;	Focus team for business plan
Jul	Efficacy WG	
Aug	<i>TCs on draft ISPMs</i>	
Sep	PRA for RNQP WG	
Oct		Strategic Planning and Tech Asst
Nov	SC-2	
Dec		
Jan 2003		
Feb		
Mar		[Dispute settlement subsidiary body]

10. Autonomy

The IWG recommended that the Secretariat undertake an analysis to identify specific issues that might be addressed by having limited autonomous status within FAO. This study should include discussions on the advantages and disadvantages (including legal implications), and options for different levels of autonomy.