

REPORT OF THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE ICPM INFORMAL WORKING GROUP ON STRATEGIC PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

1. FUNDING AND BUDGET ISSUES

A. IPPC Budget Crisis

The Secretariat noted that a number of scheduled activities have been cancelled or postponed as a result of a serious shortfall in funding. In particular, the Secretariat, together with the Bureau of the ICPM, postponed three working groups for ISPMs; canceled a meeting to review the International Phytosanitary Portal; canceled Secretariat participation in various RPPO or WTO meetings (except where outside funding became available) and reduced the printing of new standards in “green book format”.

The Secretary informed the meeting on FAO procedures regarding budget processes for different programmes. The FAO Conference will meet next year and approve the budget for the next biennium (2004-2005) but the budget preparatory process has already started with meetings of the Programme and Finance Committees where the issue of IPPC funding had been raised. Discussions on the budget will also be on the agenda of the FAO Council that will meet this year. The SPTA agreed that it is important for FAO Members, through their Permanent Representations, to take a proactive role in the FAO Council to highlight both the importance of the IPPC and the urgent need for substantial increases in core funding for the IPPC work programme.

B. Strategies to increase FAO resources

Business plan (Carberry to submit amended draft to SPTA)

Mr Carberry introduced the draft Business Plan that was formulated by an ad hoc Focus Group convened at the request of the ICPM Bureau and the IPPC Secretariat. He explained that the purpose of formulating the business plan was to support the case to be made to FAO bodies regarding the need for additional funding for the IPPC. He noted that the business plan explains the role of the ICPM, the current situation for resources and the additional resources needed for a core work programme. Members of the SPTA agreed to present the draft to Council Members and FAO representatives from their countries and regions.

The SPTA agreed that the Business Plan is an important document and should be presented to as wide an audience as possible. The SPTA also indicated that the Business Plan should be amended to expand the Executive Summary to include more budgetary information. Mr Carberry agreed to amend the Business Plan accordingly. The SPTA agreed that the revised document should be presented to the ICPM for its information, and that it would also be made available on the IPP.

C. Financial reporting

In order to ensure maximum transparency in financial reporting, the SPTA suggested that budget and expenditures should follow the six strategic directions indicated the Strategic Plan. The meeting also agreed to make the expenditures on each strategic direction clear in the reporting system.

The meeting discussed whether the budget proposed by the Secretariat requires the approval of the ICPM. The budget of the IPPC provided by FAO would be submitted by the Bureau to the ICPM for its information, but did not require approval. However, if a Special Trust Fund was established, the budget of such a fund should be subject to the approval of the ICPM.

The Secretariat provided the meeting with a table for budgeting and reporting (see Appendix I).

D. Analysis of proposal for Special Trust Fund

The SPTA analyzed the benefits and costs of a Special Trust Fund in comparison to normal bilateral type trust funds that are administered by the Director General of FAO. Table 1 (Appendix II) represents the summary of the discussion taking into account the request of the ICPM for this analysis. It indicates that, in general, a Special Trust Fund that is under the direct control of the ICPM provides significant advantages for funding certain types of technical assistance activities (such as participation in the ICPM). The need for increasing the staff of the IPPC Secretariat before such a Special Trust Fund could be effectively managed was recognized.

2. STRATEGIC PLANNING

The meeting discussed the Strategic Plan that had been amended by the ad hoc Focus Group in July. The SPTA made additional changes which included updating the Strategic Plan based on what has already been accomplished by the ICPM. The meeting noted that the Secretariat should inform the ICPM of any major additions to the Strategic Plan, or important changes in the priorities of elements of the work programme arising from this meeting. The amended Strategic Plan is attached (Appendix III).

3. WORK PROGRAMME

A. Composition of working groups

The SPTA discussed the need to draft more formal procedures for the establishment of working groups. The Secretariat noted that any procedure for the establishment of such working groups must be flexible to deal with administrative contingencies taking account of:

- limited number of experts;
- limited availability of identified experts;
- difficulties with administrative invitation procedures;
- likelihood of last minute changes; and
- retaining the informal nature of the working groups.

The Secretariat explained that the primary criteria that have been applied so far in designating working group members include:

- subject matter expertise;
- wide geographic representation (including proportional developing country participation);
- availability of suitable experts to participate and contribute (e.g. discussion papers);
- a target of 6-10 participants; and
- allowing the host to participate regardless of group composition.

