IPPC StRATEGIC FRAMEWORK 2020-2030

*(prepared by Mr Peter THOMSON and Mr Ralf LOPIAN)*

Guidance has been sought from the SPG for the development of the new IPPC Strategic Framework. Development of the framework is in the initial stages. Guidance from the SPG helped directing the work to develop an early draft and/or discussion papers for consideration by CPM 12 (2017).

The paper was in three parts:

* Part A sought guidance on the general structure of the framework. SPG participants ideas were asked on introductory materials that should be included in the document, or on the hierarchy of the framework.
* Part B sought guidance on what the key strategic and functional objectives of the IPPC should be over the 10 year period. Some draft strategic objectives were proposed for discussion. How the draft strategic objectives support the UN Sustainable Development Goals 2030 was also shown.
* Part C sought guidance on priority initiatives for the strategic framework. Several potential priority initiatives have been developed from the IPPC in 20 years discussions held at SPG in 2014 and subsequent discussions at SPG in 2015 and CPM meetings.

Following SPG, Ralf Lopian, Peter Thomson, and a Secretariat representative will develop papers for CPM 12 (2016). Assistance from SPG participants is likely to be needed.

The TC-RPPO is invited to:

* 1. - take note of the discussions held during the SPG on the IPPC strategic framework 2020-2030.
	2. - brainstorm and provide ideas to contribute to this strategic framework and its implementation

Part A: General Structure of the strategic framework

1. It was proposed that the new Strategic Framework followed the general structure of the existing one with a hierarchy as follows (refer to *IPPC Strategic Framework 2012-2019: Celebrating 60 years of protecting plant resources from pests*):
2. Vision of the IPPC
3. Mission of the IPPC
4. Strategic Objectives

**A. Strategic Objective**

* A1 Organizational result
* A2 Organizational result
* Etc.

**B. Strategic Objective**

* B1 Organizational result
* B2 Organizational result
* Etc.

Functional Objectives

**X. Functional Objective**

* X1 Organizational result
* X2 Organizational result
* Etc.

**Y. Functional Objective**

* Y1 Organizational result
* Y2 Organizational result
* Etc.

Priority Initiatives

 1. Priority initiative

 2. Priority initiative

 Etc.

Core Functions

Note the Strategic framework was preceded in the document by an introduction, background on the IPPC, information on plant pests and the global context for the framework. All of this information will be updated and will be informed by existing IPPC reference material, the IPPC in 20 years discussions at SPG in 2014, SPG 2015, and CPM 10 (2015), and subsequent discussions.

Also note the addition of ‘Priority Initiatives’ in the list above. This was discussed in Part C of this document.

Recommendation for Part A

SPG was invited to consider:

1. If there is a need to substantially change the structure of the new document, and if so, how?
2. Is the hierarchy of the framework appropriate and easy to follow?
3. What other feedback or suggestions does SPG have for improvements on the general structure of the document?

PART B: Selecting Draft Strategic Objectives

1. SPG was invited to consider draft strategic objectives for the IPPC Strategic framework 2020-2030. Based on SPG and Bureau discussions a paper will be prepared for CPM 12 (2017).

This first attempt at defining the strategic framework for the IPPC 2020-2030 has been undertaken within an intent to bind the IPPC strategic objectives as close as possible to the Sustainable Development Goals of the UN (UN SDG). The existing IPPC strategic objectives were modelled according to the FAO Strategic Objectives and this has been beneficial to the IPPC without being overly constraining.

The benefit of having the IPPC strategic objectives interlinked to the UN SDGs is to demonstrate that plant health and the IPPC are critical components to realize these overarching goals for humanity.

Each of the new strategic objectives would have to be populated with 2 - 4 specific priority initiatives to give substance to the strategic framework. These can be adjusted from the old ones, selected from the analysis of the “IPPC in 20 Years” themes discussed in 2014 and 2015, or be developed from entirely fresh thinking. As with the current strategic framework, it is proposed that we retain the concept of having both strategic and functional objectives within the framework.

I Current IPPC Strategic Objectives 2012 – 2019

Strategic Objectives

* 1. protect sustainable agriculture and enhance global food security through the prevention of pest spread;
	2. protect the environment, forests and biodiversity from plant pests;
	3. facilitate economic and trade development through the promotion of harmonized scientifically based phytosanitary measures; and
	4. develop phytosanitary capacity for members to accomplish a), b) and c).

