



Open Ended Working Group on Building National Phytosanitary Capacity (OEWG-BNPC)

8 – 12 December 2008,

Rome, Italy.

Final Report

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING (MEETING CHAIR)

1. At its June 2008 meeting, the Bureau elected Reinouw Bast-Tjeerde (Canada), Chair of the CPM, to chair the OEWG-BNPC meeting.
2. Welcome from IPPC Secretary

The Secretary welcomed the participants and expressed delight to see such a high level of interest in the subject reflected in the attendance. He informed the working group that its work extended from mandates given by the SPTA/CPM and the FAO governing body. He noted that the development of a capacity building strategy is the most important area still to be realised by the IPPC. He estimated that there were over 300 years of experience in plant protection in the room and that we should learn from each other. Ultimately, the Secretary expressed desire to see the work of the group translated into the major outputs for the IPPC so that the standards can be better implemented by the majority of the Contracting Parties. He wished the group a good working session.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (MEETING CHAIR)

2.1 Agenda

3. The agenda was reviewed and accepted with no modifications. The chair revised the order in which some of the papers would be introduced due to the late arrival of some of the presenters. It was decided that the papers from the author Bill Roberts and the country submission from Australia would be presented by the Secretariat. The agenda is attached in Annex 1.

2.2 Documents List

4. The chair reviewed the list of background documents and discussion papers. The Chair indicated that the Canada paper would be presented orally since the author was unable to formally submit a paper. The document list is attached in Annex 2.

2.3 List of Participants

5. Around 40 delegates, representing all FAO regions, from both national and relevant international organizations attended. The list of participants is attached in Annex 3.

3. DISCUSSION TERMS OF REFERENCE AND GOALS OF THE OEWG (MEETING CHAIR)

3.1 Background

6. The Chair introduced the Terms of Reference for the meeting which were developed and approved by CPM. The Chair reminded the participants that the mandate to provide technical assistance is written into the convention and made reference to Article XX of the Convention which states that Contracting Parties agree to promote Technical Assistance either bilaterally or through organizations with the objective to facilitate implementation of the convention. Furthermore, the ICPM and CPM have discussed Technical Assistance extensively. At ICPM 3 a decision was reached to establish an informal working group for Technical Assistance.
7. Improving phytosanitary capacity has also been established as a goal within the CPM Business plan. The Chair emphasized the fact that the CPM rejected the Independent Evaluation (IE) recommendations concerning capacity building, (i.e., that the IPPC do less phytosanitary capacity building and FAO do more), thereby reinforcing the need for an IPPC capacity building concept and strategy. The chair emphasized that that it will take a coordinated approach to develop a PCB strategy and that the OEWG meeting participants are the right people to build the PCB strategy.
8. The chair emphasized the need to be pragmatic and realistic when developing the expected outputs identified in the TOR for the OEWG meeting (i.e., draft concept paper, draft strategy, and draft operational plan). Particularly, it was noted that certain elements in the Terms of Reference might not be achieved (i.e., a 6 year operational plan); but so long as the operational plan clearly defined next steps it would suffice. In this regard the participants were invited to flag the elements of the strategy that may require further development by working groups or experts post meeting.

3.2 Goals/Outputs

9. The Chair defined the three expected outputs of the meeting: a draft concept paper; a draft strategy document; an indicative operational plan.

3.3 Report

10. The Chair informed the delegates that due to the postponement of the OEWG meeting from September to December, the informal working group on strategic planning and technical assistance (SPTA) would not have the opportunity to deliberate on the outputs of the OEWG-BNPC; but that the SPTA had agreed that the meeting outputs (draft concept paper, draft strategy, indicative operational plan) could be presented directly to CPM4.

DISCUSSION PAPERS

4. IPPC CONCEPT PAPER -- PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY – DEFINITION AND LESSONS LEARNED, PETER KENMORE AND JEFFREY JONES (PRESENTED BY JEFFREY JONES).

11. Mr. Jeffrey Jones introduced the paper (OEWG document 6) and emphasized five points:

- Definition: Cited the need for a definition on phytosanitary capacity. He provided a definition for phytosanitary capacity in the context of the IPPC and invited the delegates to consider it.
- Priority areas and Lessons learnt from IPPCs involvement in Phytosanitary Capacity Building (PCB): Listed the priority areas where countries have requested help from the IPPC in implementing the convention and its standards. He reviewed issues that need to be addressed in order to implement specific ISPMS and highlighted that needs are not limited to training but involve a complex level and range of interactions.
- Delimiting IPPC's role in PCB: Urged that the IPPC's current limited resources should not limit its future role in PCB; rather the IPPC's role in PCB should be based on a clear vision of its potential to influence PCB, whether direct or indirectly. The IPPC should then adjust its institution to deliver on its mandate.
- Pillars of IPPC implementation: Identified three pillars on which to base PCB delivery, namely standards implementation, guidance on phytosanitary priorities, and networking. Pillars can only be reliably sustained when there is adequate mobilization of funds. As such this should be a part of the IPPC strategy for implementation.
- Actions to support capacity building strategy: He introduced three areas that include resource mobilization, facilitation of possible donor inputs by the IPPC and collaboration with other agencies or donors.

12. List of five priorities for implementation of PCB strategy were identified:

- Ensure regional and national empowerment – Listed several means by which regional interactions could result in national empowerment including building cadres of technical experts, champions for PCB, and involvement of RPPOs. He noted that some RPPOs are weak and need inputs from the stronger organizations.
- Establish networks for sustainable PCB – involvement of universities by infusing, collaboration of taxonomic institutions and others how best to tap into their resources.
- Establish centres of phytosanitary excellence – important in areas where PC is weak and the countries in that region can be assisted.
- Engage where possible RPPOs – ensure that they play an important role in the IPPC work programme – TA can be one of those roles.
- Direct involvement of FAO Regional Plant Protection Officers – important to enlist and strengthen their support to achieve region PCB.

5. INVITED DISCUSSION PAPER BY BILL ROBERTS (PRESENTED BY JEFFREY JONES)

13. The paper written by Bill Roberts (OEWG document 7) provided an analysis of the current situation of PCB. It noted that a number of PCB activities are being undertaken by NGOs, FAO and others as well as country level initiatives. In terms of the IPPC, the paper noted that few countries have contributed to the Trust Fund which is a limitation to setting up a coherent PCB programme. The author concluded that CPM plays a limited role in the delivery of PCB.

