



**Report of the Expert Working Group on
Phytosanitary Capacity Building**

25 –29 October 2010

Rome, Italy



**Report of the Expert Working Group on
Phytosanitary Capacity Building
25 –29 October 2010
Rome, Italy**

I. Opening of the Meeting

1. Mr. Brent Larson, IPPC Standard Setting Officer opened the meeting. He welcomed the participants and pointed out the different products expected from the EWG , as well as the interest of the CPM, Bureau and the Secretariat in the results of the meeting. He wished a positive week of work to the participants.
2. The group selected Mr. Craig Fedchock, from the United States of America as the chairperson of the meeting and Mrs. Shelia Harvey from Jamaica, as rapporteur. The agenda as appended (**Appendix 1**) was determined on, based on the terms of reference for the Expert Working Group (EWG) adopted by CPM-5 (**Appendix 2**). Full introductions were made with each member giving a brief description of their background. A list of participants and their contact details are appended (**Appendix 3**).

II. Purpose of the meeting

3. The IPPC Implementation Officer, Ms. Ana Peralta, outlined the purpose of the meeting. She explained that at CPM-5 it was agreed that an Expert Working Group (EWG) would be created to review and refine the Phytosanitary Capacity Development Operational Plan and to assist the Secretariat with developing national phytosanitary capacity. The EWG would also consider the need for a permanent subsidiary body to deal with phytosanitary capacity development and assist the CPM in providing advice on advocacy and resource mobilization related to capacity development.
4. She also explained that the Bureau asked the EWG to analyze the links between this EWG and the Strategic Planning & Technical Assistance Group (SPTA) and the possible relationship with the proposed new body. The Terms of Reference of the Group were highlighted (**Appendix 1**). The products of the working group were discussed as outlined in the agenda (**Appendix 2**) as well as the process for presenting the report to the SPTA, for its consideration in their 2011 meeting, prior to sending it to CPM-7 (2012) for approval or adoption. She informed the EWG that the Bureau decided that this EWG could meet again in 2011, before the next meeting of the SPTA.

5. The Secretariat informed the EWG that the SPTA approved the presentation to CPM-6 of a new classification of documents. This new classification would include a category “Technical resources” which would be a range of documents prepared by the IPPC Secretariat, relevant bodies, NPPOs, RPPOs, advisory and informal groups (as the IAGPRA) or any other organizations, related to good phytosanitary practices (manuals, guidelines, SOPs, etc) and training materials, such as videos, power point presentations, Web based links, etc.

6. Other important issues raised were that the EU had provided funds to address the first year of implementation of the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS), that more support would be needed to cover the 3 years cycle of this tool and that the IPPC was currently in a critical financial situation, obliging the Bureau to adopt the decision to stop relevant activities related to standard setting and to make substantive cuts in the budget for all other activities in 2011, including capacity development.

7. Finally, the EWG was informed that an IPPC strategic plan was under development and could be presented to CPM-6, which could lead in the future to a need to adjust the Capacity Building Strategic Framework recently adopted by the CPM-5.

III. Work Programme

a) Listing of priorities

8. The list of priorities for Capacity Building, as approved by CPM-5, paragraph 104.7, was used as a basis for the discussion of the short term work programme on capacity building. The EWG carefully considered the inputs received from CPM and the draft work plan presented to CPM-5 and decided to develop a short term work plan attached to this report as **Appendix 4**.

9. The EWG considered that it was important to not lose the momentum generated by the adoption of the Capacity Building Strategic Framework of the IPPC and determined that several initiatives could be undertaken immediately, even before approval of a global work plan by CPM-7. The selected priorities and activities were as follows:

1. Implement Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Tool (PCE) improvements
 - a. Encourage the use of PCE by donor organizations
 - b. Ask the CPM for a decision on the use of PCE by all contracting parties
 - c. Evaluate PCE outcomes to determine where synergies/investments can be achieved at RPPOs, RECs and other groupings of countries.
2. Develop tools and guidelines for preparing National Phytosanitary Action Plans (NPAPs)
 - a. Identify resources to develop these tools, which could include:
 - General management of the NPPO.
 - Management of resources.
 - Emergency action plans development.
3. Training of trainers
 - a. Prepare programs for training of trainers, including PCE.
 - b. Training for private sector/independent facilitators/consultants, including PCE.
 - c. Training for NPPOs staff to run PCE.

4. Capacity building databases established
 - a. Getting the 2 current databases established and available
5. Roster of experts established by discipline and skills
 - a. IPPC Secretariat develops a database shell taking into account the following criteria:
 - Nominations of individuals for specific disciplines and skills submitted by member states' NPPOs or RPPOs or development organizations,
 - Individuals apply for the roster based on their specific competence, i.e., an individual must provide documented evidence of actual, on-the-job performance,
 - Establishment of a knowledge-based program wherein an individual must pass an exam, and/or,
 - Use of experience-based information in which an individual must provide evidence of training or education in the specific field for which they wish to be considered as an expert resource.
6. Begin to identify technical resources (manuals, SOPs, training materials as power points presentations, courses, links, etc)
 - a. Collect information: title, keywords, summary, availability, document or link.
 - b. Establish the criteria to review and note technical resources.
 - c. Consider the development of operational procedures and training kits for core functions of the NPPOs
 - d. Identify mentoring examples and opportunities
7. IRSS
 - a. Support to the IRSS by the EWG in relation to capacity development.
8. Advocacy
 - a. Identify appropriate fora related to capacity development, where the IPPC could participate.
 - b. Generate proposals on advocacy materials to the communication area of the IPPC and review resulting documents before publication.
 - c. Human resources and organizational development
9. Resource mobilization

Discussions on the Priorities

10. The EWG addressed the selected priorities discussing the activities, actions, timing and responsibilities for each. It was the opinion of the EWG that this short term plan included activities that needed to be performed in any event.

