IC paper for SPG

(Prepared by CPM Chair with input from Focus Group participants and Bureau)

The Focus Group on Implementation met in Paris from 18-22 July 2016 and worked through the actions in the Terms of Reference (ToR)[[1]](#footnote-1) agreed by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) 11 (2016). It discussed a wide range of issues in the course of developing the purpose, scope, ToR and rules of procedures (RoP) for the new committee.

The outcomes of discussion are presented in Appendices 4, 5 and 6 of the attached report. They are the ToR, RoP and recommendations to CPM respectively. Note that reference to implementation of the IPPC in the report includes the Convention and the standards, guidelines and recommendations adopted by CPM.

The Focus Group proposes that new committee be known as the *IPPC Implementation and Capacity Development Committee*, abbreviated to IC. This reflects the two key elements in the committee's purpose (i) implementation of the IPPC, including international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs) and (ii) strengthening the phytosanitary capacity of contracting parties.

SPG is invited to review the Focus Group report and make recommendations to the Bureau on the form, function, establishment and initial priority actions of the IC.

Key elements

The scope of the IC applies an assessment of the collective capacity and capability needs of Contracting Parties against the minimum required to meet IPPC obligations. These needs form the basis for an integrated work programme that:

* identifies and addresses impediments to effective implementation, and
* develops and delivers capacity development activities to enhance the ability of contracting parties to implement the IPPC.

The work programme includes national reporting obligations, dispute avoidance, the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS), capacity and technical resources development, implementation pilot programmes and innovation programmes such as ePhyto. The IC will oversee any formal dispute when such assistance is requested through the IPPC Secretariat.

Ongoing monitoring and evaluation will continue to enhance the work programme to meet the needs of contracting parties. The consolidated outputs from monitoring and evaluation of the work plan will enable collective progress to better implement the IPPC to be reported as one measure of the state of plant protection in the world (Article XI, 2(a).

The IC will collaborate with the IPPC Standards Committee (SC) at several levels, both formally through joint activities, and more informally through participation in each other's meetings, the October Bureau meeting and discussions between the Committee Chairs.

The IC will also enhance its collaboration and engagement with individual regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs), inter alia through the annual Technical Consultation. This will provide opportunities to better plan and deliver implementation and capacity development to countries within a region with the RPPOs and FAO Regional Offices and plant protection officers, and share resources and programmes between regions.

Considerations of the Focus Group

The Focus Group acknowledged the significant work and outcomes achieved by the IPPC Capacity Development Committee (CDC) and recognised that this was largely due to the commitment, enthusiasm and skills of its members. The proposed ToR and RoP of the IC increase the number of Committee members from 7 to 11 and add permanent representation from the SC and RPPOs. In keeping with the desire of the Focus Group to ensure the IC is flexible and responsive to development and implementation needs, IC members will be selected by the Bureau following a call for appropriately skilled and experienced experts. The Bureau will ensure that each FAO region is represented and that there is a mix of members from developed and developing, island and continental countries.

The IC has a wide range of functions, reflecting its broad scope. These have been grouped into a number of themes including technical, Committee management, working with the Secretariat and other bodies, and actions directed by CPM.

The Focus Group noted that a number of subsidiary bodies currently exist that have a role in implementation and capacity development. It recommends that a priority for the IC should be a review of the need for the existing committees that fall within the scope of the IC, how actions and outcomes within the scope of each of these committees will be managed by IC and the ongoing relationship between the IC and sub groups operating under its oversight. These include the National Reporting Obligations Advisory Group (NROAG), Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement (SBDS) and the Triennial Review Group (TRG).

It further agreed that the ToRs for each sub group or subsidiary body that operates under the oversight of the IC should clearly describe the scope of the IC role in management, oversight and reporting. This particularly applies to bodies established by CPM and which continue to report to CPM, such as the proposed sea containers task force (Bureau, June 2016) and the ePhyto Steering Group.

