



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

13-17 October 2003- FAO, Rome

Final Report

1. Opening of the meeting

The 5th meeting of the ICPM Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) was chaired by Mr Chinappen, Vice-Chairman of the Interim Commission for Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM). A list of attendees at the meeting is provided at Appendix 1.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The draft agenda is at Appendix 2.

It was requested that in future papers for the meeting should be distributed 4 weeks in advance of the meeting, to allow time or input to be obtained

It was agreed that the implications of the implementation of the International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) No. 15 in countries be discussed, if time allowed it. A paper drafted by Sweden was circulated.

The SPTA adopted the agenda with the modifications proposed above.

3. Budget

The Secretariat presented the paper on budget-related issues. Resources for the Secretariat functions are provided by FAO's Regular Programme, through contributions of its member countries. The budget for the next biennium (2004-2005) will be decided at the forthcoming meeting of the FAO Conference in November 2003.

3.1 Expenditures 2002-2003

The budget was slightly below 1 million USD. The IPPC Secretariat overspent its 2002 portion of the budget by \$140 000 US and has overspent to date, about \$400 000 US in the 2003 portion of the budget. These shortfalls have been recovered for time spent on TCP projects, and by redirecting some resources from other programmes of the Plant Protection Service. In addition, arrears money from contributions paid to FAO had been allocated to the IPPC budget, according to a previous resolution by FAO Conference, and would be available until the end of 2005.

In regard to support for developing countries monies from FAO are statutory not allowed to be used to fund attendance at intergovernmental meetings, such as the ICPM. However, some funding for support is available indirectly through budgets for regional plant protection officers and for the Technical Cooperation Programme (mostly directed at technical assistance and capacity-building). In addition, extra-budgetary resources are available through the provision of staff by individual countries, by

targeted financial contributions for defined tasks (e.g. specific meetings) and contributions to support developing country attendance at ICPM activities.

3.2 Budget for 2004-2005

Normal budget

During the past years, ICPM recognized that member countries should promote the importance of IPPC activities, and on the need to increase the budget. Consequently, the Programme Committee, the Finance Committee and the Council all strongly supported an increase in funding for the IPPC.

The final decision for the 2004-2005 budget will be taken by the Conference in November, 2003. The Conference will choose between three budget proposals: a zero real growth (i.e. with a correction to compensate for inflation and currency fluctuations), a real growth (budget increase beyond inflation) and zero nominal growth (which would not compensate for inflation and currency fluctuations and result in a budget decrease, this third budget is being prepared and its content is not yet known).

The Business Plan indicated that the IPPC budget should increase, for the 2004-2005 biennium, from approximately \$1 to \$2 million US per annum. If a zero real growth budget was endorsed by FAO Conference, the direct budget from FAO and the arrears contribution available to the IPPC Secretariat will allow the realization of the business plan, as planned for this 2 year period. By contrast, if the zero nominal growth budget is adopted, the FAO budget will decrease significantly and there are uncertainties as to what would happen to the IPPC budget under this scenario. It is possible that the budget allocated to IPPC could be insufficient to cover the Business Plan activities and priorities would need to be decided.

Consideration of detailed budget

The SPTA expressed its satisfaction that, if the zero real growth budget were adopted, sufficient funds would be available to meet the financial requirements of the Business plan. However, it also noted that, \$3 000 000 US would come from the regular programme and \$1 000 000 US from the arrears, which would only be available to the end of 2005, which would make it impossible to make longer term commitments with regards to additional staff.

The SPTA noted the budget details presented by the Secretariat. The SPTA agreed that it would be appropriate to show the expenditure on regional workshops on draft standards meetings and technical support to capacity building projects against Strategic Direction 4.

The SPTA noted the uncertainty in the budget situation for 2004- 2005. It agreed to the relative level of expenditure against the different Directions in the Budget presented. A revised detailed budget will be developed after FAO Conference, by the Secretariat, in consultation with the Bureau and submitted to the next session of the ICPM for information. If a lower level of funding was provided, then priority should be given to Strategic Direction 1 (Standards) and Strategic Direction 2 (Information Exchange).

Extra-budgetary resources

The trust fund decided at ICPM-5 is being established by FAO. It is proposed that the letter inviting contracting parties to contribute to this trust fund be sent out after the FAO Conference had made a final decision on the FAO budget, and the sums allocated to the IPPC are known.

The SPTA agreed that the highest priority for expenditure from the Trust Fund should be for attendance at ICPM and at regional workshops on draft ISPMs. The SPTA recommended that the first \$500 000 US funds received should go to these activities with additional funds allocated to the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) and Information Exchange, with the requirement that

funding for PCE, Information exchange and general operating expenses would not exceed 30% of the total.

The SPTA noted that some extra-budgetary resources were likely to be available in 2004 to support developing country participation in IPPC activities. In addition ongoing support for a position of Associate Professional Officer, other ad-hoc contributions were likely to be available.

3.3 Next biennium (2006-2007) and long term

The SPTA noted that there was still a need for countries to continue to seek support through their Governments (Permanent Representatives), for IPPC activities emphasising that they were very important and that an increased budget should be maintained.

The SPTA recognized that there was a need to consider longer term funding strategies as the availability of arrears money was a one-time occurrence and the increase of IPPC budget in the general FAO budget for the 2004-2005 biennium (if delivered) could not be guaranteed to be maintained. In addition if the demand for standard setting and technical assistance was to be addressed a substantial increase in funding over the longer term was needed.

The current increase of budget for 2004-2005 would allow for additional posts to be filled in the IPPC Secretariat, but if the budget increase was not maintained for the 2006-2007 biennium, these positions could not be maintained past the end of 2005.

The SPTA agreed that long-term funding options should be analysed, taking into account the need for regular funding to maintain activities and staff and the fact that the IPPC budget is critically dependent on the overall priorities of FAO members.

The SPTA recommends to the ICPM that a focus group be created with the following tasks : consideration and revision of the strategic plan and business plan and consideration of long term funding arrangements. The outcome of this group would be submitted to ICPM-7 in 2005 through the next session of the SPTA.

4. Focus group on standards – discussion of proposals

The SPTA discussed the report of the Focus Group (FG) and the draft recommendations made by the 15th Technical Consultation (TC) of Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs).

The SPTA recalled that the Focus Group had identified 4 steps in the standard setting process. ICPM 5 had agreed that the guidelines on the development and revision of standards would be developed, and a fifth step (Review of standards) could have been added to the procedure.