11. The following are summaries of the discussions on some of the identified priorities.

Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) Tool: Improvements made and its mode of Implementation.

12. This was the first identified priority and the EWG asked for information on the status of the tool. The group was informed that the IPPC has improved the old PCE tool and has now developed an online version. The old version will no longer be used. The advantages of the online version were explained some of which are:

- Data from country evaluations are securely and confidentially stored on the FAO web server and accessible only by the individual NPPO.
- The Secretariat can collect anonymous information from the PCE tool to identify gaps in capacity, information on implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs, constraints to implementation on a regional or global basis.
- Results of PCE are versioned and stored in a data base for each country.
- Countries have the flexibility to perform a complete PCE or to conduct specific assessments of the phytosanitary system of concern to the NPPO.
- Only NPPOs have access to the system and they can grant read only access to facilitators.
- The new PCE has automated tools that can be used to produce the NPAP. The end result of a PCE assessment is a strategic framework comprised of logical framework tables.

13. The new system will be ready for a pilot user testing in nine (9) countries of the OIRSA region. There are plans to run the new version in countries in other regions later this year. Twenty (20) countries per year completing the new PCE is a realistic target. The STDF requires countries to indicate whether projects are developed using the PCE as a basis. The FAO/IPPC uses the PCE tool to assess real country needs and develop phytosanitary projects. Additional donors and technical assistance providers should be encouraged to follow the example set by the STDF and FAO/IPPC. The IPPC advocates that the PCE be implemented with the assistance of a facilitator. However NPPOs can implement the PCE on their own without the support of a facilitator. NPPOs will need training in the use of this new PCE and plans are being made to have “Training the Trainers” sessions in the countries for the new version of the tool.

Develop Tools and Guidelines for Preparing National Phytosanitary Action Plans (NPAPs)

14. The need for the implementation of the PCE tool was again highlighted as this is an invaluable instrument in preparing NPAPs. The EWG will be identifying the necessary resources to develop these NPAPs. Some areas to be developed are:

- General management of the NPPOs
- Management of resources, both human and financial
- Emergency action plans development.

Training the Trainers

15. The meeting recognised that there were several levels of training that are required by the NPPOs and RPPOs. It was pointed out that NPPOs could be trained to administer tools such as the PCE and trained trainers could be used also. One major area of training that is of utmost importance is training trainers for the PCE. It was pointed out that some private sector or independent facilitators could be trained in the PCE application at their own expense. The EWG considered that charging for this type of activity should be considered by the CPM.

Capacity Building Activities Database

16. The next phase of work for the capacity building database is to get the databases populated and edited. This information will be very useful in determining the gaps and overlaps as it relates to capacity building projects and activities within countries and contains search mechanisms to obtain other types of information. NPPOs can also use the information to identify possible donors and be able to access their resources.

17. Demonstrations of the electronic Phytosanitary Projects and Activities databases input forms were given by the consultant working on the project. Members were taken through both forms and were asked to provide feedback as to what could be added or removed. A document entitled “Description on the Database of Projects and Activities” was circulated showing the various fields and the content for the drop down boxes.

18. The databases will be linked to the IPPC Portal and NPPOs may report their projects and activities there. The databases, when populated, will perform several tasks, including searches by countries, donors, import the data into Excel, etc. The EWG commended the IPPC for its work on the database so far. To date over four hundred and eighty (480) projects are listed on the database, mostly from Latin America. The information currently in the database is from the year 2005 to present.

19. The following changes to the input pages were recommended:

- An additional field be included for attachments of documents on both input forms.
- Projects in planning stage to be included in the database.
- An additional field be included for source of information
- Insert a field between items 13 & 14 for estimated value of phytosanitary components.
- Add a field to identify who provided the information and the date it was provided
- Move field 13 up, close to Number 4 and leave title Blank

- Use the word *scheduling* instead of *duration*

20. The consultant will be working on this project until December 2010. The EWG suggested that the databases be demonstrated at CPM-6 in 2011 and a request made for the continuation of their development. The link to the databases will be sent to key stakeholders for test run and evaluation.

21. One comment/concern was that Plant Health/Phytosanitary issues often are small components in some projects so there will be the challenge of capturing this information. It was pointed out that this will be the recipient's responsibility to report such projects and activities to the IPPC, as they would have the information as well as the technical expertise to determine its suitability for the databases. It is however the responsibility of the IPPC Secretariat to screen the information and determine its suitability for the databases.

22. The sustainability of the databases was raised as a key issue and it was felt that there needs to be a dedicated person to maintain it, bearing in mind that it will be providing information for other tools such as the IRSS/Help Desk and others mentioned in the Strategic Plan.

23. The description of the databases, containing the suggested changes, is appended (Appendix 5)

Beginning to Identify Technical Resources

24. There are numerous phytosanitary related technical resources available all over the world. Certain resources such as power point presentations for Pest Risk Analysis (PRA) training are available on the IPP. Other important resources need to be added. Presently only certain categories of documents are approved by the IPPC or submitted by individual countries and can be uploaded to the IPP. In the expectation of approval by CPM-6 of the proposal to make available to contracting parties, technical resources prepared by the IPPC Secretariat, relevant bodies, NPPOs, RPPOs, advisory and informal groups (as the IAGPRA) or any other organizations, the EWG proposed including in the short term plan the establishment of the criteria to approve adding these resources to the IPP, examples of which are:

- manuals,
- Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs),
- training materials such as power point presentations,
- Courses
- Relevant web page links.

