



Commission on Phytosanitary Measures

Report of the CPM Bureau Meeting

7-8 October 2010
Rome, Italy

REPORT OF THE BUREAU MEETING 7-8 OCTOBER 2010

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

The meeting was opened by the Chairperson of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) and the Bureau, Mr. Mohammed Katbeh-Bader (Jordan). He welcomed Bureau members to the meeting and looked forward to a fruitful meeting. See Appendix 6 for the participants list.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted as presented in Appendix 1, with the addition of an item under other business on the use of the IPPC logo that was carried over from the meeting (4-6 October 2010) of the Informal Open-End Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) and an item added on the IPPC trust fund.

3. HOUSEKEEPING

Nothing to report.

4. REPORT OF LAST MEETING

The Bureau officially adopted the report of the previous Bureau meeting (June 2010).

5. SECRETARIAT'S REPORT

The Secretariat provided an overview of their activities since the last Bureau meeting.

6. GOAL 1 – A ROBUST INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SETTING AND IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMME

6.1 Improvements for the development and approval of diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments under the special standard setting process

This item had already been presented to the SPTA. The SPTA had reviewed this proposal and recommended to keep both diagnostic protocols (DPs) and phytosanitary treatments as ISPMs, in addition the SPTA had recommended that in addition to having draft DPs posted publically on the IPP after the SC approved them for member consultation, they agreed to have the draft DPs posted publically on the IPP to seek input from experts in the early stages of development.

7. GOAL 2 - INFORMATION EXCHANGE SYSTEMS APPROPRIATE TO MEET IPPC OBLIGATIONS

7.1 Reporting within the IPPC framework

The Secretariat reported that the working paper for this agenda item was a draft document and therefore had not been posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) website. At this stage the Secretariat was only seeking informal feedback from the Bureau.

At its last meeting, the Bureau had discussed the issue of pest reporting and various suggestions were made for improving pest reporting. However, the Secretariat thought it would be timely to review all International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) reporting arrangements and not only those for pest reporting. The working paper had been drafted with this broader review of reporting arrangements in mind. The issues raised in the paper mainly related to interpretation of the standards and the IPPC convention itself. The Secretariat proposed that this paper be finalized following the Bureau meeting and presented to CPM. The Secretariat suggested focusing on reporting on in this broader context, as this was core to the IPPC.

The Secretariat asked the Bureau to agree that two papers on reporting be submitted by the Secretariat to CPM for its consideration: one paper on pest reporting and one on reporting more broadly that would be based on the working paper for this agenda item. However, the Bureau commented that it had not been provided sufficient time to digest the working paper and it was therefore difficult to make a decision. The Secretariat asked the Bureau to provide comments on the working paper by the end of October 2010. The Bureau agreed that Bureau members could make their comments using the on-line forum space in the restricted work area provided for the Bureau on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP).

8. GOAL 3 - EFFECTIVE DISPUTE SETTLEMENT SYSTEMS

8.1 Update

The Secretariat reported that a dispute on 03 June 2010 had been initiated and was ongoing under the IPPC's dispute settlement mechanism. It was hoped parties would soon be meeting to discuss the next steps. As soon as parties agreed the information would be made public, this would be communicated.

9. GOAL 4 - IMPROVED PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY OF MEMBERS

9.1 Expert Working Group on Capacity Development

The Bureau noted that this agenda item had already been reported to the SPTA earlier in the week. The Secretariat explained that item four of the Bureau working paper included a short list of anticipated outcomes from the Expert Working Group on Capacity Building (EWG CB) meeting. Some of the experts nominated to participate in the meeting were interested in producing papers and were working with the Secretariat to do this prior to the meeting. The Secretariat was pleased with the level of interest and the contact it had had with the experts it had chosen.

The Secretariat reported that an updated capacity building operational plan would be presented to CPM-7 (2012), since the proposal needs to be reviewed by the SPTA. The report of the EWG CB 2010 would be provided to contracting parties as a work in progress at CPM- 6 and the Secretariat would ask for comments from contracting parties.

The Secretariat noted that an operational plan will be difficult to develop without any resources and therefore sought the Bureau's opinion on whether to delay the operational plan for a year. The Bureau noted that it had left money in the budget for a meeting on capacity development in 2011 and therefore made a decision that another working group meeting should be held in 2011.

