



**Seventh Meeting of the ICPM Informal Working Group on
Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance**

**11-14 October 2005
FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy**

Report

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

The 7th meeting of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM) Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) was chaired by Mr Ralf Lopian, Vice-Chairman of the ICPM.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The provisional agenda was amended and adopted as presented in Appendix 1.

3. REPORT OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (October 2004)

The report of the SPTA meeting in 2004 was presented for information.

**4. INTERIM TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE INFORMAL WORKING GROUP ON
STRATEGIC PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

The SPTA noted their interim Terms of Reference, which were adopted by ICPM-7 (2005).

Specific topics, outside of the Strategic Directions

5. ELECTRONIC CERTIFICATION

Based on a working paper by the Secretariat, the SPTA discussed the Terms of Reference (TORs) of the working group on electronic certification and amended them. It was noted that the planned meeting of the working group would take place in early 2006. For this reason it was decided to give the working group the mandate to make recommendations directly to CPM-1 in 2006, instead of submitting them through the SPTA, as decided by ICPM-7. In view of the limited financial resources of the IPPC Secretariat, the Netherlands generously offered to sponsor the meeting of the working group.

**6. REPORT OF THE FOCUS GROUP: COMPOSITION OF A WORKING GROUP AND
TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR A FEASIBILITY STUDY ON THE INTERNATIONAL
RECOGNITION OF PEST FREE AREAS**

The SPTA discussed in detail the report of the Focus Group in relation with the composition of a working group and TORs for a feasibility study on the international recognition of pest free areas. Modifications/additions were made covering various issues and the TORs were modified accordingly.

It was reported to the SPTA that the expert working group (EWG) on the ISPM for the *Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence* did not know what pest free areas (PFAs) had been established and for what organisms. The EWG felt that before work was conducted on the analysis, a survey should be put together and a database created on PFAs, which could include recognized areas, size of area recognized, commodity involved, pest involved and recognized by whom, etc, that would allow for a better understanding.

Strategic Direction No. 5: The maintenance of an effective and efficient administrative framework

7. TWO STAGE APPROACH TO EVALUATE THE IPPC AND ITS FUNDING

7.1 Report of the Focus Group: Analysis of funding options for the IPPC

The FG considered the advantages and disadvantages of various possible funding options for the IPPC. They felt that information was not sufficient to make solid recommendations on the subject and instead made a series of conclusions for discussion by the SPTA, including the implications of reduced funding on the work programme, expansion of the use of the trust funds and voluntary assessed contributions.

Different funding sources were discussed, including the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF), sponsorship and in-kind funding by contracting parties. The SPTA felt that in particular, sponsorship of meetings would be of long term benefit in meeting budget shortfalls. The SPTA recommended that contracting parties be invited to support the IPPC by providing in-kind contributions, particularly the sponsorship of meetings (including EWGs, Technical Panels, etc.), including travel for delegates, meeting rooms and document production.

Fees as a means of funding IPPC activities were discussed in detail. Areas such as legal implications and the reactions of industries and stakeholder groups were considered. It was recognised that collecting fees was expensive and that many countries may need to rewrite laws. Fees would likely have to vary from country to country as there could be problems with charging a uniform fee. Fees could be based on an assessed contribution. There was some concern expressed over the risk of a reduction of the regular programme funding if a fee system was implemented.

The SPTA recommended that:

- A study on service fees and charges be conducted, but that such an analysis should first look at the framework of the evaluation of the IPPC. Possible stakeholder benefits and opinions might be considered in this framework.
- A FAO legal analysis of service charges and fees should be carried out and that this also be considered in the framework of the evaluation of the IPPC.
- The Secretariat discuss the use of fees with other organisations that are in similar fields of activity, such as OIE and ISTA.
- SPTA members be invited to make a contribution to the next meeting of the SPTA as to how they could imagine a fee system for the IPPC.
- Information collected, including for the IPPC evaluation, be considered at the next meeting and further action taken accordingly.

Voluntary assessed contributions were also considered. The Secretary noted that many multilateral environmental agreements were funded in this manner and had a relatively stable income. Assessment of contributions was based on the United Nations scale of assessment and was done on a *pro rata* basis, annually or biennially depending on how often the parties met. Any recommendation could not be implemented in the same year. It was felt that with good analysis and background information, the issue could be raised again at the CPM but that it would be better to defer any final decision to CPM-2.

The SPTA recommended that:

- The Secretariat develop an information package analysing how the voluntary trust fund would work, including a schedule of contributions, an estimate of budget to be covered and possibly a breakdown of what countries would contribute.
- The information package be available at CPM-1 for information and discussion.
- The Secretariat collect comments and reactions from countries and present these to the next SPTA meeting.