The SPTA agreed that certain criteria should be considered in the establishment of working groups:

1. Qualifications of experts:
 - Scientific expertise
 - Subject matter experience

- Experience in phytosanitary risk management
2. Proposed nomination process:
 - Specifications / nominations requested at time of adoption by ICPM or later when the specification are put on the IPP;
 - Nominations to the SC
 - SC submits list of prospective WG nominations to Bureau and Secretariat
 - Secretariat and Bureau make final selections—usually based on availability for the specified meeting date.
 3. Organization / Cost / Convenience—wherever possible experts from developed countries pay their own way. The meetings are organized at sites usually according to minimum costs (administrative, accommodation, travel).
 4. Observers: not allowed in WG (but they are allowed in the SC)
 - Representatives of industry or others may be invited by the working group to provide expertise but would not participate as members or ad hoc experts
 - Members of the Bureau or SC
 - Try to have someone from the SC in WG when possible (e.g. steward)
 - Representative of the Bureau may attend

B. IPPC liaison with research institutes

Mr Hedley discussed the possible need for greater cooperation between the ICPM and research institutions. The meeting noted that there were clear benefits that could be realized from such cooperation. It was suggested that an informal working group could develop an information package defining ICPM interests with respect to research in areas of phytosanitary concern that could be presented to interested parties. The SPTA suggested that the ICPM be informed of this proposal and, pending the approval of the ICPM, an ad hoc working group would be established to examine the issue in greater detail.

C. IPPC—CBD Joint Secretariat meeting

The outcome of the COP6 in relation to the IPPC was reviewed. It was noted that Decision 6/23 provided for a sectoral implementation of article 8(h) on alien invasive species. As a consequence, the Decision called for close cooperation between the CBD and IPPC. In decision 6/20, there was also a reference to cooperation with the CBD and its Cartagena Protocol.

The Secretariat informed the meeting that a Memorandum of Understanding between IPPC and CBD Secretariats would be finished by end of year. The CBD and IPPC have established a close collaborative relationship in recent years and are exploring means to further enhance this cooperation.

The Secretariat asked the SPTA for inputs on potential agenda items for a future joint consultation of the CBD and IPPC Secretariats. The agenda points included:

- Routine liaison and regular meetings of the Secretariats
- IPPC participation in the CBD reporting system
- Analysis of gaps in international instruments and how the IPPC should be involved (outside the IPPC, some work has been done, e.g., biosecurity), including the environmental aspects

- Developing possible programme for collaboration
 - research on invasive species and pathways
 - risk analysis procedures
 - harmonization of terminology
 - inventory of expertise
 - listing various types of procedures
 - training and technical assistance
- Identifying potential sources of funding

The SPTA requested the Secretariat to report to the next session of the ICPM.

D. PCE Implementation

Mr Jones presented a brief summary of the status of the implementation of the PCE. He explained that the PCE had been implemented in over 30 countries to date, largely included as part of FAO Technical Cooperation Projects (TCPs). The meeting noted that the PCE is a valuable tool for developing national strategic plans for phytosanitary capacity building, and that the PCE should be promoted as widely as possible. The Secretariat noted that the PCE would be presented in the upcoming SPS seminar on technical assistance as a possible model for developing national strategic plans for SPS disciplines (e.g. food safety, and animal and plant health). It was also suggested that Members should promote the PCE to donor countries and other agencies such as the World Bank.

E. IPP Implementation

Mr Nowell informed the meeting on the status of the IPP implementation. The IPP replaced the old IPPC website in August 2002. Since that time, some problems have arisen which are expected to be resolved in the near future. He noted that the IPP was using software developed for other purposes in the Organization which had resulted in a number of navigation problems that were being resolved now. Concerns were expressed about the IPP being linked to a complicated computer programme, and stressed the importance of keeping the IPP as simple as possible.

He also noted that this software had many features that were not necessary for the IPP. Concerning the information exchange system of the IPP, this was developed within the framework of the information system for food safety, animal and plant health. This approached information exchange in these fields in a systematic manner and provided resources that would otherwise not be available to the IPP. A small number of countries were working with the Secretariat to provide country information for the system. It was expected that the system would be fully functional and contain information from a limited number of countries by the time of the next ICPM.

F. Work programme priorities

The SPTA discussed priorities for the work programme for 2003 and 2004 considering the projected FAO core budget. The meeting also made note of additional priorities should additional funding become available (see Appendix IV). The SPTA agreed that a list of possible topics for standards should be generated. It was suggested that the Chair of the ICPM request topics from Members prior to the next Meeting of the ICPM noting that proposals should also include draft specifications. The SPTA also recommended that the Secretariat prepare a paper for the upcoming technical consultation of RPPOs that discusses the need and benefit of having such consultations, and the necessity of IPPC Secretariat participation. The SPTA noted that liaison with other organizations, including the SPS

Committee and CBD meetings (e.g. SBSTTA and COP) is an important component of the work programme.

