



# **Report of the 3rd Meeting of the Expert Working Group on Phytosanitary Capacity Development**

**21-25 May 2012**

**Cairns, Australia**



## **Report of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Expert Working Group on**

### **Phytosanitary Capacity Development**

**21 –25 May 2012**

**Cairns, Australia**

#### **I. Opening of the Meeting**

1. The IPPC Capacity Development Officer opened the meeting. She welcomed and thanked the participants for coming to the third meeting of the Expert Working group on Capacity Development. The IPPC Secretariat thanked Australia for hosting the meeting and for the financial support given. Dr. Ian Naumann, Director of the SPS Capacity Building Program of the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, welcomed the participants of the meeting to Cairns, Australia. He informed about the official dinner that would be held on Tuesday the 22<sup>nd</sup> in the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park and about the half-day field visit to the AQIS laboratories and border control facilities at Cairns International Airport.

#### **II. Purpose of the meeting**

2. The IPPC Capacity Development Officer outlined the objectives of the meeting. She explained that the meeting of the Expert Working Group on Capacity Development has been called by the IPPC Bureau to perform specific tasks requested by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM). The main purpose of the meeting is to implement the CD operational work plan and to set priorities and criteria for the establishment and implementation of the Capacity Development Committee (CDC).

#### **III. Adoption of the Agenda**

3. The agenda as appended (See **Appendix 1**) was adopted after two modifications. Agenda item 4.1 was changed to “Selection of criteria to prioritize capacity development actions and development of phytosanitary technical resources”. The second modification to the agenda was related to the invitation to the official dinner to be held on Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> of May.
4. Full introductions were made with each member giving a brief description of their background. A list of participants and their contact details are appended (See **Appendix 2**)

#### **IV. Election of Rapporteur and Chair**

5. The group selected Ms. Ana Peralta, from the IPPC Secretariat, as the chairperson of the meeting and Mr. Corné van Alphen from the Netherlands, as rapporteur.

#### **V. Update from the IPPC Secretariat**

6. The representatives of the IPPC Secretariat provided information on all related activities of the Secretariat, relevant for the work of the EWG.

- Information on new IPPC staff members was presented: Mr. Craig Fedchock (IPPC Coordinator), Mrs. Celine Germain (Standard Setting Officer), Ms. Nadia Villaseñor (IRSS Analyst) and Mr. Washington Otieno (Capacity Development Consultant).
- The IPPC Secretariat informed that the CPM-7 (2012) established an IPPC Capacity Development Committee (CDC), under specific Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure. Until the CDC becomes operational, the Expert Working Group on Capacity Development (EWGCD) shall continue its work in the area of capacity development.
- An e-learning course on PRA is operational in English and Spanish and can be found at [www.phytopsanitary.info](http://www.phytopsanitary.info).
- The IPPC Secretariat informed that the IPPC Capacity Development Trust Fund was created in December 2011. This allows donors to deposit funds for capacity development and provides a platform for greater accountability on the part of the IPPC. The first contributions to the fund have been received from the STDF for project STDF 350 and the Japanese government, as an in kind contribution of a staff member at a P-2 level for 2 years.
- Additional FAO funds at the end of 2011, resulted in two letters of agreement (50.000 USD each). The first one included the funding of the workshop on Draft ISPMs in the Caribbean region and the support to the participation of the Andean Community in the Latin America workshop. The second one included the development of two manuals “ A guide to market access negotiations for NPPOs” and “ A manual on handling transit of consignment presenting possible pest risks” and one additional study to be developed as a part of the IRSS project, on the use of the concept of “equivalence”, . The Secretariat asked the members of the EWG for comments to the 3 drafts.

#### **Agenda Item 1: Work Plan and Strategies**

##### **1. Review of the IPPC National Capacity Development Strategy and Work Plan.**

The complete document of the IPPC National Capacity Development Strategy , revised in March 2012 and adopted by CPM7, was presented to the group. The EWGCD agreed on the document to be a basis to help governments to establish phytosanitary capacity development priorities and investments. It could be used to guide capacity development activities of development partners (including RPPOs and NPPOs). The Expert Working Group discussed how to implement the strategy and how to raise awareness about capacity development activities globally. The recommendations were:

- The IPPC National Capacity Development Strategy would be sent to various stakeholders and donors and promoted in a series of occasions and events (See **Appendix 3** for a full plan)
- Information on the strategy should be provided as part of different types of capacity development activities e.g. training.
- The EWGCD members to promote the strategy in their own regions.
- IPPC Secretariat to provide presentation on the strategy for general use.

## **1.2 Operationalization of the IPPC Capacity Development Committee (CDC)**

It was recommended to have a first meeting of the CDC at the beginning of December 2012. This meeting should be an integrated meeting together with the members of the EWGCD.

## **1.3 Procedural issues**

The Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedures of the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) were presented. The EWGCD Group discussed the criteria and qualifications that the future members of the committee need to demonstrate (See **Appendix 4**).

As required in the ToRs and RoPs, the Secretariat shall issue an open call to RPPOs and NPPOs for candidates for membership of the CDC. The Bureau will make the final selection.

## **Agenda Item 2: Information and Decisions**

### **2.1 Resource page: [www.phytosanitary.info](http://www.phytosanitary.info).**

The IPPC Secretariat gave an introduction to the phytosanitary technical resources page on the web ([www.phytosanitary.info](http://www.phytosanitary.info)) and welcomed suggestions for improvement. It was suggested that the design of the site could be improved by:

1. Reducing the amount of text on the homepage
2. Clarifying the difference between categories and tags
3. Clarifying the type and size of documents
4. SOP should be spelled out
5. Use of the word “posted” instead of “published”,
6. Mouse-over for explanations of words

Some members suggested publishing models of phytosanitary certificates used by contracting parties on the page. It was pointed out that in such case it would be desirable to deface them with a watermark or post them as a read-only document to prevent fraud.

To promote the entire website the EWGCD will make use of different activities such as workshops, a meeting of the “Technical consultation among RPPOs”, SPS technical assistance regional events, the STDF newsletter, the NEPPO newsletter and others. The Secretariat will prepare a standard template for this purpose.

#### **2.1.1 Project Databases.**

The Secretariat presented the Global Phytosanitary Capacity Development Projects Database (internal and global). The EWGCD provided some suggestions for their improvement. The EWGCD was asked to test the database and to provide additional feedback by the 10th of June 2012. Further the IPPC Secretariat encouraged the group to add projects from their regions and to promote the database to different stakeholders.

#### **2.1.2 Activities Database**

The Secretariat demonstrated the phytosanitary capacity development activities database and suggested to test and comment it by the 10<sup>th</sup> of June 2012.

The EWGCD was encouraged to populate and promote the database.

#### **2.1.3 Donors table.**

The IPPC Secretariat explained that the development of a roster of donors has been delayed due to lack of time and resources. An update will be provided in the next meeting.