Issues and opportunities

The Focus Group is proposing to retain the flexible selection process for members of the IC to ensure it has the range of skills and knowledge to facilitate its work. Consideration was made of the size of the IC, with a view to balancing efficient operations and the actual capacity to complete its work, noting that the IC is expected to work as well as provide oversight. The final structure of 11 plus 2 provides an additional 5 people to cover the expanded scope of the IC role.

The difference in size and member selection processes between the proposed IC and SC was noted by the Focus Group. A small committee is more economical to run and operates more efficiently. Recruiting appropriately skilled and experienced members also improves productivity and output quality. The Focus Group thought that the size and member selection processes for SC could be reviewed in light of the approach proposed for IC to explore the potential benefits from this alternative approach.

The Focus Group considered the increase in costs as a result of the increased size of the IC, but felt that the savings achieved through dissolving the NROAG and subsuming its activities into the IC work programme, and the activation of SBDS only when the IPPC dispute resolution process is required, would offset the rise in costs. There is potential that changes will end up being cost neutral.

Supporting contracting parties to implement the IPPC through the development of technical resources and capacity development will continue to be critical to achieving the Convention objectives and global outcomes on food security, environment protection and trade facilitation. It will be an ongoing priority for the CPM and as such, operations of the committee should be considered in developing the sustainable funding model and the IPPC Strategic Framework.

The Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) process was developed by the IPPC Secretariat to assess the capacity of contracting parties relevant to implementing the Convention. Its use by contracting parties should be strongly encouraged, and the assessment and resultant country strategy to increase capacity to be used to inform the development of CPM implementation priorities, IPPC Strategic Framework, IPPC National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy and the IC work plan.

To complement the PCE as an indicator of capacity development needs, the current call for topics for standards should be refocussed in a call for ‘problems/issues’ which are supported by analysis of impact or consequence. Such a call should elicit a broader spread of issues impacting harmonisation, implementation or compliance and not presuppose that a standard is the only solution to the problem identified. A process for the joint analysis by SC and IC of the problems identified also offers opportunities for exploration of innovative solutions.

The Focus Group considered that CPM should set implementation and capacity development priorities. These priorities would then be addressed through the IC work plan. This approach allows the IC to retain flexibility over how priority outcomes could be achieved.

CPM and the Secretariat has long been considering how to review state of plant protection in the world as required by the Convention (ref IPPC ARTICLE XI 2(a): ‘*review the state of plant protection in the world and the need for action to control the international spread of pests and their introduction into endangered areas*’). A measure of the state of plant protection in the world could be achieved through monitoring improvements in the capacity of contracting parties to implement the IPPC.

A strong theme through Focus Group discussions was cementing the collaborative working relationship between the IC and SC. Elements have been included in the RoP and there was an expectation that the relationship would be connected at all levels, including across the Secretariat, through Chairs and in joint activities and projects.

Recommendations for SPG

The SPG is invited to:

* *consider* the report and recommendations of the Implementation Focus Group
* *integrate* strategic elements and outcomes of effective implementation of the IPPC into the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030
* *include* allowance of sufficient resources for implementation and capacity building in the sustainable funding model for the IPPC Secretariat.
* *consider* and agree to send the following recommendations to the Bureau and subsequent presentation to CPM 12 (2017) for adoption:

SPG recommends to the Bureau that:

* The Implementation and Capacity Development Committee be established under the proposed Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure
* The usual abbreviation for the Committee should be IC
* The IC should start operations in the second half of 2017
* CPM be requested to dissolve the CDC from the time that the IC commences operations
* The call for topics be delayed so that a joint SC/IC call for topics for standards and issues for implementation can be held
* A priority task for the IC will be to develop criteria for the joint IC/SC call for topics and issues, in collaboration with SC
* A further priority task for the IC will be to review groups and bodies in the implementation area and make recommendation to CPM on which should be dissolved, which should be retained and how terms of reference should be amended in the light of the establishment of the IC. This includes SBDS, NROAG, TRG, ePhyto Steering Group and the proposed Sea Containers Task Force
* Until its dissolution, CDC starts work on these priority tasks of the IC
* The CDC also works to complete its programme as far as possible to ensure a smooth transition to the new Committee.
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