7.2 Evaluation of the IPPC and its structures

Mr John Markie (Chief of the FAO Evaluation Service) gave an update on the evaluation of the IPPC. A desk review had been initiated to form the overview of the project and the evaluation unit was putting together an evaluation team. Candidates would be from outside of the IPPC structure and would be recruited from academia, consultancy, retirees, those having changed careers, etc. The total cost was estimated at US \$300,000 - \$400,000, of which there would need to be a contribution from the IPPC.

The evaluation would be stand alone, with the primary target being the usefulness of the IPPC. The evaluation had to be available for the November 2007 FAO Conference, which meant that it had to be undertaken in 2006, be presented to CPM-2 in April 2007, the FAO Program Committee in May 2007 and FAO Council in June 2007. It would consider the resources of the IPPC, its mechanisms and its requirements. It was felt that the evaluation would be a great opportunity to get data and baseline information as to what stakeholders expected from NPPOs. In contrast to the Strategic Plan, which was based on input from an internal group, the evaluation should help to evaluate global expectations and mandates.

8. PREPARATIONS FOR ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE NEW REVISED TEXT OF THE IPPC

8.1 Analysis

The SPTA was joined by officers from the FAO Legal Service. The Secretariat announced that the revised IPPC had come into force. The FAO Director General would have to formally convene the First Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) in April 2006. At that point the ICPM would no longer be relevant.

The new Commission would have to approve Rules of Procedure (ROP), elect a new Bureau and establish, if so wished, its subsidiary bodies. The meeting would be open to all contracting parties of the IPPC and non-contracting parties may attend as observers. Credentials would be required for each contracting party representative.

The SPTA discussed the benefits of an enlarged Bureau of seven persons, representing each FAO region. The enlarged Bureau could take over the functions of Focus Groups and could constitute the core group of the SPTA. The enlarged Bureau would also mean that all the regions could be involved in any deliberations required during the CPM meetings. The term of members would be two years (with exceptions for the chair and vice chairs). Rule II of the current ROP may have to be modified to enable the Bureau to be enlarged. An alternative may be to establish a subsidiary body consisting of the Bureau and four additional members representing the other FAO regions. The SPTA agreed that the Bureau and Secretariat would develop a discussion paper for the CPM considering possible TORs, and how the ROP should be changed to enable it.

Procedures and decisions taken by ICPM were identified to ascertain whether they could be adopted by CPM-1 without change. There were several instances where the CPM might want to review the procedures in more detail before adopting them. The SPTA would need to be aware of available resources and ensure implications were clear when/if recommending procedures, committees, etc. to be adopted by the CPM (e.g. where there was a large representation on committees such as the Standards Committee).

FAO Legal Service advised that it was not necessary to readopt decisions made by the ICPM as the ICPM made its decisions on behalf of the FAO Conference, the governing body until the 1997 amendments came into force. However as far as the subsidiary bodies were concerned, they would cease to exist and would have to be recreated and readopted (including TORs and ROP). Decisions made by ICPM that were not linked to subsidiary bodies did not need to be readopted, so many decisions would not need to be readopted. Additionally, standards would not have to be re-adopted.

It was noted that problems with discrepancies of text between languages had been identified, particularly the Chinese version of the IPPC. FAO Legal Service had proposed that China and the FAO translators agree on a text, which would then be sent to all parties.

The SPTA:

- Requested that the Secretariat and FAO Legal Service consider the procedures that had been developed for the ICPM and identify which needed to be readopted and which did not require re-adoption.
- Recommended that all procedures developed for the ICPM which would need to be adopted by the CPM be presented in a paper to CPM-1 for adoption in block.

8.2 Information exchange under the IPPC

The Secretariat provided an initial revision of the information exchange paper produced for ICPM-7 as ICPM 2005/25, which gives guidance on the information exchange obligations under the IPPC which had been referred back for further development with the SPTA. Feedback from workshops had indicated some confusion as to who was responsible for reporting what and how. A table outlining reporting obligations had been created to help overcome confusion and identified the responsible party, the receiving parties, the IPPC Article involved, the subject, a suggested time frame, any relevant ISPM and the medium/language to be used. The SPTA welcomed the document as valuable information on information exchange, and decided that it be distributed to the CPM as an annex to the information exchange report.