25. Several mechanisms could be explored for listing these resources on the portal, e.g.:

- According to phytosanitary capabilities/ ISPMs

- By subject matter
- By key words/Title/Summary/Links

Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)

26. The Subsidiary Body on Dispute settlement (SBDS) of the IPPC, was asked in 2007 to explore the establishment of an IPPC Compliance Mechanism. In 2007 an OEWG on a possible compliance mechanism analyzed the options and the SBDS suggested that it was more positive to develop an Implementation Review and Support System that would close the disconnect between the core functions of the IPPC- standards setting, information exchange and capacity development.

27. The SBDS felt that it was important to assess on a regular basis the way standards and the Convention are being implemented. In addition it was important to determine the problems, constraints and difficulties faced by contracting parties in implementation. CPM-3 adopted the revised version of the IRSS.

28. The IRSS also has a support function that will be embodied in the establishment of a helpdesk. The IRSS would produce a report every 3 years The IRSS is a cross cutting theme in the Secretariat and will look at implementation and support issues relating to the core functions of the IPPC.

29. The IRSS will build upon existing review mechanisms of the IPPC and establish a formalized system using the IPP, data (implementation of IPPC and Standards, constraints and priorities) captured through the application of the PCE and information on country quality of participation in the standard setting process. There is currently a gap in a consolidated understanding of the level of information on implementation of standards. The IRSS will rely, in addition to IPPC information, on the support of other partners such as the RPPOs to help monitor, report on implementation issues of the standards and the IPPC as well as participate in the help desk functions. The Secretariat reported that the EU will provide the funding for the first year of the three (3) year programme of operation of the IRSS. The IPPC is actively seeking funding for the next two (2) years. The EWG suggested a possible initiative could be that countries or group of countries can implement the PCE and build on the results.

30. Having countries use the PCE was central to the IRSS since it could be a primary source of data on implementation, identification of gaps, constraints and priorities. The Secretariat informed that there was a need to develop the modalities on how the EWG and the IRSS will interact and that 2011 will be primarily for development and piloting of the IRSS. The Secretariat suggested that by October of 2011 there could be enough information gathered by the IRSS to project trends, gaps, level of implementation of IPPC and its standards. The Secretariat suggested that the EWG could play a pivotal role in providing guidance for the development of the IRSS as well as advice on the type of information and its presentation from a capacity development perspective. The EWG thought that IRSS information would be important in revising the global capacity development strategy and plan, especially three (3) years from now.

b) Global Work Plan

31. It was acknowledged that the Global Work Plan addressing the IPPC Capacity Building Strategic Framework, as presented at CPM-5, is comprehensive and very useful. It is not intended for use solely by the Secretariat but by other organisations and the contracting parties. The content is valid but it needs to be presented in a more user friendly and clear format. The EWG decided not to change the contents and identified drafting issues that should be addressed before any type of reconsideration. Members recognised that the plan is a dynamic document to be accomplished over time, therefore the priorities chosen for the short term plan are those considered to be achievable by the IPPC in the near future and are included in the Global Work Plan presented to CPM-5.

32. The EWG decided to perform the following activities related to the Global Work Plan:

- 1) Review the IPPC global strategy (to be presented and considered by CPM-6) to ensure that the capacity development strategy formerly adopted by CPM-5 in 2010 is compatible, to make sure that the future global work plan in capacity building is appropriately aligned.
- 2) Develop a short version of the capacity building strategy to be used for advocacy/training.
- 3) Advocate for capacity development whenever possible and appropriate.
- 4) In the future, review the operational plan for capacity building on a three (3) year basis, in coordination with the IRSS mechanism to provide information.

33. The EWG also developed suggestions to modify the document presented for adoption to CPM-5, in order to present a new version/executive summary to SPTA and CPM-7 :

1. Prefix the activities with the numbers of the strategic areas/Secretariat re-numbers and send documents for comments
2. The EWG will consider EU comments to the document / EWG sends responses to the Secretariat, if any.
3. Use a different structure e.g. structure: 1-.1- Title, estimated duration, potential costs.
4. Eliminate the time frame and budget cost columns, opened by year/Secretariat
5. Develop suitable informational formats for the CPM smaller documents, considering Pacific region suggestions about expanding the 6 strategic areas into 8 by breaking out the B sections in strategic areas 2 and 3/ EWG sends responses to the Secretariat.
6. About Lead entity and supporting entity: Include a clear explanation at the beginning of the document in the sense that leadership and active participation is expected, recognising that capacities and resources could be different or unavailable.

7. Other explanations must be provided as to whom the strategy belongs and what is expected of the different actors in this work plan. The whole global strategy is actually NPPOs oriented. There is still some work to be done on the document in order to make it more user friendly.