#### **2.1.4 Roster of consultants.**

The progress report was provided and the EWGCD noted it. Further development will be consulted once all functions are developed.

### **2.2 Compiled phytosanitary technical resources.**

The EWGCD reviewed the list of compiled phytosanitary technical resources and developed a table (See **Appendix 5**) on the criteria to categorize the technical resources. These criteria will be helpful to decide which resources are to be included in the resources page. Use of language, criteria for inclusion or exclusion and the procedures for review of documents were discussed.

It was decided that technical resources could be proposed in any language, although priority will be given to UN languages. Documents including key words, such as Standards, Guidelines, Recommendations should be closely looked at in the review because these words have specific meanings in the context of the SPS Agreement. It was agreed that a general disclaimer was going to be placed in the resources page, indicating that posted documents have not been reviewed for full compatibility with terms in ISPM5.

A decision was made that the IPPC Secretariat will provide the EWGCD with a priority list of resources to be reviewed. Documents that are not easily accessed elsewhere, will have a priority. The group recommended including full documents rather than links. Documents such as PRAs, bilateral agreements, comprehensive diagnostic resources and pest fact sheets, should not be subject to review by the EWGCD.

Any documents reviewed and noted by other Subsidiary bodies (not the CDC) are automatically posted and the coordination responsibility relies in the pertinent subsidiary body. This is the particular case of explanatory documents for ISPMs, produced under the auspices of the SC.

The EWGCD will seek advice of Subsidiary Bodies regarding material submitted, when necessary.

The Secretariat will provide the tool to be used for the review of technical resources between meetings. The tool and decision process will be tested until December 2012. Details on the process are provided in **Appendix 5**.

### **2.3 Implementation Review and Support System**

The Secretariat presented the activities performed under the IRSS programme during 2011. The IRSS website was demonstrated including country profiles, the Help Desk and FAQ.

The findings from the surveys on ISPM4, ISPM6 and ISPM8 were reviewed by the EWGCD. Due to the richness of the contents, the group decided to focus the discussion on the ISPM6 results. The EWGCD came to a consensus in regards to some main points of consideration towards future actions and activities.

#### **ISPM6**

Based on the analysis of ISPM 6, five major priority areas were identified by the EWGCD as most relevant to guide future activities for capacity development.

1. *Storage Information systems*
2. *Operational Manuals (pest surveillance procedures)*
3. *Staff training and qualifications*
4. *Advocacy*
5. *Resource Mobilization*

Under each of these priority areas, the EWGCD considered activities for capacity development. Details are provided in **Appendix 6**.

Two case studies, the "Aquatic plants (Ryan M. Versal and James Madsen) and the "Internet Trade"(IPPC Secretariat) conducted under the IRSS programme were briefly summarized. Recommendations and outcomes of the two studies were presented. The EWG noted the lack of consolidated best practices for managing aquatic plants that are pests and suggestions were made for posting such best practices at [www.phytosanitary.info](http://www.phytosanitary.info), when available.

Further, the report of the Triennial Review Group of the Implementation Review and Support System was presented. The aim of this group is to assist the IRSS to produce the Triennial Review Report, the final product of the IRSS at the end of its 1<sup>st</sup> cycle. The EWGCD was informed that the first project was concluded successfully with the progress reporting being submitted to the donor on schedule. A general survey on all ISPMs and the IPPC has been prepared and is going to be released shortly. The Secretariat recommended that this survey be implemented once in the 3 years IRSS cycle.

The Secretariat expressed concern about the sustainability of the financial support for the IRSS programme. It is currently a 3-year project funded by the EU, but it needs (more) funding for the next 3 year cycle.

The Secretariat requested that the CDC should consider reporting to the IRSS on the use of the data and information produced for the preparation of the Triennial Review report.

The Secretariat presented a paper in which it requested suggestions from the EWGCD for activities to be added to the 2012-2014 IRSS work programme. The EWGCD members made two projects proposals (See **Appendix 7**).

### ***Agenda Item 3: Advocacy and Resource Mobilization***

**3.1.** The EWGCD discussed the possibilities to prepare projects and activities related to resource mobilization and advocacy for Capacity Development as well as any related capacity development activity in the IPPC.

#### **ISPM15**

The Secretariat gave background information on an evaluation of the implementation of ISPM 15 made from a workshop held in Vancouver, Canada, in 2005 and on the registration of the ISPM 15 mark. Concerns were raised highlighting the many requests for advice sent to the IPPC Secretariat regarding this standard. To date, there are still more than 80 countries that have not yet registered the ISPM15 mark. The IPPC Secretariat asked for ideas from the EWGCD on future actions that could be taken for improving implementation. The group discussed the topic and came up with suggestions (See **Appendix 8**). These ideas are going to be the basis for the preparation of a future project proposal addressing different aspects of the support to ISPM 15 implementation.

The Expert Working Group will seek synergies with the Capacity Development Group in the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) on the identification of the components of this project related to the ISPM 15.

#### **ISPM6**

The IPPC Secretariat welcomed the EWGCD to brainstorm ideas for future actions to develop project proposals related to ISPM6. It is anticipated that a workshop on surveillance is going to be organized by the APPPC in October 2012 that will propose development of a number of technical documents. The Secretariat informed that funds from the STDF project “Global Phytosanitary Manuals, Standard Operating Procedures and Training Kits Project” (50 000 USD) are ear-marked to develop one of these documents. The EWGCD decided to defer making recommendations for activities on ISPM 6, until after that workshop.

The EWGCD recommended seeking funds from donors for activities including a regional approach to information management systems. It was decided to submit a Project Preparation Grant (PPG) on this issue to the Standards and Trade Facility Organization (STDF) as a 1<sup>st</sup> phase, 50 000 USD submission. Members of the EWGCD will prepare a project proposal concept for the South East Asian Region for submission as a PPG to STDF by the end of this year.

### **Agenda Item 4: Capacity Development Activities**

#### **4.1 Project STDF/PG/350**

The EWGCD developed criteria for prioritizing the products to be developed under this project. (See **Appendix 9**).

The agreed criteria for prioritization of products are:

1. Whether the product addresses core functions of the IPPC.
2. Whether the product relates to NPPO management.
3. Global applicability of the resource.
4. Whether the product addresses emerging and urgent topics.
5. Whether the product can be considered a general manual.
6. Whether the product address multiple areas of interest or activities.
7. Whether other options of related technical resource are not available.
8. Whether there is very little or no material available to address urgent topics.

The EWGCD agreed on 18 products to be developed after application of the criteria to the table on possible areas and topics for technical resources prepared at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the EWGCD in 2011 and updated in 2012.