Functional objectives

X. Effective collaboration with members and stakeholders

Y. Efficient and effective administration

II Draft IPPC Strategic Objectives 2020 – 2030

Strategic Objectives

* 1. **Facilitate economic growth and trade development through the promotion of harmonized science-based phytosanitary measures for safe trade in plants and plant products;**

*Sustainable development goals pertaining to this objective:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * *Goal 1.*
 | *End poverty in all its forms everywhere* |
| * *Goal 8.*
 | *Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all* |
| * *Goal 17.*
 | *Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development* |

* 1. **Enhance global food security and protect sustainable agriculture through minimising the spread of harmful plant pests.**

*Sustainable development goals pertaining to this objective:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * *Goal 2.*
 | *End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture* |
| * *Goal 12.*
 | *Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns* |

* 1. **Protect the environment, forests and ecosystems from the impacts of plant pests and plant pest threats associated with climate change and biodiversity loss.**

*Sustainable development goals pertaining to this objective:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * *Goal 15.*
 | *Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss* |
| * *Goal 13.*
 | *Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts* |

* 1. **Strengthen the capacity of members to implement the IPPC, its standards and recommendations.**

*Sustainable development goals pertaining to this objective:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * *Goal 17.*
 | *Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development* |

Functional Objectives

**X. Efficient and effective governance**

*This could include issues such as:*

* *Operation of the Commission*
* *The Bureau (its role and delegated authority from CPM), and the effective performance of subsidiary bodies*
* *Sustainable resourcing and establishing finance mechanisms*
* *Prioritization of activities by CPM*
* *Effective decision making etc.*

**Y. Efficient and effective administration**

*This could include issues such as:*

* *The performance of the Secretariat*
* *Communications*
* *Information management*
* *Effective programme and staff management*
* *Study on independent IPPC*

**Recommendation for Part B**

SPG was invited to consider:

1. Is the approach of aligning strategic objectives to UN Sustainable development goals a reasonable approach to take?
2. Are the four strategic objectives generally the right ones?
3. Is there an additional significant strategic issue that should be covered by a new strategic objective?
4. Are there some objectives that should be higher priority or have more emphasis than others?
5. What key elements should be included in a description of each strategic objective and its importance?

PART C: Selecting Priority Initiatives to deliver the Strategic Objectives

1. It was proposed that 8-10 ‘priority initiatives’ be selected as key priorities for focused effort during the ten year period of the strategic framework.

The priority initiatives support the achievement of the strategic objectives. Some priority initiatives will be very closely aligned to one strategic objective and others will contribute to multiple strategic objectives.

The table below shows how 16 possible priority initiatives contribute to the proposed strategic objectives. The 16 possible priority initiatives have been taken from the IPPC in 20 years discussions at SPG in 2014 and as presented and discussed in CPM 11 (2015). The 16 are not a closed list and other ideas for priority initiatives should be considered before a shortlist is made.

Collectively the priority initiatives would provide the basis for the development of very tangible programmes of work, on top of the core standard setting and implementation work of the IPPC. They would represent the CPM’s agreed priorities for the 10 year period. They would provide contracting parties and external stakeholders with a clear idea of what we are actually aiming to achieve within the 10 year period.

Most priority initiatives will require significant additional resources to implement. Being quite tangible areas of work, they could prove to be very attractive options for donors, who often wish to target funds to practical areas of work where progress and deliverables can be more easily measured.

For each priority initiative high level outlines should be developed to help contracting parties fully appreciate the nature of what the initiative is, why it is important, and what difference it would make.

The outlines would help CPM 12 make decisions on which potential priority initiatives to include in the strategic framework document. The outlines do not provide a detailed plan or budget to operationalise the initiative.

At this stage a start has been made to briefly outline 8 of the possible initiatives listed in the table. The outlines were developed using the IPPC in 20 Years outputs but some of the papers in this SPG meeting (e.g. the Australia paper on treatments) will provide more advanced thinking on these topic. The outlines are sitting below the table.