9. STRATEGIC PLAN

9.1 Characterization/definition of priorities (high, medium, low) for the Strategic Plan

The SPTA discussed in detail the Strategic Plan and made amendments. The SPTA agreed that the Strategic Plan should express what the IPPC would like to do, despite this not necessarily being in agreement with the financial situation. The SPTA also reviewed the Strategic Plan with Goals and Detailed Outputs.

The Standards Committee had had difficulty with the work load over the past few years due to, among other things, the large number of country comments on draft ISPMs and the short time period to deal with them. The SC had asked that the Secretariat draft a paper with suggestions for improvement to the process. The question as to how to measure efficiencies was raised and it was noted that it would be one of the questions the evaluation team would evaluate. The Secretariat was asked to check that all the standards were on the work programme and to adjust the output deadline as appropriate. Electronic certification was removed as it was outside the normal standard setting process.

With regard to information exchange, concern was expressed that it should be two-way and that the information exchange goals tended to focus on the IPP. The SPTA agreed to add a new section requiring the Secretariat to fulfil reporting obligations and communicate administrative matters efficiently.

The provision of dispute settlement mechanisms output deadlines were extended to reflect the decision to reduce the budget for this strategic direction.

With regard to technical assistance, the SPTA considered the recommendations made to ICPM-7 by the Informal Working Group Meeting on the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Tool and agreed to add the high priority recommendations to the strategic plan with an output deadline of 2008.

In considering Strategic direction No. 5 (The maintenance of an effective and efficient administrative framework) the SPTA felt that a more proactive approach was required and that mechanisms should be considered rather than strategies. The sub-goal and associated activities were modified accordingly.

Concern was expressed in that Strategic Direction No. 6 did not highlight the underlying importance of science to the IPPC. The SPTA considered the need for a seventh Strategic Direction entitled *Strengthen the scientific basis of the IPPC* and would put it on the agenda for the 2006 SPTA meeting. In the meantime it was included as a new sub-goal in Strategic Direction No. 6.

10. BUSINESS PLAN

The Business Plan would be adjusted by the Bureau following the FAO Conference and submitted to the CPM. Additional points identified for consideration in the plan included the promotion of the IPPC, to emphasize its importance for world trade and benefits for developing countries from trade in plants and plant products, the introduction of the scientific basis of the IPPC and whether there was a way to advertise the un-sponsored activities for donors.

11. BUDGET

11.1 Regular programme budget

11.1.1 Financial report 2005

Based on information by the Secretariat, the budget report for 2005 was discussed. It was noted that the Regular Programme funds and available arrears would be exhausted over 2005. The Secretariat would try to ensure that the European Commission Trade Department trust fund was fully utilised. The Secretariat informed that it was not in financial problems until the end of 2005 and activities would carry on in an organized way until the end of the year.

The Secretariat reported that the FAO contribution to the anticipated budget for 2006 would only include regular programme funds and no longer include financial resources made available through arrears. This would mean that the overall financial resources available to the IPPC would substantially decrease. Exact details on the budget could only be provided after the meeting of the FAO Conference in November 2005 and when FAO internal discussions on budget allocations were completed. The SPTA expressed its strong concern and disappointment with the financial situation of the IPPC for the year 2006.

The SPTA noted the financial report for 2005.

11.1.2 Budget plan 2006-2007 and prioritization of activities for 2006

The budget plan and prioritization of activities were considered together to ensure priority activities were able to continue with adequate funding.

Due to the depressing financial outlook for the IPPC in 2006, the SPTA discussed in detail, on the basis of a proposal by the Secretariat, the prioritization of IPPC activities for 2006. The anticipated revenue was calculated at approximately US \$2.5m, primarily to be received through regular budget, trust funds and possible carry-overs. The estimated expenditure on activities for 2006, which should be undertaken to achieve the strategic/business plan, came to approximately US \$4m, which left a shortfall of approximately \$1.5m.

The budget indicating priorities and reductions was considered. The SPTA agreed with the prioritisation and reduction of activities as proposed by the Secretariat. The SPTA expressed strong concern as to the implications of the shortfall in the budget. The use of the trust funds was discussed and whether the funds allocated to each area could be modified. The Secretariat explained that in developing the budget the figures were not proportional to those agreed to by the ICPM but rather funds were put where the need was identified.

Concern was expressed that the budget shortfall would significantly impact the activities of the CPM. The idea of holding a CPM meeting every second year arose, during which a larger number of standards could be approved, or where one year the meeting could focus on standards and the following year on other matters. The dilemma was recognised in that the CPM was responsible for the

development of rules for international trade and to approve them every two years may not be a good position. Also the IPPC required an annual meeting of parties, albeit there was the option of reducing this to 3 or 4 days. It was recognised that the CPM cost of \$250,000 that would be saved if biennial meetings were held included trust fund monies that could only be spent on funding participation of developing countries at the meeting. It was agreed that the costs for the CPM could not be reduced. The Secretariat noted that if contracting parties believed the IPPC was an important treaty they would need to look closely at how they could fund it. The SPTA agreed to put their concerns to the CPM for discussion with a request for advice as to how the subject should be dealt with.