The EWGCD agreed to:

- 1) Suggest to the Secretariat potential consultants and collaborators by the end of June 2012.
- 2) Require any consultant used for the project to register in the IPPC roster of consultants.
- 3) The Secretariat being responsible for the selection of consultants.
- 4) Use a flexible approach for the development of the products (e.g. inclusion of workshops preparation in languages other than English).
- 5) Make an active search of funds to cover translation, including exploring synergies with other projects or as a last resort, request STDF increasing the allocation to the project prior to its closure.

## **4.2 New Project Proposals**

The Expert Working Group reviewed two draft Project proposals to be presented to the STDF.

The Expert Working Group was supportive on the proposals and suggested ways to improve them. It was noted that the CDC shall serve as the steering committee for both projects, if approved.(See the comments in **Appendix 10**)

Decisions made for both project proposals:

1. The IPPC Secretariat will modify the project proposals for a fast consideration by the EWGCD with a timeframe given.
2. The members of the EWGCD will identify countries from the respective regions to propose the projects to the STDF (deadline for this by the end of June).

3. The members agreed to submit letters of support for the projects by their respective institutions (deadline for this by the end of September).

(Ana, I remember a little warning from Kenza about the wording of the role of the Secretariat in the preparation of these proposals. Is this sufficiently taken into account, in particular in point1?)

#### **4.3 Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE)**

The Secretariat gave a report on the status of the application the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Tool (PCE).

The Secretariat provided examples of national action plans prepared by four countries using the tool. All four reports are for internal use by the EWGCD and are considered to be confidential documents.

The EWGCD decided to include an update on the application of the PCE as a standing agenda item in the meetings of the CDC.

#### **4.4 Regional workshop on draft ISPM.**

The Secretariat reported that seven regional workshops are projected to be held in 2012. The purpose of the workshops is to discuss draft standards. These workshops provide an opportunity to discuss other IPPC related areas of information exchange, implementation and capacity development.

### **Agenda Item 5: Any Other Matters**

#### **5.1. WTO SPS Technical Assistance**

The Secretariat reported that a number of specific technical assistance activities on the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) have been planned by the Secretariat of the WTO-SPS. The scheduled activities for 2012 include an e-learning course on the SPS Agreement, National SPS seminars as well as various regional SPS workshops. The Secretariat will participate in some of these activities.

#### **VII. Date and venue of the next Meeting.**

The next meeting of the EWGCD/CDC will be held in Rome, Italy, on December 3- 7. Malaysia offered to host the May 2013 meeting of the CDC. The IPPC Secretariat will confirm these arrangements or changes to them, as appropriate.

#### **VIII. Review and Adoption of the report.**

The EWGCD thanked the representatives of Australia for their financial contribution and their gracious hospitality during the meeting. The report was adopted.

<b>Appendix 1.- Agenda for the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Expert Working Group on Capacity Development.</b>
--

<b>EXPERT WORKING GROUP MEETING</b>
<b>PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT</b>
<b>Third Meeting</b>
<b>Cairns, Australia, 21 - 25 May 2012</b>
<b>Provisional Agenda</b>

- I. Opening of the Meeting.*
- II. Purpose of the Meeting.*
- III. Adoption of the Agenda.*
- IV. Election of the Rapporteur and Chair.*
- V. Update from IPPC Secretariat*

***Agenda Item 1: Work Plan and Strategies***

- 1.1** Review the IPPC National Capacity Development Strategy and Work Plan.
- 1.2** Operationalization of the IPPC Capacity Development Committee(CDC).
- 1.3** Procedural issues.

***Agenda Item 2: Information and Decisions***

- 2.1** Phytosanitary. info
  - *Review and improvement*
- 2.1.1** Roster of Experts
- 2.1.2** Projects Database

- *Review*
- *Use and comment*
- *Promote*

### 2.1.3 Activities Database

- *Review*
- *Use and comment*
- *Promote*

### 2.1.4 Donors Table(Delayed)

**2.2** Compiled phytosanitary technical resources. Review of the compiled and other phytosanitary technical resources to be considered as candidates to be included in the resources page.

### 2.3 IRSS

- Update on 2011 IRSS work programme and suggestions for 2012 IRSS work programme.
- Presentation of the results for the IRSS studies undertaken: “Implementation challenges and best practices of ISPM 6:1997”; Internet Trade of Plants; Aquatic Plants and Equivalence.
- Coordination of the activities to support the IRSS Programme.
- Information on the IRSS Triennial Review Group.

### ***Agenda Item 3: Advocacy and Resource Mobilization***

**3.** Discuss the possibilities to prepare projects and activities related to resource mobilization and advocacy for Capacity Development as well as any related capacity development in the IPPC.

#### **3.1** Possible areas of action.

- ISPM 6.
- ISPM 15.
- Other.

### ***Agenda Item 4: Capacity Development Activitiess***

#### **4.1** Project STDF/PG/350

- Management of the project obtained from the STDF on the preparation of manuals, SOPs and training kits.

- Selection of criteria to prioritize Capacity development actions and development of phytosanitary technical resources.

#### 4.2 Project Proposals

Review the two drafted Project proposals to be presented to possible donors.

- *“Global Training of Trainers Workshops in Phytosanitary Capacity Development”*  
- Project AusAID
- *“Global Training of Trainers Workshops on Implementation of Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation”*
- *Other proposals.*

#### 4.3 PCE

- Update on the PCE and the use by donors and contracting parties of the PCE tool prior to developing and implementing phytosanitary capacity development projects. Linked with the project proposals: *“Global Training of Trainers and Workshops on Implementation of Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation”*.

#### 4.4 Regional workshop on draft ISPM .

#### ***Agenda Item 5: Any Other Matters***

##### 5.1 WTO-SPS Technical Assistance

##### 5.2 Official Dinner

To be held Tuesday 22 May 2012, venue to be determined.

##### 5.3 Field Visit

Half-day tour on Wednesday 23 May 2012.

#### VI. *Review and Adoption of the report.*

**Appendix 2.- Participants list**

**EXPERT WORKING GROUP ON PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY BUILDING**

**Cairns, Australia, 21- 25 May 2012**

**PARTICIPANT LIST**

	<b>Region</b>	<b>Name, mailing, address, telephone</b>	<b>E- mail address</b>
1	Africa	Mr.Similo MAVIMBELA Research Officer Agricultural Research and Specialist Services Ministry of Agriculture Malkerns Research Station P.O. Box 4 Malkerns SWAZILAND Tel: (+268) 5274071 Fax: (+268) 5274070	<a href="mailto:mrs@realnet.co.sz">mrs@realnet.co.sz</a> <a href="mailto:Seemelo@yahoo.com">Seemelo@yahoo.com</a>
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	<a href="mailto:syharvey@moa.gov.jm">syharvey@moa.gov.jm</a> <a href="mailto:sheharv@yahoo.com">sheharv@yahoo.com</a>
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 Fax: +249 185 33 94 23	<a href="mailto:neltayb@yahoo.com">neltayb@yahoo.com</a>
4	Europe	Mr. Corné VAN ALPHEN Ministry of Economic Affairs Agriculture and Innovation Department of Plant Supply Chains and Food Quality NETHERLANDS Tel: +31 (0)70 - 3785552 Fax: +31 (0)70 - 3786123	<a href="mailto:c.a.m.van.alphen@minlnv.nl">c.a.m.van.alphen@minlnv.nl</a> <a href="mailto:c.a.m.vanalphen@mineleni.nl">c.a.m.vanalphen@mineleni.nl</a>
5	North America	Ms. Parul Patel Plant Protection and Quarantine USDA-APHIS 4700 River Road Riverdale, MD. 20737 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Tele: 301-851-2351	<a href="mailto:Parul.R.Patel@aphis.usda.gov">Parul.R.Patel@aphis.usda.gov</a>