A summary of the SPTA recommendation on the recommendations of the Focus Group is attached at (Appendix 3). More detailed comments and recommendations from the SPTA on some of the Focus Group recommendations are given below. The relevant Focus Group recommendations are indicated where relevant.

4.1. Improvements to the existing system

Guidelines for Standards Committee and Expert Working Group members (FG 3.10, FG 3.12)

The SPTA endorsed the recommendations from the Focus Group that guidelines should be developed for Standards Committee and Expert Working Group members. The SPTA recommended that these guidelines be endorsed by ICPM.

Transparency (FG 3.3, FG 3.7)

The SPTA supported the use of a standard template for entering comments (matrix) for the submission of country comments.

The SPTA recommended that there should be better access to comments made by other countries, and that all country comments should be published on the IPP. The Coordinator noted that comments could be posted on the IPP in the format they are received (hopefully as a matrix) or as the version that is compiled by the Secretariat for presentation to the Standards Committee (SC).

The SPTA recognized the resource implications and constraints of reporting on comments and how they are considered in the SC, but thought that more detailed reporting was necessary. The SC, in its reporting, should prepare a generic summary of reactions to classes of comments made in country comments. The SPTA endorsed the suggestion by the Focus Group that regional representatives in the SC could act as rapporteurs for countries in their regions (this would be part of the guidelines for SC members, to be developed)

Technical Panels (FG 3.2)

The SPTA agreed with the principle of having Technical Panels, but their roles should be clearly established, and the difference with EWG should also be made clearer. A similar conclusion was reached by the 15th TC of RPPOs.

Reduction of the consultation period to 90 days (FG 3.11)

The SPTA recognized the concerns of some delegates with the shortening of the consultation period (time for the standards to reach the person concerned, time to get the comments for complex standards etc.). However, it agreed that the shortening of the consultation period to 90 days could be tried out and after some experience should be analysed. It was noted that the Secretariat could not refuse to submit late comments to the SC.

The SPTA also recommended that the distribution of the draft standards should be improved, and that countries should be informed when draft standards for consultation are put on the Web. It was suggested that an email group be formed to do this.

The SC should develop criteria to be used in determining that a second round of consultation is needed for a given standard.

Language

The FG had identified a problem of language in the drafting process (i.e. discussions taking place in English only) but had not made recommendations on it. The SPTA noted that other languages could be used in the drafting process, and the draft could be prepared in other languages. In some cases, it may be possible to use the language skill of the experts in the working group to assist.

It was noted that the Secretariat were considering forming a small specialized group for each language that would be the final authority on this language. These groups could also intervene after ICPM, if necessary, to assist in resolving problems with translations.

Editorial comments (FG 3.3)

The SPTA recommended that comments made at the ICPM should be of substantive nature and not of editorial nature. This was also recommended by the 15th TC of RPPOs.

The proposal that the Secretariat should be authorized to incorporate editorial changes was discussed. The SPTA preferred that no changes would be made after the ICPM (i.e. that the ICPM would approve the very final version of the text) but recognized that minor corrections might need to be made by the Secretariat.

Regional technical assistance/consultation (FG 3.4)

The SPTA agreed that the regional technical consultations on draft ISPMs are a very valuable tool to enhance the participation of developing countries in the standard setting process of the ICPM. In order to clearly separate the from Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations and to highlight their workshop-like character the SPTA recommended that they should be called in the future “Regional Workshops on Draft ISPMs”. The SPTA also recommended that RPPOs should play a role, as appropriate, in these regional workshops within their region.

Adoption process

The SPTA recommended that in cases where there were no substantial comments received on a draft standard, and therefore no substantial changes made to the draft by the Standards Committee, the Chair of the ICPM should propose that these standards be adopted without discussion. However, the SPTA acknowledged that if issues were raised at the plenary then these would be discussed. The SPTA also recommended that the chairperson of the ICPM should use this tool at his discretion and that criteria for its use should be developed.

4.2 Fast-track system

The SPTA discussed the fast track system proposed by the FG. Although the SPTA could understand the advantages of the proposed out of session adoption system there was concern about the legal status and the practical application of such a system.

The SPTA agreed that the use of Technical Panels and a “no-discussion” adoption system may allow ICPM to trial most of the features of the proposed fast track system without the need for the out of session adoption process.

A “no-discussion” adoption system would mean that fast track standards that had not received any objections in the consultation phase would be placed on the agenda and the Chair would suggest that all standards on the no-discussion list be adopted as a block. However, if any parties at the ICPM objected to any of the standards then ICPM would need to decide if they should be discussed further in the current session of the ICPM or referred back to the Secretariat and Standards Committee for further work. SPTA noted that standards being developed under this process were likely to be highly technical and it is possible that the ICPM plenary may not have sufficient expertise to deal with technical comments.

A revised fast track system was agreed by SPTA for recommendation to the ICPM. This consists of the following steps:

1. ICPM specifies subject areas for the fast track procedure (such as diagnostic, seed pathology, specific pest free areas, organism or commodity specific standards or treatments).
2. Technical Panels are formed on the specific subject areas endorsed by the ICPM according to the rules endorsed for forming expert working groups.
3. SC sets specifications that provide general guidance on the technical standards required (e.g. format, type of information required, method of dealing with uncertainties etc).
4. Technical Panels work to the specifications set by SC
5. Technical Panel submits specific draft standards, via the Secretariat, to the SC at any time.
6. As far as possible SC clears these (check that they are in the correct format and that they meet the specifications) by email.

7. The Secretariat sends draft standards that have been cleared by the SC to all ICPM Members in appropriate official FAO languages
8. If no formal objections are received after 90 days then the standard is included on the agenda for the next ICPM plenary session for adoption without discussion.
 - If objections to adoption are raised at ICPM then ICPM would need to decide to either try and resolve them in the current ICPM session or refer them back to the Secretariat and Standards Committee for further work.
9. If one or more formal objections are received during the 90 day consultation period, the Secretariat tries to resolve the issue(s) with the country(ies) concerned, and if these issues are resolved, submits the standard to the ICPM for adoption without discussion.
10. If the issues cannot be resolved, the Secretariat requests the SC examine the comments and modify the standard if needed in consultation with the relevant Technical Panel.
11. The revised standard is placed on the agenda for the next ICPM meeting for discussion and adoption in the normal manner.