14. In light of the above considerations, the author proposed three possibilities for engaging the CPM in PCB, that is, continue the *ad hoc* approach to PCB; function as a coordinator and facilitator or develop a strategy for direct involvement in PCB. The author argues that, based on the CPM's establishment of the OEWG, the CPM has already elected to follow the option for direct involvement in PCB. This should include direct efforts toward addressing basic functions including regulatory and legislative frameworks and that PCB should focus on understanding and implementing standards.
15. In terms of standards implementation, the author proposed that a capacity building strategy be developed along with every new ISPM and that approval of the standard should be contingent on the provision of such a strategy. The capacity building strategy would focus on assisting the largest possible number of NPPOs, that is, focus on regional needs.
16. The author listed the resources that would be necessary to implement a PCB strategy and noted that this would require obtaining extra budgetary funding. Obtaining this funding would require selling the IPPC mandate and its global impact.
17. The author argued that PCB should be recognized as a high priority and significant resources should be allocated to this area over the next three years. Furthermore, the author argued that PCB may even take precedence over Standard setting. The author believes significant resources should be allocated to this area over the next 3 years.
18. During the ensuing discussion, members of the OEWG-BNPC re-emphasized the importance of regional approaches to PCB and the need to coordinate with regional technical organizations such as IICA, SPC, SADEC, etc.

6. INVITED DISCUSSION PAPER BY JOHN HEDLEY (AUTHOR)

19. The paper (OEWG document 8) proposed a definition of PCB: The ability to accomplish the functions of an NPPO so as to meet the plant protection requirements and trade facilitation needs of the country or territory. This stresses the relationship of the CPM with the relevant organizations - the NPPOs of contracting parties. In relation to the proposed definition, the author noted that there was also a need to describe what an NPPO does. He referred to a similar initiative undertaken by the OIE in regard to veterinary services. He noted that the Convention and the ISPMs mention some of these functions but do not present them as a coherent whole. Tools such as the PCE include most of the areas of what an NPPO does but not in a form that is easy to understand.
20. The author suggested a strategy based on: a description of the present situation; a determination of what the PCB programme would aim for in the form of a mission statement and goals; and a work programme for implementation of the goals. The importance of accurately describing the present situation before we actually go ahead in developing a strategy was emphasized.
21. The author emphasized that the IPPC has a comparative advantage over other bodies that may try to assist with phytosanitary capacity building since it is in the privileged position of being in FAO, working with WTO and other organizations, and has direct linkages to RPPOs and NPPOs.
22. The goals proposed by the author for inclusion in the PCB strategy had similar basic aims as those of the Secretariat paper. They were: the determination of the requirements of developing countries; coordination with other agencies in developing PCB programmes; development of PCB programmes relating to the implementation of ISPMs for specific countries or regions.
23. The author recognised that developing an operational plan for implementing the strategy would require time and depend on the proper allocation of resources. A draft time table was presented. The author also suggested that placing higher priority for implementation on activities such as surveillance could attract

more donor interest to phytosanitary capacity building and have significant impact in the delivery of PCB.

7. SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION PAPERS:

24. It was recognised that implementation of standards is complex, involving many different areas/capabilities, and is more easily said than done. It was noted that there is a gap/imbalance between standards development and standards implementation. That is, between how many standards have been adopted by the IPPC and how well they are being implemented by contracting parties.
25. There are many elements to phytosanitary capacity building. Perspectives vary at national, regional, and international levels, and each has a role to play.
26. Members of the group agreed that the lack of resources should not influence the scope of the capacity building strategy. Partners are needed to obtain resources.
27. To evaluate national phytosanitary capacity, tools other than the PCE should also be available and a more basic tool than PCE is needed.
28. There is the need for regional approaches, such as cadres, regional centres of excellence, etc - to garner all regional expertise, all to improve capacity for the benefit of the countries in those regions.
29. The PCB strategy should ensure that training strengthens institutions and not just individuals.
30. It is very important to coordinate PCB by donors in order to prevent duplication in training and technical assistance. There needs to be coordination/cooperation with donors at the international, regional and national levels.
31. A definition of phytosanitary capacity is required and the definition needs to be applicable to individual countries.
32. The strategy should be based on the fact that the IPPC is unique (e.g. phytosanitary standards are unique to the IPPC) and it has a comparative advantage in the phytosanitary arena.
33. If the IPPC is to be successful, effort is needed to ensure that all members are able to implement standards. Implementation could take a regional focus and ensure that the RPPOs play a role. Regional models work well because they can address differences between regions – emphasis on use of different approaches in different regions.
34. There is a need to increase the visibility of the IPPC. In order to do so the IPPC should better publicize its unique role and relevance in the protection of plant resources and facilitation of trade. With increased visibility it should be easier to obtain resources that are needed.
35. For the overall PCB strategy, a one size fits all approach will not work, the IPPC should be cognizant of what is available where and build on that.

EXPERT PAPERS

8. CABI DISCUSSION PAPER BY ROGER DAY (AUTHOR)

36. The author presented the paper (OEWG document 9) which focused on concepts of capacity building in development work. He offered an analysis of the definition of capacity used by a number of international and multilateral agencies. Particular reference was made to the UNDP definition and its approach to capacity building. Comparison was made to the definition of phytosanitary capacity given by the Informal Working Group on Technical Assistance and to the definition given in the paper by John Hedley.
37. The author highlighted five elements that should be included in the PCB strategy: engaging stakeholders; assessing capacity needs; formulating responses (national as well as donor level); implementing a capacity building response and evaluating capacity development.
38. The author urged that the principles outlined in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (Report of High Level Forum held in Paris, France, March 2, 2005) are reflected in the capacity building strategy, in particular in relation to donor interventions.
39. The author gave an example of the use of a mentoring system as used by the STDF and suggested that modelling a system off the example could serve a good purpose in the IPPC.

9. STDF DISCUSSION PAPER BY KENZA LE MENTEC (AUTHOR)

40. The paper (OEWG document 10) introduced by the STDF highlighted capacity building and its relationship to trade and aid for trade. The paper noted the level of importance of trade of plant and plant products in terms of its growth over a number of years. The paper recognised that with growing trade the risk for movement of pests increased and therefore justified the need for countries to protect trade through establishment of effective phytosanitary systems.
41. The author also noted that the plant protection community was not effective in communicating the cost of pest spread, losses of production and productivity and the linkage between pest spread and poverty due in part to lost trade opportunities. The role of NPPOs as an invaluable advocate at country level in raising the profile of plant health with policy makers was also emphasized.
42. The STDF paper also recognised the IPPC's role in standard setting and urged that possible repercussions should be considered before the IPPC decides to slow down standard development in favour of standards implementation.
43. The paper emphasized STDF's role in terms of its advocacy work for plant health i.e. establish the link between trade and plant health, in aid for trade evaluations, raising the profile of SPS issues in policy frameworks and moving toward basket funds for implementation.
44. The author noted the difficulty in obtaining accurate and updated information on PCB activities due to the wide ranging initiatives under which they occur making it impossible to relate the information. In particular the author noted that phytosanitary capacity projects were often included in other initiatives.
45. The author encourages the continued participation of the IPPC in the STDF since it would serve to place it in direct contact with donors.