	<b>Region</b>	<b>Name, mailing, address, telephone</b>	<u>E- mail address</u>
6	Pacific	Dr 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 Phone: +61 2 6272 3442 Fax: +61 2 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 Kuala Lumpur MALAYSIA Tel: 6 03 20301415 (Off. line) 017 67 588 76 (mobile phone) Fax: 6 03 26977164	<a href="mailto:hawlengtho@doa.gov.my">hawlengtho@doa.gov.my</a> <a href="mailto:hawlengtho@yahoo.com">hawlengtho@yahoo.com</a>
8	<b>IPPC Secretariat</b>	Ms. Ana PERALTA Implementation Officer International Plant Protection Convention Sec(IPPC), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Room B703, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153, Rome, ITALY Tel: +39-06-5705-5322 Fax: +39-06-5705-4819	ana.peralta@fao.org
9		Mr. Orlando SOSA Implementation Review and Support System Officer(IRSS) International Plant Protection Convention Sec(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

	Region	Name, mailing, address, telephone	E- mail address
10		Ms. Johanna GARDESTEN Capacity Development 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- 5705-53768 Fax: +(39) 06 - 570-54819	johanna.gardesten@fao.org
11		Ms. Nadia VILLASEÑOR IRSS- Analyst 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- 5705-53035 Fax: +(39) 06 - 570-54819	nadia.villasenor@fao.org

	Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
12	<b>Observers</b>	Ms Kenza Le MENTEC, PhD Economic Affairs Officer World Trade Organisation Rue de Lausanne, 154 CH 1211 Genève 21, SUISSE Tel: + (41) 22 739 65 38 Fax: + (41) 22 739 57 60	<a href="mailto:Kenza.LeMentec@wto.org">Kenza.LeMentec@wto.org</a>
13		Ms. Lois RANSOM Chief Plant Protection Officer Office of the Chief Plant Protection Officer (OCPPO) Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Tel: (+61) 2 6272 4888 Fax: (+61) 2 6272 5835	lois.ransom@daff.gov.au

### **Appendix 3.- Plan to release the IPPC national phytosanitary capacity development strategy.**

#### **List of Agencies to be contacted for release of the strategy:**

- Donors and related initiatives, including COLEACP-EDES and PIP, BTSF
- SPS Committee
- NPPOs, RPPOs
- Other Conventions: CBD, Montreal Protocol, CODEX, OIE, Nagoya protocol
- Other organizations: IFAD, IICA, IDB, CABI, RECs, CGIAR Centers ( as IITA), COPE, ICIPE, CIRAD, UN Agencies (UNIDO, IAEA) and Commissions, FAO regions and Sub regions, FAO HQ Units (specially TC),
- Technical assistance agencies, for example: USAID, AusAID, MCC, FAS, GTZ, JICA, CIDA, NORAD, CDE, Sida.
- Related projects: PANSPSO
- Related programs: NEPAD/ CAADP
- Electronic fora: CABI Plantwise, Pestnet, IPP, Tech Res Page, roster of consultants, STDF Website.

#### **How to disseminate the document:**

- Members of the EWG in their own regions: Plant Health Directors meetings, Regional Workshops on Draft ISPMs,
- Secretariat: TC RPPOs, IPPC Strategic planning group, Bureau ( align with the resources mobilization and communication strategies), Financial Committee of the IPPC, WTO-SPS technical assistance activities program, STDF WG, Liaison meetings with donors, Conventions and Agreements.
- Events: Lunch time event at the SPS Committee meeting, CPM-8 side event, other regional meetings (RPPOs and RECs)
- STDF: Ensure project submitted include reference to IPPC NPCD strategy

**Secretariat to provide a Power Point presentation on the strategy for general use.**

**Initiation: June 2012.**

## Appendix 4.- Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the IPPC Capacity Development Committee (CDC)

### Procedural issues of the CDC.

Procedures for nominating candidates should be absolutely open to NPPO and RPPOs

#### General requirements for consideration of candidates:

- Selection of members will be based on geographical representation, with one delegate from each FAO region and a minimum of three members from developing countries.
- Selection will seek balance of skills and experience for the composition of the Committee.
- Appropriate references of technical expertise and qualifications of the candidates need to be provided.
- Endorsement by NPPO or RPPOs is advisable.
- Adequate knowledge of English to be able to participate in the meetings and discussions is needed ( self rating, indication of English language proficiency in the CV, etc)
- All information provided is subject to independent enquiries and personal interviews.
- For the selection of alternates, the same rules apply.
- On confidentiality, any member should fill and sign an agreement following a model developed by the Secretariat.

#### General requirements for selection of members:

The following are **criteria** suggested by the EWGCD to the Bureau, for the selection of members. They have been scored. Measures to assess and verify its compliance are included in the table.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Value of the criteria</b>	<b>Assessment measures</b>	<b>Verification means</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demonstrated experience in managing phytosanitary systems;</li> </ul>	35	Senior level positions occupied.  Nature/Description of activities related to phytosanitary systems management.  Years of experience (preferred experience of 7 years or more).	CV.  Confirmation letters of NPPO or employer .  Supporting documents.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demonstrated experience in delivering phytosanitary capacity development</li> </ul>	25	Nature/Description of activities related to delivering phytosanitary capacity development activities.	CV.  Confirmation letters of employer .  Supporting documents confirming the role.

activities;		Role played. Years of experience (preferred experience of 3 years or more).	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>in depth knowledge of the IPPC and International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures:</li> </ul>	25	Participation in meetings of subsidiary bodies, any EWG , Technical Panels.  Demonstrated experience in national implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs.  Leadership role in IPPC meetings, committees, bodies.	CV. IPPC participants database.  References from IPPC technical lead of respective meeting.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>experience in the application of phytosanitary regulations/legislation;</li> </ul>	10	Demonstrated experience in application or implementation of phytosanitary regulations/legislation	CV. Confirmation letters of NPPO, RPPO and/or employer .  Supporting documents confirming the role.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>knowledge, qualifications and/or experience in developing training materials</li> </ul>	5	Demonstrated experience.	CV. Supporting documents confirming the role.