A formal objection would be a technically supported objection to the adoption of the draft standard in its current form, sent through the official contact point (IPPC contact point or, if not available, FAO contact point). The Secretariat would not make any judgement about the validity of the objection – an objection with some technical discussion of the issue would be accepted.

It was noted that the proposed system would allow contracting parties to trial a different form of adoption for standards. The SPTA recommended that after a trial period of up to 3 years that ICPM should consider if an out-of-session adoption procedure would be practical.

The SPTA noted that the advantages of the suggested approach are that the SC work load will not increase as much as with the normal process, that it builds experience that will allow a better assessment of the practicalities of an “out of session” adoption process and that it allows standard drafting processes to continue out of phase with face to face meetings of the Standards Committee.

5. Strategic plan

The strategic plan was considered in detail. The SPTA recommended that the Plan be redrafted next year as part of a general review of the work programme, the Business Plan and the Strategic Plan (see section on Business Plan). It was suggested that the revised plan be formatted in a way that clearly identified outcomes, goals and outputs. A section of the Plan should allow for reporting on achievements. In future reports to the ICPM should be provided according to the Strategic Plan.

A revised plan incorporating minor updates/edits suggested by SPTA is shown at Appendix 4.

6. Role of the RPPOs

The SPTA discussed the role that the RPPOs could play particularly in regard to the implementation of ISPMs. It recommended that RPPOs play a significant role as appropriate in workshops on draft ISPMs in their regions.

The SPTA recommended that during 2004, a small group of 6-7 should be convened, of which 2 would be appointed representatives of the TC of RPPOs and the rest individuals from ICPM members. This group would analyse the possible roles and functions of the RPPOs with regard to the Convention and consider which of strategic goals and directions RPPOs could support. There would need to be an analysis of the current functions and capacities of RPPOs to be provided as an input to the group. The report of this group would be sent to the 16th TC of RPPOs (October 2004) and would be submitted for discussion at the ICPM, after being seen by the SPTA. The RPPOs would be responsible for choosing their representatives.

7. Business plan

The SPTA considered minor updates and edits to the Business Plan. Given the uncertainty about the Budget for 04/05 it was considered premature to comprehensively review the document.

The SPTA recommended that:

1. A Focus Group meet in the middle of next year to undertake a review of IPPC activities and to update the Strategic Plan and the Business Plan on the basis of this review and the budget situation.
2. As soon as the budget situation for 04/05 is known, the Secretariat, in consultation with the Bureau, prepare a draft work programme for 04/05 showing proposed expenditure. This would be circulated to the SPTA for comment and the final draft submitted to ICPM6 for information.
3. The updated appendix in the Business Plan showing the involvement of developing countries in IPPC activities be formatted as an information document for use by the ICPM.

8. Work programme

8.1 Topics and priorities for standards

The SPTA noted that the following standards were under development and that some of them may require Expert Working Groups in 2004. The Secretariat would report on progress on these standards at the next ICPM: Supplement on PRA for living modified organisms; PRA for regulated non-quarantine pests; guidelines for an import regulatory system; Efficacy of measures; Glossary of phytosanitary terms; Surveillance for citrus canker; revision of ISPMs No. 1, 2 and 3; Low pest prevalence; Inspection methodology; Guidelines for equivalence; Guidelines for consignments in transit; Guidelines on formatting of specific diagnostic protocols for regulated pests; Use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management of citrus fruit for citrus canker

The SPTA recommended that the ICPM draw from the following list when determining priorities for standard development. This list is not in any priority order.

Numbers between brackets refer to the original number on the list appended to document No. ICPM 03/14.

Concept standards

- Alternative strategies to methyl bromide [39]
- Classification of commodities by level of processing and intended use and phytosanitary risk [submission from 2003 Regional Technical Consultation]
- Electronic certification [4]
- Import of plant breeding material [30]
- Post-entry quarantine facilities [32; 2003 Regional Technical Consultation]
- Research protocols for phytosanitary measures [9]
- Sampling [14-15]
- Entry of consumption / low risk commodities [49]
- Risk analysis for low mobility pests on products for consumption [50]

Reference standards

From strategic direction 1.2.1

- Guidelines for the formatting/drafting of commodity ISPMs [42]

- Guidelines for the formatting/drafting of pest specific ISPMs [42]

Commodity specific standards

- Export certification for potatoes [60]
- Possible Fast Track
 - Debarking of wood [68]

Groups of pest specific standards to be considered by Technical Panels

- Seed testing procedures (or accept ISTA protocols) [63]
- Diagnostic protocols (one or several Technical Panels) (possibly fast track) based on available EPPO and other diagnostic protocols, including for:
 - *Aleurocanthus spiniferus* [72]
 - *Aleurocanthus woglumi* [73]
 - *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* [83]
 - *Cacoecimorpha pronubana* [84]
 - *Ceratocystis fagacearum* [85]
 - *Frankliniella occidentalis* [97]
 - *Fusarium oxysporum f.sp. albedinis* [105]
 - *Guignardia citricarpa* [110]
 - *Helicoverpa armigera* [112]
 - *Nacobbus aberrans* [120]
 - *Thrips palmi* [132]
 - *Trogoderma granarium* [137]
- Fruit flies (fast track decided on a case by case basis):
 - Determination of a fruit fly situation in an area based on trapping [98]
 - Fruit flies, phytosanitary requirements to establish pest free areas [99]
 - Mitigation treatment against Mediterranean fruit fly (*Ceratitidis capitata*) [100]
 - Fruit fly management, a systems approach [101]
 - Guidelines for the establishment, maintenance and verification of fruit fly free areas [102]
 - Requirements for the establishment of an area of low fruit fly prevalence [103]
 - Requirements for the establishment of production sites temporarily free of fruit flies [104]
- Treatments (some fast track decided on a case by case basis):
 - Approved treatment manual [40]
 - Treatment procedural manual [41]

8.2 Work programme 2004/2005

The SPTA noted that the work program for 2004/05 would be similar to 2003 although the specific topics would vary. The Secretariat in consultation with the Bureau will consider the financial outcome of the Conference and will redraft a detailed budget and work programme accordingly

8.3 Working group on liaison with research and teaching organizations

The SPTA recognized the importance of liaison with research and teaching organizations, with the aims of:

- review the state of plant protection in the world,
- having better information on the state of research on different aspects,
- having information on what is being done and avoid duplication of work.