Procedures for budget planning and reporting

- Step 1 April: ICPM establishes work programme priorities for the following year (e.g., in 2003 the ICPM will determine priorities for 2004) and is informed by the Secretariat of the current FAO budget (2003). The ICPM requested to adopt the proposed budget for any Trust Fund activities.
- Step 2 Costs for the future work programme (2004) are estimated by the Secretariat according to:
- core function costs based on the anticipated or known contribution of FAO (FAO Conference decision), plus
 - additional costs anticipated to meet the desired work programme.
- Step 3 October: The SPTA reviews the programme budget provided by the Secretariat (for 2004) and recommends adjustments as appropriate. The SPTA also recommends a new work programme for one year ahead (2005).
- Step 4 November/December: Bureau reviews recommendations of the SPTA (for 2005) for core FAO funding and Trust Funds, and agrees on a proposal to submit to the ICPM for its consideration (core FAO funding) or approval (Trust Funds)– return to Step 1.

Analysis of the benefits and costs of Special Trust Fund

ACTIVITY	STF	Bilateral (DG admin.)	Regular Programme
	More appropriate fund type?		
Developing country access	yes		limited
Training programme	yes	yes	possibly, limited
Regional workshop	yes		possibly, limited
Evaluating institutional and regulatory aspects of national systems (development of guidance—tool)	yes		limited
National plans	yes	yes	limited
Participation in standard setting	yes		limited
Secretariat in-service training	yes	yes	no
Development of new tools	yes		no
Different sources of funding	yes		n.a.
Continuity of funding	(1)	(1)	yes
Certainty of funding	(1)	(1)	yes
Transparency	(2)	(2)	yes
Independence	(2)	(2)	no
Effectiveness	(2)	(2)	no
Flexibility	(2)	(2)	limited
Political influence	no	yes	no
Management	(2)	(2)	n.a.

(1) In the case of certainty and continuity of funding, both a STF and bilateral funds are equally dependent on the level of interest and contributions.

(2) A special trust fund is more beneficial for the ICPM. A bilateral trust is more beneficial for the donor(s). However, in bilateral projects, the funding may be for a number of years and therefore more predictable than in a STF.

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 for Strategic Direction No. 1

- 1.1 Maintain an effective standard adoption system using the ICPM and SC
 - 1.1.1 Increase the number of standards to meet targets established in the ICPM work programme
 - 1.1.2 Develop specific standards where relevant concept standards are in place
 - 1.1.3 Develop concept standards where necessary for the preparation of specific standards in priority areas
 - 1.1.4 Request RPPO cooperation in the development of ISPMs
- 1.2 Improve the standard-setting mechanism
 - 1.2.1 Establish “Guidelines on the establishment of commodity or pest-specific standards”
- 1.3 Ensure that ISPMs take account of the protection of the environment
 - 1.3.1 Establish a mechanism to review standards with this in mind
- 1.4 Increase transparency and participation in the standard-setting process
 - 1.4.1 Increase the participation by developing countries in standard setting
 - 1.4.2 Develop efficient information sharing systems concerning standard-setting activities and procedures
- 1.5 Facilitate the implementation of standards
 - 1.5.1 Establish explanatory documents corresponding to ISPMs if needed
 - 1.5.2 Encourage RPPOs to assist their members in the implementation of ISPMs

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 for Strategic Direction No. 2

- 2.1 Establish procedures for pest reporting and information exchange
- 2.2 Promote increased access and use of electronic communication/Internet
- 2.3 Develop the IPP for provision of official information by countries
- 2.4 Establish systems to identify sources of information on pests

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 for Strategic Direction No. 3

- 3.1 Increase awareness of dispute settlement mechanism

- 3.1.1 Develop information material concerning the requirements for effective preparation of a dispute settlement
- 3.2 Provide supporting information on IPPC and other dispute settlement systems
 - 3.2.1 Establish an inventory of other dispute settlement systems
 - 3.2.2 Provide rulings/precedents from dispute settlements (e.g. WTO)
 - 3.2.3 Establish a regular ICPM agenda item for dispute settlement
 - 3.2.4

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 for Strategic Direction No. 4