46. The author criticised the PCE in terms of its application and not engaging a wider number of stakeholders during implementation. It noted that the confidentiality clause placed it at a disadvantage for donors to react appropriately to country needs. The author recommended that more could be done with the PCE in terms of sharing information of the assessments done and the importance of using the information by countries to prioritise needs and integrating them in national poverty reduction plans.
47. The author also emphasized the need to measure impact and recognized that appropriate impact indicators need to be developed. A recommendation was made for the IPPC to develop a framework to assess impact of capacity building and to develop impact indicators.
48. The role of the STDF in terms of its coordination potential was reviewed. Contributions in terms of tracking technical assistance flows, information sharing and organization of thematic events particularly those where donors inform about ongoing capacity building initiatives were some of the strong points identified.
49. The STDF stated that continued participation of the IPPC was needed at its meetings in particular to provide guidance, for example on activities planned for certain countries, and this in turn gives the IPPC and plant protection greater visibility.

10. OIE PRESENTATION BY MARA GONZALEZ (AUTHOR)

50. The OIE representative gave a detailed presentation on the Performance of Veterinary Services tool (PVS) which is used for evaluation of national veterinary services in countries.
51. The OIE highlighted its role in terms of coordination of activities related to the capacity building of veterinary services, provision of expertise and help to improve regulatory frameworks.
52. The PVS tool has been used to evaluate the level of compliance with OIE standards, of almost half of the 172 countries that make up the OIE. The tool may be used by OIE certified experts to evaluate the performance of the Veterinary Services, but also could be used to conduct self evaluations. The outcomes of the application of the tool may also be used in the decision making process in bilateral negotiations and to support national financial requests for assistance and investments.
53. The representative of the OIE provided a step by step detailed methodology of the implementation of the PVS from country request to the production of a report of findings. It was stressed that the initial results were confidential in nature and were only made public with the country's approval.
54. A few additional points to register were that funding for OIE experts was through the OIE World Fund for Animal Health and Welfare (sources of donations are the World Bank, United States of America (USDA), United Kingdom, Switzerland, Japan, France, European Commission, Australia and Canada), all requests for a PVS evaluation receive a positive response but exceptionally some countries do not follow up its initial request. The organization of PVS evaluation missions is sometimes difficult with technical and logistical aspects to consider; a GAP analysis to follow up on the PVS evaluation in terms of investments is not always requested and has only been carried out in 11 countries to date.

11. SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS OF THE EXPERT PAPERS

55. Assessments of phytosanitary capacity need to also assess if organizations are actually carrying out the required functions, not just if the capacity is available to carry them out. In this regard a range of tools are required, not just the PCE.

56. On developing the strategy there is a need to recognize globally accepted concepts eg. Subsidiarity - activities should be carried out at the lowest possible level.
57. An element considered important was monitoring of PCB efforts to evaluate whether goals of the strategy are achieved.
58. New approaches, such as mentoring or other ways to achieve synergies in capacity building, should be considered. Respective roles of the different parties for these approaches need to be clarified.
59. The members emphasized that beneficiaries of projects need to have assurance that funding is going to be available.
60. A benchmark system was considered desirable to be able to better measure how much of gap there is with the expected outcome.
61. Capacity building projects should preferably have impact indicators to show linkages to other, broader projects or initiatives.
62. Although plant health projects are often combined with ongoing initiatives, there is a need for some single plant health specific projects.
63. Members emphasized the importance of raising the visibility of the IPPC and to advocate plant protection. Public/private memberships should be promoted.
64. A specific need for countries is the ability to detect new and emerging problems (surveillance in countries and information gathering).

COUNTRY PAPERS

65. Delegates from Australia, Azerbaijan, India and Kenya also provided discussion papers. Presentations were made on behalf of Canada and the UK as well as each of the aforementioned countries.

12. CANADA DISCUSSION PAPER (REINOUW BAST-TJEERDE FOR LESLEY CREE)

66. The chair made a submission on behalf of the author in the absence of a formal paper. The author highlighted that PCB should be aligned along three pillars: 1. Knowledge and skill, 2. Resources, and 3. Opportunity.
67. The author used PRA and the recently developed PRA training package as an example of how the first pillar, knowledge and skill, could be incorporated into a PCB strategy.
68. The second pillar would be translated into action perhaps through networking, resource sharing, and establishment of a mentoring system. The important element was to establish a system between countries that have and those that do not.
69. The third pillar introduced by the author focused on establishing an enabling environment and examples of this would be revised legislation and improved infrastructures to allow for import inspections and export facilitation.

13. AUSTRALIA DISCUSSION PAPER (JEFFREY JONES FOR LOIS RANSOM)

70. The secretariat introduced the paper (OEWG document 15) on behalf of the author. The paper introduced the concept of a continuum that connects capacity building to the production chain. The author referenced Australia's Biosecurity System as a model for appropriate phytosanitary capacity.
71. The paper recommended a model capability framework that includes the provision of an evaluation tool; providing a focal point for collating, identifying, assisting parties to undertake phytosanitary capacity evaluation, liaising with other international organizations and donor networks, providing a help desk, and provision of explanatory notes and implementation guidance for each ISPM.
72. The author also emphasized that contracting parties have basic responsibilities within a PCB framework, i.e., to develop their own strategy, develop a plan to achieve goals established, implement the plan, review and analyse outcomes against goals and plan again.
73. The paper introduced a framework of functional areas for phytosanitary capacity and provided an outline of Plant Health Building Steps.

14. KENYA DISCUSSION PAPER BY WASHINGTON OTIENO (AUTHOR)

74. The country submission (OEWG document 13) focused on the project to establish a Centre of Phytosanitary Excellence (COPE) based in Kenya. The author emphasized that the COPE, although housed in KEPHIS, is a public sector agency that is used regionally. Main funders include the STDF, KEPHIS and the Netherlands.
75. The author highlighted that the private sector plays an active role to drive PCB and in the case of COPE is founded on existing facilities and procedures. It was designed not only to deliver service but also to train people.
76. The overall objectives are to reorient development and utilization of phytosanitary capacity in Africa leading to better management of contemporary phytosanitary issues and establishing good systems for accessing markets.
77. Capitalizing on the existing capacity in its region, e.g. for PRA, training, use of services, and strengthening of legal and institutional frameworks, is one of COPE's specific objectives cited. The members agreed that it is important to share and use synergies that are in a region.
78. The author emphasized the need to train trainers in countries of the region, to strengthen systems for information exchange and to help build capacity not just for Kenya but for the region. The author pointed out that a training need assessment has already been implemented in eastern African countries. There will be a pool of capacity to start from.
79. In terms of the PCB strategy the author recommended that the IPPC should focus on resource mobilization and partnerships, building a core group of resource persons at regional level, and it should position itself on African issues in order to obtain visibility on global level, especially when considering the impact of invasive pests.
80. The author stressed the need for IAPSC to champion PCB initiatives for Africa and to support it so that it can become an effective RPPO.