The Bureau noted that there would be a change in the role and status of the SPTA to make it more strategic. The Technical assistance component of SPTA should be removed if the creation of a new subsidiary body for capacity building was created. One Bureau member suggested asking the EWG CB to analyze the links between the current EWG CB and the Strategic Planning & Technical Assistance Group (SPTA) and the possible relationship with the proposed new subsidiary body.

10. GOAL 5 - SUSTAINABLE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IPPC

10.1 CPM

The Bureau decided that CPM-6 would be a five day meeting. It would consist of eight sessions, starting on Monday afternoon with one session, continuing with two sessions on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday and finishing with one session on Friday afternoon. The current budget allotment would not allow for any evening sessions and some Bureau members felt this may adversely affect the adoption of ISPMs.

The Bureau agreed to make its comments on CPM documents online using Google Docs, as had been done last year. Mr Ashby and Mr Katbeh-Bader agreed to come to Rome in early December to review drafts of CPM documents prepared by the Secretariat. The Secretariat said that it would email Bureau members with further details.

The Secretariat said that it would be helpful if any suggestions for ministers to attend CPM-6 would come by the end of November 2010 as ministerial attendance would need to be organized through the FAO official channels, which normally takes several months.

Topics for CPM 6 science sessions

The Bureau agreed on the following two topics and a backup topic for the science session at CPM 6:

- the risk of selling seeds through the internet
- climatic change – case study on a wood pests (Brian Zak)
- presentation on the relationship between food security and plant protection (backup topic – world food program or grain).

The Bureau decided to keep the whole science session to 1 1/2 hours.

10.1.1 How to deal with large volume of comments

This item was postponed to a the later meeting in order to complete other priority issues.

10.2 Work Plans and budgeting

10.2.1 Work plan and budget for 2010

The Secretariat reported that in 2010 over USD 100,000 had been spent on temporary administrative staff as the Secretariat had only one G3 permanent administrative staff.

Out of the seven goals, the ones which were overspent include: Standards setting (Goal 1), mainly for the SC meetings; Capacity building (Goal 4), slightly; and, CPM 5 (Goal 5). Information exchange (Goal 2) was slightly under spent, Dispute settlement (Goal 3) was as budgeted as was Cooperation with other organizations (Goal 6). There had been savings on Review the status of plant protection in the world (Goal 7) as the meeting planned on electronic certification (eCertification) had been deferred to 2011. There had also been an increase in charges from FAO. There was less income than in previous years for providing advice on other FAO projects. See Appendix 2.

One member queried why the SC was overspent. The Secretariat said that it depended on where the SC members came from (how far away from Rome they were) and whether FAO needed to pay for their travel. In addition, the Secretariat had paid for some of the “in-kind contribution” staff to travel to the meeting from various countries.

10.2.2 Work plan and budget for 2011

The Secretariat reported that the projected income from the FAO regular programme for 2011 was USD 3.8 million including USD 1.22 million from all trust funds – see Appendix 3.

Staff costs were projected to substantially increase as vacant positions are filled. Under Standards Setting, the Secretariat had increased the projected costs for the SC to match the level overspent in 2010.

The Bureau reviewed the budget and made various changes, including some drastic cuts such as:

- *Cancel* all TPs in 2011 and continue only with TPPT wood packaging treatments by email and the fruit fly meeting of the TPF which is paid for by IAEA.
- *Cancel* both full SC meetings for 2011 and have the SC-7 meet in place of the SC in May 2011 and in November 2011 and also maintain the regular SC-7 meeting in May 2011. One SC meeting normally costs approximately \$130 000 with interpretation and one SC-7 meeting costs approximately \$10,000.
- Adding a new line to differentiate between the IPPC Trust Fund (\$10,000 USD) and other Trust Funds (\$25,000 USD).
- *Cancelling* the CPM 6 cocktail
- *Cancelling* evening sessions at CPM 6
- Consultant funding *cut* by 70 000 for standards setting.

The Bureau decided to send a letter to all contracting parties and permanent representatives advising of the cuts that are needed and stating the cost of reinstating certain activities. The deadline for providing a response by mid-November 2010. The general message would be that cuts are necessarily drastic but some things could be reinstated if extra budgetary funding is provided.