However, it noted that this was a huge area of work, which was broadly subdivided into three components:

- research
- education
- standard setting activities (identify existing standards and develop policies for their use)

Given the magnitude of the task it may be better as a first step, any activities should target specific areas, such as:

- Research on nematode identification, fruit fly identification
- Training on pest risk analysis

The SPTA noted that ICPM-5 had defined the tasks for the Informal Working Group, and recommended that it should consider:

1. the development of an information package
2. other ways of increasing liaison and how can other organizations be involved in the work of the IPPC
3. Identification of specific target areas for initial work
4. The 4 subject areas on standard setting (from point 4.2.1 of the report of the Focus Group on Standard Setting, 2003) and advise the SPTA of their relevance:
 - The need to provide specific recognition in standards of collaborators
 - Legal issues related to the use of other standards – recognition/copyright/ownership (the SPTA noted that this item should be submitted to a legal review)
 - Any potential contractual arrangements with experts
 - The possibility of ICPM recognising other standards directly

8.4 Working group on technical assistance

The SPTA noted that the ICPM had requested that an informal group on technical assistance be convened subject to the availability of resources. It considered a proposal that this group be established as a formal (subsidiary) body for technical assistance. No agreement was reached for similar concerns to the proposal to form a subsidiary body for Strategic Planning (see above).

The SPTA :

1. Noted that an informal working group on technical assistance to be convened would work to the mandate provided by ICPM 5
2. Noted that membership of this informal working group should be selected according to normal rules for expert working groups
3. Requested that the Secretariat should provide the report of the SPTA meeting (or relevant extracts of it) to the informal working group.

8.5 Policy on explanatory documents/training guides

The SPTA noted the demand for explanatory documents, manuals etc to help countries implement ISPMs. The SPTA noted the difficulties of endorsing these type of documents as they had no legal status under the IPPC. However, it was noted that other organisations such as WTO-SPS produced guidance documents with a disclaimer indicating that they have no legal status.

SPTA recommends that the ICPM endorses a policy that would allow these documents to be developed and distributed under the auspices of the Secretariat. The SPTA recommended that these documents should be reviewed (but not endorsed) by the Standards Committee before publication.

They would be published over the authors name with a clear disclaimer that these were not legal or official IPPC documents. They would also be placed on the IPP.

8.6 Procedure for dealing with the review of scientific data

ICPM 5 agreed to the Secretariat seeking an agreement with the International Forest Quarantine Research Group and the International Consultative Group on Food Irradiation to utilize their expertise to review scientific data on treatments of wood and treatments using irradiation, respectively.

The SPTA acknowledged that these groups were not ICPM bodies and had a wider scope than the review of ISPM annexes. However, these groups would be well placed to work on these technical annexes, and could be envisaged as possible Technical Panels if this concept was agreed at ICPM-6. In any case, there was a need to ensure transparency.

The SPTA recommended that the IPPC Secretariat:

1. contact these groups and obtain their authorization to publish their membership on the IPP
2. as soon as the ICPM has agreed to have TPs, start an initiative to transform these groups in TPs for the IPPC, under the current rules

8.7 Review of PCE implementation

The SPTA acknowledged the information presented to it on the PCE. It discussed the role of the STPTA in regard to the PCE activities. It requested that a comprehensive analysis of the results of the application of the PCE should be included as a regular item in the report presented to the ICPM on PCE. It noted that the analysis could only be presented in aggregate form due to the need to respect the confidentiality provisions of the use of the PCE.

8.8 Review of IPP implementation

The SPTA took note of the elements presented by the Secretariat. In particular, the data entry functionalities will be developed based on plans to be made by the IPP support group on information exchange. It was noted that the International Portal for Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health (IPFSAPH) would be related to the IPP in so far as information would be pulled out from the IPP onto the IPFSAPH.

The SPTA acknowledged that the IPP had undergone substantial development over this year and was now a very useful site.

The SPTA recommended that further work on the IPP should concentrate on helping contracting parties meet their information sharing obligations under the IPPC. The SPTA noted that the next meeting of the IPP support group would concentrate on this aspect.

It was recommended that the IPP should incorporate a flagging system for new information posted on the IPP, especially when countries would start linking to their web sites and would post new information on these.

9. Long term role and composition of SPTA

The SPTA recalled the work done by this group over the years, and in particular the development of the strategic and business plans. It recognized the impact that these plans had in relation to an increased level of FAO funding.

The SPTA discussed a number of issues identified by the ICPM and Bureau in relation to the operation of the SPTA. These included:

- the SPTA does not always have enough time to address technical issues on technical assistance
- does not have formal terms of reference
- its structure is unbalanced, with an insufficient representation from developing countries;
- continuity of membership is a problem particularly for developing country attendees.

The SPTA discussed a range of possible options to address these issues including: to separate administrative matters from technical assistance matters and to expand the length of SPTA meetings, so that technical assistance matters could be addressed adequately.

The SPTA had mixed views on the establishment of formal (subsidiary) bodies on strategic planning and on technical assistance. While not dismissing this idea completely there were uncertainties on costing, mode of operation, determining membership etc. The SPTA did not agree to recommend formalization of the administrative structures of the ICPM in advance of the coming into force of the 1997 IPPC amendments.

The SPTA:

- 1 Recognized the very important role the SPTA has played and its contribution to increasing the profile of and the funding for the IPPC.
2. Recognized that the linkage between Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance is important.
3. Recognises that the open-ended nature of the working group has allowed the input of those particularly interested in this subject and has allowed flexibility
- 4 Noted that there are some shortcomings in the current operation of the SPTA Working Group.
5. Recommended that a sound structure be developed in the future when the revised text of the IPPC comes into force
- 6 Recommended as an interim measure, that the Secretariat seeks to facilitate the participation of 2 representatives from developing countries per FAO region at the next SPTA.
7. Noted that an expert working group is to be convened to consider Technical Assistance
8. Recommended that the SPTA should maintain an overall administrative and financial oversight of technical assistance matters.

10. Other Business

10.1 Timing difficulties in Standards Committee

Several SPTA members noted difficulties in the practical operation of the SC-20 and SC-7 (timing of nominations for the SC-7, replacement of members). The SPTA agreed these difficulties should be kept under review but did not consider it was appropriate to recommend any changes in the SC system at this time. The SPTA noted that the Secretariat is working with the SC to ensure that these difficulties do not interfere with the efficiency of the operation of the Committee.