**Recommendations for Part C**

SPG was invited to consider:

* 1. Agree, 8 – 10 initiatives should be identified for the strategic framework.
	2. Agree ’initiative outlines’ should be developed to support discussions in CPM.
	3. Decide which of the potential priority initiatives (list in the table plus any others identified) should have full outlines developed to support further discussion at CPM.
	4. Identify who should develop the outlines for each potential priority initiative.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Potential Priority Initiatives for Inclusion in IPPC strategic Framework 2020-2030** | A. Facilitate economic growth and trade development through the promotion of harmonized science-based phytosanitary measures for safe trade in plants and plant products | B. Enhance global food security and protect sustainable agriculture through minimising the spread of harmful plant pests. | C. Protect the environment, forests and ecosystems from the impacts of plant pests and plant pest threats associated with climate change and biodiversity loss. | D. Strengthen the capacity of members to implement the IPPC, its standards and recommendations | X. Efficient and effective governance | Y. Efficient and effective administration |
| 1. | Commodity standards to harmonise and simplify rules-based trade. | X | X | X |  |  |  |
| 2. | Strengthened focus on Implementation of the Convention and ISPM’s. | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| 3. | Expanded treatments and other measures to manage pest risk.  | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| 4. | Enhanced communication & advocacy of the IPPC. |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| 5. | Electronic systems to facilitate trade (ephyto & generic cert system). | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 6. | Enhanced global diagnostic services. | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| 7. | Management of established pests and diseases. |  | X | X | X |  |  |
| 8. | Deliver a sustainable funding solution: donor and self-funding approaches. |  |  |  |  | X | X |
| 9. | Develop Public:Private partnerships to support IPPC programmes. | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| 10. | Coordination R&D effort and dissemination of R&D results. | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| 11. | Facilitating emerging risks information exchange. | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| 12. | New approaches to managing risk within global product supply chains. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13.  | Enhanced RPPO role in capacity development and implementation.  |  |  |  | X |  | X |
| 14.  | Integration of plant heath, emergency prevention, and plant protection efforts across FAO. |  | X | X | X | X | X |
| 15 | IPPC tertiary educational curriculum. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16. | Monitoring global plant health and IPPC impact |  |  |  | X | X | X |

Outlines for 8 of the possible Priority Initiatives

Initiative Outline: 1. Commodity Standards to Harmonise and Simplify rules-based international trade

Excerpt from the “IPPC in 20 years” discussions:

* *ISPM 15 is the “gold standard” of commodity-based standards, providing protection irrespective of a country’s plant health capacity or import requirements. Similar standards could be developed for other commodities, regardless of origin/destination, leading to a series of standards providing constant plant protection for all countries, irrespective of individual requirements.*
* *Pathway-based standards could address a number of pests rather than individually, reducing the need for individual testing and focusing more on general measures to prevent movement of pests.*
* *It has been noticeable that there has been a shift to developing mandatory requirements for key pests. In particular this is due to decreasing resources in NPPOs. This reduces the need for individual PRAs and separate technical justifications of measures. IPPC standards look more like OIE standards and there has been an agreement that trade in certain key commodities should be carried out in similar ways across the world. Auditing systems will have to be adopted and been implemented.*
1. We can all see international trade and management of pest and disease risk associated with it is becoming more and more complex. As an international standard setting body we should be able to help countries to harmonise and simplify. We did this with ISPM15 and delivered significant value at an international scale through simplifying the rules environment for wood packaging, making this trade pathway safer (as evidenced by fewer incursions) and protected members countries from the losses associated with new forest and solid wood pests and diseases. There is an increasing desire to move towards commodity (and pathway) standards on a broader scale. Although commodity standards present a huge challenge and potentially require a whole new approach to standard-setting, we cannot overlook the merits of commodity standards and their potential to simplify bi-lateral trade.

If commodity standards could be developed for the major traded commodities, the IPPC would be making a huge contribution to many of the FAO’s sustainable development goals.

**Initiative Outline: 2. Strengthened focus on Implementation of the Convention and ISPM’s**

Implementation of standards has to remain a priority and developing capacity of NPPO’s/countries to implement has to be a fundamental for this.

Excerpt from the “IPPC in 20 years” discussions:

* *The IPPC could more actively encourage implementation of all standards through capacity evaluation/building*

The work of the IPPC only makes a difference when member countries meet their obligations and implement the ISPM’s within their own countries legislation and programmes. Standards in and of themselves are pointless if countries do not have the desire and capacity to implement them.

CPM has agreed that there needs to be a stronger focus on implementation. IPPC is well placed to understand the high level implementation needs of countries and regions.