The Bureau noted that continuing standard setting work with only the SC-7 meeting in 2011 would still take a similar amount of preparation by Secretariat staff as compared to a full SC meeting. There would also be increased Secretariat time spent on working virtually with the SC and TPs with the continuation of work via the special process and electronic work in the absence of meetings. The Bureau agreed that most technical panels would need to be cancelled in 2011 regardless of whether additional funding was received, as there were limited Secretariat staff resources and no funding was allocated to employ consultants to undertake the large volume of tracking and preparation required for these meetings.

One Bureau member noted that making these immediate cuts was only a short term solution and that a long term solution needed to be made. The IPPC would need to have a plan that was commensurate with the amount of work needed to deliver the work programme.

The IPPC was thinking of hiring a consultant to draft (in consultation with FAO Legal Services Office) a supplementary agreement on a voluntary funding mechanism for the IPPC. It could also be possible to build in several ways to contribute, depending on what the contributor's interests were (e.g. standards setting, capacity development etc). The agreement would be voluntary to sign but then once signed, contributions would be mandatory. One Bureau member recalled that something similar had been tried in the past and that some contracting parties had blocked it but the Bureau agreed that it was again time to push this issue as there were few alternatives to address this urgent issue and support for the work of the IPPC was needed or some of the activities would have to be stopped.

The Secretariat asked whether activities that had been cut should no longer be shown in the budget or left in for the rest of the biennium. The Bureau chose to leave these in.

10.2.3 Work Plans and projected budget 2012-13

The Secretariat introduced a projected budget for 2012 and 2013 and explained that, according to the projected figures, the Secretariat would need to raise at least USD 3 million to meet a budget projected to cover all staff and operational costs for 2012-2013. See Appendix 4.

The projected figures for 2012-2013 were presented to Bureau under the categories of fully costed and reduced figures showing cuts that would be needed for the Secretariat to remain within the current budget provided by the FAO regular programme and projected trust funds. This paper was targeted towards demonstrating to contracting parties what funding it would take to return to a full work programme.

Some increased costs projected for 2012-2013 included:

- an increase in staff costs as two extra P2 officers had been included
- full Russian translation costs.

The Bureau agreed with the Secretariat's suggestion that in future staff costs be presented as percentages of full time persons allocated per project. One Bureau member disagreed with the Secretariat's suggestion to only present a summary of the projected budget to CPM and preferred that more detail be presented to CPM. The Bureau agreed that CPM should be presented with two lists of activities, one that could be completed with the current budget and another that could be completed if additional extra budgetary funding was provided.

10.2.4 IPPC Trust fund budget for 2011

The Secretariat reported that USD 175 000 would be carried over from 2010.

One Bureau member asked to see details for the IPPC Trust Fund for 2010 to understand how calculations had been made for the amount to be carried forward to 2011. However, the Secretariat explained that these were estimates and it was not yet able to provide details as the final FAO figures would not be available until early next year.

10.3 Activities that can be undertaken remotely

This agenda item was follow-up to the previous Bureau meeting in June 2010, in which the Bureau asked the Secretariat provide a list of tasks that could be completed by remote staff provided as in-kind contributions to the Secretariat. The Secretariat continues to develop a list of such tasks noting that it was difficult to separate out core activities of the Secretariat into one off tasks that can be taken up remotely.

10.4 Expert Working Group on Resource Mobilisation

The Secretary reported that there had been a very poor response to the Secretariat's call earlier in 2010 for experts to attend a meeting on resource mobilization. He asked the Bureau for advice on what to do next and whether to agree on a new time or cancel the meeting. The Secretary said that if a meeting was held in February 2010, outcomes could not be reported to contracting parties by the time of CPM 6.

The Bureau agreed to cancel the meeting on resource mobilisation. One Bureau member emphasized that it was important that the Secretariat had completed some substantive work on resource mobilisation by early 2011 and could report on this by CPM 6.

The Bureau reiterated the importance of involving new people that had experience in resource mobilisation and obtaining funding. This should include people that had been successful in mobilizing resources in an organizations like the IPPC, people from development banks and perhaps also from private industry.

The Secretary commented that people involved in development work were experienced at seeking funding for development activities, but that it was more difficult to identify those that had been successful at seeking funding for standards setting and international normative work. One Bureau member thought it still feasible to ask for funding to support standards setting as all plant protection systems were underpinned by standards. The Secretariat said that some donors may consider 34 standards to already be enough and therefore consider that money is better spent on implementing the standards than developing new ones.