10.2 Actions to alter or suspend an ISPM

The STPA held a general discussion on issues relating to ISPM 15. Questions were raised regarding a previous recommendation to contracting parties from the Secretariat that ISPM 15 be suspended, due to intrinsic barriers to the use of the logo.

The SPTA noted that the FAO Legal Service would provide a paper to the next ICPM on this issue.

10.3 Problems with the implementation of ISPM No. 15

A presentation on some practical problems faced by industry in the implementation of ISPM No. 15 was made. These practical problems include dealing with:

- repaired wood packaging,

- wood packaging treated and marked but before the new logo had been approved,
- costs of re-marking wood packaging,
- the possibility of using the mark for treated sawn wood,
- the use of old wood packaging material which should not present a risk and should not need to be retreated and marked etc.).

Action under ISPM No. 15 had huge costs for the industry and the different cases should be carefully studied on the basis of scientific evidence and an assessment of the practicality of the actions proposed. The industry should also be involved on the process of defining these justifications.

The SPTA recognized that, with the implementation of ISPM No. 15 starting in countries, it was important to identify the issues now arising in practice, and move to resolve them. It is likely that other countries are experiencing operational and implementation issues in addition to those list above and these should be identified and examined.

The SPTA discussed the possibility of recommending the formation of Technical Panel. However, the SPTA concluded that it was important to identify the full range of problems and issues before deciding on the best way to proceed.

SPTA recommended that an open-ended informal working group should be convened during ICPM-6. This group should identify problems of implementation and issues in relation with ISPM No. 15, and if possible make recommendations on future action to the ICPM, for immediate adoption during the plenary session.

The SPTA recommended that this issue should be added to the agenda of the ICPM.

10.4 Error in Focus Group report

The SPTA noted that point 3.2 of the Focus Group Report on the standard setting process implied that Technical Panels would be established under the TOR 4 of the SC, i.e. with the same regional representation as the SC. This is a drafting mistake which will be corrected in the Focus Group report before it is presented to ICPM6. Technical Panels would be formed following the same rules as Expert Working Groups under TOR 5 of the SC.

Appendix 1.

SPTA Meeting Participants Details

Mr Steve J. Ashby

Plant Quarantine,
Plant Health Division,
Department for Environment, Food and
Rural Affairs,
Room 343, Foss House,
King's Pool,
1-2 Peasholme Green,
York YO1 7PX
Tel: 44-1904-455048
Fax: 44-1904-455198
Email: steve.ashby@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Mr Alhaji Bello Bindawa

Nigerian Plant Quarantine Service
P.M.B. 3048, Airport Road,
Kano--Nigeria
Mobile: 234- 8055071832
Email: bindawabello@yahoo.co.uk

Mr Felipe Canale

Vice Chairman ICPM/IPPC
Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura
Y Pesca
Meliton Gonzalez, 1169 – p.5
Montevideo - URUGUAY
Tel: 598 2 628 9471
Fax: 598 2 628 9473
Email: fcanale@celersys.com

Mr Maghespren Chinappen

Principal Research and Development
Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Food Technology
And Natural Resources,
Réduit
Tel: 230-4644872
Fax: 230-4659591
Email: plpath@intnet.mu

Mr Marcos Beeche Cisternas

Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero,
Departamento de Protección Agrícola,
Subdepartamento de Defensa Agrícola,
Av. Bulnes 140, Piso 3,
Santiago – Chile,
Phone: (56-2) 698 8205/698 2244 Annex 245
Directo: (56-2) 688 0260
Fax: (56-2) 698 6480
Email: marcos.beeche@sag.gob.cl

Mr Richard Dunkle

Animal Plant Health Inspection Service
(APHIS)
US Department of Agriculture,
12th & Independence Avenue, S.W.,
Room 302, Jamie Whitten Building,
Washington DC 20250,
USA
Fax: +1.202.690 0472
Tel: +1.202.720 5601
Email: richard.l.dunkle@usda.gov

Mr John Greifer

Trade Support Team
Animal Plant Health Inspection Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Rm. 1132 12 Independence Avenue S.W.
Washington D.C. 20250
Tel: 1-202-720 7677
Fax: 1-202-690 2861
Email: John.k.Greifer@usda.gov

Ms Diana Guillén

Servicio Nacional Sanidad y Calidad
Agroalimentario
Paseo Colón 367
1063 Buenos Aires
Argentina
Tel: 5411-43316041 ext. 1706
Fax: 54-11-434-25137
Email: dguillen@sinavimo.com.ar
Or: dguillenaar@yahoo.com.ar

Mr John Hedley

National Adviser,
Biosecurity Coordination – International
Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry
101 – 103 The Terrace
P.O. Box 2526
Wellington,
New Zealand
Tel: +64. 4 474 4170
Fax: + 64 4 4702730
E.Mail: john.hedley@maf.govt.nz

Mr Göran Kroeker

Agronomist,
Plant Protection Service,
Swedish Board of Agriculture,
Hamngatan 3, SE 75186 Uppsala
Sweden

Tel: +46 36155913

Fax: + 46 18 666 1825

Email: goran.kroeker@telia.com (home);
goran.kroeker@sju.se (business)

Mr Ralf Lopian

Senior Adviser
Food and Health Department
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
PL 30, 00023 Valtioneuvosto
Tel: 358-9-16052449
Fax: 358-9-16052443
Email: Ralf.Lopian@mmm.fi

Mr. Ralf Petzold

Federal Ministry of Consumer Protection,
Food and Agriculture – Head of Plant Protection
Division, Rochusstrasse, 1
52123 Bonn, Germany
Tel: +49.228.529.3527
Fax: +49. 228.529.55-3595
Email: petzold@bmvel.bund.de

Mr Nico van Opstal

Deputy Director,
Plant Production Service
P.O. Box 9012
6700 Wageningen
Fax: +31 317421701
Tel: +31 317496603
Email: N.A.van.Opstal@MINLNV.NL

Mr Charles Zarzour

Chief,
Agriculture Importation and Exportation and Plant
Quarantine Department,
Ministry of Agriculture,
Beirut
Lebanon