In analysing the IPPC activities, the SPTA recommended that the standard setting activities need to continue in order to avoid a disruption of the standard setting process in the years to come. However, there would be a need to reduce standard setting activities from its current level.

The SPTA further recommended that information exchange would be reduced to the maintenance of the IPP, with issues relating to the assistance to countries to participate in the IPP being substantially reduced.

In regards to the activities on dispute settlement, the SPTA recommended that this would be given low priority with activities being limited to the development of manuals.

Staff support to technical assistance would continue at lower levels, with greater reliance on regional and sub-regional plant protection officers for such activities. Concern was expressed that regional plant protection officers differed in experience. The SPTA also recommended that there would need to be greater reliance on extra budgetary funding for regional workshops and working groups on PCE.

It was noted that with regard to regional workshops on draft ISPMs, if sufficient funding was not available the number would be reduced from 7 to 3 or 4. It was suggested that the problem be raised at the CPM and a request be made for sponsors.

The SPTA also recommended that liaison with other organisations would be substantially reduced, participation in the work of the CBD would be given lower priority and participation in regional plant protection meetings would be curtailed.

Of particular concern was the removal of non-permanent staff from the budget (Personal Services Agreement staff and an Agricultural Officer) and the effect that would have on the standard setting and technical cooperation programmes, as these were too big to be managed by one person. It would also not be possible to offer positions to visiting scientists.

It was noted that no funds had been allocated for the evaluation of the IPPC. Furthermore, it was foreseen that funds in the trust fund would be exhausted over 2006. Activities in 2007 would therefore be critically dependent on voluntary contributions in 2006 and 2007.

The SPTA recommended that members of the SPTA contact their FAO permanent representatives to emphasise the importance of the IPPC, and also in relation to future budget negotiations after FAO Conference in 2005.

11.2 Trust fund for the IPPC

11.2.1 Trust fund financial report 2005

The Secretariat reported that the Trust Fund for the IPPC would not be fully spent in 2005. There would be a carry over of some funds to next year. To date only two countries (Canada and New Zealand) had donated to the Trust Fund of the IPPC, even though a letter had been sent to contracting parties. The European Commission Trade Department had also contributed funds, but to a separate trust fund. Unless more countries contributed, the fund would soon be spent. The SPTA agreed to the

financial report, which would be updated as the year progressed and be presented through the Bureau to CPM-1.

11.2.2 Trust fund budget plan 2006-2007

In regard to the trust fund budget for 2006, the SPTA expressed its concern on the low amount of contributions to the Trust Fund for the IPPC. It recognized that the Canadian contribution would finish in 2006 and there was no indication as to whether other donors would continue to contribute to the Trust Fund for the IPPC. The SPTA agreed that the Secretariat should start to intensify its efforts to invite potential donors to contribute to the trust fund. The SPTA recommended that the CPM invite countries and donor organizations to contribute to the trust fund.

Strategic Direction No. 1: The development, adoption and monitoring of the implementation of ISPMs

12. MATTERS RELATING TO THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE (SC) AND STANDARD SETTING

A summary of the standard setting work programme was presented.

12.1 Draft report of the SC (April 2005)

The SPTA noted that discussion by the SC on some subjects had to be postponed due to the volume of work.

12.2 Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for Technical Panels

The SPTA discussed various aspects of the TORs and ROP for technical panels. Minor suggestions were made and the SPTA approved them for submission to the CPM.

12.3 Draft Terms of Reference for the Glossary Working Group

The Secretariat and Bureau had developed a Specification and TORs for the Glossary Working Group (GWG) based on those for technical panels. The SPTA recommended that the GWG should be transformed into a technical panel.

12.4 Administrative procedures sent back to the SC by ICPM-7

The SC had approved several administrative and procedural documents in 2004 and forwarded them to ICPM-7 for information (*Guidelines on the role of a steward of an ISPM, Guidelines on the duties of members of the Standards Committee and Criteria for the formation, content and subsequent change of supplements, annexes and appendices in ISPMs*). The ICPM raised several issues on the documents and returned them to the SC for revision. Due to their workload, the SC was unable to address the issues at their meeting in April 2005 and would try to address them at their next meeting.