One Bureau member commented that the ultimate beneficiaries of IPPC standards were mostly consumers and retailers that benefited from plant products produced without pests. Therefore retail bodies could potentially provide assistance. Another Bureau member noted that there was also a link to food security issues.

10.5 TIMING OF CALLS

The Secretariat noted that there had been a very low response to calls during 2010. The Secretariat explained that the working paper for this agenda item addressed a concern recently expressed by some contracting parties that the timing of calls made by the Secretariat in 2010 was not appropriate due to vacation periods. However the Secretariat explained that, as had always been the case, it needed to fit in with other organizations and it was also difficult to organize around various holiday periods for all regions.

The Secretariat asked the Bureau for advice on how not to overload contact points with information. The Secretariat expected to be releasing more information and sending it to contact points. Some Bureau members commented that many NPPO Contact Points were also understaffed and overloaded with work.

Bureau asked the Secretariat to provide CPM with an indicative list of calls that were anticipated for the year ahead, but also acknowledged that not all calls could be anticipated.

The Bureau encouraged contracting parties to establish generic email addresses for their contact points and asked Secretariat to add additional fields for contact points to add additional email addresses so that the emails could be sent to more than one recipient.

11. GOAL 6 - INTERNATIONAL PROMOTION OF THE IPPC AND COOPERATION WITH RELEVANT REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

11.1 Progress on the development of advocacy material

The Secretariat reported that there had been progress on developing a glossy brochure on the IPPC. It had also begun development of a brochure for standards setting and was accumulating some case studies to use for other advocacy purposes. Once completed, these materials would all be free for downloading and distribution from the IPP. The Secretariat also planned to release one news item per week so that the IPPC maintained a constant presence. It also planned to generate a series of wall posters and some advocacy material on sea containers (posters, fliers and electronic material), however this would be expensive and a lot of time was needed to develop a communications plan for sea containers.

One Bureau member asked how the posters would be distributed and where and wanted to be sure the posters would be used and widely viewed. The Secretariat replied that these were the sort of posters that could be taken to meetings and displayed around the world.

12. GOAL 7 – REVIEW THE STATUS OF PLANT PROTECTION IN THE WORLD

12.1 eCert

This was discussed by the SPTA. Some SPTA participants felt that work on electronic certification was important and would help increase the profile of the IPPC.

12.2 IRSS

The Secretariat reported that information was being gathered to establish the Implementation, Review and Support System (IRSS), but that not a lot of progress had yet been made. Contracting parties needed to be convinced to provide information for the IRSS system and it would be important for the Bureau members

to act as ambassadors to encourage contracting parties to provide information. The Secretariat mentioned that some promotional and advocacy material may be developed for the IRSS.

13. REVIEW OF CALENDAR 2009-2010 TO DETERMINE BUREAU PARTICIPATION

Mr Ashby (UK) advised that he would not be attending the November 2010 Standards Committee meeting since two other Bureau members were already attending.

14. OTHER BUSINESS

14.1 Use of the IPPC logo

The Secretariat reported that there were currently no rules about how NPPOs and other international organizations use the IPPC logo and therefore its proposal was to add more information to the existing procedures on the IPPC logo. The Secretariat proposed that the paper on the use of the IPPC logo to be submitted to CPM for approval and then be incorporated into the IPPC procedural manual. While the Secretariat had wanted to be liberal with the use of the logo, it was still conscious of the issue of branding and quality control. The Secretariat asked the Bureau for advice on whether to be more specific than stating “that clearance depended on content and purpose”.

The Bureau did not think it possible to be more specific and agreed that documents should be reviewed by the Secretariat on a case by case basis to see if the IPPC accepted them and if they were accepted, add the logo. One Bureau member said that if there was material cut and pasted directly from the IPPC, the IPPC logo could be used, but if the material was written nationally this should not be attributed to the IPPC logo.

The Bureau agreed that if the logo was used the words “International Plant Protection Convention” would need to be included so that it could be clearly identified as belonging to the IPPC. See Appendix 5.