Tel: + 961 8 805 830

+ 961 5 952 510

+ 961 3 666 676

Fax: 961 8814 564

Email: chzr@vitesse racing.com

Appendix 2. PROVISIONAL AGENDA

1. Opening of the Session

2. Adoption of the Agenda

3. Budget

- Budget (regular) report for 2002/3
- Budget (regular) plan for 2004/5
- Budget (trust fund) report for 2003
- Budget (trust fund) plan for 2004/5
- Developing a long term funding strategy

4. Strategic Planning

- Review of Strategic Plan
 - recommendations for updating the Strategic Plan and work programme

5. Business Plan

- Amendment of Business Plan

6. Work Programme

1. Topics and priorities for standards
2. Work-programme 2004/5
3. Calendar
4. Working group on liaison with research and teaching organizations -Develop TORs
5. Working group on technical assistance -Develop TORs
6. Policy on explanatory documents/training guides -Develop policy for consideration at ICPM6
7. Procedure for dealing with a review of scientific data -Develop recommendations for consideration at ICPM6
8. Review of PCE implementation
9. Review of IPP implementation

7. Focus group on standards – discussion of proposals

1. RPPOs comments
2. Development of recommendations to ICPM6

8. Long term role and composition of the SPTA

- Role and terms of reference
- Membership
- Drafting of recommendations for ICPM 6

9. Matters arising from the 15th TC among RPPOs

- Role and functions of the TC among RPPOs

10. Completion of draft report

Appendix 3. Summary of SPTA recommendations on Focus Group recommendations.

The recommendations from the Focus Group Report are listed below with the recommendations of the SPTA shown in **bold** under each recommendation. More detailed discussion on some recommendations is given in the main SPTA report. The numbering system refers to the Focus Group report.

3.1. Additional rounds of formal consultation

The Focus Group recommends:

- *That the SC initiates a further round of consultation on standards that have undergone extensive changes as a result of formal country consultation. In such cases the SC should report to the ICPM their justification for sending a standard for a second round of consultation but could use its judgement in regard to this matter.*
- *The SC should draw up criteria/guidance that it proposes to apply in determining the need for a further round of formal consultation on a draft standard.*
- *That in cases where a standard was submitted to the ICPM but not adopted the ICPM could decide if another round of consultation was needed.*

SPTA - Endorsed

3.2. Use of Technical Panels

The Focus Group recommends:

- *That the SC establish Technical Panels (TP) in specific areas to assist the work of the SC.*
- *That these Technical Panels should work under general specifications established by the SC, according to TOR 4, with membership according to current expert working group membership rules. Under the direction of SC, Technical Panels should provide the SC with: draft technical standards, advice on draft technical standards, advice on country comments and advice on topics and priorities for technical standard development in their field of activity and other task as requested by SC. Technical Panels may draw on specialised expertise, the work of other working groups, other appropriate standards and the work of other relevant organisations in their work as appropriate. The chair of the Technical Panel should act as the steward for the subject area of the Technical Panel.*
- *That potential areas for the formation of Technical Panels may include technical matters such as diagnostics, seed pathology, specific pest free areas, organism or commodity specific standards or treatments.*
- *When the specific work of a Technical Panel is completed SC should disestablish the group.*

SPTA – Endorsed with a request to clearly establish their role and clarify the differences between Expert Working Groups and Technical Panels.

3.3. Procedures for comments on standards at ICPM

The Focus Group recommends:

- *The drafting of guidelines on submission of comments at meetings of the ICPM.*

These guidelines should include the following points:

- *Parties should endeavour to provide comments in writing to the Secretariat at least 14 days before the ICPM. The Secretariat will provide a copy of all comments received, in original form at the start of the ICPM.*
- *Parties should indicate comments that are strictly editorial (do not change the substance) and could be incorporated by the Secretariat as considered appropriate and necessary.*
- *The Secretariat should provide a format/matrix for country comments. It would be preferable that comments be provided electronically using the standard format/matrix to allow comments to be collated.*
- *The same matrix should also be used for comments provided on standards during the formal consultation period.*
- *The matrix should be available on the IPP and the current guidance on comments on standards already present on the IPP should be modified to request that countries use the matrix.*

SPTA – endorsed the proposal of the Focus Group and suggested the addition of a new first bullet point:

- *Parties should endeavour to submit only substantive comments at meetings of the ICPM.*

For the adoption process of ISPMs at ICPM meetings SPTA recommended an additional component to the Focus Group Report:

- **In cases where there where no substantial comments received on a draft standard, and therefore no substantial changes made to the draft by the Standards Committee, the Chair of the ICPM should propose that these standards be adopted without discussion**
- **The chairperson of the ICPM should use this tool at his discretion.**
- **Criteria for such a system should be developed.**

3.4. Regional technical assistance/consultation

The Focus Group recommends:

- *That as many as possible regional technical consultations should be conducted and that the ICPM should investigate potential mechanisms to expand these consultations as well as seek to build opportunities for regional consultations through the trust fund or voluntary contributions.*

SPTA – endorsed the proposal of the Focus Group and suggested that:

- the term “Regional technical Consultation” should be changed to “Regional Workshops on Draft ISPMs”
- RPPOs should play a role, as appropriate, in regional workshops within their region.

3.6. Expanded role of stewards

The Focus Group recommends:

- That the SC should make greater use of stewards. Guidelines for the roles and responsibilities of a steward should be developed by the SC. Stewards should be invited to relevant SC meeting to assist the work of the SC on the standard that the steward is responsible for. The Secretariat should supply editorial expertise to assist stewards in carrying out their role.

SPTA - endorsed

3.7. Transparency to and from the SC

The Focus Group notes:

- That more formal feedback mechanisms on country comments may not provide a benefit that outweighs the cost of the very resource intensive process that would be necessary to address this in a more formal way.

SPTA : To improve the transparency the SPTA made a number of recommendations:

- All country comments should be published in the IPP.
- The IPPC Secretariat should produce and make accessible a generic summary of SC reactions to classes of comments made in the country consultation.
- Members of the SC should act as rapporteurs for countries in their regions.
- The to be developed guidelines for members of the SC should incorporate guidance on the rapporteur function of SC members.

3.8. Use of modern communications and timing of meetings – improving procedures for working

The Focus Group recommends:

- That email, teleconferencing, and other modern communication methods should be used where possible to advance discussion on standards. However, the Focus Group recommends that face to face meetings of experts be continued with email communications used to supplement these meeting but not replace them.