Being placed within the FAO provides IPPC with privileged opportunities to influence capacity development work across multiple FAO programmes, whether focused on crops, pests, communities, poverty, or economic development.

Leading activities by the IPPC could include:

* Highlighting common capacity development needs among donor organisations and connecting donors with candidate countries.
* Facilitating global and regional capacity development initiatives – manuals, tools, workshops.
* Assisting countries in developing proposals for donor funding for capacity development.
* Providing guidance on and templates for model legislative/regulatory systems, organisational frameworks etc to support the functions and responsibilities of NPPO’s.
* Promoting and facilitating the use of the PCE tool as a basic first step for any country with capacity development needs.

Initiative Outline: 3. Expanded treatments and other measures to manage pest risk.

As a service offering IPPC should provide global leadership or at least coordination of international efforts to develop new and alternative treatments for plant pests and diseases.

Excerpt from the “IPPC in 20 years” discussions:

* *More challenges are likely to occur with respect to the international use of methyl bromide for quarantine purposes. Presently, Quarantine and Pre-shipment (QPS) use of methyl bromide is exempt from the global phase-out of the chemical under the Montreal Protocol. However, every year there is increasing pressure to remove this exemption.*
* *Can organic production fit into traditional plant quarantine paradigms related to managing plant health risks and emergencies? Is reliance on some non-chemical approaches resulting in adaptations of plant diseases/pests that could spill over into conventional crops and orchards?*
* *Traditional tools used by quarantine officials are coming under increasing scrutiny.*
* *Public acceptance of eradication programs and some pest control programs also continue to be a public relations challenge.*

All countries are facing the challenges of having fewer tools to treat pests. Acceptability and accessibility of MeBr as a treatment is reducing and at some stage the QPS exemption will be removed. MeBr and other more traditional treatments are under pressure for more sustainable alternatives to be developed. Emergency response tools for incursions are also under pressure – even aerial spraying of organic biocides is no longer publicly acceptable in many jurisdictions.

IPPC could play an important role in communicating to researchers and funders of research the global priority areas of need for treatments and tools in the plant health space. IPPC could provide an electronic clearing house for needs and solutions, connecting regulators with researchers and even providers of treatments and tools. A bi-annual international symposium could be facilitated by the IPPC to bring regulators, industry, researchers and commercial providers together, highlighting current needs and new advances.

Not only would this provide solutions to the need but also create a platform for IPPC to be playing a central and high profile role in matters of international importance and value.

Initiative Outline: 4. Enhanced Communication & Advocacy of the IPPC.

Communication and advocacy is key, not just for IPPC support but it is essential for many NPPO’s to gain domestic support/funding to perform their proper functions.

Excerpt from the “IPPC in 20 years” discussions:

* *Effective communication and advocacy materials are readily available (e.g., statistical analyses and related information on the benefits of the IPPC and information on the economic impacts of pests). This should include a strategic advocacy package targeted to world leaders and policy makers. Having access to such material could help to obtain political support for the IPPC.*

The international community, donors and NPPO’s need the IPPC’s purpose, objectives and functions to be well understood and valued. This understanding and valuing, along with a reputation for performance and delivery, gives IPPC its licence to operate and be effective as an organisation. It is through communications and advocacy that this occurs, especially when built upon being a high performing organization.

Communication and advocacy will build support for IPPC and its objectives and attract sustainable funding to priority programmes. NPPO’s also need IPPC to be advocating for countries to have well functioning NPPO’s that are able to meet their obligations and implement the IPPC and ISPM’s.

Initiative Outline: 5. Electronic Systems to Facilitate Trade

Ephyto hub and related services (generic national system, ISPM 12 Appendix 1, etc.) will provide a massive contribution to trade facilitation. There is a need to keep this high on the agenda of the IPPC.

Excerpt from the “IPPC in 20 years” discussions:

* *Phytosanitary import requirements could be stored centrally, to improve on the current situation within which all exporting countries each maintain individual databases that may contain possibly incorrect or outdated interpretations of import requirements.*
* *A centralized import requirements database could be based on information uploaded by each importing country and, further, could automatically pre-populate the electronic phytosanitary certificates where requirements are met.*

IPPC is currently leading efforts among the three international standard setting bodies to facilitate global trade through harmonisation of phytosanitary certification, and provision of systems to support all countries (developed and developing) to exchange certificates in a simple and cost effective manner.