15. INDIA DISCUSSION PAPER BY R.V. KHETARPAL (AUTHOR)

81. The author, in opening, underscored the need for the IPPC to be visible and recommended use of terms such as biosecurity and food security to sell itself (OEWG document 14).
82. The author recounted India's experience in phytosanitary capacity building and more recently the establishment of a biosecurity framework. He cited examples of success and examples of failure in the delivery of PCB.
83. In terms of the IPPC strategy the author recommended that there was a need for a global standard for phytosanitary capacity evaluation. He indicated that the current PCE must be supplemented by other tools to cover issues related to geographic location, economic status, language, level of education, promotion of policies (example of personnel moving up levels), and inter-ministerial coordination.
84. He emphasized that capacity should have a long term benefit. The author supported the view that capacity building should have both short and long term approaches allowing for countries to develop gradually.
85. The author stressed the importance of sharing of facilities and diagnostics at the regional level, placing special focus on emergency issues and expanding technical cooperation among developing countries (TCDC) consultants to develop a list of regional experts.
86. The author recommended that assessment of the IPPC funding capacity was needed in conjunction with an assessment of the status of involvement of global donors. If this is achieved the IPPC would be in a better position to use donors and to have synergy for an effective PCB programme.
87. The author recommended expanding seeking funds from traditional donors to include those agencies involved in environmental, biodiversity and biosafety issues.
88. The author also emphasized that all PCB activities would not be sustainable unless assurance was given for sustainable national funding. He believes that the beneficiary of PCB should ultimately become independent and sustain their national programmes.

16. AZERBAIJAN DISCUSSION PAPER BY DILZARA AGHAYEVA (AUTHOR)

89. The author presented on the experience of phytosanitary capacity building in Azerbaijan (OEWG document 15a). The author stated that the Government started the process in 2003 with an FAO funded project for strengthening the state phytosanitary control service.
90. The author gave an overview of the progress made to date including providing a description of their updated institutional arrangements (organogram), progress in enacting legislation, their recent membership in the regional RPPO (EPPO) and achieving accreditation of laboratories. Government initiatives in establishing intergovernmental agreements on cooperation in the field of plant quarantine and protection with seven countries, establishment of a one window system as part of compliance with WTO-SPS requirements, moving toward national adoption of ISPMs and development of pest surveillance programmes was also highlighted.
91. Notwithstanding this the author emphasized the further need for specific technical assistance and support in a number of areas including provision of local quarantine points with appropriate minimum materials and equipment, information exchange with countries, establishment of a computer network between NPPO and internal quarantine; need for funds to establish surveillance programmes, need to translate the documents from the English language into Azeri language, creation of a group of experts

for conducting PRA and help in learning languages necessary for communicating with trading partners and participating in global phytosanitary fora.

17. SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS ON COUNTRY PAPERS

92. Members concurred that capacity building is for two objectives - for biodiversity and trade. They recognised that capacity levels are different for each country and the strategy should be flexible and make provisions for the different levels.
93. Promotion of Public/private partnerships: Members agreed that beside governments, universities and institutions and private sector should be engaged in phytosanitary capacity building. Commitments from higher levels of government with respect to legislation updates and also to ensure sustainability (higher level buy in) in PCB are needed.
94. The benefits of the ISPMs and the IPPC need to be described (advocacy) in order to improve visibility. The term biosecurity may capture more attention than plant quarantine and plant protection. The members agreed that Advocacy should be at both the global and national level.
95. Funding is required not only for the capacity building strategy but also for the Secretariat (if it is going to do more work, it needs more funds).
96. Regarding coordination – there is a lot of phytosanitary capacity building going on in every region already and quite a bit of duplication is happening – we don't know where the gaps are. We need to find out where these gaps are to prevent duplication in order to get greater bang for your buck.
97. The members recognised that contracting parties have responsibilities both internally and internationally. Policies inside a country may influence ability to enforce plant protection which may result in conflicting priorities.
98. The need for a definition of Phytosanitary capacity was re-stated.
99. The members agreed that in developing the strategy the OEWG should focus on the seven areas defined in the table of the Australian paper (table 1 of paper 15) so as not to get lost in too broad a discussion.
100. The strategy would need to be simple rather than a complicated one.
101. The participants recognised that phytosanitary capacity comes from within the region. There is a need to enhance cooperation in order to establish capacity and infrastructure. This should be addressed in future PCB.

RESULTS

18. ELEMENTS OF A PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY BUILDING STRATEGY

102. The chair established a small working group to work on the development of a definition for national phytosanitary capacity and the elements associated with the concept of national phytosanitary capacity.
 - The chair also established three small groups to work on the development of the key elements of a PCB strategy. She instructed the three groups to present their deliberations to the plenary

group. After presentation of the initial proposals, one small group continued to work on the PCB strategy, one group worked on a proposal for an operational plan, based on a first draft of the strategy and a third group worked on the overarching issues, such as the situation description, a possible mission statement and elements of an advocacy program

19. AGREEMENT ON ELEMENTS OF CONCEPT, STRATEGY, AND OPERATIONAL PLAN TO BE PRESENTED TO THE CPM

19.1 Draft Concept Paper for Presentation to CPM

103. A definition was discussed and agreed. The definition reads as, “The ability of individuals, organizations and systems of a country to perform functions effectively and sustainably in order to protect plants and plant products from pests and to facilitate trade, in accordance with the IPPC”.

104. Refer to Annex 4 for the full draft concept paper.

19.2 Draft Strategy for Presentation to CPM

105. There was extensive deliberation on the draft strategy. Three versions were produced and amalgamated into one strategy document.

106. The elements of the final version were agreed upon but it was recognised that the document needed to be polished and reformatted. See Annex 5 for the final version from the OEWG.

19.3 Draft Operational Plan for Presentation to CPM

107. Elements of the operational plan as presented were discussed. There was considerable discussion on the advocacy element, ie, on who would implement it. The Secretariat clarified that it would not be able to implement it alone (general advocacy programme) but could implement a part of it in particular to ensure that PCB be focused. The Chair recognised that without a defined strategy it would be very difficult to develop the operational plan further. The operational plan is considered to be indicative and would require more work to finalize for presentation to CPM 4. The indicative plan is attached in Annex 6. It is anticipated that additional meetings following CPM 4 may be required to finalize the operational plan.