SPTA - endorsed

3.9. Use of annexes

The Focus Group recommends:

- That technical annexes (such as treatment schedules, e.g. wood packaging) should be used as much as possible, where appropriate. Annexes should be open to revision separately to the main standard. Revisions could be by a fast track procedure.
- That Annexes should only contain highly specific information that may need to be changed over time and that does not affect the principles incorporated in the primary standard.

- *That criteria for the formation and content of annexes should be developed by the SC.*

SPTA - endorsed

3.10. Guidelines for expert working group members

The Focus Group recommends:

- *That a brief guideline for the operation of expert working groups is produced by the Secretariat in consultation with SC. This should be provided to all expert working group participants.*
- *That when each expert working group is convened the chair spends time to discuss and explain the mode of operation and the roles and responsibilities of participants.*

SPTA – endorsed but recommended that any guidelines developed should be approved by ICPM

3.11. Length of formal consultation period

The Focus Group recommends:

- *That the current 120 day formal consultation period should be reduced to 90 days to allow sufficient time for the SC and the Secretariat to deal with comments.*
- *That the distribution of draft standards should be improved and that countries should be informed when draft standards for consultation are put on the Web. It was suggested that an email group be formed to do this.*

SPTA - endorsed

3.12. Guidelines for Standards Committee members

The Focus Group recommends:

- *That a brief guideline on the role and responsibilities of SC members and the SC procedures is produced by the Secretariat in consultation with SC. This should be provided to all SC members.*

SPTA – endorsed but SPTA recommended that any guidelines developed should be approved by ICPM

4.1. Criteria for a fast track procedure

The Focus Group concluded that the fast track system should be used:

- *Where specific technical material and resources are available or simple to develop.*
- *Where non concept or technical standards of potential global interest that are approved by RPPOs or other organisations are available*
- *Where technical annexes to concept and other existing standards are needed*
- *For minor revisions to existing standards where these revisions are not of a conceptual nature*
- *Where specifically authorised by ICPM*

SPTA - endorsed

4.2.1. Drafting Process

The Focus Group recommends:

- *That the Informal Working Group on Liaison with Research and Educational Organisations should investigate ways to coordinate and create linkages with relevant organisations that could assist in developing technical standards.*

SPTA - endorsed

4.2.2. Safeguards for ICPM Members

The Focus Group recommends:

- *That consultation resulting in out of session adoption would be a useful mechanism for standards that are developed using the Fast Track procedure as set out above and in the Table 1 and in the Flow Chart.*

SPTA – not endorsed. Modified fast track proposed by SPTA:

- 1. ICPM specifies subject areas for the fast track procedure (such as diagnostic, seed pathology, specific pest free areas, organism or commodity specific standards or treatments).**
 - 2. Technical Panels are formed on the specific subject areas endorsed by the ICPM according to the rules endorsed for forming expert working groups.**
 - 3. SC sets specifications that provide general guidance on the technical standards required (e.g. format, type of information required, method of dealing with uncertainties etc).**
 - 4. Technical Panels work to the specifications set by SC**
 - 5. Technical Panel submits specific draft standards, via the Secretariat, to the SC at any time.**
 - 6. As far as possible SC clears these (check that they are in the correct format and that they meet the specifications) by email.**
 - 7. The Secretariat sends draft standards that have been cleared by the SC to all ICPM Members in appropriate official FAO languages**
 - 8. If no formal objections are received after 90 days then the standard is included on the agenda for the next ICPM plenary session for adoption without discussion.**
 - If objections to adoption are raised at ICPM then ICPM would need to decide to either try and resolve them in the current ICPM session or refer them back to the Secretariat and Standards Committee for further work.**
 - 9. If one or more formal objections are received during the 90 day consultation period, the Secretariat tries to resolve the issue(s) with the country(ies) concerned, and if these issues are resolved, submits the standard to the ICPM for adoption without discussion.**
 - 10. If the issues cannot be resolved, the Secretariat requests the SC examine the comments and modify the standard if needed in consultation with the relevant Technical Panel.**
 - 11. The revised standard is placed on the agenda for the next ICPM meeting for discussion and adoption in the normal manner.**
- 5. Financial consequences of recommendations for changes in the standard setting procedure**

The Focus Group requested:

That the Secretariat provide an analysis of the financial implications of the suggested changes in the standard setting procedure and the proposed fast track system for inclusion as an annex in the final report of the Focus Group.

SPTA – noted the report provided by the Secretariat.

Appendix 4

STRATEGIC PLAN 2004

The Strategic Plan incorporating minor changes suggested by the SPTA I shown below in table form.

STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS AND GOALS

Strategic Direction No. 1: The development, adoption and monitoring of the implementation of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs)

Setting international phytosanitary standards is a basic and unique role identified in the IPPC, particularly given the status accorded IPPC standards as a result of the WTO SPS Agreement. Internationally accepted phytosanitary standards form the basis for the harmonization of phytosanitary measures that protect natural and cultivated plant resources while ensuring fair and safe trade. An increased number of international standards is necessary to facilitate international trade as envisaged by the WTO SPS Agreement.

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
1.1 Maintain an effective standard development and adoption system using the ICPM and SC			
1.1.1 Increase the number of standards to meet targets established in the ICPM work programme	Ongoing	High	ICPM
1.1.2 Develop specific standards where relevant concept standards are in place	Ongoing	High	ICPM
1.1.3 Develop concept standards where necessary for the preparation of specific standards in priority areas	Ongoing	High	ICPM
1.1.4 Involve RPPO cooperation in the development of ISPMs	Ongoing	Low	ICPM and Secretariat
1.2 Improve the standard-setting mechanism			
1.2.1 Establish “Guidelines on the establishment of commodity or pest-specific standards”	Ongoing	Medium	ICPM
1.3 Ensure that ISPMs take account of the protection of the environment			
1.3.1 Establish a mechanism to review standards to ensure they take account of the protection of the environment	Ongoing	High	ICPM, Bureau and Secretariat
1.4 Increase transparency and participation in the standard-setting process			
1.4.2 Develop efficient information sharing systems concerning standard-setting activities and procedures	Ongoing	Medium	ICPM and Secretariat
1.5 Facilitate the implementation of standards			
1.5.1 Establish explanatory documents corresponding to ISPMs if needed	Ongoing	Medium	SC

1.5.2 Investigate the feasibility of including implementation programs in the standard setting process	2004	Medium	ICPM
1.5.3 Encourage RPPOs to assist their members in the implementation of ISPMs	Ongoing	Medium	ICPM

Strategic direction No. 2: Information exchange

This strategic direction covers members and the IPPC Secretariat's obligations to provide information as specified in the IPPC and information exchange that may be specified by the ICPM or in ISPMs, including such information as pest lists, pest reports, and phytosanitary measures. Information exchange activities ensure that members communicate officially on phytosanitary regulations and other issues of phytosanitary significance, and determine the means by which the IPPC Secretariat makes them available to other members.