These initiatives have the potential to significantly improve the efficiency and accessibility of trade across developed and developing countries. In fact many proponents of the system have been surprised recently at the level of enthusiasm that currently exists.

CODEX is actively exploring following IPPC’s lead and OIE are just starting to explore the opportunity. If delivered successfully this work has the potential to not only benefit the trade in plants and plant products but may also have spill-over benefits to animal and animal products and other processed foods.

As indicated in the “20 years” comments, further opportunities remain to enhance safe trade

Initiative Outline: 6. Enhanced Global Diagnostic Services

One of the most difficult capacities to maintain and a limiting factor in implementation of IPPC obligations and ISPM’s is diagnostic capability. Maintaining this capability can be a massive challenge due to the high levels of expertise required, the breadth of expertise, the cost of equipment and the speed of scientific advances in this area.

Excerpt from the “IPPC in 20 years” discussions:

* *Regional centres of expertise for laboratories with specific expertise available for use by developing CPs particularly for the diagnosis of critical pests.*

A valuable contribution to implementation of the IPPC and ISPM’s and in fact a valuable contribution to the global plant health community, would be to enable every country to have access to highly qualified, reliable diagnostic services in the form of IPPC Recognised Reference Laboratories. There may be only 1 or 2 reference laboratories in a region, or there may be reference laboratories with recognised competencies in certain defined diagnostic techniques or pest groups. The Reference Laboratories would be part of an NPPO’s organisation and other countries access it through service agreements.

Most countries would have some sort of diagnostic capability perhaps targeted to the pests they encounter the most and the capability they are able to maintain. This would then be supplimented by services from reference laboratories and a remote microscopy network and facilitated access for pathogen samples.

The OIE already have a system to support this and a network of recognised laboratories around the world so we could learn and adapt from that past experience.

Perhaps this could be part of a wider initiative of enhancing regional plant health services through IPPC facilitating development of standards and formal recognition/accreditation across a range of services wider than just diagnostics.

Initiative Outline: 7. Management of Established Pests and Diseases

An opportunity exists for the IPPC to leverage its plant health knowledge to assist countires to better manage the impacts of established pests and diseases.

Excerpt from the “IPPC in 20 years” discussions:

* *Contracting parties will need to be confident that the IPPC can provide increased assistance following such pest reports if they are to support this. This confidence can be developed through the coordination of integrated pest management response and NPPO assistance teams (Pest control Article IV 2a Emergency action Article VII 6) to provide technical assistance as required.*
* *Pest management options: operational material available for pest-host situations. Environmental and forestry sectors provided with sufficient information and tools.*
* *Systems and cooperation available for CPs with pests of national concern with the provision of technical tools and support for countries to combat pests affecting their food security and economy*
* *Merging the FAO activities with regard to plant health (IPPC) and the plant protection components of the “Emergency Prevention System (EMPRES). The FAO places the phytosanitary EMPRES projects in form of supplementary agreements under the IPPC. Annually at the occasion of the CPM meetings of the members of these supplementary agreements meet to plan further control activities. The oversight committees are composed of representatives of the countries which are members of the relevant supplementary agreement.*

Broadening IPPC mandate to include management / impact mitigation for established pests. Some contracting parties have expressed keenness to do this in the recent past, eg. at SPG in 2014 years ago. No doubt this would benefit contracting parties but perhaps it should be done via IPPC connecting better with FAO rather than broadening IPPCs mandate – a question worth discussing.

Rinderpest appeared as a devastating disease in the 1980’s. OIE established a global eradication programme for and declared it successfully eradicated in 2011.

Wouldn’t that be a great IPPC achievement – what pest would we choose?

Initiative Outline: 8. A Sustainable Funding Solution

A sustainable funding solution is a must.

Excerpt from the “IPPC in 20 years” discussions:

* *The key challenge, however, is making the IPPC a self-supporting organization that can adequately fund its mission and be viewed as a high performing, credible, and needed international organization. The trend among inter-governmental organizations, like the CPM, is to rely increasingly on voluntary contributions from non-governmental sources, rather than a traditional budget based on assessed contributions from member governments. We envision that the development and ongoing maintenance of a global ePhyto system can be a major IPPC contribution to making the future global trade system functional and safe, while also creating a new opportunity for the IPPC to generate revenue to cover its costs, support the exchange and movement of goods, and allow it to be self-funded.*