12.5 Must, shall, should and may in ISPMs

The SPTA discussed the report of the 17th Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPOs) in relation with discussions on the use of the words “must”, “shall”, “should” and “may” in ISPMs. The TC-RPPOs had recommended that the current system of usage continue with a statement of obligation and that in future ISPMs, the word “should” be interpreted as a moral or political commitment that something will be done. Previously adopted ISPMs should be reviewed in this regard when they were due for review. There were times where it may be necessary to use the terms “shall” and “must” in ISPMs, particularly in situations where the IPPC itself was quoted. The SPTA supported the recommendations of the TC-RPPOs.

13. PROPOSALS FOR TOPICS FOR STANDARDS

13.1 Criteria to be used for the review of topics and priorities for ISPMs

The SPTA discussed the criteria and procedure for selecting topics and priorities for standards. Based on a working paper by the Secretariat, the SPTA agreed on amending the criteria and procedure for

selecting topics and priorities for standards as adopted at ICPM-4 (2002). The submissions for topics would be collected by the Secretariat and presented to the SPTA. There was some concern that if a submitting body considered all 18 criteria the documents could be very lengthy. The Secretariat explained that the criteria had been there in the past and experience indicated that usually there was not enough information supplied.

The SPTA undertook some minor modifications on the draft proposal by the Secretariat and will submit it to the CPM for adoption after consideration by the SC. The SPTA agreed that the criteria outlined should form the basis on which the SPTA and SC would make their recommendation to the CPM on priorities.

13.2 Review of topics received during the call for topics for standards

Based on submissions from countries, the SPTA discussed the strategic priorities for the inclusion of new standards into the standard setting work programme of the CPM, in accordance with procedures established under ICPM-4. Considering the relatively high number of standards in the work programme and the shortage of financial resources during the biennium 2006/2007, the SPTA agreed that only urgently needed standards be proposed for the standard setting work programme.

With regard to strategic priorities, the SPTA identified the revision of ISPM No. 15, and problems related to export and re-export certification, especially in connection with ISPMs No. 7 and 12, as needing to be urgently addressed. The SPTA set the following two strategic priorities for consideration by the SC when reviewing submission of topics for inclusion in the CPM standard setting work programme:

1. To ensure the methyl bromide treatment, described in ISPM No. 15, was done correctly and to use the experience gained in implementing the standard to improve it.
2. To align existing export standards.

14. EXPLANATORY DOCUMENTS STATUS AND ISSUES

The Secretariat informed the SPTA that several explanatory documents had been commissioned, but only one had been posted on the IPP (ISPM No. 20). Various reasons for this had been identified including lack of funds to hire consultants, lack of resources and possible disagreement between the author and the SC. The SPTA agreed that explanatory documents were useful tools. If the SC or referees did not agree with the author, it was suggested that an annex could be included with the opposing views cited.

Strategic Direction No. 2: Information exchange

15. INFORMATION EXCHANGE WORK PROGRAMME PROGRESS REPORT FOR 2005 AND PROPOSED WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2006

Due to the lack of financial resources the SPTA recommended that activities on information exchange would need to be prioritized and possibly postponed. Based on the draft budget for 2006 it was anticipated that the IPP Support Group would not meet. The same topics would be kept but there would be a cutback on development work and resources would be spent on maintenance, such as the French and Spanish versions of the site. The Arabic and Chinese versions and most of the plans for technical assistance would not be delivered.

The SPTA agreed that with the funds available:

- The primary work priority be to maintain the IPP as much as possible.
- Some Trust Fund money be used for workshops to train developing countries on IPP use.

Strategic Direction No. 3: The provision of dispute settlement mechanisms

16. REPORT OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON DISPUTE SETTLEMENT (SBDS)

The Secretariat reported that there had been no dispute activities during the previous 12 months. There had been enquiries about procedures but no formal request for assistance. The SPTA noted that a proposal on the interpretation of ISPMs had been considered by the SBDS. The SBDS had concluded that it fell within the TORs for the group, albeit it was noted that such interpretations would not involve justification of measures but only clarification of the ISPMs.

17. STATUS OF RECENTLY PREPARED DOCUMENTS ON DISPUTE SETTLEMENT

The chair of the SBDS presented various documents developed or under development by the SBDS.

Dispute settlement manual

The SPTA noted the dispute settlement manual, and indicated that it was very comprehensive and would be an excellent TORs for an IPPC dispute settlement, giving an explanation as to how a dispute would operate and what techniques could be used.

Guide to dispute settlement under IPPC

The SPTA noted the *Guide to dispute settlement under the IPPC*. The SPTA noted that the method suggested for dispute settlements was conciliation.