20. FOLLOW-ON TASKS AND PRESENTATION OF PAPERS TO THE CPM (MEETING CHAIR)

108. It was suggested that as the IPPC moves forward it should address the six strategic areas outlined in the strategy (i.e. assessment of needs and planning, provision of assistance for standards implementation, coordination and communication, resource mobilisation, advocacy, and sustainability).

109. It was agreed that the Informal Working Group on Technical Assistance and PCE would be the appropriate forum to work on the elements of the strategy dealing with the assessment of needs (area one).

110. With respect to the provision of assistance for standards, it was felt that the implementation of the IRSS would meet that objective (area 2).

111. The participants discussed the importance of moving forward on the aspects of the strategy related to facilitating and improving communication and coordination and agreed to recommend to CPM that a working group should be established to further the work on that (area 3).
112. The second aspect of the proposed strategy which could not easily be assigned or achieved through existing working groups or already existing initiatives were the areas of resource mobilization and advocacy. It was agreed to recommend to CPM that a working group consisting of NPPOs works to address the advocacy programme (area 5). The advocacy programme would be part of a resource mobilization programme.
113. The participants thought that work on the sustainability of the PCB strategy could only start once the strategy was in place and that no immediate steps were required in this area (area 6)
114. To make immediate progress on the sub-elements of mentoring and understanding the principles of the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness in the context of the IPPC, two subgroups were established. The work of the two sub-groups would be conducted via email and the information documents should be finalized for presentation to the CPM 4.
115. The sub-group on a draft document on principles for effective phytosanitary capacity building was composed of the delegates from the USA (Mary Lisa Maddel), Belize (Delilah Cabb), Zambia (Arundel Sakala) and two officers from the IPPC Secretariat (Lottie Erikson and Melanie Bateman)
116. Delegates from Zambia (Brian Sofu), STDF (Kenza Le Mentec), UK (Julian Smith), Canada (Lesley Cree), SPC (Sidney Suma), Belize (Delilah Cabb), and an officer of the Secretariat (Melanie Bateman) were identified to develop a draft document on an IPPC mentoring strategy.
117. The representative from CABI was asked to “polish and reformat” the PCB strategy and operational plan in time for presentation to CPM-4.

21. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING (MEETING CHAIR)

118. The Chair of the OEWG-PCB meeting provided the closing remarks and congratulated the participants for their participation and hard work in meeting the goals and objectives set out in the terms of reference. The chair considered the meeting a success. The meeting was adjourned at 12:45pm December, 12, 2008.

ANNEX 1 – Agenda

Open Ended Working Group on Phytosanitary Capacity Building 8 – 12 December 2008, Rome, Italy

Agenda Item
1. Opening of the Meeting (Meeting Chair) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting Chair Welcome from IPPC Secretary
2. Adoption of the Agenda (Meeting Chair) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agenda Documents List List of Participants Local Information
3. Discussion Terms of Reference and Goals of the OEWG (Meeting Chair) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background Goals/Outputs
4. IPPC Concept Paper -- Presentation and Group Discussion (Peter Kenmore, Jeffrey Jones) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phytosanitary Capacity – Definition and Lessons Learned Suggested IPPC Role in Phytosanitary Capacity Suggested Priorities for Implementing Capacity Building Strategy <p><i>Q&A/ Group Discussion</i></p>
Discussion Papers (Presented by Authors) <i>(Please Limit Presentations to 30 Minutes)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invited Discussion Paper by Bill Roberts (presented by Jeffrey Jones) Invited Discussion Paper by John Hedley <i>Q&A/Discussion/Break</i> CABI Discussion Paper (Roger Day) STDF Discussion Paper (Kenza Lementec) OIE Presentation (Mara Gonzales) <i>Q&A /Discussion/Break</i> Canada Discussion Paper (Reinouw Bast-Tjeerde for Lesley Cree) Kenya Discussion Paper (Washington Otieno) India Discussion Paper (R.V. Khetarpal) Australia Discussion Paper, Lois Ransom Azerbaijan Discussion Paper, Dilzara Aghayeva <i>Group Discussion –elements of a phytosanitary capacity building strategy</i>
5. IPPC Role in Phytosanitary Capacity Building (Small Group Discussion and Reporting) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convene in Mexico Room -- identify small group members, leaders, rapporteurs (Meeting Chair) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group 1 – AGPP Meeting Room, B750 Group 2 – Slovak Business Center, Ground floor, Bldg. B Group 3 – Mexico Room, D211 <p>All Groups re-convene in Mexico Room for Reporting and Discussion</p>

6. Priority Steps for Implementing Phytosanitary Capacity Building Strategy (Small Group Discussion and Reporting) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Convene in Mexico Room -- identify small group members, leaders, rapporteurs (Meeting Chair)<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Group 1 – AGPP Meeting Room, B750○ Group 2 – Slovak Business Center, Ground floor, Bldg. B○ Group 3 – Mexico Room, D211 <p>All Groups re-convene in Mexico Room for Reporting and Discussion</p>
7. Agreement on elements of concept, strategy, and operational plan to be presented to the CPM <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Draft Concept Paper for Presentation to CPM• Draft Strategy for Presentation to CPM• Draft Operational Plan for Presentation to CPM
8. Follow-On Tasks and Presentation of papers to the CPM (Meeting Chair)
9. Adjournment of Meeting (Meeting Chair)

ANNEX 2 – Document list

Open Ended Working Group Phytosanitary Capacity Building Rome, December 8 – 12, 2008 (December 3, 2008)

Meeting Documents

1. Agenda
2. Document List
3. List of Participants
4. Local Information
5. Terms of Reference for the open-ended working group on building national phytosanitary capacity
6. IPPC Secretariat Draft Concept Paper
7. Invited Discussion Paper, Bill Roberts*
8. Invited Discussion Paper, John Hedley
9. CABI Discussion Paper, Roger Day
10. STDF Discussion Paper, Kenza Lementec
11. OIE Presentation, Mara Gonzalez
12. Canada Discussion Paper, Lesley Cree*
13. Kenya Discussion Paper, Washington Otieno
14. India Discussion Paper, R.V. Kheterpal
15. Australia Discussion Paper, Lois Ransom
- 15a. Azerbaijan Discussion Paper, Dilzara Aghayeva

Background Documents

16. Programme for the Development of the IPPC Implementation Review and Support System
17. Report of the OEWG on a Possible Compliance Mechanism under the IPPC
18. SPTA and FAO Responses to the IPPC Evaluation Recommendations on Capacity Building
19. STDF Evaluation of the PRA Workshop
20. PCE_CABI_Assessment

* To be presented on behalf of the Authors.