**Participation commitments of members and alternates.**

- If the participant is an NPPO employee and from a developed country, then:
  - Provide some form of commitment attesting that you are fully able to fund the participation.
  - Provide attestation that your government releases you to attend and prepare for participation, including follow up.
  - Provide endorsement in writing.
  
- If the participant is an NPPO employee and from a developing country, then:
  - Provide a request for funding to cover cost of participation at key meetings where presence is required.

- Provide attestation that your government releases you to attend and prepare for participation, including follow up.
    - Provide endorsement in writing.
  - If the participant is not an NPPO employee (self employed, retired, employee of another organization), whether from a developed or developing country, then:
    - An employee of another organization or retired person.
        - Provide some form of commitment attesting that you are fully able to be sponsored to participate.
        - Provide attestation that your organization releases you to attend and prepare for participation, including follow up.
        - Provide endorsement in writing.
      - A self employed or retired person unable to fund his/her participation.
        - Demonstrate that sponsorship was not granted by relevant organizations.
        - Provide a request for funding to cover cost of participation at key meetings where presence is required.
        - Provide a letter of commitment where you agree to attend meetings and prepare for participation, including follow up.
- **Reconsideration of financial support:** In situations where countries which have submitted funding commitments are unable to meet them, the Secretariat could cover partially or totally the participation costs, as required.

**Observers and invited experts:**

- Observers are not funded by the Secretariat.
- The CDC can invite standing observers.
- Other observers should request to the Secretariat clearance to participate. The request needs to be approved by the CDC on a meeting by meeting basis.
- Experts may be invited and funded, at the discretion of the CDC and by consensus .

**Appendix 5.- Review of the compiled and other phytosanitary technical resources to be considered as candidates to be included in the resources page.**

- 1) On the use of language :
  - Key words/flags to be taken into account for review are : Standards, guidelines, recommendations.
  - The resources can be proposed in any language, however less used languages are going to have less priority. Priority should be given to UN languages.  
In the process of review of non-UN languages, in-kind translation services could be used by the EWG/CDC.
  - A general disclaimer on lack of compatibility with ISPM 5 is going to be added to the resources page.
- 2) On the criteria for inclusion or exclusion of technical resources from the resources page:

<b>Inclusion</b>	<b>Exclusion</b>
Assisting with the implementation of core IPPC provisions (obligations, rights and responsibilities) .	Incompatible with the provisions of the IPPC text and ISPMs
Usefulness and relevance of information for NPPOs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Applicability to the implementation of specific ISPMs</li> <li>- Relationship with the areas of the IPPC NPCD Strategy.</li> <li>- Used to implement core functions of the NPPO.</li> <li>- Practicality of the material.</li> </ul>	Non-IPPC standards that could create confusion.
Has the potential to have international application .	Documents endorsed, approved or adopted by the CPM.
Is peer reviewed.	Detection of an infringement of copyright
Date of publication	Documents subject to confidentiality agreements, unless the parties agree to its publication
	Documents subject to frequent update.
	Documents published or intended to be published in journals and easily accessible.

- 3) On operational aspects:
  - Any document reviewed and noted by other Subsidiary bodies (not the CDC) is automatically posted and the coordination responsibility relies in the pertinent subsidiary body.
  - The EWG may seek advice of Subsidiary Bodies regarding material submitted.
  - PRA documents, bilateral agreements, comprehensive diagnostic resources, pest factsheets and specific pest control manuals are not subjected to review by the EWG/CDC .
  - The Secretariat will pre-review the videos to considered if they need to be submitted for EWG/CDC review.

- The Secretariat is going to propose periodically a priority list for review.
- A general policy for the inclusion of resources in the Site is that full documents are preferable to links.

4) Procedures of the EWG to review documents.

The working modality is going to be face to face meetings and remote electronic work. The Secretariat will send a proposal for electronic decision by the EWG.

- a. Initially and till December 2012, for testing the application of the criteria and get familiar with the process, the entire EWG is going to assess each document proposed, coming from a sample of different types of resources.
- b. The Secretariat shall prepare an assessment format using the criteria established.
- c. Later, in December the EWG/CDC is going to decide on the possibility to rely on single assessments by EWG/CDC members.
- d. A period of time should be granted to the members to review the assessment. Lack of comments before the deadline imply approval.
- e. In case of receiving comments, the Chair will initiate a discussion process by electronic means. If consensus is not reached, the resource should not be posted.
- f. When requested, a reason for not posting or removing a resource should be given to proposers, based on the established criteria, including information on the possible process for revisiting the application.

## Appendix 6.- IRSS ISPM6: Analysis by EWGCD.

The following are the comments performed by the EWGCD on the results obtained by the IRSS in the analysis of the implementation of ISPM6. The analysis is based on a specific document submitted by the IRSS, identifying priority areas.

Under the first priority area of Storage of Information, a number of considerations and activities were proposed by the EWGCD:

1. A regional approach to information technology and at the same time, safeguarding the role of the NPPO,
2. Regional Trainings on information technology including NPPOs as well as research agencies and other non-traditional partners which would also serve to increase advocacy, communication and potential coordination,
3. Emphasize three main points including a. a data exchange framework, b. the inter-operability of the information systems and c. in-house capacity needed to keep the systems working,
4. Special consideration of ownership issues in regards to IT systems,
5. Regional workshops bringing together experiences of participants and having them decide what they want – however considering some minimal fields to be completed both at the national and international level,
6. Consideration of motivations of NPPOs and sustainability issues,
7. Potentiality of tapping into RECs to further the motivation of NPPOs as a result of the ISPM6 analysis results which had reflected trade motivations of NPPOs and
8. the consideration of advocacy at the national level to increase the profile of surveillance activities, increase the motivation, and knowledge.

Under the second priority area of Advocacy, main points of discussion and future consideration include:

1. Focusing on the most important crop commodities for countries,
2. Focusing on surveillance systems as a cornerstone of plant protection and trade activities,
3. creating different messages for different stakeholders,
4. Creating a general message for Contact Points that could be supported by funds coming from environmental arenas,
5. Use of all advocacy tools available.

Under the third priority area of Training Staff and Human Resources, the group proposed:

1. Training workshops by crop commodity,
2. Various levels of trainings as well as the identification of different levels/roles and responsibilities of actors in the systems,
3. Detailed step by step trainings, and
4. To begin training programmes at a early years of education

Under the fourth priority area of Resource Mobilization considerations were made in regards to:

1. Increasing stakeholders awareness of how they could fit into the pest surveillance agenda,
2. Use of tools for advocacy, and
3. Seeking out non-traditional resources.

Under the final priority point of Operational Manuals – Pest Surveillance Procedures the EWGCD noted the importance of developing manuals to identify all possible tasks required to address procedures as well as good surveillance practices.

As a side point, the group noted that it would be important to include all best surveillance practices in the technical resources page.