IPPC roster of experts: Nomination forms

The SPTA noted the two examples of nomination forms that were presented. The longer version of the form contained details on areas of expertise. It was intended that the short version would be used for certain types of experts, where not so much background information was needed.

Strategic Direction No. 4: The development of the phytosanitary capacity of members by promoting the provision of technical assistance

18. UPDATE ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES

Impact of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) Tool

The Secretariat reported that a Letter of Agreement had been signed with CABI for the evaluation of the PCE tool. CABI was in the process of formulating questionnaires and undertaking the study. The informal working group on the PCE thought that the TORs were too narrowly focused and decided to extend it as a needs assessment tool. The SPTA expressed its wish that the report would be available at its next meeting in 2006 and possibly available for the CPM meeting.

Technical assistance phytosanitary activities by region (2001-2005)

A document was presented which listed the phytosanitary technical cooperation projects undertaken over the period 2001-2005.

The SPTA noted the report on technical assistance activities.

19. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INFORMAL WORKING GROUP MEETING ON THE PCE

The Secretariat informed the SPTA about priorities identified by the PCE informal working group (IWG) which included: the holding of a PCE facilitators workshop, enhancement of the PCE tool to enable the storage and retrieval of information of various versions of results for a NPPO and the production of interactive learning tools to increase awareness and knowledge of the IPPC and ISPMs as an integrated component of the PCE. It was further recommended that a mechanism be established as part of the IPP work plan for releasing both a CD-ROM version and enabling the PCE to be downloaded from the IPP, and that it be updated regularly to reflect new developments.

The SPTA agreed to:

- Submit all the IWG recommendations to the CPM for consideration
- Add the goals given a high priority by the IWG to the Strategic Plan, with a timing date of 2008.

20. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WORKING GROUP ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The Secretariat reported on the recommendations of the Working Group on Technical Assistance. These included several modifications to Strategic Direction No. 4 in the Strategic Plan to make technical assistance more effective. The SPTA decided that the Bureau and Secretariat would go through the proposals and make a revised version with the changes and amendments clearly indicated and present it as a paper for CPM-1. The CPM could then advise as to how the issue should be addressed.

21. REPORT ON 2005 REGIONAL WORKSHOPS ON DRAFT ISPMs

A total of seven regional workshops on draft ISPMs were held in five FAO regions. Six of the workshops were financed by IPPC trust funds and the FAO regular programme funds, with the seventh being financed in part with funds provided by the USA. Participants indicated that the workshops on draft ISPMs should continue. The SPTA noted the report.

Strategic Direction No. 6: Promotion of IPPC and cooperation with the relevant international organizations

22. LIAISON WITH RESEARCH AND TEACHING ORGANIZATIONS

22.1 Future working group on liaison with research and teaching organizations

A pilot project had been undertaken early in 2005 and a draft policy document developed as a basis to progress liaison linkages between NPPOs and research and education institutes (REIs). Further options included holding an informal working group on REIs to establish a work programme. The SPTA appreciated the importance of the need for a link with education and research bodies and that some kind of plan/progress report should be reported to the CPM.

23. COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

The Secretariat summarized the activities undertaken/anticipated by the Secretariat/Bureau with other organizations. These included: Convention on Biological Diversity, Codex Alimentarius, World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE), Montreal Protocol, International Atomic Energy Agency, International Seed Testing Association, Biological Weapons Convention and the WTO SPS Committee.

24. DRAFT REPORT OF THE 17TH TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG RPPOS

The Secretariat distributed the draft report of the 17th TC-RPPOs and indicated that it was waiting for comments from the RPPOs. The SPTA noted the draft report

25. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

26. CLOSE

The chair thanked the SPTA members for their input and closed the meeting.



Seventh Meeting of the ICPM Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance
11-14 October 2005 – FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy

AGENDA

1. **Opening of the meeting**
2. **Adoption of the agenda**
3. **Relevant reports**
- 3.1 Report of the previous meeting (October 2004)
4. **Interim Terms of Reference for the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance**

Specific topics, outside of the Strategic Directions

5. **Electronic certification**
6. **Report of the Focus Group: Composition of a working group and terms of reference for a feasibility study on the international recognition of pest free areas**

Strategic Direction No. 5: The maintenance of an effective and efficient administrative framework