34. The following table establishes the timeframes associated with the different responsibilities.

Table 1

ACTIONS TO REVIEW THE GLOBAL WORK PLAN

ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBILITY	TIMEFRAME
1) Prefix the activities with the numbers of the strategic area/	Secretariat rennumbers and sends documents for comments.	Before 15 th November 2010
2) Consider EU document and send at the same time personal comments	EWG members	Till the end of 2010
3) Suggest a different structure, for example: 1.1- (Title) Estimated duration , Potential cost	EWG members	Till the end of 2010
4) Develop suitable information/formats for work plan documents	IPPC Secretariat/ Supported by EWG comments	End of March 2011

c) Creation of a Subsidiary Body on Capacity Development

35. The EWG decided on the mechanism for preparing a paper containing recommendations about the possibility of forming a subsidiary body to be presented to the SPTA 2011 for their consideration, which will then be presented to the CPM-7 in 2012. A SWOT analysis was conducted and this will be used to assist with the development of the TOR for the proposed body as well as the rules of procedures that will form part of the document. Areas discussed were:

- Objectives/scope of the body
- Structure and membership of the body

- Terms of reference
- Rules of procedure

36. The EWG felt that it should be appropriate to take the most useful aspects of the TOR and ROP for the two subsidiary bodies of the IPPC (SC and SBDS), to create a unique TOR and ROP for a subsidiary body on capacity development. The intention will be to create a highly focused and flexible working unit that could provide a maximum support to capacity building activities at a minimal cost and with an efficient use of technical resources developed by any type of possible partner.

37. The Secretariat is going to circulate a draft version containing the changes proposed at this meeting. The chair of this meeting will provide specific advice and adjust the document and the EWG will provide comments. This document will be finalised in the next meeting of the EWG in 2011 as the initial issue in the agenda.

d) List of Recommendations for Preparing Capacity Development Advocacy Material

38. The IPPC global capacity development strategy identifies the following goals and actions for advocacy:

GOALS	ACTIONS
collect, collate and disseminate information on plant protection programmes and existing capacity building providers and projects	define exactly what information to collect from whom (countries, donors, through linkages, all other partners) take advantage of existing databases, projects, CPM meeting reports
advise countries and donors on possible synergies and opportunities collaboration with partners (implementation and supervision agreements, initiatives, etc) – Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) projects, World Bank missions, Centers of Phytosanitary Excellence (COPE), etc.	use linkages to make better programmes (benefit to NPPOs) continue existing agreements actively seek further opportunities to collaborate/provide technical input to programmes of others engage stakeholders by convening international consultative group on phytosanitary capacity building
create mechanism for matchmaking for mentoring, coaching and assistance	create similar format to the one used for mentoring SPS Inquiry Points

document world plant pest status (emerging issues), including regional perspectives (annual report as an advocacy tool)	analysis of pest occurrence at national and regional levels, report of pest concerns at CPM. Other official reports of the IPPC Secretariat or FAO Committee/Council such as State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA) develop early warning system
---	--

39. The EWG agreed on a set of concrete actions that the IPPC Secretariat can focus on in the short term that will constitute its work in the area of Advocacy for capacity development.

40. Some possible activities include:

- Documenting capacity development work
- Identifying and analysing case studies on good capacity development practice and strategies
- Production of customized materials, including video, to improve stakeholders understanding of the IPPC and its capacity development focus area.
- Mentoring opportunities
- Study tours
- Use of linkages to FAO events and special occasions.

41. A priority should be the sensitizing of the political directorate, including Case studies/Success Stories for ministerial meetings.

e) Resource Mobilization

42. FAO regular budget funds for Article XIV Bodies may decrease over the next few years. Therefore the IPPC will have to be looking externally for the funds it requires to carry out its work. The IPPC has been very active in collecting extra budgetary funds, but these funds are not enough to cover the basic budget of the IPPC.

43. The group was shown the list of major donors for capacity development projects involving the IPPC and the way the table is used. Donors were listed by the countries they support and the areas they have supported in the past, ranging from integrated pest management, capacity strengthening, emergency response operations, crop protection, pest management, etc

44. The donors ranged from individual countries to international institutions/foundations (the World Bank, USDA, CIDA, AUSAID, private foundations to name a few that were used for the support of countries users requests).

45. The meeting decided that this should be reviewed and updated and used as a tool. Other donors could be added such as industry e.g. forestry, SAAF, Ministries of Defence, RECs and Private Sector organizations. The Secretariat will post the document in the work area of the IPP for further work of the EWG. The table is going to be reconsidered at next meeting.

f) Roster of Experts

46. A discussion paper entitled “Discussion Paper on Establishing a Roster of IPPC Capacity Building Experts” was tabled for discussion. The limitations of resources within the IPPC were noted and no major improvement is foreseen in the near future. Hence for a more sustainable and functional system, there is a need to rely more on experts in the relevant areas. Over the years, the FAO/IPPC has been using several experts all over the world. However there is no independent and impartial mechanism for selecting these experts. The present system used was demonstrated and members expressed the view that the present information could be used to develop a database. It was agreed that the database will be developed by the Secretariat with the inputs of the members of the EWG and a roster of experts be established by area of expertise.

47. Possible approaches for implementing a roster of IPPC capacity building experts could include:

- Nominations of individuals for specific areas submitted by member states, NPPOs or RPPOs or Developmental Organisations
- Individuals apply for inclusions on the roster based on their specific competencies. The individual must provide documented evidence of actual, on-the-job performance
- Establishment of a knowledge-based program where an individual must pass an examination
- Use of experienced-based information in which an individual must provide evidence of training or education in the specific field for which they wish to be considered.

48. The experts that could be used by the IPPC are basically :

- a. Project Writers
- b. Consultants
- c. PRA Experts
- d. PCE Facilitators

49. There were suggestions as to criteria that could be used to keep an expert on the roster and also reasons for their removal. Some possible criteria could be:

- Experts being trained by the IPPC
- Having a good track record with past trainings
- IPPC adjudicated examination

- IPPC approved based on experience
- Endorsed by their NPPOs

50. It was proposed that a resource documenting individuals participation the results and difficult experiences be maintained.