**Appendix 7.- Proposals for the 2012-2014 IRSS work programme: IRSS Project Concept Proposals**

<b>Activity Title:</b>	<b>Global review and analysis of the implementation of ISPM 17 (Pest reporting)</b>
<b>Lead Agency:</b>	IPPC
<b>Key project collaborators:</b>	Contracting Parties; RPPOs
<b>Funding source:</b>	IPPC-IRSS Project
<b>Project duration:</b>	
<b>Background</b>	<p>The results of the IRSS review of ISPMs 6 and 8 have initiated the review of the other ISPMs closely related to surveillance. Pest reporting depends on the establishment, within countries, of national systems for surveillance, as required by the IPPC. The results of the review revealed weakness in surveillance activities leading to poor pest reporting i.e. low number of trained and experienced staff , limited diagnostic capabilities; poor pest information management and accessibility, etc.</p> <p>The review will consider processes to address issues related to implementation of the pest reporting standard and present to CPM recommendations to inform IPPC related initiatives.</p>
<b>Objective</b>	The primary objective of this activity is to collect and analyse information from contracting parties on their implementation of ISPM 17 and on the use of pest information in reporting the occurrence, outbreak and spread of pests in areas under their responsibilities, for compliance with the IPPC.
<b>Purpose</b>	To provide background information and analysis to support the review of pest reporting obligations of contracting parties and the implementation of ISPM 17.
<b>Key outputs and outcome</b>	<p>The key outputs will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A report of a survey of NPPOs and RPPOs that analyses implementation practices and challenges of ISPM 17.</li> </ul> <p>The expected project outcomes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Identified problems for fulfilment of pest reporting</li> </ul>

	<p>obligations lists</p> <p>b) Identify actions to support improvement of pest reporting by contracting parties.</p> <p>c) Identify actions to support country's fulfilment of their trade-related transparency obligations</p>
<b>Expected impact</b>	Improved implementation of the IPPC and the SPS Agreement
<b>Targets</b>	NPPOs, RPPOs, Research organizations, other organizations and initiatives involved in surveillance and reporting activities.
<b>Approach</b>	The following outlines and strategy to produce listed outputs
<b>Date ( To be adjusted later)</b>	<b>Activity ( To be adjusted later)</b>
	<p>Prepare and distribute survey of NPPOs and RPPOs</p> <p>Collate and analyse responses</p> <p>Prepare report</p>

<b>Activity Title:</b>	<b>Global survey and analysis to identify the world's top ranked regulated pests</b>
<b>Lead Agency:</b>	IPPC
<b>Key project collaborators:</b>	EWG-CD/CDC; Contracting parties; RPPOs
<b>Funding source:</b>	IPPC-IRSS Project
<b>Project duration:</b>	
<b>Background</b>	The "IPPC Implementation Review and Support System" (IRSS) concept emanated from an IPPC Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) proposed to the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement (SBDS) for the establishment of a possible IPPC Compliance Mechanism, in 2007. This concept was refined by the SBDS and a modified program for the development of an IRSS that was adopted by CPM in 2008, while noting the importance of this programme in the implementation of the IPPC and the implementation of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs).
<b>Objective</b>	The primary objective of this activity is to collect and analyse regulated

	<p>pest information from contracting parties and RPPO's to help identify common pest threats and to use this information to assist NPPO's and RPPO's to inform and update their lists of regulated pests.</p> <p>This activity supports the implementation of Guidelines on Lists of Regulated Pests (ISPM 19), since it stimulates sharing information on, review and analyse the current lists of regulated pests.</p>
<p><b>Purpose</b></p>	<p>To provide a listing of top ranked regulated pests and a full analysis of regional differences and commonalities regarding plant health, promoting regional harmonized actions. The results of this project could help inform and drive initiatives for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Determining surveillance priorities.</li> <li>○ Identifying and preparing diagnostic protocols.</li> <li>○ Determining the need for contingency plans and emergency actions for priority pests.</li> <li>○ Preparing pest management guidelines</li> <li>○ Identifying and prioritizing availability and use of resources for capacity development and other areas of the IPPC.</li> <li>○ Identifying and preparing treatment protocols.</li> <li>○ Identifying training priorities.</li> <li>○ Promoting regional analysis of PRA methodologies</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, the information shall be used by the IPPC for setting priorities on its related activities and could help other Conventions to establish sound programs related to AIS and plant health.</p> <p>The information obtained helps to fulfil commitments of IPPC contracting parties under ISPM 19.</p>
<p><b>Key outputs and outcome</b></p>	<p>The key outputs will be:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A report of a survey of NPPOs and RPPOs to determine top ranked regulated pests, in support of the implementation of Guidelines on Lists of Regulated Pests (ISPM 19).</p> <p>The expected project outcome is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Global/Regional listing of top ranked regulated pest</li> <li>b) Highlight some challenges for implementation of ISPM 17 and 19.</li> <li>c) Drive key complementary safeguarding initiatives, such as pest surveillance and promoting regional harmonization and analysis (pests, commodities, pathways)</li> </ul>

<b>Expected impact</b>	<p>Countries:</p> <p>Could better utilise and benefit from a harmonized approach to identifying common pests threats and actions arising to improve their capacity to implement the Convention and reduce the risk of global movement of plant pests.</p> <p>RPPOs and RECs:</p> <p>Obtain information to focus their activities and efficiently allocate resources for regional harmonization.</p> <p>IPPC and related Conventions:</p> <p>Prioritize global actions, influence cross-cutting priorities related to the environment ( e.g.: CBD) and food security.</p>
<b>Targets</b>	NPPOs, RPPO's
<b>Approach</b>	The following outlines and strategy to produce listed outputs
<b>Date (To be adjusted later)</b>	<b>Activity(To be adjusted later)</b>
	<p>Prepare and distribute survey of NPPOs and RPPOs</p> <p>Collate and analyse responses</p> <p>Prepare report</p>

## Appendix 8.- ISPM15 Technical Gaps by the EWGCD

The EWG analyzed the potential areas for technical assistance/capacity development for the case of ISPM 15: 2009 (*Regulation of wood packaging materials in international trade*), based on a document prepared by the IRSS group of the IPPC Secretariat.

ISPM 15 was adopted by the Fourth Session of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM) in 2002 as *guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade*. It was later revised and the modification adopted by the First Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-1) in 2006. The first revision was adopted by the Fourth Session of Commission of Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-4) in 2009 as the present standard.

The standard describes phytosanitary measures that reduce risk of introduction and spread of quarantine pests associated with the movement in international trade of wood packaging material made from raw wood. Wood packaging material covered by the standard includes dunnage but excludes material made from wood processed in such a way that it is free from pests.