7. **Two stage approach to evaluate the IPPC and its funding**
 - 7.1 Report of the Focus Group: Analysis of funding options for the IPPC
 - 7.2 Evaluation of the IPPC and its structures
8. **Preparations for entry into force of the New Revised Text of the IPPC**
 - 8.1 Analysis
 - 8.2 Information exchange under the IPPC
9. **Strategic Plan**
 - 9.1 Strategic directions and goals
 - 9.2 Characterization/definition of priorities (high, medium, low) for the strategic plan
10. **Business Plan**
11. **Budget**
 - 11.1 Regular programme budget
 - 11.1.1 Financial report 2005
 - 11.1.2 Budget plan 2006-2007
 - 11.2 Trust fund for the IPPC
 - 11.2.1 Trust fund financial report 2005
 - 11.2.2 Trust fund budget plan 2006-2007
 - 11.3 Prioritization of activities for 2006

Strategic Direction No. 1: The development, adoption and monitoring of the implementation of ISPMs

12. **Matters relating to the Standards Committee and standard setting**
 - 12.1 Draft report of the SC April 2005
 - 12.2 Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for Technical Panels
 - 12.3 Draft Terms of Reference for the Glossary Working Group
 - 12.4 Administrative procedures sent back to the SC by ICPM-7
 - 12.5 Must, shall, should and may in ISPMs

- 13. Proposals for topics for standards**
- 13.1 Criteria to be used for review of topics and priorities
- 13.2 Review of topics received during the call for topics
- 13.3 Supporting documents for the review

14. Explanatory documents status and issues

Strategic Direction No. 2: Information exchange

- 15. Information exchange work programme progress report for 2005 and proposed work programme for 2006**

Strategic Direction No. 3: The provision of dispute settlement mechanisms

- 16. Report of the 2005 meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement**
- 17. Status of recently prepared documents on dispute settlement**

Strategic Direction No. 4: The development of the phytosanitary capacity of members by promoting the provision of technical assistance

- 18. Update on technical assistance activities**
- 19. Recommendations of the PCE facilitators workshop**
- 20. Recommendations of the working group on technical assistance**
- 21. Report on 2005 regional workshops on draft ISPMs**

Strategic Direction No. 6: Promotion of IPPC and cooperation with the relevant international organizations

- 22. Liaison with research and teaching organizations**
- 22.1 Secretariat's report
- 22.2 Future working group on liaison with research and teaching organizations

- 23. Cooperation with other organizations**
- 23.1 SPS-WTO
- 23.2 CBD
- 23.3 OIE
- 23.4 Codex Alimentarius
- 23.5 IAEA
- 23.6 Montreal Protocol
- 23.7 ISTA/ISF
- 23.8 Others (bioweapons, etc.)

- 24. Draft report of the 17th Technical Consultation among RPPOs**
- 25. Other business**
- 26. Close**

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

SPTA 2005	
<p>Steve ASHBY Deputy Head International Plant Quarantine Policy Branch Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Room 343, Foss House, King's Pool 1-2 Peasholme Green York YO1 7PX UNITED KINGDOM Tel: (+44) 1904 455 048 Fax: (+44) 1904 455 198 E-mail: steve.ashby@defra.gsi.gov.uk</p>	<p>Reinouw BAST-TJEERDE ICPM Vice-chair and Manager International Plant Protection Issues Plant Health Division Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, ON CANADA Tel: (+1) 613 225 2342 Fax: (+1) 613 228 6602 E-mail: rbast@inspection.gc.ca</p>
<p>Richard DUNKLE Deputy Administrator Plant Protection and Quarantine United States Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service 4700 River Road Riverdale, MD 20737 UNITED STATES Tel: (+1) 202 720 5601 Fax: (+1) 202 690 0472 E-mail: richard.l.dunkle@aphis.usda.gov</p>	<p>John GREIFER Director International Services United States Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service 1400 Independence Avenue SW Washington DC 20250 UNITED STATES Tel: (+1) 202 720 7677 Fax: (+1) 202 690 2861 E-mail: john.k.greifer@usda.gov</p>
<p>Diana GULLÉN Directora Nacional de Protección Vegetal Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria Pasero Colón 367, 7 Piso Buenos Aires 1063 ARGENTINA Tel: (+54) 11 4331 6041 Ext. 1706 Fax: (+54) 11 4331 6041 Ext. 1709 E-mail: dnpv@sinavimo.gov.ar</p>	<p>John HEDLEY Principal Adviser International Coordination Policy and Business Biosecurity New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry P.O. Box 2526 Wellington NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 4 474 4170 Fax: (+64) 4 474 4257 E-mail: john.hedley@maf.govt.nz</p>
<p>Chagama KEDERA ICPM Chair and Managing Director Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) Ministry of Agriculture P.O. Box 49592 Oloolua Ridge, Karen 00100 GPO Nairobi KENYA Tel: (+254) 020 884545 / 882340 Fax: (+254) 020 882265 E-mail: kephis@nbnet.co.ke</p>	<p>Göran KROEKER Chief Phytosanitary Officer Swedish Board of Agriculture Dragarbrunnsgata no. 35 SE 75320 Uppsala SWEDEN Tel: (+46) 1866 1822 Fax: (+46) 1866 1825 E-mail: goran.kroeker@sjv.se</p>