ANNEX 3 - PARTICIPANT LIST

Open-Ended Working Group Phytosanitary Capacity Building
08 – 12, December 2008
Rome, Italy

PARTICIPANTS	
<p>Ms. Dilzara AGHAYEVA IPPC contact point to Azerbaijan State Phytosanitary Control Service at the Ministry of Agriculture R. Aliyev 5, Az 1025 Baku Azerbaijan</p> <p>Tel: +994124902464 FAX +994124902464 E-mail: a_dilzara@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Mr. Porfirio ALVAREZ Director of IPM Program Plant Health Department Departamento de Sanidad Vegetal Secretaria de Estado de Agricultura Santo Domingo Republica Dominicana</p> <p>E-mail: jerahme72@yahoo.com; Porfirio_alvarez@yahoo.es</p>
<p>Mr. Marcel BAKAK Head, Plant Quarantine Ministry of Agriculture Minader, Yaounde Cameroon</p> <p>Tel: +23799961337 FAX: +23725050934 E-mail: Mandjek4@yahoo.fr</p>	<p>Mrs. Reinouw BAST-TJEERDE OEWG Meeting Chair CPM Bureau Chair Manager of International Plant Protection Issues Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Promenade Camelot 59 Ottawa ON K1A 0Y9 Canada</p> <p>Tel: (+1) 613-221-4344 Fax: (+1) 613 228 6602 E-mail: Reinouw.Bast-Tjeerde@inspection.gc.ca</p>
<p>Ms. Delilah A.CABB Coordinator Sanitary and Phytosanitary Enquiry Point Belize Agricultural Health Authority Central Farm, Cayo District, Belize</p> <p>Tel: 501 824 4899/4872 FAX: 501 824 3773/4899 E-mail: bahasps@btl.net</p>	<p>Ms. Hannah CLARENDON Crop Protection Officer RAFT-AG FAO Regional Office for Africa Gamel Abdul Nasser Road P.O.Box 1628 Accra Ghana</p> <p>Tel: 233 21 67 5000 ext. 3137 Fax 233 21 7010943 E-mail: hannah.clarendon@fao.org</p>

PARTICIPANTS	
Mr. Ambrose CHINEKE Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service, Moor Plantation, P.M.B. 5672, Ibadan. Nigeria Tel: 234 - 8038064378 234 - 22008446 E-mail: npgs_ngr@yahoo.com ; ambrosechineke@yahoo.co.uk	Mr. Zdenek CHROMY Head of Region Department Address: State Phytosanitary Administration Region Department Havlickuv Brod Smetanovo nam. 279 580 01 Havlickuv Brod The Czech Republic Tel: +420 724 248 914 Fax: +420 569 421 158 E-mail: zdenek.chromy@srs.cz
Mr. Roger DAY Director CABI Africa United Nations Avenue P.O.Box 633-00621 Nairobi, Kenya E-mail: R.Day@cabi.org	Mr. Ernesto GALLIANI President of COSAVE Independencia National 821 di Humanita, Edificio Lider VI Piso 5, oficinas 4 and 5, Asunción Paraguay Tel/FAX 59521 453 922 E-mail: cosave@cosave.org ; proteccionvegetal@senave.gov.py
Mr. Blaise GASSILA Directeur de la Production Agricole et de la Protection des Végétaux Ministère de l'Agriculture ET DE LÉLEVAGE B.P. 2453 Brazzaville Tel: (+242) 669 25 42/ 564 2991 Tel: (+242) 81 45 13 (c/o FAO Office) E-mail: blaisegassila@yahoo.fr ;	Ms. Mennie GERRITSEN-WIELARD Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality P.O. box 20401 2500 EK The Hague, The Netherlands E-mail: m.j.gerritsen@minlnv.nl
Ms. Mara E GONZALEZ ORTIZ Deputy Head, Regional Activities Department International Organization for Animal Health (OIE) 12 rue de Prony 75017 Paris, France Phone 33 (0) 1 44 15 18 88 Fax 33 (0) 1 42 67 09 87 e-mail: m.gonzalez@oie.int	Ms. Shelia HARVEY Chief Plant Quarantine/Produce Officer Ministry of Agriculture 193 Old Hope Rd. Kingston 6 Jamaica Tel: 1 876 977 0632 (1 876 977 6401) FAX: 1 876 977 6992 E-mail: syharvey@moa.gov.jm

PARTICIPANTS	
Mr. John HEDLEY Principal Adviser International Coordination Biosecurity New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry P.O. Box 2526 Wellington NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0733 E-mail: john.hedley@maf.govt.nz	Mr. Ravi K. KHETARPAL Head, Plant Quarantine Division National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources New Delhi India 110 012 Tel: +91 9958424292 +91 1125841457 FAX: +91 11 25842594 E-mail: RKK94RK@yahoo.com ; ravi@nbpgr.ernet.in
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 E-mail: Kenza.LeMentec@wto.org ;	Ms. Mary Lisa MADELL Acting Director SPS Management Team International Services Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service US Department of Agriculture (USDA) 1400 Independence Ave. SW Washington, DC 20250 United States of America Tel: +1 202 7207677 Fax: +1 202 6902861 E-mail: Mary.L.Madell@aphis.usda.gov
Mr. Tekleab MESGHENA Director Regulatory Service Department Ministry of Agriculture P.O.Box 1162, Asmara, Eritrea Tel: 291-1-120395 Fax: 291-1-127508 E-mail: mtekleab@eol.com.er	Mr. Ngatoko Ta NGATOKO Quarantine Advisor/IPPC Contact Point Ministry of Agriculture PO Box 96 Rarotonga Cook Islands E-mail: nngatoko@agriculture.gov.ck ; cimoa@oyster.net.ck
Mr. Washington OTIENO General Manager Phytosanitary Services Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service Nairobi, Kenya E-mail: wotieno@kephis.org	Mr. Phaydy PHIXAYSARAKHAM Director of Plant Quarantine Division Department of Agriculture Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Lane Xang Avenue, Patuxay Square P.O.Box.811, Vientiane, Laos Tel: +85621412350 FAX: +85621412349 E-mail: doag@laotel.com