- 4.1 Develop and maintain methods and tools for individual countries to evaluate and develop their phytosanitary capacity as well as their needs and demands for technical assistance
 - 4.1.1 Maintain and update Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE)
 - 4.1.2 Promote use of the PCE
 - 4.1.3 Identify and develop additional technical assistance tools
- 4.2 Promote technical assistance
 - 4.2.1 Increase the number of workshops and other activities to improve the understanding and application of international standards
 - 4.2.2 Increase assistance for the establishment, revision and updating of national legislation
 - 4.2.3 Establish a checklist on phytosanitary legal and associated institutional issues
 - 4.2.4 Establish a process to identify and rank priorities for the ICPM's activities in technical assistance
- 4.3 Provide information to help Members obtain technical assistance from donors
- 4.4 Promote the improvement and development of RPPOs
 - 4.4.1 Assist RPPOs in the establishment of information systems

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 for Strategic Direction No. 5

- 5.1 Establish planning, reporting and review mechanisms
 - 5.1.1 Provide a transparent budget
 - 5.1.2 Establish strategies for increasing resources available to the IPPC
 - 5.1.2 Increase Secretariat capacity through the use of FAO resources
 - 5.1.3 Review business plan annually
 - 5.1.4 Establish internal planning, review and evaluation mechanisms
 - 5.1.5 Report on activities of the Secretariat, including reporting by Secretariat on the implementation of the strategic plan
 - 5.1.6 Update strategic plan and operational programme annually
- 5.2 Identification of the relationship of the IPPC Secretariat in the context of FAO
- 5.3 Establish procedures to identify issues where common action of the ICPM is required

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 for Strategic Direction No. 6

- 6.1 Promote the IPPC
 - 6.1.1 Encourage Members to deposit their instrument of acceptance for the new revised text
 - 6.1.2 Encourage non-contracting parties to adopt the IPPC
 - 6.1.3 Communicate IPPC issues, obligations, processes and interests to all concerned, including other bodies with similar or overlapping interests
 - 6.1.4 Request RPPOs to promote regionally the implementation of the IPPC
- 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
 - 6.2.2 Strengthen cooperation and coordination with relevant organizations on technical assistance
- 6.3 Establish linkages with research and education institutions to identify 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

Tables indicating the timing, priorities and means for achieving goals recommended by the ICPM Technical Consultation on Strategic Planning.

Table 1. Strategic Direction No. 1: The development, adoption and monitoring of the implementation of international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs)

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
1.1 Maintain an effective standard adoption system using the ICPM and SC	Ongoing	High	SC and ICPM
1.1.1 Increasing the number of standards by improving the standard-setting mechanism	Ongoing	High	
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	
1.1.4 Request RPPO cooperation in the development of ISPMs	Ongoing	Low	SPWG
1.2 Improve the standard-setting mechanism			
1.2.1 Establish “Guidelines on the establishment of commodity or pest-specific standards”h	Ongoing	Medium	ICPM
1.2.3			
1.3 Ensure that ISPMs take account of the protection of the environment	Ongoing	High	ICPM, Bureau and Secretariat
1.3.1 Establish a mechanism to review standards with this in mind	Ongoing	High	ICPM, Bureau and Secretariat
1.4 Increase transparency and participation in the standard setting process	Ongoing	High	ICPM
1.4.1 Increase the participation by developing countries in standard setting	Ongoing	High	ICPM WG
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	2002	High	ICPM
1.5.1 Establish explanatory documents corresponding to ISPMs if needed	2003	Medium	SC
1.5.2 Encourage RPPOs to assist their members in the implementation of ISPMs	Ongoing	Medium	ICPM

Table 2. Strategic Direction No. 2: Information exchange

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
2.1 Establish procedures for pest reporting and information exchange	In process	High	SC
2.2 Promote increased access and use of electronic communication/Internet	Ongoing	Medium	Secretariat
2.3 Develop the IPP for provision of official information by countries,	2003	High	Secretariat
2.4 Establish systems to identify sources of information on pests	2004	Medium	Working group
2.4	In process	High	ISC

Table 3. Strategic Direction No. 3: Dispute settlement

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
3.1 Increase awareness of dispute settlement mechanism	Ongoing	Medium	Report to ICPM
3.1.1 Development of information material concerning the requirements for effective preparation of a dispute settlement	2004	Medium	Subsidiary body
3.2 Providing supporting information on IPPC and other dispute settlement systems	2004	Medium	Subsidiary body
3.2.1 Establishment of an inventory of other dispute settlement systems	2004	Medium	Subsidiary body
3.2.2 Providing rulings/precedents from dispute settlements (e.g. WTO)	2004	Medium	Subsidiary body
3.2.3 Establish a regular ICPM agenda item for dispute settlement mechanism	2003	Medium	ICPM