14.2 Paying for articles about the IPPC

The Secretariat sought the Bureau’s permission to decide to pay for research articles to be written about the IPPC in various publications (e.g. in a paper in the G20 summit that would be produced by the G20 Research Group and cost \$5000 USD per page). This Bureau granted permission, provided that the Secretariat was conscious that these articles needed to be high profile and not buried in the back of the document. They acknowledged that it was important to advocacy for the IPPC.

14.3 Implementation of ISPM 15

This issue was not discussed as the report from the legal consultant had not yet been finalized.

14.4 Communication with the Bureau

The Bureau asked the Secretariat to provide it with more frequent updates and information between meetings. The Secretariat undertook to do this using the forum established for the Bureau on the IPP and also encouraged Bureau members to feedback information from their regions through this forum.

15. NEXT MEETING

The Bureau decided to have its next meeting on the Thursday and Friday directly before CPM 6 (10 and 11 March 2011).

15.1 Evaluation of the Bureau and SPTA meetings

The Chairperson of the SPTA (Mr Ashby) said that it would have been helpful to have some discussion with the Secretariat and the Bureau prior to the SPTA meeting in order to plan the SPTA better in the future. The Bureau decided to have its next October meeting on the days before and after the SPTA meeting (e.g. Bureau on Monday, SPTA on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday and Bureau again on Friday).

15.2 Having CPM outside of Rome

The Secretariat said that it was in the Convention to have an annual CPM meeting. However, the Secretariat sought feedback from the Bureau on some possible options for hosting the meeting in locations outside of Rome every second year. Countries would need to come forward to indicate their willingness to host the CPM. The Secretariat did not think that this would save money for the IPPC but did think it would have benefits for raising awareness and advocacy for the IPPC. The Bureau agreed in principle that this idea could be investigated.

16. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Secretary thanked all Bureau members for their contributions and positive attitudes. In particular, he thanked the Chairperson. The Chairperson closed the meeting thanking the Secretariat for all their efforts and he also thanked the Bureau members for their work and encouraged them to continue their advocacy for the IPPC.

Appendix 1

AGENDA

Agenda item	Document No
1. Opening of the meeting	
2. Adoption of the agenda	Bureau10_2010/01
3. Housekeeping	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Documents list</i> • <i>Participants list</i> • <i>Local information</i> 	Bureau10_2010/03 Bureau10_2010/04 Bureau10_2010/05
4. Report of last meeting	Posted on IPP
5. Secretariat's Report	SPTA2010/07
6. Goal 1 – A robust international standard setting and implementation programme	
6.1 Improvements for the development and approval of diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments under the special standard setting process	Bureau10_2010/06
7. Goal 2 - Information exchange systems appropriate to meet IPPC obligations	
7.1 Reporting within the IPPC framework	Bureau10_2010/11
8. Goal 3 - Effective dispute settlement systems	
8.1 Update	No Paper
9. Goal 4 - Improved phytosanitary capacity of members	
9.1 Expert Working Group on Capacity Development	Bureau10_2010/12
10. Goal 5 - Sustainable implementation of the IPPC	
10.1 CPM	
10.1.1 How to deal with large volume of comments	
10.2 Work Plans	
10.2.1 Work plan 2010	Bureau10_2010/08
10.2.2 Work plan 2011	Bureau10_2010/09
10.2.1 Work Plans 2012-13	Bureau10_2010/10
10.3 Activities that can be undertaken remotely	No Paper
10.4 Expert Working Group on Resource Mobilization	No Paper
10.5 Timing of calls	Bureau10_2010/02
11. Goal 6 - International promotion of the IPPC and cooperation with relevant regional and international organizations	
11.1 Progress on the development of advocacy material.	No Paper
12. Goal 7 – Review the status of plant protection in the world	
12.1 e-Cert	No Paper
12.2 IRSS	Bureau10_2010/07
13. Review of calendar 2009-2010 to determine Bureau participation	
14. Other business	

Agenda item	Document No
14.1 Implementation of ISPM 15	No Paper
15. Next meeting	

Appendix 2

2010 BUDGET AFTER BUREAU REVIEW		
(OCTOBER 2010)		
CATEGORY		USD
Income		3,556,038
Regular Programme	2,631,586	
All Trust Funds	924,452	
Expenditure		3,672,553
Staff	1,941,355	
Operating	1,731,198	
Balance		(116,515)
Goal 1: A robust international standard setting and implementation programme		
2 meetings of the Standards Committee (SC)		97,856
20 sessions of the SC will be interpreted		132,000
5 Technical Panels (TP)		29,080
2 Expert Working Group meetings		9,160
Consultants will be contracted		165,751
Consultant study on ISPM 15 symbol		3,000
TOTAL		436,847
Goal 2: Information exchange systems appropriate to meet IPPC obligations		
National/sub-regional capacity building workshops		17,949
IPP Information Exchange manual		10,000
Hardware and software for the IPP		20,180
Staff to maintain and develop the IPP		31,870