51. The data for the present roster was garnered from the IPPC contacts database, records of attendance to meetings and persons who worked on projects for the FAO/IPPC. The general consensus of the meeting was that there should be a transparent way to select persons to the Expert Roster Database. Members recognised that language is a limiting factor for some phytosanitary experts and that some disciplines would not be conducive to examinations by the IPPC e.g. Diagnostics, while an area such as the PCE tool would be appropriate.

52. The roster could also be linked to the IRSS Help Desk and the suggestion was made to have a disclaimer included, as the IPPC cannot guarantee performance.

g) Annual Award

53. The EWG considered that a possible mechanism for increasing awareness of IPPC capacity building efforts, and possibly a means to improve those efforts, would be to establish an annual award or awards to recognize plant health related capacity building efforts over the course of a year.

54. It could be a single award or multiple awards, depending on the intent of the CPM. For example, there could be an award for a country which has achieved significant goals over the course of a year: best use of training, best use of personnel and resources, most effective contribution to plant health in a country, etc. Alternatively, there could be an award for the best individual capacity building project, thus including the recognition of all the participants, or there may be additional alternative possibilities, such as recognition of the best projects by specific field.

55. Ideally, such an award should be considered prestigious, be announced with significant fanfare, and should draw maximum attention to the winner. The process for determining the winner should be highly competitive and have very specific criteria. The best context for granting the award would be during the annual CPM meeting for maximum exposure.

56. The EWG noted that additional consideration before establishing this type of award could be the method of nomination and the selection process.

57. It has been clearly determined that for capacity building issues, such award should be granted to the best efforts in creating national phytosanitary capacity, and should include attention to innovation and involve stakeholders participation.

IV. Agenda for Next Meeting

Mandate of the EWG

58. The EWG discussed how to address its mandate and sustain capacity building efforts till CPM-7, when CPM guidance is expected to be provided related to the future structure and mode of operation of the expert working group, including the possibility of forming a subsidiary body on capacity building. In the interim, the EWG will provide guidance on capacity development, advice to CPM on related developments and assume an active role in the preparation of technical resources and projects intended to finance activities of the IPPC capacity building strategic framework.

59. The following are the items to be included in the addenda of the next meeting of the EWG on Phytosanitary Capacity Development:

1. Completion of the SWOT analysis for the Subsidiary Body.
2. Preparation of the final version of TOR , rules or procedure and an explanatory paper for the proposed Subsidiary Body on Phytosanitary Development (Special attention should be paid to the possibility to invite partners to next meetings).
3. Considers and prepare a new version of the IPPC capacity building work plan for the SPTA.
4. Review the activities and responsibilities contained in the short term operational plan on capacity building.
5. Review the work of all databases related to capacity development.
6. Consider the activities developed under the IRSS.
7. Finalize the proposals for an IPPC award to capacity building and a roster of expert , to send them to the SPTA.
8. Discuss the possibilities to prepare projects and activities related to resource mobilization and advocacy for capacity building as well as any related development in the IPPC.

V. Any Other Business

a) Presentation by the FAO/Food and Quality Standards Service(AGNS)

60. Ms. Catherine Bessie, Food Quality and Safety Officer of the Food Control and Consumer Protection Group/ Nutrition and Consumer Protection Division of FAO, presented to the EWG CB the Capacity Development activities of the FAO Body working for CODEX .She provided a presentation explaining the organizational details, the process to detect the needs of the countries, arrangements for meeting organization, financial support by the CODEX Trust Fund and explained in detail that in the capacity building area they: support project development, perform training activities and prepare guidance documents (different from CODEX standards) explaining what CODEX rules mean and the technicalities needed for the implementation.

61. The presentation ended with a long and useful exchange of views with the participants in the EWG CB, addressing the differences and similarities with the IPPC case on issues like: selection of trainers, management of rosters of experts, prioritization of training of trainers activities, needs of staff resources, need of neutral advice, reporting of capacity building /implementation issues to CODEX meetings, etc.

b) FAO Capacity Development Presentation

62. Ms. Sally Berman, Capacity Development Officer/OEKC/FAO presented the FAO Capacity Development strategy and explained the three dimensions of the issue: Individual, Organisation and Environment and the kind of capacities/skills needed: technical and functional. She referred to the functional skills as the ones related to: formulation and review of policies, information and knowledge management (IKM), partnerships/ability to form alliances and implementation. Later she discussed with the EWG CB the similarities and application of these concepts to the IPPC.

63. She provided advice to the EWG on the use of terms, recommending the use of capacity development, technical cooperation and developing partners, instead of capacity building, technical assistance and donors.

c) Concept Paper on IPPC national phytosanitary capacity

64. The EWG asked the Secretariat to post the Concept paper on the IPP and also to request from CPM to include the definition of national phytosanitary capacity in the Glossary of phytosanitary terms ISPM # 5 .

d)Communication Plan of the EWG

65. The EWG decided to establish a periodic communication plan covering emails, teleconferencing , etc. The documents will be circulated to the group for their comments. The EWG felt that there is a need to keep the momentum going and the creation of a work area in the IPP where documents are posted and discussed by the EWG is vital. The Secretariat will maintain a running agenda with timelines.

e) Use of the IPPC logo

66. The use of the IPPC Logo for capacity development materials was discussed. Currently it may only be used in official IPPC documents. The Secretariat reported that permission should be sought from the IPPC Secretariat for inclusion in other type of documents and the request would reviewed on a case by case basis.

VI. Review and adoption of the report .

67. The draft report of the meeting will be sent by the Secretariat to the EWG before the 5th of November 2010. EWG members are expected to send comments by the 12th of November 2010.