A workshop was held in Vancouver, Canada from February 28 – March 4, 2005 in which participants from various (NPPOs), RPPOs and industries presented their experiences with implementation of the standard. Notwithstanding this, several countries still experience challenges with some aspects of implementation of the standard such as notification of non compliance in relation to traceability where the country of phytosanitary treatment is different from the country of use of the treated material. As a result, IPPC Secretariat wanted to elicit some reactions from members of the EWGCD on possible actions that may be considered for follow up , especially in the areas of, inter alia, policy/legislation, trade, advocacy, human resource capacity, environmental considerations and technical as well as operational capacities (see the table below) that constrain implementation of the standard.

The following table shows the actions suggested by the EWGCD, that decided to prepare a project proposal addressing these aspects to support ISPM 15 implementation.

Thematic Area	2005 Workshop and Evaluation Recommendations	Suggested Actions by the EWG-CD
Policy/Legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A monitoring system is required in order to control the correct use of this mark by authorized industries.</li> <li>In practice, ISPM 15 is considered implemented if its requirements are somehow embedded in the national legislation, or a national program is available in which the implementation and application of ISPM 15 are described, or (preferably) both. Yet, several respondents indicated in their questionnaire that their country does not have such law or program, whereas it has a system for monitoring correct use of the ISPM 15 compliance mark.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidance on supervision/audit/acceptance/withdrawal/illegal use of authorized industries.</li> <li>Guidance on legal developments needed for the implementation.</li> <li>Guidance on national registration and safeguarding of the mark.</li> </ol>
Trade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To avoid unnecessary trade disruption, it is critical that all countries utilizing wood packaging</li> </ul>	Training activities :Update of capacities on changes to the standard

	<p>materials with their export commodities establish certification methods in accordance with the standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consequently, for exporting countries it is essential that they meet the export criteria of ISPM 15 in order to have access to international trade.</li> </ul>	<p>Country based training, with priority for the ones wanting to export.</p> <p>Modular format to allow tailoring.</p> <p>On-site activities should be included, as well as practical experiences from NPPOs in the operation of the standard.</p> <p>Consider the industry as one of the receptors of training.</p>
<p>Technical</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wood packaging material that meets the requirements set out in the standard should display a specified ISPM 15 compliance mark.</li> <li>• Wood packaging treatment and manufacturing companies have to be authorized in order to use this mark.</li> <li>• A disadvantage of organizing one workshop for all countries in the world is that it is difficult to cover all issues, especially difficulties that specifically apply to a particular region in the world. An alternative would have been to organize several small-scale workshops in different regions in the world.</li> <li>• provide all NPPO's of (developing) countries with a bound copy of the training material; this would also solve the accessibility</li> <li>• problems experienced with the internet version.</li> <li>• individual, tailor-made capacity building activities may help overcome the practical difficulties in implementing ISPM 15.</li> <li>• Provision of knowledge on how to deal with particular difficulties and how to implement international guidelines and standards is a first step in assisting countries in meeting international standards, protocols,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance on the selection and use of treatment facilities.</li> <li>• Guidance on the operation of new treatment methodologies, if adopted in the ISPM</li> </ul>

	<p>guidelines etc. the institutional environment or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (information or logistic) infrastructure in a country may not be suitable for bringing this knowledge into practice.</li> </ul> <p>capacity building should focus on the development of a stable and transparent institutional environment and infrastructure.</p>	
Operational Aspects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) have the responsibility for ensuring that the requirements of ISPM 15 have been met.</li> <li>• One country even does not have such monitoring system, but has authorized one or more companies to use the mark, according to the respondent.</li> <li>• Another (industry) respondent indicated that the workshop had contributed to the theoretical implementation of the standard, but not to the practice in field.</li> <li>• One of the activities of the project was to develop training material, to provide support to countries in developing a national implementation plan. Unfortunately, from the questionnaire it appears that not all countries are aware of the availability of the training material.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement a process of collection of training materials to populate the Resources page.</li> <li>• Develop products related to the identification of packaging materials and exemptions to the standard</li> </ul>
Economic		
Human Resource		
Advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industry plays a major role in the movement of wood packaging.</li> <li>• Although industry representatives did not belong to the target group of the workshop, they are actively involved and have a direct interest in the practical application of ISPM 15 in their country.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop advocacy material: raise the scope and application of the standard. (Check available material for inclusion in the resources page.)</li> <li>• Promote the increase partnerships and interactions at country level.</li> <li>• Priority: Develop products with clear instructions for industry.</li> </ul>

Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RPPO's are assumed to have, at least to some extent, an overview of the past and current status of ISPM 15 implementation in the countries that belong to their RPPO, and of the common difficulties in implementation that are experienced in their region.</li> </ul>	Coordinate actions with RPPOs
Environment		

**Appendix 9.- Table for the discussion on possible topics for Manuals and other resources for project STDF/350 (EWGCD 2011, updated in 2012).**

Generic inspection for import/export	Export certification	Surveillance and diagnostic	Import Verification	NPPO management	Status and pest listing	Emergency response	PRA
Green houses	Packinghouses specifications	Determination of surveillance plans	Post entry quarantine	Setting up an NPPO	Preparation of lists of regulated pests .	Contingency planning	Climate matching
Storage places	Silos	Collection of samples	Treatments	Client management	Information sharing on pest status	Funding mechanisms	Environmental assessment
Containers	General export procedures	Processing of samples for analysis	Systems approaches	Customers service		Stakeholders coordination	Determination of economic impact
Grain and seeds, including turf	Treatments	Surveillance information management	Preclearance	Stakeholder fora		Declaration of regulated areas.	PRA 101
Handicrafts	Systems approaches	PFA and ALPP	Documentary verification	Phytosanitary information system management			
Lumber and timber and sawn wood products	Preclearance	PFPP and PFPS	Emergency procedures	Hazard profiling★			
Packaging Material	PFA and ALPP	Trapping for specific pests	Handling of non-compliance cases	Cost recovery/Fees structure			
Air Passenger Baggage	PFPP and PFPS		Offsite inspection	Policy and legislation			
Air Cargo	Field inspection		Sampling for diagnostics	Human resources management			
Maritime and inland waterways cargo	Issuance of PC		Processing of biological control agents for import	Import permits			
Mail Facility	Traceability of consignments		Leakage surveys	Market access negotiations★			
Passenger Vehicles	Maintenance of identity and integrity			Training requirements for public			

	of consignments			officers and designated officers			
Overland Cargo	Sampling for diagnostics			Participation in IPPC activities			
Heavy used machinery	Handling of transit consignments ★			Performance management			
Animals	Processing pest specimens for confirmatory diagnostics			Audits			
Pedestrian				Quality assurance			
Pre departure Air Passenger				Third parties authorization			
Rail Cargo				Service providers supervision			
Feed inspection				Branding and promotion			
Express Carrier				Prosecuting cases of offenses			
Cruise Ship							

Nursery Stock							
Ornamentals							
Garbage							
Soil							
Organic Fertilizers							
Ship Ballast							
Handling of transit consignments★							
Sampling for diagnostics.							