SPTA 2005	
<p>Larry LACSON Agricultural Center Chief Plant Quarantine Service Bureau of Plant Industry Department of Agriculture 692 San Andres Street, Malate Manila PHILIPPINES Tel: (+632) 523 9132 / 831 1812 Fax: (+632) 521 7650 E-mail: jacsonlr@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Ralf LOPIAN ICPM Vice-chair and Senior Adviser Food and Health Department Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry P.O. Box 30 00023 Helsinki FINLAND Tel: (+358) 9 1605 2449 Fax: (+358) 9 1605 2443 E-mail: ralf.lopian@mmm.fi</p>
<p>Lilory McCOMIE Deputy Director Research, Crops Research Division Ministry of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources CES, Centeno, Via Arima TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO Tel: (+1) 868 642 6008 Fax: (+1) 868 646 1646 / 2149 E-mail: lilory@tstt.net.tt</p>	<p>Kirifi POUONO Head of Quarantine Division Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries P.O. Box 1874 Apia SAMOA Tel: (+685) 20103 Fax: (+685) 20103 E-mail: kpouono@lesamoa.net; maffm@lesamoa.net</p>
<p>Rob SCHWARTZ Biosecurity Australia G.P.O. Box 858 Canberra, ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Tel: (+61) 26 272 4865 Fax: (+61) 26 272 3307 E-mail: rob.schwartz@aqis.gov.au</p>	<p>Edmond Kojo Jack-Vesper SUGLO Director Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate Ministry of Food and Agriculture P.O. Box M 37, Pokuase Accra GHANA Tel: (+233) 21 302638 Fax: (+233) 21 665282 E-mail: jcpacc@ghana.com; jackvesper@yahoo.com</p>
<p>Rob VAN LINT Director Netherlands Plant Protection Service P.O.Box 9102 6700 HC Wageningen NETHERLANDS Tel: (+31) 317 496600 / 496601 Fax: (+31) 317 421701 E-mail: r.j.t.van.lint@minlnv.nl</p>	<p>Charles ZARZOUR Chef Département de l'importation et l'exportation agricole Ministère de l'agriculture Beyrouth LIBAN Tel: (+961) 366 6676 Fax: (+961) 184 9635 E-mail: chzr@vitesseracing.com</p>

Observers and FAO	
<p>Luis BOMBIN Chief, FAO Legal Service Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Rome ITALY Tel: (+39) 06 5705 5643 E-mail: luis.bombin@fao.org</p>	<p>Jean-Pierre CHIARADIA BOUSQUET Senior Legal Officer Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Rome ITALY Tel: (+39) 06 5705 3956 E-mail: jeanpierre.chiaradiabousquet@fao.org</p>
<p>John MARKIE Chief, Evaluation Service Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Rome ITALY Tel: (+39) 06 5705 3936 E-mail: john.markie@fao.org</p>	<p>Alan RANDELL Consultant Evaluation Service Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Rome ITALY</p>

IPPC Secretariat	
<p>Niek VAN DER GRAAFF Secretary to the IPPC and Chief, Plant Protection Service Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Rome ITALY Tel: (+39) 06 5705 3441 Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4819 E-mail: niek.vandergraaff@fao.org</p>	<p>Richard IVESS Coordinator IPPC Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Rome ITALY Tel: (+39) 06 5705 3588 Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4819 E-mail: richard.ivess@fao.org</p>
<p>Fabienne GROUSSET Information Officer IPPC Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Rome ITALY Tel: (+39) 06 5705 5696 Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4819 E-mail: fabienne.grousset@fao.org</p>	<p>Jeffrey JONES Technical Assistance Officer IPPC Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Rome ITALY Tel: (+39) 06 5705 2040 Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4819 E-mail: jeffrey.jones@fao.org</p>
<p>Brent LARSON Standards Officer IPPC Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Rome ITALY Tel: (+39) 06 5705 4915 Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4819 E-mail: brent.larson@fao.org</p>	<p>David NOWELL Information Officer IPPC Secretariat Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Rome ITALY Tel: (+39) 06 5705 2034 Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4819 E-mail: dave.nowell@fao.org</p>