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

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	Ongoing	Medium	ICPM
4.1.1 Maintain and update Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE)	Ongoing	Medium	Secretariat and Members
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 assistance	Ongoing	High	ICPM and Bureau
4.2.1 Increase the number of workshops and other activities to improve the understanding and application of international standards	Ongoing	High	Regional workshops
4.2.2 Increase assistance for the establishment, revision and updating of national legislation	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
4.2.3 Establish a checklist on phytosanitary legal and associated institutional issues	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 Provide information to help Members obtain technical assistance from donors	2002	High	Bureau and Secretariat
4.5 Promote the improvement and development of RPPOs	Ongoing	Medium	Members and the Secretariat
4.5.1 Assistance to RPPOs to establish information systems	Ongoing	Medium	Members and the Secretariat

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

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
5.1 Establish planning, reporting and review mechanisms	2003	High	Secretariat
5.1.1 Provide a transparent budget	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
5.1.2 Establish strategies for increasing resources available to the IPPC	Ongoing	High	SPTA and ICPM
5.1.3 Increase Secretariat capacity through the use of FAO resources	Ongoing	High	ICPM, Bureau and Members
5.1.4 Review business plan annually	2002 and ongoing	High	Bureau and Secretariat
5.1.5 Establish internal planning, review and evaluation mechanisms	2003	High	Working Group
5.1.6 Report on activities of the Secretariat, including reporting by Secretariat on the implementation of the strategic plan	Ongoing	High	ICPM
5.1.7 Regular updating of strategic plan and operational programme	Ongoing	High	Working group
5.2 Identification of the relationship of the IPPC and its Secretariat in the context of FAO	Ongoing	Low	ICPM
5.3 Identification of other issues where common action of the ICPM required	Ongoing	Low	ICPM

Table 6. Strategic Direction No. 6: Promotion of IPPC and cooperation with other international bodies

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
6.1 Promote the IPPC	Ongoing	High	Members and Secretariat
6.1.1 Encourage Members to deposit their instrument of acceptance for the New Revised Text	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	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
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, WTO	Ongoing	High	Secretariat and Bureau
6.2.2 Strengthen cooperation and coordination with relevant organizations on technical assistance	Ongoing	Medium	ICPM and Secretariat
6.3 Establish linkages with research and education institutions to identify a plan of action for the provision of scientific and technical support for the IPPC	Ongoing	Medium	SPTA
6.3.1 Develop a plan of action for the provision of scientific and technical support for IPPC implementation	Ongoing	Medium	Bureau

WORK PROGRAMME PRIORITIES

	2003	2004
FAO CORE FUNDING	<p>ICPM-5</p> <p>Standards Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 WG - 1 SC <p>CBD-IPPC Secretariat meeting</p> <p>3 Working Groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Citrus canker (based on ICPM)** - Revision of ISPM 1 - Glossary Group (in connection with CBD / IPPC meeting) - PRA for RNQPs - <i>Inspection Methodology</i> - Specific standards <p>Liaison activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WTO-SPS Committee - CBD - RPPOs--TC (regular) <p>Strategic Planning</p> <p>Dispute Settlement Subsidiary body</p>	<p>ICPM-6</p> <p>Standards Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 WG - 1 SC <p>5 Working Groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Glossary Group - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 <p>Liaison activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WTO-SPS Committee - CBD - RPPOs--TC (regular) - <i>research</i> <p>Strategic Planning</p> <p>Information Exchange (assuming additional funding)</p> <p>Technical Assistance – PCE (assuming additional funding)</p> <p>Other—eg Dispute Settlement</p>
DESIRED (IF FUNDING BECOMES AVAILABLE)	<p>*Information Exchange Support Group</p> <p>Liaison activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research - RPPOs ▪ NAPPO ▪ EPPO ▪ IAPSC - Others (e.g. World Bank) <p>*Technical consultations on draft stds.</p> <p>Working Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low pest prevalence - Revision of ISPM 2 - Equivalence <p>IPP inputs</p>	<p><i>FOLLOWS BUSINESS PLAN</i></p> <p>Liaison activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research - RPPOs ▪ NAPPO ▪ EPPO ▪ IAPSC - Others (e.g. World Bank) <p>Technical consultations on draft stds.</p>

* These activities were regarded as high priority within the list of desired activities.

**Specifications for the remainder of the Citrus Canker standard are in preparation.