★Technical resource under preparation or developed under other initiative

**GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS:**

- Some selected activities could gather multiple topics
- Collaborators could be identified for the production of technical resources outside the EWGCD and the Secretariat.
- Topics could be subject to replacement if enough information or expertise is not available.

**CRITERIA TO AGREE ON PRIORITY:**

- 1) Addressing core functions of the IPPC.
- 2) NPPO management is a priority.
- 3) Global applicability of the resource.
- 4) Emerging and urgent topics could be given a high priority.
- 5) General manuals should be prioritized.
- 6) Addressing multiple areas of interest or activities.
- 7) If there is no other available technical resource in the proposals received or when the modality is not the desired one.

**PROVISIONAL TABLE OF PRIORITIES:**

Area	Topic	Type of resource / product (Manual, SOP or training kit)	Possible contents	Possible collaborators	Priority criteria applicable	Score
<b>Export certification</b>	Dielectric heating system	M	Description Operation  Examples of Equipment and specifications	Treatment developer	1,3, 4, 7	4
<b>NPPO management</b>	Setting up an NPPO;	M;TK	fulfilment of IPPC related obligations; Policy and legislation; Cost recovery / Fees structure; Third parties authorization; Prosecuting cases of offenses;	Consultants; Collaborating NPPOs	1,2,3,5,6,7	6
	Operating the NPPO	M;SOP;TK	Human resources management; Training requirements for NPPO officers and designated officers; Good management practices (incl. documented procedures, Performance management); Service providers supervision (incl. Audits etc); Phytosanitary information system management	Consultants; Collaborating NPPOs	1,2,3,5,6,7	6
	External relations	M	Client management; Customers service; Stakeholder fora; Phytosanitary information system management; Market access negotiations; Branding and	Consultants; Collaborating NPPOs	2, 4, 6	3

			promotion			
	International relations	M	Participation in IPPC activities; Market access negotiations;	Consultants; Collaborators	1, 3, 5	3
<b>Generic inspection for import/export</b>	Transportation related Pathway	SOPs	Passenger Vehicles; Cruise Ship; Pre departure Air Passenger; Pedestrian; Air Passenger Baggage; Express Carrier; Containers; Ship Ballast; Packaging Material; Animals; Maritime and inland waterways cargo; Rail Cargo; Overland Cargo	Consultants; Collaborators (incl. NPPOs)	1, 3, 4	3
	Regulated Articles	SOPs	Heavy used machinery; Organic Fertilizers; Nursery Stock; Ornamentals; Lumber and timber and sawn wood products; Feed inspection	Consultants; Collaborators (incl. NPPOs)	1, 3, 5	3
	Facilities	SOPs	Green houses; Mail Facility; Storage places	Consultants; Collaborators (incl. NPPOs)	1,3, 5	3
<b>PRA</b>	Operational	M	Climate matching; Environmental assessment; Determination of economic impact	Consultants; Collaborators (incl. NPPOs)	1,3, 5	3
	Training	TK	PRA 101	Consultants; Collaborators	1,3, 5	3
<b>Export certification</b>	General export procedures	M;SOP;TK	Treatments; Traceability of consignments; Maintenance of identity and integrity of consignments; Issuance of PC	Consultants; Collaborators (incl. NPPOs)	1,3, 5	3
	Diagnostics	M;SOP;TK	Sampling for diagnostics; Processing pest	Consultants; Collaborators	1,3, 5	3

			specimens for confirmatory diagnostics			
	Measures	M;SOP	PFA and ALPP; PFPP and PFPS; Systems approaches	Consultants; Collaborators	1,3, 5,6,7	5
	Facility	SOP	Silos; Packinghouses specifications; Field inspection	Consultants; Collaborators (incl. NPPOs)	1,3, 5	3
<b>Import verification</b>	General import procedures	M;SOP;TK	Post entry quarantine; Handling of non-compliance cases; Leakage surveys; Documentary verification; Offsite inspection; Emergency procedures	Consultants; Collaborators	1,3, 5	3
	Diagnostics	SOP	Sampling for diagnostics	Consultants; Collaborators (incl. NPPOs)	1,3, 5	3
	Measures	M;SOP	Systems approaches; Treatments; Processing of biological control agents for import	Consultants; Collaborators (incl. NPPOs)	1,3, 5, 7	4
<b>Emergency response</b>	General Procedures	M;SOP;TK	Contingency planning; Funding mechanisms; Stakeholders coordination; Declaration of regulated areas.	Consultants; Collaborators (incl. NPPOs)	1,3, 5	3
<b>Status and pest listing : On hold till next meeting. A proposal is going to be performed to the IRSS.</b>	<b>General procedures</b>	<b>M; SOP</b>	<b>Preparation of lists of regulated pests; Information sharing on pest status</b>	<b>Consultants; Collaborators (incl. NPPOs)</b>	<b>1,3,5,6</b>	<b>4</b>

## Appendix 10.- Suggestions for the STDF Project Application Grants discussed by the EWGCD

### STDF Project Proposal 1

- 1) The materials produced under STDF 350, are going to be used for this training or adapted if necessary.
- 2) The trained trainers are going to test the materials produced for NPPO management in STDF 350 ( a feedback loop)
- 3) Retraining and updating are future aspirations.
- 4) Link between training trainers and PCE facilitators should be made.
- 5) It is advisable to include a possible E-learning platform for the materials produced under this proposal, even if it should increase costs.
- 6) Adjust the use of language in the text : Senior advisors vs. Trainers, it should be trainer. (not clear for me...)
- 7) The role of being a mentoring platform, is not explicit in the project or in the purpose of the project. Adjust the text.
- 8) Do not link the project to FAO planning with so much emphasis. Mention and contact also processes as GEF, national support, etc

### STDF Project Proposal 2

- 1) How to get trained PCE facilitators committed to provide training? We do not have any mechanism to lock them, confidentiality agreements and commitment are the only available tools.
- 2) The selection process should be performed by the CDC and Secretariat.
- 3) Guidelines and descriptor for the PCE are available to inform donors on it.
- 4) The number of facilitators per workshop should be driven by the Secretariat for the purposes of this project.
- 5) For guiding the NPPO in the selection of a facilitator, level of background and personal traits should be considered.
- 6) On the selection of the places for the workshops, the list of requested PCEs should guide the places in which the 4 workshops are based.
- 7) An official certificate for authorized officials is going to be established.
- 8) A selected plan of action for participants when they come back from the workshop is going to be developed, linked with other national planning actions.
- 9) CDC needs to formulate the criteria for selection of participants for the second phase. Possible psychological assessment was considered.
- 10) Revise the budget to include interpretation at the meetings and translation of the materials, including PCE, to French and Spanish. Clarify costs of translation and interpretation in the project text.
- 11) Project servicing: make clear overhead PSC