68. The Chairman commended the group on the work done during the week and thanked the Secretariat for the work done in organising the meeting.

69. Members expressed their thanks to all colleagues in the EWG for the open and positive discussions performed at the meeting and the possibility to address issues of their interest.

VII. Date of Next Meeting .

70. The EWG considered that it should be better to address the ongoing capacity development businesses to perform next meeting in May 2011, proposing as possible venues Jamaica, Rome or Washington.

APPENDIX 1

AGENDA

MEETING OF EXPERT WORKING GROUP PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY BUILDING

ROME

25 – 29 October 2010

- I. Opening of the Meeting
- II. Purpose of the Meeting
- III. Work Programme
 - a. List of priority areas for IPPC capacity building activities, related to the existing and practical realities in different regions/ ***Two hours at the beginning and later at the end of the week***
 - b. Global plan on phytosanitary capacity building prepared, considering timing, overlaps, and interactions among activities of the IPPC and other organizations./ ***1-1.5 days***
 - i. PCE
 - ii. IRSS
 - iii. Databases
 - iv. Projects
 - c. A paper containing recommendations about the possibility of forming a Subsidiary Body to the CPM, including the draft terms of reference and rules of procedure for this body. /***Half a day for the draft***
 - i. EWG 2011: Mandate, TOR, work plan
 - d. List of recommendations for preparing capacity building advocacy materials that could be taken on board by the EWG on Resource Mobilization./ ***Half a day***
 - i. identifying target audiences
 - ii. purpose and key messages
 - iii. general brainstorming and review of the IPPC communication strategy (kind of materials, events, links, etc)
 - e. List of identified strategies to approach donors to raise funds for capacity building that could be taken on board by the EWG on Resource Mobilization./***Half a day***
 - i. Review of TOR of resource mobilization EWG
 - ii. General brainstorming
 - f. Roster of experts / ***Two hours***
 - g. Annual award./***Two hours***
- IV. Agenda for Next Meeting of the EWG
- V. Any Other Business
- VI. Review and Adoption of Report
- VII. Date of Next Meeting

APPENDIX 2

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EXPERT WORKING GROUP ON PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY BUILDING

CPM-5 (2010) / REPORT, Appendix 12

Membership

One person from each region with experience in Phytosanitary Capacity Building

Terms of Reference

Review the draft Operational Plan under each of the logical frameworks identifying activities that are new and those that are part of existing activities. The group should also identify overlaps and linkages between different activities.

1. Review and provide advice on priorities for activities taking into account the financial situation of the IPPC.
2. Provide advice on the timing of proposed activities and the potential benefits of cooperation with other organizations (e.g. Standards and Trade Development Facility - STDF).
3. Provide advice to the Secretariat on the preparation of advocacy materials needed to support fund raising for capacity building.
4. Provide advice on strategies that could be used to approach donors for contributions to support capacity building.
5. Provide recommendations on the future structure and mode of operation of the expert working group including the possibility of forming a subsidiary body on capacity building.
6. Report to CPM-6 through the Bureau and Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA).

APPENDIX 3

EXPERT WORKING GROUP ON PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY BUILDING

Rome, Italy, 25-29 October, 2010

PARTICIPANT LIST

	Region	Name, mailing, address, telephone	E- mail address
1	Africa	Mr. Lucien KOUAMÉ KONAN Directeur Direction de la protection des végétaux, du contrôle et de la qualité. Ministère de l'Agriculture B.P. V7 Abidjan CÔTE D'IVOIRE Tel: +225 20 22 22 60 +225 07 90 37 54 Fax: +225 20 21 20 32	l_kouame@yahoo.fr isysphyt@aviso.ci
2	Latin America & Caribbean	Ms. Shelia HARVEY Chief Plant Quarantine, Produce Officer Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries 193 Old Hope Rd. Kingston 6 JAMAICA Tel: 1-876-977-0637 1-876-977-6401 Fax:1-876-977-6992	syharvey@moa.gov.jm sheharv@yahoo.com
3	Near East	Ms. Nagat MUBARAK EL TAYEB Plant Protection Directorate (PPD) Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) P.O.Box 14 Khartoum North SUDAN Tel: +249 185 33 74 42 +249 185 33 94 23	neltayb@yahoo.com
4	Europe	Mr. Corné VAN ALPHEN Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation Department of Agriculture, Agribusiness and Fisheries NETHERLANDS Phone: +31 (0)70 - 3785552 Fax: +31 (0)70 - 3786123	c.a.m.van.alphen@minlnv.nl

	Region	Name, mailing, address, telephone	E- mail address
5	North America	Mr. Craig FEDCHOCK U.S Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service USA Tel: +202 257 2715 Fax:+301 734 3396	craig.fedchock@aphis.usda.gov
6	Pacific	Mr. Ian NAUMANN Director, SPS Capacity Building Program Office of the Chief Plant Protection Officer Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Tel: 02- 6272 3442 Fax: 02- 6272 5835 Mobile: 0412 678 463	ian.naumann@daff.gov.au
7	Asia	Mr. Ho Haw LENG Deputy Director Crop Protection and Plant Quarantine Division Department of Agriculture 3rd Floor, Wisma Tani Jalan Sultan Salahuddin 50632 Kaula Lumpur, MALAYSIA Tel: 6 03 20301417 (Off. line) 017 67 588 76 (mobile phone) Fax: 6 03 26977164	hawlengho@doa.gov.my hawlengho@yahoo.com

Others

	Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
8	Observers	Ms. Kenza Arfi LE MENTEC Economic Affairs Officer STDF - WTO 154 rue de Lausanne Geneve Swisse	Kenza.LeMentec@wto.org