TOTAL	79,999
Goal 3: Effective dispute settlement systems	
A brochure on the IPPC dispute settlement process	5,000
One dispute activity	15,000
TOTAL	20,000
Goal 4: Improved phytosanitary capacity of members	
PCE tool	3,500
One train the trainers PCE workshop	5,000
Regional Workshop	72,500
5 Project formulation missions	16,223
OEWG phytosanitary capacity building	25,000
Costs associated with various CD projects	44,318
TOTAL	122,223
Goal 5: Sustainable implementation of the IPPC - CPM	
CPM	
Participants from developing countries	236,909
Translation of all CPM-5 documents and ISPMs and printing	215,566
CPM-5 will be interpreted into languages	102,300
General operating costs and temporary help	56,700
Travel for FAO Regional Officers to attend CPM	34,728
SUB-TOTAL	646,203
Secretariat	
General Operating Costs FAO back charges	49,522

A Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) tool will be revised and updated	8,000
Online Comment System (OCS) will be developed and implemented	100,000
Translation of non-CPM documents	24,978
DPs developed in English and translated into other languages upon request	10,000
Bureau travel	20,000
FAO Project Servicing Costs (PSC) for administration of the IPPC Trust Fund	10,000
General travel e.g. draft ISPMs workshops	17,349
Secretariat staff will be trained	3680
Secretary will visit donors	5674
Secretary will convene a meeting of experts to develop a resource mobilization strategy	10,000
Develop and populate an IPP database for contacts and consultants	10,000
Secretariat / Bureau: approach traditional and potential donors	10,000
SUB-TOTAL	279,203
TOTAL	925,406
Goal 6: International promotion of the IPPC and cooperation with relevant regional and international organizations	
Secretariat will update the Guide to the IPPC	15,000
A public relations consultant will be hired	15,000
Relevant meetings will be attended by the IPPC Secretariat or Bureau: international organizations	40,099
Relevant meetings will be attended by the IPPC Secretariat or Bureau: regional organizations	4,877
The Secretariat will coordinate and fund the first meeting of NEPPO	40,000
TC among RPPOs	1,617

2 meetings of RPPOs	10,250
TOTAL	126,843
Goal 7: Review of the status of plant protection in the world	
A scientific session will be organized for CPM-5	5,000
The “IPPC Help Desk” will be established	14,880
TOTAL	19,880

Appendix 3

2011 BUDGET AFTER BUREAU REVIEW		
(OCTOBER 2010)		
CATEGORY		USD
Income		3,851,586
Regular Programme	2,631,586	
All Trust Funds	1,220,000	
Expenditure		3,847,248
Staff	2,498,248	
Operating	1,349,500	
Balance		4,938
Goal 1: A robust international standard setting and implementation programme		
2 meetings of the Standards Committee (SC)		0
20 sessions of the SC will be interpreted		0
5 Technical Panels (TP)		0
2 Expert Working Group meetings		50,000
Consultants will be contracted		50,000
Consultant study on ISPM 15 symbol		0
TOTAL		100,000
Goal 2: Information exchange systems appropriate to meet IPPC obligations		
National/sub-regional capacity building workshops		20,000
IPP Information Exchange manual		

Hardware and software for the IPP	10,000
Staff to maintain and develop the IPP	
TOTAL	30,000
Goal 3: Effective dispute settlement systems	
SBDS meeting	5,000
One dispute activity	5,000
TOTAL	10,000
Goal 4: Improved phytosanitary capacity of members	
PCE tool	500
One train the trainers PCE workshop	0
Regional Workshop	0
5 Project formulation missions	30,000
OEWG phytosanitary capacity building	25,000
Costs associated with various CD projects	0
TOTAL	55,500
Goal 5: Sustainable implementation of the IPPC - CPM	
CPM	
Participants from developing countries	150,000
Translation of all CPM-5 documents and ISPMs and printing	280,000
CPM-5 will be interpreted into languages	92,000
General operating costs and temporary help	30,000
Travel for FAO Regional Officers to attend CPM	0
SUB-TOTAL	552,000