PARTICIPANTS	
<p>Mr. Yongfan PIAO Crop Protection Officer FAO Regional Office for Asia</p> <p>E-mail: yongfan.piao@fao.org</p>	<p>Mr. Dam Quoc TRU Deputy Director General Plant Protection Department Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development 149 Ho Dac K Street Dong Da District Hanoi, Vietnam</p> <p>Tel: (84-4) 38518198 FAX: (84-4) 35330043 E-mail: trudq@fpt.vn</p>
<p>Mr. Gamel RAMADAN Senior Plant Quarantine Officer Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation General Department of Plant Quarantine P box 26 Zaied Street Sanaá Yemen</p> <p>E-mail: p-quarantine@yemen.net.ye; gamelramadan@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Mr. Arundel SAKALA National Coordinator Plant Quarantine and Phytosanitary Service Zambia Agriculture Research Institute Mount Makulu Research Station Private Bag 07 Chilanga ZAMBIA</p> <p>Tel: (+260) 211 278130 / 141 / 380 Fax: (+260) 211 278141 / 130 E-mail: mwati1lango@yahoo.com; Infornet@zari.zm</p>
<p>Mr. Julian SMITH International Development Central Science Laboratory Sand Hutton York YO41 1LZ</p> <p>Tel: +44 (0)1904 462746 Fax: +44 (0)1904 462250 E-mail: julian.j.smith@csl.gov.uk Web: http://www.csl.gov.uk</p>	<p>Mr. Sidney SUMA Biosecurity & Trade Facilitation Adviser/Executive Secretary Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO) Secretariat Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) Land Resources Division Private Mail Bag Service Suva Fiji</p> <p>Tel: (+679) 337 0733 or Ph D/L: (+679) 337 9231 Fax: (+679) 337 0021 E-mail: sidneys@spc.int</p>

PARTICIPANTS	
Mr. Tekon Timothy TUMUKON Principal Plant Protection Officer Dept. of Livestock & Quarantine PMB 9095, Port Vila Republic of Vanuatu E-mail: ttumukon@vanuatu.gov.vu	Ms. Dita VRBOVA Phytosanitary inspector Address: State Phytosanitary Administration Region Department Havlickuv Brod Smetanovo nam. 279 580 01 Havlickuv Brod The Czech Republic Tel: +420 724 052 039 Fax: +420 569 421 158 E-mail: dita.vrbova@srs.cz
Mr. Kyu-Ock YIM International Quarantine Cooperation Division National Plant Quarantine Service MIFAFF Rep. of KOREA 433-1 Anyang b-dong Manan-gu Anyang, Gyunggi-do Rep. of Korea Tel: +82-31-420-7665 E-mail: koyim@npqs.go.kr	Mr. Konan. L. KOUAME Head, Plant Protection Directorate 14th Floor CAISTAB Building 01 BP 944 Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire Tel: 225 20222260/225 07903754 E-mail: l_kouame@yahoo.fr
Mr. Edmond Kojo Jack-Vesper Suglo Director, Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate Ghana Tel: +233244388275 E-mail: jackvesper@yahoo.com	

IPPC SECRETARIAT	
Mr. Peter Kenmore, IPPC Secretary Mr. Jeffrey Jones, Agricultural Officer (Capacity Building) Ms. Lottie Erikson, IPPC Secretariat Ms. Melanie Bateman, IPPC Secretariat Mr. Orlando Sosa, IPPC Secretariat	IPPC Secretariat, AGPP Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: (+39) 06 5705 4812 Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4819 E-mail: ippc@fao.org

FAO	
Mr. Mike Robson, AGPP Ms. Manuela Allara, AGPP	IPPC Secretariat, AGPP Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: (+39) 06 5705 4812 Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4819 E-mail: ippc@fao.org

ANNEX 4 - Concept paper

Definition of national phytosanitary capacity

The ability of individuals, organizations and systems of a country to perform functions effectively and sustainably in order to protect plants and plant products from pests and to facilitate trade, in accordance with the IPPC.

The following concepts form the basis (further expand on) of the definition for national phytosanitary capacity of contracting and non-contracting parties.

- By referring to the individuals, organizations and systems of a country, it is recognized that national phytosanitary capacity combines the knowledge and functions of many entities in a country, not just NPPOs.
- By referring to systems of a country, it clarifies that national capacity includes the ability for individuals and organizations to cooperate and communicate, both formally and informally. Such cooperation may be national, regional and international.
- The functions which need to be performed are technical, legal, administrative, and managerial. Capacity includes the ability to develop and apply knowledge, skills and tools appropriate to these functions.
- Each country will have its own level of capacity and it is recognized that phytosanitary capacity is not static and changes over time.
- The phytosanitary capacity, current or aspired to, will be influenced by overarching national policies and international obligations that may or may not be directly related to plant health considerations.
- Many things contribute to the sustainability of the performance of functions. These include but are not limited to:
 - An enabling environment in countries such as policies which allow plant health activities to evolve and adapt to changing circumstance; plant health regulations which empower NPPOs to function; visibility and understanding of the IPPC and understanding of the importance of implementation
 - private-public partnerships
 - programs for staff retention
 - mobilization of resources, including cost recovery policies
 - viable plan(s) for protecting plant health and trade
 - national commitment to sustain phytosanitary capacity
- The definition for phytosanitary capacity refers to the ability to protect plants and plant products from pests. The ability to *support* biosecurity also contributes to achieving other national or international goals under other initiatives which deal with protecting biodiversity, food security, and poverty reduction.
- Referring to the IPPC in the definition aligns national phytosanitary capacity with the Convention.

ANNEX 5 – Draft Strategy¹

Strategic Areas	Activities	How	Who
1 a assessment of country phytosanitary needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop methods and tools to help countries assess and prioritize their phytosanitary needs - including Gap analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> implement PCE improvements from the CABI review review the OIE-PVS (and IICA PVS tool) and use as basis to develop a new more comprehensive gap analysis process for phytosanitary needs (including stakeholders; peer review step... etc) 	
1 b development of national phytosanitary action plans (NPAPs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> encourage inclusive approaches for preparing NPAPs assist in project preparation to address priorities (legislation, surveillance, etc) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop tools and guidelines for preparing NPAPs follow up on assessment with national phytosanitary capacity strategy 	
2. Advise/assist countries in establishing systems for standards implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> establish standards implementation support programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop guidelines/tips for implementation provide help desk develop training materials, deliver training, feedback mechanisms from workshops develop list of experienced facilitators for implementing ISPMs develop tools for sharing experiences regional draft standards workshops 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> adopt implementation review and support system (IRSS) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> questionnaire and follow as per 	

¹ The strategy outlined in this table will be further developed for presentation to CPM-4.