9	IPPC Secretariat	Ms. Ana PERALTA Implementation Officer IPPC Secretariat International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat(IPPC), AGP - FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy. Tel: +39-06-5705-5322 Fax: +39-06-5705-4819	ana.peralta@fao.org
10	IPPC Secretariat	Mr. Orlando SOSA Agricultural Officer International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Room B703, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153, Rome, Italy. Tel: +(39) 06 - 570-53613 Fax: +(39) 06 - 570-54819	orlando.sosa@fao.org
11	IPPC Secretariat	Ms. Johanna GARDESTEN Consultant IPPC Plant Production and Protection Division Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: +39.06.5705.53768	johanna.gardesten@fao.org
12	FAO HQ	Ms. Sally BERMAN Capacity Development Officer Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations. OEKC Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: +39.06.5705.56439	sally.berman@fao.org
	FAO HQ	Ms. Catherine Bessy Food Quality and Safety Officer Food Control and Consumer Protection Group Nutrition and Consumer Protection Division. Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: +39 06 570 53 679	catherine.bessy@fao.org

APPENDIX 4

SHORT TERM OPERATIONAL PLAN

PRIORITY	ACTIVITY	ACTION	TIMING AND RESPONSIBILITIES
1) Implement PCE improvements	Encourage the use of PCE by donor organizations	Draft discussion paper for CPM on PCE prior to embarking in capacity development projects.	2011/ Mr. Craig Fedchock
		Prepare a recommendation to CPM to resensitize donors that PCE is an initial component of phytosanitary projects, mentioning STDF policy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2010-11/Based on the previously mentioned discussion paper.• CPM members and IPPC, Secretariat to take action at CPM-6 (2011)
	Ask to CPM for a decision on the use of PCE by all contracting parties	Prepare a justification on why IPPC and contracting parties can benefit on the application of PCE. Consider it could be a central tool for IRSS/Help desk and goal 7 (Status of Plant Protection in the world) of the current IPPC work plan. It also could help countries to develop their own national phytosanitary action plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2011/Based on the previously mentioned discussion paper.• To be presented to CPM-6(2011)• IPPC Secretariat develops a paper.
	Evaluate PCE outcomes to determine where synergies/investments can be achieved at RPPOs, RECs and other grouping of countries.	Information paper on how this has been applied for the Pacific grouping of countries under STDF 133.	2011/ To be presented to CPM-6 IPPC Secretariat develops paper.
2) Develop tools and guidelines for preparing	Identify resources to develop these tools Which could	Regions gather information on: - availability of materials that	2011/ EWG members report at next meeting.

NPAPs	include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General management of the NPPO. • Management of resources. • Emergency action plans development. 	could be adapted for these specific issues and on - needs of countries in the regions.	
		Ask CPM members to champion the development of one of these tools.	2012/IPPC Secretariat prepares document.
3) Training of trainers	Prepare programs for training of trainers, including PCE.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project formulation, design and management, • IPPC and ISPMs, • PCE, • General management of the NPPO, • Management of resources. • Others. 	2011/IPPC Secretariat.
	Training for private sector/independent facilitators/consultants, including PCE.		<p>IPPC Secretariat develops a proposal.</p> <p>2011/ EWG considers the proposal to be sent to SPTA.</p> <p>2012/ IPPC asks CPM-7 for a decision to charge for training activities.</p>
	Training for NPPOs staff to run PCE.		2011/Continuous activity
4) Capacity building databases	Getting the 2 current databases established and	a)Refine databases contents b)Populate databases/	a) EWG 2010 b) Cataloguing information

<p>established</p>	<p>available(on- going activity)</p>	<p>test for functionality and link with IRSS c)Promote databases use (with beneficiaries and donors) d)Evaluate usage/utility and provide options for long term sustainability</p>	<p>EWG/2010 to put together information. EWG CD members and stakeholders test functionality/2010-11. c) Show databases at CPM-6 and request for continuation of the databases. IPPC Secretariat promotes the benefits of having the system in places(what users will gain from the system) d) Consultant (IRSS lead).</p>
<p>5) Roster of experts initiated (various disciplines and skills).</p>	<p>IPPC Secretariat develops a database shell taking into account the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nominations of individuals for specific disciplines and skills submitted by member states' NPPOs or RPPOs or development organizations, - Individuals apply for the roster based on their specific competence, i.e., an individual must provide documented evidence of actual, on-the-job 	<p>1)Build the shell(IPPC) 2) Proposal for SPTA is prepared including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The shell, - The guidelines on CV format. - Recommendation to link with IRSS Help desk and other mechanisms. 	<p>2010/ IPPC Secretariat develops shell/ EWG CD discuss electronically/ database and document to SPTA/2011</p>

	<p>performance,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establishment of a knowledge-based program wherein an individual must pass an exam, and/or, - Use of experience-based information in which an individual must provide evidence of training or education in the specific field for which they wish to be considered as an expert resource. 		
6) Begin to identify technical resources (manuals, SOPs, training materials as PPoints, courses, links, etc)	Collect information: title, keywords, summary, availability, document or link.	Identify relevant IPPC related courses in Universities and other institutions at national and international level.	EWG on-going task . Discuss and provide minimum information virtually/Mid December 2010.
	Establish the criteria to review and note technical resources.		Discussion paper prepared by Corné van Alphen / Circulated to the EWG at the end of the year.
	Consider the development of operational procedures and training kits for core functions of the NPPOs.		EWG prepares a proposal for a project, circulate the proposal and identify a donor , seeks country support for the project by January 1 st Sudan, Cote d'Ivoire, Jamaica, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea and Malaysia.