Secretariat	
General Operating Costs FAO back charges	60,000
A Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) tool will be revised and updated	0
Online Comment System (OCS) will be developed and implemented	0
Translation of non-CPM documents	25,000
DPs developed in English and translated into other languages upon request	0
Bureau travel	20,000
FAO Project Servicing Costs (PSC) for administration of the IPPC Trust Fund	35,000
General travel e.g. draft ISPMs workshops	0
Secretariat staff will be trained	0
Secretary will visit donors	50,000
Secretary will convene a meeting of experts to develop a resource mobilization strategy	0
Develop and populate an IPP database for contacts and consultants	0
Secretariat / Bureau: approach traditional and potential donors	15,000
SUB-TOTAL	205,000
TOTAL	757,000
Goal 6: International promotion of the IPPC and cooperation with relevant regional and international organizations	
Secretariat will update the Guide to the IPPC	0
A public relations consultant will be hired	70,000
Relevant meetings will be attended by the IPPC Secretariat or Bureau: international organizations	50,000
Relevant meetings will be attended by the IPPC Secretariat or Bureau: regional organizations	0

The Secretariat will coordinate and fund the first meeting of NEPPO	0
TC among RPPOs	5,000
2 meetings of RPPOs	0
TOTAL	125,000
Goal 7: Review of the status of plant protection in the world	
A scientific session will be organized for CPM-5	0
eCert meeting	45,000
The “IPPC Help Desk” / IRSS	367,000
TOTAL	412,000

Appendix 4

2012 - 2013 BUDGET PROJECTIONS		
(OCTOBER 2010)		
CATEGORY		USD
Income		3,770,000
Regular Programme	2,650,000	
All Trust Funds	1,120,000	
Expenditure		
Staff	2,177,000	
Operating	3,705,000	
Balance		(2,922,000)

Appendix 5

IPPC Policy for the use of the IPPC Logo

The following policy on the use of the IPPC logo applies:

- The IPPC logo can be used in/on *all materials* related to activities endorsed by the CPM or undertaken by the IPPC Secretariat.
- The IPPC logo can only be used in/on *training materials, seminar presentations, etc* where these are endorsed or supported by CPM or the IPPC Secretariat. This includes training activities within FAO.
- The IPPC logo could be used in/on *NPPO materials* related to activities endorsed by the CPM or undertaken by the IPPC Secretariat provided it is authorized by the IPPC Secretariat before publication/use. It should be made clear that the logo does not imply endorsement by the IPPC (e.g. with a footnote in the document).
- The IPPC logo could be used in/on materials generated through joint activities with relevant *international organizations* endorsed by the CPM or undertaken by the IPPC Secretariat provided it is authorized by the IPPC Secretariat before publication/use. It may be necessary to make it clear that the logo does not imply endorsement by the IPPC (e.g. with a footnote in the document).
- *RPPOs* should be allowed to use the IPPC logo on/in materials that have a direct relevance to IPPC. Where these materials produced by the RPPOs are not specifically endorsed by CPM or the IPPC Secretariat it should be made clear that the logo does not imply endorsement by the IPPC, (for example with a footnote in the document).
- The IPPC logo is not authorized for use on any *commercial products*.
- *Private consultants* are not authorized to use the logo unless undertaking an activity directly endorsed or supported by CPM or the IPPC Secretariat.
- *Speakers* at seminars, conferences and training courses should not use the logo in a way that implies they are speaking on behalf of the IPPC unless they have been specifically authorized to do so.

All other uses of the IPPC logo should be considered *by the Secretariat as whole* before usage and if appropriate refer this to the CPM Bureau for advise.

Table 1 provides specific examples and guidance regards the use of the IPPC logo.