		proposal (kuching)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> enhance countries effective participation in CPM (and in the standard setting process) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> assess participation of countries at CPM develop orientation programme for new CPM delegates to participate in CPM (immediately prior to CPM) facilitate regional discussion on CPM positions (in region or immediately prior to CPM), and coordination during meetings continue regional draft standards workshops encourage and support participation in expert working groups, technical panels 	
3. Facilitate improved coordination/communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> collect information on plant protection programmes to advise countries and donors on possible synergies and opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> define exactly what information to collect from whom (countries, donors, through linkages, all other partners) take advantage of existing databases, projects, CPM meeting reports use linkages to make better programmes (benefit to NPPOs) 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> world plant pest status (emerging issues), including regional perspectives (annual report as an advocacy tool) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> analysis of pest occurrence at national and regional levels, report of pest concerns at CPM (<i>official report of secretariat – like SOFA</i>) develop early warning system 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> collaboration with partners (implementation and supervision agreements, initiatives, etc) – STDF projects, World Bank missions, COPE, etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> continue existing agreements actively seek further opportunities to collaborate/provide technical 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> input to programmes of others engage stakeholders by convening international consultative group on PCB 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> create mechanism for matchmaking for mentoring, coaching and assistance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> create similar format to the one used by SPS for mentoring Inquiry Points 	
4. a Implement appropriate structures in IPPC secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> determine resource needs for IPPC secretariat related to CB maintain and develop IPPC programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> prepare paper on staffing requirements for CB for CPM 4 	
4. b Mobilise resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> assess current resources available to IPPC to deliver CB strategy (targeted, trust fund, slush fund, assistance in-kind) support NPPOs in raising funds for priority projects obtain further resources and ensure effective use of resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> raise funds (see Koivisto paper to SPTA for ideas) hire a dedicated fund raiser Secretary takes raised profile for fundraising 	
5. Advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> adopt "Paris principles" for phytosanitary capacity building activities (national commitment, etc) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OEWG/sub group to draft principles for effective phytosanitary capacity building for approval by CPM SPTA review CPM 5 adopt 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> help countries 'embed' phytosanitary considerations in policy and national development strategies assist phytosanitary authorities to communicate effectively with other institutions within their country, with other countries and with regional organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> conduct sensitisation activities for policy makers develop training modules for phytosanitary authorities in effective communication and advocacy 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> enhance visibility of IPPC (and phytosanitary concerns) among development partners encourage adoption of risk-based approaches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IPPC communication activities (publication, communication products, films, etc) access to governing bodies (especially FAO, but also RECs); FAO and other goodwill 	

		ambassadors to reach senior decision makers	
6. Sustainability of the CB strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop approaches for impact assessment for CB activities (in accordance with “Paris principles” and regarding IPPC strategy) • Monitoring to assess impact of CB activities (review and evaluation) • Continuous improvement of programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure involvement of all stakeholders (including creating networks for sustainability, involving universities, public-private partnerships, etc) • link to other national initiatives 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPPC ‘seal of approval’ for capacity building programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • decide criteria for seal of approval • test • promote with donors and countries • adopt 	

Annex 6 – Indicative operational plan²

No.	Areas	Activity	Who	timeframe	resources	Assumptions
1	Assessment of phytosanitary needs	Develop methods and tools to help countries undertake assessment,	Support groups, RPPO, IPPC secretariat and other partners as appropriate	immediate		
		develop strategic plans and prioritise their phytosanitary needs	NPPO	as requested		
		Assist in project preparation to address priorities	NPPO driven with the support from IPPC and others	as requested		
2	Advise/assist countries in establishing systems for standards implementation	Advise and assist countries implement standards	IPPC and STDF	as requested	Training and documentation; experts	
		IPPC Seal of approval for capacity building programmes				
		implementation review mechanism and provide help desk, develop training materials, guidelines/tips for implementation	IPPC secretariat; RPPOs; Other technical agencies; champions in regions; centres of excellence; NPPOs	immediate	1 fulltime staff by June 2009 (Help Desk);	
		prepare countries for more effective participation in CPM	RPPO; IPPC Secretariat	ongoing	Information packages on IPPC;	
		enhance participation of developing countries in the standard setting process	NPPO, IPPC Secretariat; REOs; RPPOs; Donor partners	ongoing	Allocation of resources for SC participation and Regional workshops	

² The operational plan outlined in this table will be further developed for presentation to CPM-4.

No.	Areas	Activity	Who	timeframe	resources	Assumptions
3	Facilitate improved coordination/communication	collect, collate and disseminate information on plant protection programmes	NPPO, RPPO, IPPC secretariat	ongoing	IPP; internet access; computers	
		world pest status (emerging issues), including regional perspectives	IPPC Secretariat, RPPOs, NPPOs	medium term	Staff time; database	
		foster institutional collaboration within countries	NPPO	ongoing	Training on managerial skills	
		advise countries and donors on possible synergies and opportunities	IPPC Secretariat, RPPOs, REOs, NPPOs	ongoing		
		Collaboration with partners (implementation and supervision agreements, initiatives etc.)	IPPC Secretariat, STDF, Regional Plant Protection Officers, Other Donors, Regional Technical Organizations	ongoing	Develop a system for regular contact; Staff time; Regional Plant Protection Officers.	
		foster coordination (between countries with RPPOs, REOs)	NPPO, RPPO, IPPC secretariat	ongoing		
		create mechanism for matchmaking, for mentoring, coaching and assistance	IPPC Secretariat; NPPOs	medium term	Help desk; Mentors	
4	Mobilise resources	assess current resource needs and obtain resources (human, financial) of IPPC to deliver CB strategy	CPM Bureau, IPPC Secretary, NPPOs	immediate	Staff time;	
		Maintain and develop IPPC programmes	IPPC Secretariat, SPTA, Bureau, CPM	ongoing	Staff time; Allocation of resources as appropriate	

No.	Areas	Activity	Who	timeframe	resources	Assumptions
5	Advocacy	Paris principles for phytosanitary capacity building activities (national commitment etc)	NPPO, IPPC Secretary, Bureau	immediate and ongoing	Staff time, Advocacy packages, Communication strategy; Information which shows effects of pests and benefits of Phytosanitary actions.	
		Help countries 'embed' phytosanitary considerations in policy and national development strategies	NPPO, IPPC Secretariat, Bureau, RPPOs	ongoing	Staff time, Advocacy packages, Communication strategy; Information which shows effects of pests and benefits of Phytosanitary actions.	
		encourage adoption of risk-based approaches	NPPO, RPPO	long term		
6	Sustainability of the CB strategy	Develop and apply approaches for impact assessment for CB activities (both as part of "Paris principles" and regarding IPPC strategy)	IPPC, Donors, NPPOs	long term	Allocation of resources as appropriate; Evaluation tool	
		Continuous improvement of programme	CPM	ongoing	Allocation of resources as appropriate	