	Identification of mentoring examples and opportunities		EWG draft a proposal of how to catalog this information before next meeting.
7) IRSS	Support to the IRSS by the EWG in relation to capacity development.	EWG provides guidance to the IRSS on needs assessment and monitoring of implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs. The EWG will also be consulted on the following activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting up of the IRSS mechanisms Review the questionnaire and provide advice. • Use and presentation of information generated by the IRSS in relation to . capacity development, fund raising and advocacy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guidance on setting the IRSS mechanism by March 1st. • Advice on the use and presentation of IRSS information , based on an indicative idea of the product by October 2011.
		Use the IRSS information to adjust and refine the capacity building operational global and short term plans.	On-going activity
8) Advocacy	Identify the appropriate fora related to capacity development, in which IPPC could participate.	Identify the fora and relevant contracting parties to be called upon to advocate on capacity development Plan participation in regional fora using the good offices of IPPC and contracting parties. Identify and develop messages/talking points/ boiler plate messages and	EWG and IPPC Secretariat working together/on-going activity IPPC Secretary, on-going activity. EWG/Develop a boiler plate template by end of January.

		case stories.	
	Generate proposals on advocacy materials to the communication area of the IPPC and review resulting documents before publication.	Based on ISPMs, generate concepts for positive messages. Develop advocacy material customized for specific needs (political, public in general, etc.)	EWG/on-going activity, have some concepts and ideas available before the end of January 2011.
	Human resources and organizational development	Identify ideas and concepts that will promote the development and inclusion of relevant IPPC issues in the curricula of courses in Universities, Centres of Excellence and other institutions at national and international level, to build capacities. Promotion of IPPC training for private sector/independent facilitators/consultants, including PCE	EWG/On-going activity IPPC Secretariat with the support of the EWG/2012, after CPM's decision on whether to charge for training activities.
9) Resource mobilization		Generating ideas, concepts and proposals as a contribution to the overall resource mobilization strategy. Identification of donors, including non traditional ones for capacity building	EWG/On-going Update, complete and maintain a list of donors/ Secretariat develops a database /EWG provides information/On-going

APPENDIX 5

DESCRIPTION OF THE DATABASES ON PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES

PROJECTS

1. Project identification- *e.g. code or number for the project.*
2. Field of project- *General SPS, plant protection, capacity building, enterprise, phytosanitary measures, plant health, regional trade agreements, standards, technical assistance, trade policy, field not listed, other field not listed.*
3. Title of the project
4. Implementation agency- *RPPO, NPPO, FAO, USAID, CIDA, IICA, other implementation agency not listed.*
5. Funding agency- *CIDA, Danida, EU, FAO, GEF, IDB, IIDA, GTZ, STDF, Worldbank, USAID, national budget, funding agency not specified, other funding agency not listed.*
6. Geographic focus of the project- *Global, regional, sub regional, multiple countries, country.*
7. Country/-ies- *free text*
8. Scope and activities *-free text*
9. Beneficiaries – *RPPO, NPPO, public sector, private sector combination of the above, farmers, beneficiaries not specified, other beneficiaries not listed.*
10. Target- *RPPO, NPPO, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Economy and Trade, Farmers, Commercial, Target not specified, Other targets not listed.*
11. Purpose and objectives- *free text.*
12. Scheduled –*free text. Start date-end date, years, months, days, hours.*
13. Value: *the cost in originally currency*
14. Estimated value of phytosanitary components- *in USD*
15. Value: *the cost in USD*
16. Status- *in planning stage, awaiting contract, implementation, active, on-going, operational, completed, closed, status not specified.*
17. Source of information-*where can you find the information*
18. Contact information- *person responsible for the project.*
19. Compiler of the data

20. Attachment of documents

ACTIVITIES

1. Activity identification- *code, number*
2. Activity- *training, workshop, seminar, mentoring/assistance, bilateral assistance, other activity not specified.*
3. Field of activity-*agriculture, general SPS, phytosanitary measures, trade policy, administrative management, other field of activity not specified, other field of activity not listed.*
4. Title of activity- *free text or title blank.*
5. Content-*free text*
6. Place of activity- *free text.*
7. Implementation agency- *BIDINTAL, CARDI, CARICOM, CATIE, EMBRAPA, FAO, IICA, Mercosur, OEA, OAS, PAHO, NPPO, RPPO, STDF, Zamorano, Universities, UNDP, implementation agency not specified, other implementation agency not listed.*
8. Number of participants.
9. Countries.
10. Funding agency- *CIDA, Danida, EU, FAO, GEF, GTZ, IDB, IIDA, STDF, USAID, Worldbank, national budget, funding agency not specified, other funding agency not listed.*
11. Funding- *regional, national, IPPC, donor, multidonor, single activity through project, funding not specified, other funding not listed.*
12. Brief description on activity- *free text.*
13. Scheduled time- *Start Date-end date, years, months, days, hours.*
14. Evaluation- *yes, no or unknown.*
15. Evaluation of participants improvement after activities?- *yes, no, unknown.*
16. Objectives- *free text.*
17. Expected outputs- *free text.*
18. Beneficiaries-*RPPO, NPPO, private sector, public sector, combination of the above, beneficiaries not specified, other beneficiaries not specified.*
19. Approximately value(cost) of activity?

20. Contact information
21. Source of information-*where can you find the information*
22. Compiler of the information
23. Date when the information was compiled
24. Attachment of documents