Table 1. Examples of documents or activities and the use of the logo

Type of document or activity	Produced by	Status	Use IPPC logo?
IPPC advocacy material	IPPC Secretariat	Endorsed/authorized by Secretariat/CPM	Yes
NPPO advocacy material	NPPOs	Subject to clearance by the IPPC Secretariat	Possibly – depends on content and purpose
Commercial products	Commercial companies	Not endorsed by Secretariat/CPM	No
ISPMs, IPPC meeting reports etc	IPPC Secretariat	Endorsed/authorized by Secretariat/CPM	Yes
Procedures, standards, reports produced by RPPOs	RPPOs	Not endorsed by Secretariat/CPM	Yes, but qualified
Other international organizations to show consistency with IPPC	International organizations	Depends on specific use	Only if specific use is authorized by CPM or the Secretariat
Speakers/seminars/training courses authorized by IPPC	Individuals on behalf of IPPC	Endorsed/authorized by Secretariat/CPM	Yes
Providers of trainers not authorized by IPPC	Individuals/training organizations	Not authorized	No
Conferences/meetings where the IPPC provides some support	Not IPPC	Activity not endorsed/authorized by Secretariat/CPM	Yes – but qualified
Official training and resource materials	Individuals/organizations /member countries/commercial companies	Endorsed by Secretariat/CPM	Yes
Funding applications	Individuals/organizations	Not endorsed by Secretariat/CPM	No
Training material	Variety of sources, including FAO	Subject to clearance by the IPPC Secretariat	Yes, but qualified and prior authorization through the Secretariat

Appendix 6

PARTICIPANTS LIST

An (√) in column 1 indicates attendance at the meeting

√	Member: Chairperson	Mr. Mohammad KATBEH BADER Head of Phytosanitary Department Ministry of Agriculture P.O. Box 11732 Area code 662 Amman JORDAN Tel: (+962) 6 568 6151/795 895 691 Fax: (+962) 6 568 6310	katbehbader@moa.gov.jo	2 nd term / 2 years	2012	Near East/ Jordan
√	Member: Vice- Chairperson	Mr. Steve ASHBY Food and Environment research agency, Defra, Plant Health POLICY PROGRAMME Room 10GA07, FERA, SAND HUTTON, York, UK YO41 1LZ Phone 01904 465633	steve.ashby@Fera.gsi.gov.uk	2 nd term / 2 years	2012	Europe/ United Kingdom
√	Member: Vice- Chairperson	Ms. Kyu-Ock YIM National Plant Quarantine Service National Plant Quarantine Cooperation Division 433-1 Anyang-b dong, Manan- gu, Anyang City (430-016) Gyunggi-do Republic of Korea Tel: 82-31-420-7605 82-10-8752-3132 Fax: 82-31-420-7605	koyim@korea.kr	1 st term / 2 years	2012	Asia/ Republic of Korea
√	Member	Mr. John HEDLEY Principal Adviser International Coordination Biosecurity New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry P.O. Box 2526 Wellington NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0733 Tel: +234 805 9608494	john.hedley@maf.govt.nz	1 st term / 2 years	2012	Southwest Pacific/ New Zealand

	Member	Mr. John GREIFER Associate Deputy Administrator International Services, Animal Plant Health Inspection Service U.S. Department of Agriculture RM 1132 South Building, USDA 1400 Independence Ave. Washington, DC 20250 Tel.: 202-720-7677 Fax: 202-690-2861	john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov	1 st term / 2 years	2012	North America/ USA
√	Member	Mr. Arundel SAKALA National Coordinator Plant Quarantine and Phytosanitary Service Zambia Agriculture Research Institute Mount Makulu Research Station Private Bag 07 Chilanga ZAMBIA Tel: (+260) 1 278 141/278 130 Fax: (+260) 1 278141/2781 30	mwati1lango@yahoo.com ; pqpsmt@zamtel.zm	1 st term / 2 years	2012	Africa/ Zambia
√	Member	Mr. Francisco GUTIERREZ Director of Plant Health Plant Health Department Belize Agricultural Health Authority Central Farm, Cayo District BELIZE Tel: +501 824-4899 Mobile: +501 604-0319 Fax: +501 824-3773	frankpest@yahoo.com	2 nd term / 2 years	2012	Latin America and Caribbean/ Belize
√	IPPC Secretariat	Mr. Yukio YOKOI Secretary to the IPPC Mr. David Nowell Acting Coordinator Mr. Brent Larson Standards Setting Officer Ms Ana Peralta Implementation Officer Ms. Joanna Hamilton Agricultural Officer	yukoi.yokoi@fao.org dave.nowell@fao.org brent.larson@fao.org ana.peralta@fao.org joanna.hamilton@fao.org			