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
2.1 Establish procedures for pest reporting and information exchange			
2.1.1 Promote increased access and use of electronic communication/Internet	Ongoing	Medium	Secretariat
2.1.2 Develop the IPP for provision of official information by countries	2004	High	Secretariat
2.1.3 Establish systems to identify sources of information on pests	2004	Medium	Working group

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

This relates to the non-binding dispute settlement provisions contained in Article XIII of the IPPC (1997). The ICPM is charged to develop rules and procedures for dispute settlement under the IPPC. The Convention explicitly recognizes the complimentary role of the IPPC in this area given the formal binding dispute settlement process that exists under the WTO.

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
3.1 Increase awareness of dispute settlement mechanism			
3.1.1 Develop information material concerning the requirements for effective preparation of a dispute settlement	2004	Medium	Subsidiary body
3.2 Provide supporting information on IPPC and other dispute settlement systems			
3.2.1 Establish an inventory of other dispute settlement systems	2004	Medium	Subsidiary body
3.2.2 Provide rulings/precedents from dispute settlements (e.g. WTO)	2004	Medium	Subsidiary body

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

Article XX in the IPPC (1997) requires members to promote the provision of technical assistance especially to developing contracting parties, either bilaterally or through appropriate international organizations with the purpose of facilitating implementation of the IPPC. Adequate capacity and infrastructure for all Members are critical to accomplish the IPPC's goals.

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
4.1 Develop and maintain methods and tools for individual countries to evaluate their phytosanitary capacity as well as their needs and demands for technical assistance			
4.1.1 Maintain and update Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE)	Ongoing	Medium	SPTA and Secretariat
4.1.2 Promote use of the PCE	Ongoing	Medium	Secretariat and Bureau
4.1.3 Identify and develop additional technical assistance tools	Ongoing	Medium	SPTA and Secretariat
4.2 Promote technical cooperation to support the working programme of the ICPM			
4.2.1 Organize a minimum of four workshops per year to improve the understanding of the draft standards and promote the implementation of existing standards.	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
4.2.2 Increase assistance for the establishment, revision and updating of national legislation	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
4.2.3 Provide legal advice on phytosanitary legal and associated institutional issues to the ICPM	In process	High	Secretariat
4.2.4 Establish a process to identify and rank priorities for the ICPM's activities in technical assistance	2004	Medium	ICPM
4.3 Assist members obtain technical assistance from donors.			
4.3 Provide information to help Members obtain technical assistance from donors	2004	High	Bureau and Secretariat
4.4 Promote the improvement and development of RPPOs			
4.4.1 Develop a policy on the roles and functions of the RPPOs in relation to the IPPC.	2004	High	ICPM
4.4.2 Assist RPPOs in the establishment of information systems	Ongoing	Medium	Members and the Secretariat
4.5 Increase the participation by developing countries in IPPC activities			
4.5.1 Work to ensure that funds are contributed to the Special Trust Fund to support developing country involvement	Ongoing	High	Secretariat and ICPM
4.5.2 Facilitate the attendance of developing countries at SPTA, expert working groups and other ICPM meetings.	Ongoing	High	Secretariat

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

To function effectively, the ICPM must establish organizational structures and procedures, identify funding mechanisms, and address various support and administrative functions, including internal review and evaluation mechanisms. This strategic direction is to make provision for the ICPM to address its administrative issues and strategies, making continual improvement to ensure its business practices are effective and efficient.

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
5.1 Provision of an adequate budget for IPPC activities			
5.1.1 Establish strategies for increasing resources available to the IPPC	2004	High	ICPM, Bureau, Secretariat
5.1.2 Provide a transparent budget	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
5.1.3 Establish costing of Strategic Directions in Strategic Plan	2003	High	Secretariat
5.1.4 Identify the relationship of the IPPC Secretariat in the context of FAO	Ongoing	Low	ICPM
5.1.5 Increase Secretariat capacity through the use of FAO resources	Ongoing	High	ICPM, Bureau and Members
5.2 Implement planning, reporting and review mechanisms			
5.2.1 Review business plan annually	Ongoing	High	Bureau and Secretariat
5.2.2 Update strategic plan and operational programme annually	Ongoing	High	SPTA and ICPM
5.2.3 Report on activities of the Secretariat, including reporting by Secretariat on the implementation of the strategic plan	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
5.2.4 Establish procedures to identify issues where common action of the ICPM required	Ongoing	Low	ICPM

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

This strategy direction recognizes the need to communicate IPPC issues, obligations, processes and interests to all concerned, including other bodies with similar or overlapping interests, and to encourage RPPOs to promote regionally the implementation of the IPPC.

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
6.1 Promote the IPPC			
6.1.1 Encourage Members to deposit their instrument of acceptance for the New Revised Text (IPPC, 1997)	Ongoing	High	Members and Secretariat
6.1.2 Encourage non-contracting parties to adopt the IPPC	Ongoing	High	Members and Secretariat
6.1.3 Communicate IPPC issues, obligations, processes and interests to all concerned, including other bodies with similar or overlapping interests	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
6.1.4 Request RPPOs to promote regionally the implementation of the IPPC	Ongoing	High	ICPM
6.2 Strengthen cooperation with other international organizations			
6.2.1 Establish relations, identify areas of common interest, and where appropriate, develop coordinated activities and joint programmes with other relevant organizations including the CBD, OIE, Codex and WTO	Ongoing	High	Secretariat and Bureau
6.2.2 Strengthen cooperation and coordination with relevant organizations on technical assistance	Ongoing	Medium	ICPM and Secretariat
6.2.3 Develop a policy for linkages with research and education institutions.	2004	High	ICPM
6.3 Develop a plan of action for the provision of scientific and technical support for the IPPC			
6.3.1 Develop a plan of action for the provision of scientific and technical support for IPPC implementation	Ongoing	Medium	Bureau